

Amy Johnson

From: becky ray <becky1217@centurylink.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2020 11:35 AM
To: Chuck Bennett; citycouncil; CityRecorder
Subject: Battle Creek Master Plan

Hello,

I am writing to ask that the Battle Creek Park plan be postponed at this time. Given the massive unemployment, revenue is going to decrease for government agencies. I worked for a local government agency over 20 years developing budgets, monitoring budgets and funding/spending. Every time there has been an economic downturn, revenue decreases and funding from Federal, State, County decreases. Given the estimated \$6million price for this park, I think it would come across as poor use of funds as available funds decrease yet need remains the same or increases.

Please consider pulling the park plan until the result of this economic downturn is known or at least better understood.

Thank you,

Nancy Ray

Sent from my Verizon ASUS tablet

Amy Johnson

From: Carol Dare <carolalbrechtdare@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 10:54 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Battle Creek Master Plan

I'm concerned about the Battle Creek Master Plan for the following reasons:

Uncertainty about water retention and the impact on flooding and groundwater.

The cost of the project amid the coronavirus pandemic and a prolonged economic recession. Will city funds be needed for health and safety, especially among the homeless and minority communities?

A habitat option would be less disruptive and expensive and would preserve living space for wildlife.

Other parks in the area including on Rees Hill, Mildred Street, and another one planned for the South Gateway Neighborhood.

Carol Dare, South Gateway Neighborhood



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Amy Johnson

From: Kathryn Chambers <abbykats@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 4:16 PM
To: citycouncil
Cc: Chuck Bennett; CityRecorder
Subject: Battlecreek Master Plan

To the Salem City Council and Mayor Chuck Bennett:

As we all know, our country, county and city are in crisis due to the Covid-19 virus emergency.

I was shocked to learn that in these times the City Council and Mayor are even considering going forward with the Battlecreek Master Plan to the tune of \$6 million.

Shouldn't we be concerned about spending \$6 million of city funds as we move into "unexpected" times? Maybe park and funds should be put on hold until outcome of how life will be/not be post-COVID-19.

Right now, Salem needs to spend money on health, public safety and the still looming affordable housing crisis.

As we look to the future, we also need to address the environmental concerns posed by the Master Plan. I listened to the engineers explain the flood retention part of the Master Plan. Frankly, their report did not inspire confidence that with more residential and commercial development in the areas, the planned retention will prevent flooding.

I voted for the "Habitat Option" rather than the current option. I did so to preserve undisturbed habitat, flood retention and to reduce pressures caused by rampant development.

Please consider these points and vote to delay the Battlecreek Master Plan.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Chambers

Amy Johnson

From: Lora Meisner <lmgb@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 3:49 PM
To: citycouncil; Chuck Bennett; CityRecorder
Subject: re: stormwater management/Battle Creek Park

Expires: Monday, July 20, 2020 12:00 AM

The South Gateway Neighborhood Association voted against the present Battle Creek Park Master Plan, supporting the natural habitat plan. Additionally,

We think that the Battle Creek Park Master Plan is flawed, they don't think just addressing the issues of the park will solve the bigger issue—storm water management and flooding. The public works department with the engineering/hydrology firm came up with two scenarios: First scenario shows how flood waters disperse if there are no detention ponds on Battle Creek, and second scenario show how the flood waters disperse if there are the 2 detention ponds. What we need to request from the city is for them to develop a **Third** scenario which shows the effects of flooding with detention ponds on Battle Creek plus 100% storm water detained on new properties/developments as well as 50% of the trees preserved. We need to have this additional "mock up" so that the city can see—and it should show—significantly/noticeably less flooding than simply relying solely on the detention ponds.

Additionally, Is there enough detention created on Battle Creek Park based on *current* storm water master planning with no on-site detention of new developments? Won't the lack of storm water detention in developing areas result in overruns of proposed detention ponds on Battle Creek Park? Will more than two detention ponds be needed for this property?

Does the present design reflect a detention plan that will have enough impact on flooding for the \$6 million (price-tag) invested?

Also what happens to the groundwater as well as the natural spring water when the detention ponds are dug lower than known groundwater levels of 3 feet?

Shouldn't we be concerned about spending \$6 million of city funds as we move into "unexpected" times? Maybe park and funds should be put on hold until outcome of how life will be/not be post-Covid-19 pandemic.

Under the circumstances, it may be worth considering to put Battle Creek Park plan aside. City may need to reprioritize \$6 million for safety and health of public and changes which are unknown at this time—reallocate funding for new post-Covid 19 environment--where we will need to make changes that we are totally unaware of at this time.

We think that the Mayor and City Council need these questions and concerns answered before any final plans are voted on. Thank You.

Lora Meisner & Glenn Baly
1347 Spyglass Court SE
Salem, OR 97306
503-588-6924