



CIVIL LAND USE PLANNING SURVEY

P 503.643.8286 F 844.715.4743 www.pd-grp.com
9020 SW Washington Square Rd Suite 170
Portland, Oregon 97223

June 7, 2022

Laurie Oliver Joseph
City of Scappoose
33568 E. Columbia Avenue
Scappoose, Oregon 97056

RE: Response to Completeness Review letter dated March 22, 2022 for Buxton Ranch Subdivision (SB1-22), Planned Development (ZC1-22), Conditional Use (CU1-22), and Sensitive Lands Development Permits (SLDP 1-22, 2-22, 3-22 and 4-22)
Pioneer Project No.: 359-004

Dear Laurie:

This letter is a response to the completeness letter described above. Either the response to each item is located within this letter or the response describes whether the narrative or plans have been revised to address the item.

General:

1. *The following items were not provided or could not be located:*
 - a) *FEMA approval of CLOMR application.*

RESPONSE: The FEMA CLOMR approval will be submitted once it is approved by FEMA.

- b) *Engineer's certifications required by SMC 17.84.250.A.1, 17.85.100.B.9.b, 17.86.080.B.9.d, and 17.89.100.B.9.b.*

RESPONSE:

- c) *DSL concurrence for the delineation of Wetlands A-D and the unnamed stream.*

RESPONSE: DSL concurrence was done in 2 stages for the site and the concurrence letter for the April 29, 2019 has been added to the letter dated September 26, 2019 which was in the submittal under the DSL Concurrence tab. Combined, the letters demonstrate concurrence for the entire site.

- d) *GeoPacific memo on rock walls in the floodplain. Pending the review of this memo, staff may have additional questions regarding how the velocity of floodwaters has been adequately considered in the design of the rock walls that will be within the 100-year floodplain. The Scappoose Creek can be much higher during storm events since the 100-yr, and even lesser storm events, can have higher intensities resulting in "flashy" runoff that can exceed the elevation of the 100-yr design storm event. This has already been mentioned during the*

community open house and should be considered during design of the retaining wall to prevent the backfill from becoming unstable, causing the wall to fail.

RESPONSE: The geotechnical engineer's memo regarding the structural suitability of the rockery walls takes into account rapid draw down of floodwaters and their recommendations are to establish larger boulders for the first course to ensure the wall will not be affected by scouring. In addition, the note that their final recommendations for walls as part of the engineering process will further evaluate potential flow velocities. As long as the project is constructed in accordance with the professional engineers' recommendations, the wall along the floodplain will be sound and not a hazard.

- e) As discussed during our last conversation with the consultant team, provide a turning movement exhibit for vehicles exiting the driveways on Lots 7 – 9, demonstrating that there is adequate and safe turning room provided with the current design and describe who would be responsible for the maintenance of the shared driveway.*

RESPONSE: A turning movement exhibit for vehicles exiting the driveways on Lots 7 through 9 has been provided with this resubmittal.

- f) Consult with SRFD (Scappoose Rural Fire District) regarding which lots must be sprinklered and provide a note on the plat to that effect. Provide evidence of the response you receive from SRFD. Incorporate this information into the narrative, as appropriate.*

RESPONSE: The applicant's representative emailed SRFD captains Pritcher and Bautista on May 12, 2022. A follow up email was sent to them on May 24, 2022. We received an inquiry email from Mr. Bautista on May 26th. We replied to Mr. Bautista the same day. On June 2, 2022, we sent an email reminder to SRFD. To date, we have not gotten a formal response to this question.

However, the applicants design meets fire code requirements. Should the Fire Department provide comment, we will work with them to address any concerns or ideas they have to improve access and safety.

- g) Please verify with SRFD if the fire truck turnaround that is part of the shared driveway on Lots 28 and 29 is allowed, and if allowed, provide an update to describe who would be responsible for maintenance. Provide evidence of the response you receive from SRFD.*

RESPONSE: The applicant's representative emailed SRFD captains Pritcher and Bautista on May 12, 2022. A follow up email was sent to them on May 24, 2022. We received an inquiry email from Mr. Bautista on May 26th. We replied to Mr. Bautista the same day. On June 2, 2022, we sent an email reminder to SRFD. To date, we have not gotten a formal response to this question.

However, the applicants design meets fire code requirements. Should the Fire Department provide comment, we will work with them to address any concerns or ideas they have to improve access and safety.

- h) Please verify with SRFD if the widths of the proposed flag lots on Lots 15, 16 and 22 are adequate for emergency responders. Provide evidence of the response you receive from SRFD.

RESPONSE: The applicant's representative emailed SRFD captains Pritcher and Bautista on May 12, 2022. A follow up email was sent to them on May 24, 2022. We received an inquiry email from Mr. Bautista on May 26th. We replied to Mr. Bautista the same day. On June 2, 2022, we sent an email reminder to SRFD. To date, we have not gotten a formal response to this question.

However, the applicants design meets fire code requirements. Should the Fire Department provide comment, we will work with them to address any concerns or ideas they have to improve access and safety.

- i) *Please verify with SRFD is the width of the private shared driveway is adequate for emergency responders and provide evidence of the response you receive.*

RESPONSE: The applicant's representative emailed SRFD captains Pritcher and Bautista on May 12, 2022. A follow up email was sent to them on May 24, 2022. We received an inquiry email from Mr. Bautista on May 26th. We replied to Mr. Bautista the same day. On June 2, 2022, we sent an email reminder to SRFD. To date, we have not gotten a formal response to this question.

However, the applicants design meets fire code requirements. Should the Fire Department provide comment, we will work with them to address any concerns or ideas they have to improve access and safety.

- j) *Please provide any additional questions asked and answers provided related to the Neighborhood Meeting.*

RESPONSE: All correspondence with questions and comments prior to and after the neighborhood meeting are included within the Neighborhood Meeting section of the application.

Narrative:

2. *The narrative discusses 4 wetlands but there are 6 wetlands identified on the plans. Please ensure you are addressing all wetlands and all impacts to the wetlands. Has there been any consideration to mitigate for the wetlands that seem to have a significant impact to the adjacent lots and utility access? These "wetlands" are a manifestation of water coursing down the sewer and storm utility trenches and would seem to be more beneficial as new or enhanced wetlands, adjacent to the creek. Please provide feedback on this approach.*

RESPONSE: The applicant's narrative has been updated to describe all 6 wetlands. The DSL concurrence was completed in 2 stages. Stage 1 included 4 of the wetlands on the west side of the site and Stage 2 included 2 wetlands on the east side of the site nearest South Scappoose Creek.

Regardless of the cause and or make up of a wetland, the applicant endeavors to preserve as many wetland features as possible. Wetlands create open spaces which in turn provide both visual aesthetics and privacy to the homes surrounding Tracts that preserve wetlands. Including neighboring properties. There are also local WQ functions provided by the wetlands where they form at base of steep slopes. Even though there is storm inflow to the wetlands, they are still a benefit locally for the watershed. Removing these wetlands and doing wetland mitigation along the creek would require impacts to floodplain and riparian functions in order to create (grade) conditions meeting wetland that would meet state and federal requirements. Having wetland areas adjacent to homes is beneficial vs impactful.

The utilities in question are existing City utilities located in areas crossing these wetlands. Preserving these wetlands is not altering conditions to be more or less impactful for access. The applicant will explore options with the City of Scappoose to remedy the concern related to future access for maintenance of the sanitary line.

3. Provide a response to SMC 17.01.060.

RESPONSE: The narrative has been updated to include a response to SMC 17.01.060.

4. Expand the response to SMC 17.22.040 to address criterion C. Reframe the response to criterion D; as currently written, the response is not consistent with the criterion.

RESPONSE: The response to SMC 17.22.040 has been expanded to provide more detail regarding criterion C. The response to Criterion D has been updated to address the criterion specifically.

5. Correct the average lot size figure in your response to SMC 17.44.050 and provide a response to SMC 17.44.030.

RESPONSE: The average lot size was corrected to reflect 4,917 square feet which is only a requested lot size reduction of 18%.

6. Expand the discussion of density in the response to SMC 17.81.040.A.

RESPONSE: An expanded discussion of density has been included within the narrative in regards to SMC 17.81.040.A

7. Update the response to SMC 17.81.050.A, which states that perimeter yards meet or exceed the required yard regulations of adjoining districts even though the Planned Development includes a request for reduced side and rear yards.

RESPONSE: The response to SMC 17.81.050.A has been updated to clarify perimeter yards will meet or exceed the required yard regulations of adjoining districts. The affected peripheral property lines include proposed lots adjoining existing R-1 properties on the north and west boundaries of the site.

8. *The response to SMC 17.81.050.C.3 discusses a density bonus of 104%, but the requested increase is 4%, not 104%.*

RESPONSE: The response has been updated to clarify its only a 4 percent increase from the base density permitted.

9. *Provide a response to SMC 17.81.080.C, criteria 10 through 13.*

RESPONSE: The initial findings were related to items 1 through 13 however we have expanded the findings to provide more detail.

10. *Consider duplicating the response to SMC 17.81.080.C.18 in the introduction.*

RESPONSE: The information in SMC 17.81.080.C.18 has been duplicated within the General Information and Project Description section at the beginning of the narrative to show clearly how the design was based on specific goals and existing site conditions. on site conditions.

11. *Provide a response to SMC 17.81.080.C.20 to comment on the capacity of David Weekly Homes to complete the project. While we are not requiring "evidence" per se, we still want a comment on the capacity to complete the project.*

RESPONSE: David Weekley Homes ("Weekley") was founded in 1976 in Houston, Texas. Weekley is the 18th largest builder in the United States and the nations largest private home builder. By virtue of their size and longevity, they clearly have the capacity to complete the project.

12. *Expand Table 3 (in the response to SMC 17.81.080.C.22) to include a column for percentages.*

RESPONSE: Table 3 within the response to SMC 17.81.080.C.22 now includes a column for percentages.

13. *Consider discussing cluster development in the response to SMC 17.84.010.B.*

RESPONSE: The response under SMC 17.84.010.B has been revised to discuss more fully the Planned Development and how it permits a cluster development on the site which is what the City of Scappoose is advocating for within this section to minimize and mitigate flood hazards.

14. *Expand the discussion of SMC 17.84.030.H to explain how floodwaters will be minimized or eliminated.*

RESPONSE: The findings in SMC 17.84.030.H have been updated to describe the methods and materials used to minimize or eliminate the infiltration of floodwaters into the system and discharge from the systems into floodwaters.

15. The response to SMC 17.84.140.D says that all roads are outside the floodplain, but that disagrees with the plans. Modify the grades at the north end of Eggleston Lane to avoid ponding during the 1% annual chance storm event.

RESPONSE: The response to SMC 17.84.140.D has been updated to describe the minor area of Eggleston Lane that will remain in the floodplain. Additional descriptions have been provided to demonstrate that flood damage to lots, roads, utilities and storm facilities has been minimized as required.

16. The response to SMC 17.85.090.B.2 indicates that DSL has concurred with the wetland delineation. Provide evidence of approval for all wetlands on site.

RESPONSE: DSL concurrence was done in 2 stages for the site and the concurrence letter for the April 29, 2019 has been added to the letter dated September 26, 2019 which was in the submittal under the DSL Concurrence tab. Combined, the letters demonstrate concurrence for the entire site.

17. SMC 17.86.070(8)(e) limits diversion of stormwater into slope hazard areas. Outfall #2 is proposed to discharge into a slope hazard area (the bank of Scappoose Creek) as identified on the slope analysis exhibit. Provide a response to this code criterion.

RESPONSE: Based on a discussion with the City Engineer and Planner, the plans have been revised to remove outfall #2 from the slope hazard area and the discharge location will be on nearly flat ground with a sump or drop system overtopping in the floodplain and surrounded by rip rap resulting in very slow velocity water from the system which will make its way to the creek.

18. Discuss proposed fencing heights when located near or on retaining walls per SMC 17.100.110.A and B.

RESPONSE: Sections 17.100.110.A and B. within the narrative have been revised to include more detail on proposed fencing heights when located near or on a retaining wall. Section A is somewhat unclear however since walls are only discussed in relation to 4-foot heights in the front yards and not future discussed within the section where just berms and fences are the subject regarding heights in other areas. The landscape plans have also been revised to indicate the location, type and size of fencing proposed on the site.

19. Discuss proposed street/block dimensions in the response to SMC 17.154.040.B.

RESPONSE: Additional detail has been added to the narrative response to SMC 17.154.040.B further describing the natural conditions that limit parallel streets or street connections east or west. In summary, the valley floor between the floodplain to the east and the rising steep slope to

the west is too narrow through the site to permit block creation. Additionally, those same features prevent streets from extending east into and across the floodplain or extending west into the steep slopes. The slopes are steep enough to prevent streets from meeting the City's grade requirements.

20. The response to SMC 17.154.100.A discusses 4 inches of standing water in the street. Modify the grades at the north end of Eggleston Lane to avoid ponding during the 1% annual chance storm event.

RESPONSE: Due to the existing grades on JP West Road, the entirety of Eggleston Lane cannot be located entirely outside of ponding during the 1% annual chance storm event. However, we have made a revision to the design utilizing a "shed" section for Eggleston Lane which will bring the western 1/3rd of the street outside of the area of ponding. This will leave a clear path for all vehicles on Eggleston Lane for ingress and egress during that rare event.

Preliminary development plan(s):

21. All Sheets

a) Indicate the correct expiration date of the stamping engineer's license.

RESPONSE: All sheets have been updated with the correct expiration date of the stamping engineer's license.

22. Cover Sheet (Sheet 1):

a) The power provider is Columbia River PUD, not PGE.

RESPONSE: This sheet has been updated to show the power provider as Columbia River PUD.

23. Preliminary Plat (Sheet 2):

a) Label the existing water easement on the west end of the site.

RESPONSE: The existing water line easement on the west side has been labeled.

b) Show the portion of the existing sanitary sewer easement that will remain in place.

RESPONSE: None of the existing sanitary easement will remain in place. First because the existing sanitary easement was recorded incorrectly and is currently running through the front third of the adjacent properties to the west of the site. This portion is still showing on this sheet. The City will have to rectify the sanitary easement with the adjacent properties separately. Secondly, all portions of the sanitary line extending east into the site will be abandoned and replaced with new lines in different locations.

c) Provide an access easement to the City on Lot 22 that coincides with the HOA access easement.

RESPONSE: The note has been revised adding the City to the easement for access over lot 22 for maintenance of the sanitary sewer line.

- d) Provide the location of any easements for common backyard drainage systems including for the retaining walls and Tract B and F.*

RESPONSE: The location of easements for common backyard drainage systems including for the retaining walls and Tract B and F are now shown on the preliminary plat.

- e) Provide a separate driveway for Lot 28 that is not shared with the emergency vehicle turnaround.*

RESPONSE: The driveway for Lot 28 has been moved to not share with the temporary emergency turn-around.

- f) Is the sidewalk between Lots 40 and 41 part of Tract D?*

RESPONSE: There is a lot of line work within this specific area making it difficult to see however, the pedestrian trail between Lots 40 and 41 is located within Tract D. A separate tract would be unnecessary.

- g) Label the conservation easements discussed in the narrative, ensuring the language allows public use of the trail.*

RESPONSE: Note 11 has been added to the Easement Notes section on the plan indicating where conservation easements are proposed and that the ultimate language will accommodate the public use of the trail. The final language for the conservation easement should be determined jointly with the city prior to final plat recording to ensure that otherwise acceptable uses are not prohibited in the conservation easements yet a level of protection is afforded the natural resources. The narrative has been updated to include the following language:

“The open space tracts protecting wetlands will have conservation easements over their entirety. This include Tract B, D, E and F. Although these conservation easements will be in place, specific uses will be permitted within the easements including pedestrian, bicycle pathways and pathway construction, utilities and utility construction, wetland and resource mitigation and enhancement, floodplain management activities, etc. The applicant will work with the city to determine final uses permitted within the conservation easement that don’t have a substantial impact on the intent of the easement. Wetlands are being avoided and therefore fully protected with the design of this development plan. No alterations to wetlands are proposed.”

- h) Label Tract G as a stormwater facility tract, in addition to open space.*

RESPONSE: Tract G has been relabeled to demonstrate both proposed uses.

- i) Label all wetland buffer widths.*

RESPONSE: All of the 50-foot buffers were labeled however the plans have been revised to add labels where buffers for isolated wetlands are 25 feet.

24. *Existing Condition and Demolition Plan (Sheet 3):*

- a) *There is a callout for an existing waterline easement to be removed. Is that a public easement or a private easement?*

RESPONSE: The existing waterline easement to be removed is an old, unused, private waterline easement. The applicant is working with Title to get this exception removed from the title report.

- b) *Indicate the sizes of the trees on site (specifically, any trees proposed to be removed or any trees in or near disturbance areas).*

RESPONSE: The tree sizes of existing trees on site are now labeled. The primary development area is treeless and has been farmed or grazed in the recent past. There is only one area where construction activity comes near to trees and this is the area in the back of primarily lot 27 and a little of lot 28. On this sheet, it is labeled as “existing tree canopy” as the tree is likely off-site. There is very limited grading activity in the rears of these lots and the area nearest these trees should have orange construction fencing to protect unwanted damage.

- c) *There is a note about removing an overhead power line on tax lot 404, which is outside the site boundaries. Explain how power service will be provided to that owner.*

RESPONSE: The note incorrectly has two arrows associated with it. The overhead service to tax lot 404 will remain in place. The note is intended to apply to tax lot 403 and has been revised to be clearer. The existing service line to the house on tax lot 403 was strung by the power company with no easement across the subject site. This project will simply move the power service line to the house on tax lot 403 so that it is no longer an encroachment.

25. *Preliminary Grading and Erosion Control Plan (Sheet 4):*

- a) *Provide a cross-section of the sanitary sewer and retaining wall on the west boundary of Lots 15, 16, and 22.*

RESPONSE: Cross sections of the sanitary sewer and retaining walls on the west boundary of Lots 15, 16 and 22 have been added to this sheet.

- b) *The proposed public utility easement leading to Tract B appears to be routed through the wetland buffer which is much too steep and would need to be enhanced to provide sufficient structural support for maintenance and/or construction vehicles loads, i.e. loaded dump trucks. Need to provide feedback from DSL that improvements in the wetland buffer can be provided which alter the grades and include structural improvements. In addition, the retaining wall would need to be constructed to withstand significant vehicle loads and therefore cannot be a segmental wall since any tieback system would interfere with future replacement. The type of wall type needs to be considered with appropriate room for footings, i.e. cantilever style wall.*

RESPONSE: The applicant is revising the sanitary plan to abandon that part of the sanitary line in the utility easement connecting through Tract B. Instead, the sanitary line will be re-routed to Eggleston Lane via the driveway of lot 22. The City has indicated that they would work with the applicant to abandon the sanitary line along the western boundary and replace it with a new line given it is at the end of its lifespan. These changes in combination will eliminate the need for enhancements to provide sufficient structural support through the wetland buffer and wetland.

It is recommended the retaining wall be installed after reconstruction of the sanitary line along the western boundary of the site giving it a substantial lifespan before any maintenance would be necessary. In addition, the wall will be designed to ensure that maintenance and construction vehicles can utilize the space with final designs to be approved through the engineering review process.

- c) Modify the grades at the north end of Eggleston Lane to avoid ponding during the 1% annual chance storm event.*

RESPONSE: Due to the existing grades on JP West Road, the entirety of Eggleston Lane cannot be located entirely outside of ponding during the 1% annual chance storm event. However, we have made a revision to the design utilizing a “shed” section for Eggleston Lane which will bring the western 1/3rd of the street outside of the area of ponding. This will leave a clear path for all vehicles on Eggleston Lane for ingress and egress during that rare event.

- d) Can the proposed stockpile be relocated outside the existing floodplain?*

RESPONSE: Although the stockpile will not be located within the floodplain based upon grading of the site, it has been moved further south and located out of the current floodplain.

- e) Annotate the retaining wall detail to indicate that fence height is measured to the bottom of the wall.*

RESPONSE: The retaining wall detail and fence height cannot be annotated as the wall heights are not consistent across the entire site however fencing will likely have more consistent heights. Instead of annotating the detail, a note has been added which says:

“Combination walls and fences not to exceed 10 feet from bottom of wall to top of fence”.

- f) Show proposed grades with contours and/or spot elevations between the proposed public path (east of the retaining wall) and the erosion control fencing.*

RESPONSE: Spot grades have been added between the public path and the erosion control fencing. The area is very flat and the grading plan is already using 1 foot contour intervals. Decreasing the contour interval would make most of the site unreadable and therefore spot grades are most appropriate.

- g) Provide the identification and location of the benchmark and corresponding datum.*

RESPONSE: A note was added to Sheet 3 identifying the benchmark and its location along with the corresponding datum.

26. Preliminary Street Plan (Sheet 5):

- a) Show Visual Clearance Areas (see SMC Chapter 12.10) at driveway entrance(s).*

RESPONSE: Visual Clearance Areas are now shown for the driveways.

- b) Provide dual ramps where Eggleston Lane connects to JP West Road and include a ped crossing north to Veteran's Park with appropriate signage and continental striping.*

RESPONSE: Dual ramps are now shown along with striping. Appropriate signage in accordance with City Design Standards will be reviewed during the engineering plan review process as there is not existing signage for the Captain Kucera Way crossing at this time.

27. Typical Sections & Easement Detail (Sheet 5.1):

- a) The detail for the neighborhood collector should indicate a paved width of 36 feet.*

RESPONSE: The note was revised to show 36 feet as indicated by the section.

- b) The typical private road section and the dimensioned width on the plans do not agree.*

RESPONSE: The typical section was updated to clarify property lines.

- c) Show pipe locations in the proposed easements.*

RESPONSE: This sheet was created because the City requested something to more clearly understand the easements for access and utilities over the shared driveway area. Sheets 6 and 8 show the location of the pipes in the proposed easements. The pipe locations are now shown.

28. Preliminary Street and Storm Plan and Profile - Eggleston (Sheet 6):

- a) Modify the grades at the north end of Eggleston Lane to avoid ponding during the 1% annual chance storm event.*

RESPONSE: Due to the existing grades on JP West Road, the entirety of Eggleston Lane cannot be located entirely outside of ponding during the 1% annual chance storm event. However, we have made a revision to the design utilizing a “shed” section for Eggleston Lane which will bring the western 1/3rd of the street outside of the area of ponding. This will leave a clear path for all vehicles on Eggleston Lane for ingress and egress during that rare event.

- b) Per PWDS 2.0012, PVC is not an approved material for storm lines.*

RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to indicate city approved materials are being utilized for storm lines.

c) Per PDWS 2.0023, storm lines need at least 30" of cover in paved areas.

RESPONSE: Based upon a meeting with the City Engineer, it was recognized that storm lines can have less than 30" of cover in paved areas if approved by the City Engineer. The City Engineer indicated in areas of flat ground with limited abilities to deepen storm lines, the city would accept lines at less than 30" of cover in paved areas.

d) Provide a profile of the pipes into and out of the storm pond in Tract G.

RESPONSE: Profiles for the pipes into and out of the storm pond in Tract G have been provided.

e) The proposed water line alignment is close to the off-site structure, please demonstrate that pipe installation will not undermine the foundation.

RESPONSE: The proposed waterline has been moved south to ensure pipe installation will not undermine the foundation of the off-site structure.

f) Provide the location and connection point to any common backyard or retaining wall drains and their associated easements.

RESPONSE: The location and connection points for common backyard or retaining wall drains and their associated easements are now shown on sheet 6.

g) Provide the location of drainage for Tract B and F and their connection point and any associated easements.

RESPONSE: Drainage for Tract B and F along with connections points and associated easements are now shown on sheet 6.

29. Preliminary Street and Storm Plan and Profile – J.P. West (Sheet 7):

a) Per PWDS 2.0012, PVC is not an approved material for storm lines.

RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to proposed materials acceptable to the City.

b) Per PDWS 2.0023, storm lines need at least 30" of cover in paved areas.

RESPONSE: Based upon a meeting with the City Engineer, it was recognized that storm lines can have less than 30" of cover in paved areas if approved by the City Engineer. The City Engineer indicated in areas of flat ground with limited abilities to deepen storm lines, the city would accept lines at less than 30" of cover in paved areas.

- c) *Provide additional street improvements across TL 404 and design for TL 402 to provide improvements roughly equal to the portion of Eggleston Lane that is not being constructed. This cost should consider the cost of the public utilities as well.*

RESPONSE: The proposed plans now show half street improvements along the frontage of TL 404. This additional length results in off-site half street improvements totaling approximately 185 feet plus taper. The length is roughly similar to the portion of Eggleston Lane that cannot be completed on the project site to the southern boundary due to the unnamed stream along that property line. Additionally, the plans demonstrate design for the frontage along TL 402 (shaded back) to ensure this street section can be built to City standards and will marry with proposed improvements further west by others.

- d) *The overhead utilities would need to be undergrounded that are not exempt by our PWDS/SMC.*

RESPONSE: Overhead lines will be undergrounded where not exempt. Overhead utilities are located on the northern side of JP West Road however there is an overhead service line supplying power to the individual houses off of a single pole that are on the south side. This will be addressed as a part of the franchise utility plans and final engineering.

30. *Preliminary Sanitary and Waterline Plan and Profile (Sheet 8):*

- a) *Provide a profile of the water line loop outside the paved area.*

RESPONSE: A profile for the water line loop outside of the pave areas has been added to the plans.

- b) *Stub a waterline to the south end of the paved section of Eggleston Lane.*

RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to stub the waterline to the end of the Eggleston Lane improvement.

31. *Stormwater Facilities, SDLN-01, SDLN-03 Plan & Profile (Sheet 9):*

- a) *The proposed stormwater outfall for the Tract G storm facility depicts fill below the top of bank. This is not a completeness comment but since South Scappoose Creek is essential salmonid habitat, be advised that any amount of fill requires permits from Oregon Department of State Lands.*

RESPONSE: The applicant has met with the City Engineer and redesigned the outfall based on that meeting. The plans have been revised to move the outfall away from the top of bank and the design is consistent with what was determined to be acceptable at the meeting.

- b) *Correct Storm Note numbering at all outfalls and emergency overflows.*

RESPONSE: The Storm Note numbering at all outfalls and emergency overflows has been revised.

c) *Storm Note 3 refers to a backflow preventer, do you mean a backwater valve?*

RESPONSE: The note indicates that a flap valve is proposed to prevent backflow of floodwater into the storm system. The note doesn't refer to a "backflow preventer". However, the note has been changed to say "backwater" to be clearer.

32. *Planting Plan, Details & Notes (Sheet L1.0):*

a) *Provide a detail for required root barriers.*

RESPONSE: A detail has been added for required root barriers.

b) *Show the extents of the proposed public access easement in Tract D.*

RESPONSE: The extents of the proposed public access easement in Tract D is now shown.

c) *Provide legend and label/indicate what type of fencing will be provided where.*

RESPONSE: A legend and labels regarding types of fencing and their location is now shown on the plans.

d) *Please add trees inside western edge of Tract C WQ facility in lieu of street trees.*

RESPONSE: Street trees have been added inside the western edge of Tract C in lieu of street trees.

33. *Planting Legends & Notes (Sheet L1.1):*

a) *Mask the "Tract" names so that they can be more easily read or move them out of the facility boundary or use a callout.*

RESPONSE: The tract names have been altered for ease of reading.

b) *The Tract C & G plantings do not seem to distinguish and/or show the "shrub and low grow" areas as indicated on Sheet L2.0. Please clarify this.*

RESPONSE: "low grow" is the type of grass seed mix to be planted in the same areas of the shrubs in the water quality facilities to achieve 100% plant coverage and minimize erosion.

c) *The wall type symbols need to be tied to the photo examples for added clarity.*

RESPONSE: The wall type symbols are now tied to photo examples.

d) *The riparian areas do not show any plant material or explanation of any remedial planting to mitigate damage during demo/grading/utility work. Provide an*

explanation of what is to occur in these areas and include description of material on Sheet L2.0.

RESPONSE: Native grass seed mix has been added to all areas of disturbance as defined by the civil proposed grading plans.

Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA):

34. Why was no COVID adjustment made to the December and January traffic counts?

RESPONSE: The Traffic Impact Study has been edited to reflect the potential traffic reductions due to the Covid 19 Pandemic as noted on page 7.

35. Include a discussion of the adopted alternative mobility standards at Hwy 30 intersections.

RESPONSE: Discussion has been included in the Traffic Impact Study regarding the adopted alternative mobility standards at Hwy 30 intersections first mentioned on page 4 of the study

36. Since Planned Developments are processed as zone changes, expand the TIA to demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule. See SMC 17.22.050.

RESPONSE: A Transportation Planning Rule Analysis has been added into the Traffic Impact Analysis starting on page 21 of the report.

Stormwater Report:

37. Expand the discussion of Section 4.2 to better explain that compensatory water quality treatment is being provided due to the lack of treatment on the eastern portion of JP West Road.

RESPONSE: The discussion of Section 4.2 has been expanded to better explain that compensatory water quality treatment is being provided due to the lack of treatment on the eastern portion of JP West Road.

38. Provide additional information on the proposed backwater valves on the outfall pipes. What specific valve is proposed (mechanical? duckbill?)? How do the IE's from the ponds and outfalls compare to the base flood elevation? Will the storm ponds be able to discharge when the creek rises? Will discharge of stormwater short-circuit the backwater valve?

RESPONSE: The design incorporates a Fernco “flapper” valve. This valve will close when the pond elevation and floodplain elevation equalize to prohibit floodwaters from intruding into the pond. When the floodplain level drops, the valve opens to equalize the elevations until the pond ultimately drains with the lowering floodplain water levels.

39. The Preliminary Treated Impervious Areas & Proposed Basin Areas map illustrates an off-site shed area that is limited to portions of the paved rights-of-way of JP West Road, Jobin Lane, and Maria Lane. This likely underestimates the contributing basin area due

to runoff from adjoining driveways and rooftops. As a result, the storm facility in Tract G is likely undersized.

RESPONSE: The impervious areas for the upstream basin have been updated to capture runoff from adjoining driveways and rooftops. The facility within Tract G will accommodate the additional impervious surfaces.

40. What is the design intent of the stormwater overflows? It appears that the spillway from Tract G will discharge to the low point of the street, creating flooding issues.

RESPONSE: The spillway for Tract C will overflow into the riparian corridor of South Scappoose Creek. The overflow from Tract G will overflow into the street where the public storm system will pick up the water and direct it to South Scappoose Creek. The water will not cause additional ponding as directed to the storm system.

41. The Flow Control Structure Tables in Appendices C and D do not appear to match the elevations in Tables 4-4 and 4-5. It appears that the Water Quality orifices are below the pond bottom and detention orifices are near the pond bottom. Additionally, a pond cross section should be provided for each facility.

RESPONSE: Flow Control Structure Tables in Appendices C and D call out the orifice sizes and elevations. Whereas tables in 4-4 and 4-5 show how the released outflow meets or is less than the pre-developed outflow and the water elevation within the pond. Pond Cross sections are provided in Appendix F.

42. An Operation and Maintenance plan is needed for all the storm facilities.

RESPONSE: A draft Agreement and Operation and Maintenance Plan has been included within the resubmittal. It will be finalized during the engineering review phase and implemented prior to Final Plat recording as required by the City Engineer.

Draft CC&R's

43. There are multiple references to Columbia County that should instead refer to City of Scappoose. Please review entire document and update.

RESPONSE: The CC&R's have been revised to refer to the City of Scappoose.

44. Update to reference Tract G as a storm facility in addition to open space.

RESPONSE: Tract G references have been updated to indicate it as a storm facility in addition to open space.

45. Section 2.4 should be rephrased from "...subject to the prior approval of Columbia County" to "...subject to the prior written approval of the City of Scappoose."

RESPONSE: Section 2.4 has been rephrased.

46. Section 2.6 has a typo (should say “owned” instead of “owed”).

RESPONSE: Section 2.6 has been revised to say “owned”.

47. Section 3.1 indicates that the storm facilities will be maintained by the City, which is not the case. As stated in the pre-app memo, the City will require a stormwater maintenance and operation agreement for City review and approval prior to final occupancy inspection (please reference conformance with this recorded document in the next draft CC&R’s). The HOA will be conditioned to provide maintenance for all storm facilities. Please update the CC&R’s accordingly.

RESPONSE: Section 3.1 has been revised to indicate the storm facilities will be maintained by the HOA. A stormwater maintenance and operation agreement draft has been submitted for City review.

48. Section 4.1 indicates that owners have rights and easements to all Common Areas. However, they should not have rights to Tract C since it is a storm facility.

RESPONSE: Section 4.1 has been revised to clarify owners don’t have rights to Tract C since it is a storm facility.

49. Section 9.3 indicates that the City is responsible for maintaining street lights. However, maintenance is performed by Columbia River PUD.

RESPONSE: Section 9.3 has been revised to indicate maintenance of street lights is to be performed by Columbia River PUD.

GeoTech Report:

50. Address any additional design elements that result from the comments included above, i.e. structural section for the public utility easement areas to accommodate construction equipment.

RESPONSE: The current plan for sanitary sewer is to alter the direction of flow along the north property line. This will be accomplished by altering the project connection to the existing line via the flag pole of lot 22. The existing line along the north property line will be abandoned and replaced with a line flowing east to west at the new connection point on lot 22. The line will be constructed with development of the project site through a coordinated effort between the contractor and City of Scappoose. Walls will be constructed after reconstruction of the line and maintenance requirements along that section should be unnecessary for 60-70 years. The walls constructed beside the line will be engineered to withstand maintenance equipment and reviewed during building permit reviews for the walls at permitting stages of the development.

Architectural Plans

51. Provide exterior dimensions of proposed housing units.

RESPONSE: The applicant has provided exterior dimensions of the proposed housing units. The elevations and dimensions are examples of what they would typically construct on a site like this and not final product submissions to the city.

Thank you for the opportunity to answer your additional questions and provide additional information. Should you need anything further, please contact me.

Sincerely,
Pioneer Design Group, Inc.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Matthew L. Sprague", with a stylized, flowing script.

Matthew L. Sprague
Principle