Exhibit O

December 18, 2018

APPROVED
City of Florence
Community Development
Department
O Exhibit
PC 2031 SUB 03
File Number

Civil West Engineering Services, Inc.

RE: Sand Pine Ranch Subdivision Preliminary Document Review
Florence, Lane County, Oregon

Mike:

On behalf of the City of Florence, Civil West Engineering has reviewed the documents provided to us regarding the proposed Sand Pine Ranch Subdivision. These documents, which were submitted to us on Wednesday, December 12th, 2018, include the following:

- Preliminary Plat Drawings (5 sheets)
  - Sheet 1 – Cover
  - Sheet 2 – Existing Site Map
  - Sheet 3 – Proposed Subdivision Plat Map
  - Sheet 4 – Wastewater & Water Utility Schematic (updated 11/14/18)
  - Sheet 5 – Drainage & Grading Plan
- Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan
- Sand Management Plan

The documents are well prepared and well designed. The following major items have been confirmed:

- ✓ The proposed collector street cross section complies with Figure 9-8 from the City of Florence Transportation System Plan.
- ✓ The proposed local street cross section complies with Figure 9-9 from the City of Florence Transportation System Plan.
- ✓ The Stormwater Management Plan correctly interprets the City's dimensional requirements for Planter Sections (Std. Dwg. SW-312)
- ✓ The Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan correctly applies the design guidelines found in the City's Stormwater Design Manual, both for stormwater runoff from the public right-of-way and for runoff generated on private properties. Both conditions have been addressed by the proposal.
- ✓ The assumptions made in the reports are adequately justified.

The following questions, hereby submitted by Civil West, pertain to the request made by the City of Florence Planning Director, Wendy FarleyCambell. In an email, dated December 12th, 2018, she asked for a review of the completeness of these documents. The questions below arose during our review.

1. The corners of those tax lots which are located at intersections appear to be radiused. Is this intentional?
2. Section 5.2 of the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan asserts that "the minimum planting strip width that can accommodate a vegetated swale meeting city design criterion is 9.5 feet, which would require the sidewalk to protrude onto the lot two feet."
   a. The City's Stormwater Design manual does not expressly dictate a requirement for freeboard in roadside swales, but Std. Dwg. SW-301 appears to suggest that the maximum water surface elevation in the swale shall not be above the adjacent roadway surface. Because the detail for swales *with parking* shows the growing medium starting at the top of curb (thus providing 6-inches of freeboard), the total required minimum width of any swale would be 10 feet. We recommend that the City comment on the freeboard requirement for swales. In any case, the proposed stormwater design utilizes the stormwater planter BMP, not swales, so the prosed design is unaffected.
3. The "Alternate Street-Side Vegetated Swale" detail on Sheet 1 shows a 2.3' wide flat bottom, and total width of 9.5 feet for the planter strip. Are these dimensions correct? See #2, above.

EXHIBIT K

4. Does the City have a development code for naming new streets? The proposed streets appear to be named after cities in Utah, which seems inconsistent with the existing naming convention for Florence streets, which is that they are generally either numbered or named after a type of wood or plant.
5. The Sand Management Plan indicates that the Owner has selected the "Mechanical Mitigation with Retaining Wall" option described in Part 4.3.3 of the report. A 50-ft sand dune stabilization easement is shown on Sheet 3 of the drawings, but this configuration does not provide protection to the lots located on the westerly edge of the development (namely, lots #104, #96).
    a. How will wind erosion be mitigated at the north end of Orem Street?
    b. How will wind erosion be mitigated south of Silica drive, east of Lot #86?
6. EGR recommended that the lots on the northern and southern boundaries of the development have backyard setbacks measured from the easement line and not the property line. The total depth of those lots is 116'. After subtracting the 50-ft easement, and the required yard setbacks, how much depth is left over for the construction of a residence?

Per the City's request, Civil West intends to provide an additional review at a later date, which will evaluate more detailed aspects of the proposal related to construction drawings. This second review will provide feedback on things such as utility pipe diameter, grading information, roadway construction details, and more.

Respectfully,
Civil West Engineering Services, Inc.

Prepared By:
Aric Farnsworth, Oregon PE #93839PE