



To: Tom Reetz  
Senior Planner  
City of Stuart Development Department

From: Kevin Roberson, P.E.  
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Date: July 28 2021

Re: **Kanner CPUD – Stuart, Florida**  
**Kanner CPUD Response to 1<sup>st</sup> Reading Comments Review – Engineering**

---

Dear Mr. Reetz,

Kimley-Horn has reviewed the submittal of the Kanner CPUD Response to First Reading Comments and the associated documents, that were provided on July 21, 2021 prepared by Lucido and Associates for the above referenced project. Please find below our review comments pertaining to the following items listed within the application:

#### Response Letter

Comment 11 – How is the DBH value of the site improvement DBH determined. In prior submittal, a value of \$150 at 2.5" was used. Please provide back up for the DBH provided value of 6487. The City Development Director will need to approve the value accepted for tree replacement credit.

Comment 12 - How will the annual submittal of the water quality data findings be enforced? The applicant needs to establish a consistent date for the submittal of the annual report so that the City can track when it is due. In the event water quality is found to decline when compared to the prior year's report, what type of remedial action will be implemented?

#### Tree Mitigation Memo

1. The bottom of Page 2 indicates the BMP Trains exhibit is attached but it was not included. Please provide so the nitrogen and phosphorus removal rates can be verified.
2. Provide a summary of how the total cost of \$575,204.50 translates to 6487 DBH of credit outlined in comment response letter item 11.

Thank you for the opportunity to assist the City of Stuart in reviewing the noted project. By conducting this limited evaluation, Kimley-Horn is not assuming responsibility for the content and accuracy of the plans, which remain the sole responsibility of the Engineer of Record. Please contact us if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kevin M. Roberson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kevin M. Roberson, P.E.  
Senior Vice President

## RESPONSE TO KIMLEY HORN REVIEW COMMENTS ON APPLICATIONS RESUBMITTAL TO 1<sup>ST</sup> READING CONDITIONS.

Date: July 28 2021

Re: **Kanner CPUD – Stuart, Florida**  
**Kanner CPUD Response to 1<sup>st</sup> Reading Comments Review – Engineering**

---

### Response Letter

Comment 11 – How is the DBH value of the site improvement DBH determined. In prior submittal, a value of \$150 at 2.5" was used. Please provide back up for the DBH provided value of 6487. The City Development Director will need to approve the value accepted for tree replacement credit.

The mitigation value has been a consistent monetary amount of \$187.50 per tree credit as noted on the landscape plan set / sheet 2.

Comment 12 - How will the annual submittal of the water quality data findings be enforced? The applicant needs to establish a consistent date for the submittal of the annual report so that the City can track when it is due. In the event water quality is found to decline when compared to the prior year's report, what type of remedial action will be implemented?

In working with staff, a specific condition (as written below or similar and agreed to by both applicant and City will be added to the project (pending commission approval).

*The annual water quality data findings shall be submitted on an annual basis with the first data collection period commencing upon the date the City issues the Certificate of Occupancy for Phase IA of the CPUD. The first annual water quality data findings shall be submitted one (1) year from the City's issuance of the Phase IA Certificate of Occupancy and annually thereafter for a time period ending no earlier than five (5) years after issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the final phase of construction. The results of any annual water quality data findings shall not constitute acknowledgment by the developer or the City that the proposed system is deficient, or causing and/or contributing to a water quality violation. Rather, the annual water quality data findings shall be provided only as informational purposes to the City as it relates to performance of the proposed stormwater best management practices.*

-

### Tree Mitigation Memo

1. The bottom of Page 2 indicates the BMP Trains exhibit is attached but it was not included. Please provide so the nitrogen and phosphorus removal rates can be verified.

We have provided the requested BMP Trains exhibit as well as verifying that the latest provided '2021-07-16 Revised Tree Mitigation Stormwater Letter' from EDC is the information being reviewed and evaluated.

2. Provide a summary of how the total cost of \$575,204.50 translates to 6487 DBH of credit outlined in comment response letter item 11.

The total cost of credit for the use of Innovative Stormwater BMP's per both the Revised Tree Mitigation Letter by EDC and the provided Landscape Plans by Lucido & Associates is \$486,712. This amount is then calculated or converted into DBH inches by taking the total creditable cost \$486,712 dividing it by the value of (1) mitigation tree credit \$187.50 which will provide the number of "trees" or tree credit provided (2,595). We take this quantity of "trees" 2,595 and multiply it by the minimum size in DBH that the City will accept for mitigation purposes which is 2.5" finally providing us with the total DBH being provided through this mitigation conversion of 6,487".