Ron Backer
11710 E Lenora Dr
Spokane, WA. 99206

Nov 15, 2018

Lori Barlow, Spok Valley Public Works
10210 E Sprague Ave.
Spokane Valley, WA 99206

Dear Ms Barlow:

I am attaching 3 pages that give my concerns and comments on the proposed Painted Hills Golf Course Development. These are general suggestions (concerns), however I believe they are pertinent to the development although non-inclusive.

I am a retired Mining Engineer, and during my career part of my work dealt with environmental issues, including reclamation and remediation. I live north of the proposed development and have watched the areas' intermittent flooding over the last 20 years. I have also looked at many properties over that time that are designated floodzone AE.

While the property owner is suggesting rezoning because of the proposed regrading, etc., I find it problematic that increasing the surface grade by bringing in landfill where structures are proposed, can effectively alter the overall property floodzone rating. These developers will insulate themselves financially, dissolve their businesses, and start anew when legal heat arises from failed developments, leaving others to try to deal with the problems.

RECEIVED
NOV 16 2018
SPOKANE VALLEY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Sincerely,

Ron Backer

Painted Hills Golf Property Issues

The issues involving development on the Painted Hills Property should include overall viability of the project.

Environmental issues include dust, noise, infiltration, flooding, and wildlife considerations. Considering the magnitude of the project, work would be done during the 4 seasons of the year. Thus work would need to be done addressing the issues differently during the variety of weather conditions experienced.

Dust and noise during construction would impact the surrounding properties to the North, South, and East of the proposed site. This would extend onto the streets in the form of dust and mud from the vehicles hauling materials to and from the site. During this construction, safety for ancillary traffic and schools would be a concern, as well as congestion of roads already unable to adequately handle the traffic, notwithstanding the heavy construction vehicles that would be accessing the site for a number of years. To address this congestion, it would be important to improve the roadways to 4 lanes at least on Dishman-Mica road into and out of town. Traffic should also be restricted to residential only (non-commercial) on Pines and its extension southward (Madison) to Painted Hills development.

Infiltration changes to the Painted Hills area will undoubtedly have a major impact on both flooding in the area, and the underground aquifer. Longstanding infiltration has undoubtedly brought in organics that aid in water quality improvement, and sedimentation. This material would need to be removed in all areas where the building and roadway construction is done to mediate potential subsidence for structures being built. This material would need to be moved offsite or stockpiled for reuse after the construction is completed. Changing the surface area for this infiltration, and surface stripping will alter the permeability of the ground, and impact both the flowrate and water quality entering

the aquifer. This will change during construction, and after construction is complete. This will also impact the surrounding properties south of the project area. These properties have been constructed on "near-floodplain" levels. Any change that impacts the groundwater level positively, may induce flooding of those properties. If that happens, those property owners will undoubtedly bring legal charges against the owner of the Painted Hills project, and most probably, the City of Spokane Valley for allowing the project to proceed. It is my understanding that a property owner may NOT make changes on ones' own property that adversely impacts someone else's property. It should also be illegal to create any type of "dry-well' that allows injection of groundwaters into the aquifer for the purpose of dewatering one's own property. Considering the property size of 100 acres, if there is 1" of rain, it results in 27 million gallons of water falling on the property. This does not even account for any inflow from offsite (which always happens). How is that volume of water to be handled -- does the construction divert or "inject" it back into the aquifer? This is a serious issue, considering that much of the property will loose it's ability to be a permeable media. The potential for flooding or environmental degradation of the aquifer are issues that should not be taken lightly.

The owner says that sidewalks, and traffic safety will be enhanced in the long run. This is hard to believe, since increased traffic will result because of the development. Also, the kids will not be walking to school, since the schools are already filled to capacity. The kids will most like need to be bused to schools that have the ability to handle the load -- not University, Horizon, or Chester.

The impact on nesting raptors (eagles and hawks) in the area, and the other birds such as ducks and geese would disturb their natural habitat. Deer, moose, and other mammals in the area would also be severely impacted during and after construction by habitat destruction that cannot be mitigated.

Developers love to buy cheap property, and then load that property with new construction. This property, if developed, should be restricted to low volume development. The city planners should consider keeping it either 1 to 5 acre parcels, so that the environmental concerns are minimized, while still allowing growth. This would still allow the developer to put new properties onsite, while having property values be on the range of $20K/acre cost -- this is not unreasonable, and would not hurt surrounding home values, nor degrade the environment, nor degrade the aquifer as much as the project as proposed. It would allow for discrete building sites to be located where surface grading requirements could be minimized while creating the building sites. It would also provide for reasonable traffic safety, reasonable school loading, while minimizing wildlife disruption.