11/16/2021 RE: For Resolutions PC 21 28 PUD 01 Planning Meeting 11/23/2021 For Resolution dated 09/08/2020 Title 11 Chapter 3 Item 30 Notes concerning Geo and Hydro Reports and Sea Watch issues Submitted By Steve Williams

Dear City Planning,

I had the opportunity to review the several reports submitted

My one concern is that in the many pages of the reports I couldn't find any direct reference to our original problem with infiltration, and the spring blowout it caused that put a home here in jeopardy in the late 90's and why it can't happen again

We were also looking for references of the Coast Guard remediation project that was done shortly after Fairway Estates started in 2018 We were told by Coast Guard personnel that the Fairway Estates project (infiltration and deforestation adding to groundwater stress) caused groundwater problems they had to mitigate (a large project to recollect and reroute groundwater) We predicted this would happen and had concerns it might also affect Seawatch A letter was sent to the City in 2018 It contained a strategy to minimize mitigation needed from unforeseen results The key is detection and prompt action Problems in the past were greatly exasperated by time and argument (Letter on request) We are trying to get more detailed info on the engineering aspect of this and have a request for documents into HomeLand Security

We have forward these two issues/concerns to Planning and Mr Miller to see if GSI could comment Mr Kohlbecker (of GSI) did mention he would be responding directly to the City

Our concerns/issues may be moot, as it now comes down to what is largely an eminent domain issue and decision for the City The City knows there is risk, and a proven past history of negative effects to Seawatch

However, there is great benefit for the City to do this The project will create 120 new homes, create est \$ 20 30 million in tax base, and the City will save on any cost and time needed for infrastructure that was once identified as needed to ensure protection and limit risk for Seawatch properties Instead, the City will essentially use the aquifer under Sea Watch for the development and discharge the stormwater on our slope via the springs

The City may decide this benefit outways the risk to us, and if something unexpected does happen, it would be cheaper to address remediations or compensations later if and when they happen

I have submitted for the record the letter Sea Watch wrote to the City (03/2010) and the City's response (04/2010) acknowledging the groundwater spring issues at Sea Watch and the proposed infrastructure plan to avoid infiltration factors (attached)

Note: Attachments referenced may be found under Exhibit Q3

Report Comments

I've read the Hydrology and Geology reports I'm glad one confirmed our "evapotranspiration" calculations (water absorbed from plants or surface evaporated) at 25% or 650,000 additional cubic feet of water per year (Branch Engineering 7/6/21 page 2) Wasn't too clear what long term effect this added stress will have on our slope and springs at Sea Watch Estates

In closing, I would like to acknowledge and thank the City of Florence Planning staff that helped us work through this process They were always professional and very knowledgeable

S ncerely, Steve Williams Sea Watch Estates

From:	
То:	<u>planningdepartment</u>
Cc:	
Subject:	PC 21 28 PUD 01 & AR 21 21 SIR Rhododendron Arbor
Date:	Saturday, November 20, 2021 8:01:37 AM

I have concerns about the lack of addressing traffic impact on Rhododendron regarding proposed and existing developments. 120 units with Rhododendron Arbor, 30 sites at existing Fawn Ridge and 30 plus future homes at 4th & Heceta Rd. Well over 200 additional vehicles to impact traffic flow on Rhododendron, not to mention delivery trucks, landscaping, contractors, visitors to future homes and emergency responders. My question is, is the developer going to address traffic flow and potential accident prevention with a south bound left turn lane and north bound ingress and egress lanes at the development? Would be great foresight and less expensive to incorporate now, rather than a costlier retro fit in the near future.

Respectfully' Ann Franzen From: To: Subject: Date:

PC 21 28 PUD 01 & AR 21 21 SIR Rhododendron Arbor Saturday, November 20, 2021 7:41:18 AM

I have four questions after reading Rhododendron Arbor Stormwater Management Report, Page 13, paragraph 4.

1) Has the Fairway Estates stormwater system been connected by a 15-inch pipe into the City's storm line in Rhododendron

Drive (as assumed in the Rhododendron Arbor stormwater report)?

If it has not, how will any potential storm water overflow from Fairway Estates into both Rododendron Arbor and Mariners Village be handled?

2) Should the analysis have included consideration of the catch basin area from Mariner's Village or an overflow discharging

into Fairway Estates? If not, why not?

 The current City Budget (2021-2023 Biennial Budget) does not show plans to construct "a solution to Mariner's Village

flooding issues by installing an emergency overflow weir from that neighborhood into the Fairway Estates system".

Does the City plan to include this work in the 2023-2025 Biennial Budget? (it was listed as a higher priority in the 2018

SWMP than the two stormwater projects that are in the current budget.)

If this "emergency overflow weir" is not constructed and connected, how will this impact on the storm water

management.

of the whole area once the wetlands and vegetation in the Rhododendron Arbor area are removed?

The water which floods Tax lot 4600 in Mariner's Village includes a substantial amount of water draining into Mariner's

Village at the North -East corner from tax lot 1600 (Map 18121500). This is owned by the City. What does the City

plan to do to stop this happening?

4) If the City plans to construct the "emergency overflow weir" in future (2023-2025?) will this have any

on, or be affected in any way by the Rhododendron Arbor storm water system?

Lawrence Franzen Current President

Mariner's Village HOA

