Slope Stabilization Feedback and Recommendations Resolution Worksheet

Date: May 20, 2020

Suggested Motion:

"I move to approve the following recommendations to	not to
exceed \$	

 2^{nd} :

Vote:

	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained	Absent
Scott Buchanan				
Dan Courtney				
Susan Cox				
Maria Wildes				
James Konkel				
Kathy Schramek				
Nicholas Soto				
Robin Woods				
Nathan Davis				

Management Recommendations Slope Stabilization Building(s) 833-835

- All parties, Anne Gillette (1631), Janna Hartsock (1629), Jeff Lange and I all met on the morning of April the 30th in the rear of unit 1631 Ripon Place.
- See attached plan and proposed scope of work.
- Discussion centered around the positioning of the proposed wall and how it will affect the slumping or creep of the slope. There was some disagreement to both the plan and interpretation of the causes of the conditions.
- Additionally, other areas were viewed and discussed including the removal of trees as needed. However, they asked that the step stone wall on the other side of the fence between 1629 and 1631 be continued into the rear and that the opposite end of the new proposed wall area be extended to go past to unit 1633. This is all new to the scope as originally discussed.
- Unit owner of 1631 Ripon was clear in starting that she did not want the Association to touch the stack stone wall and she would make needed repairs. The new plan reflects that as well.
- The work areas are all located in common element outside of the patio plot.
- On Monday the 4th, Ms. Gillette emailed stating that she and Ms. Hartsock had looked at the areas and now has asked that we do not remove any trees. Unfortunately, this is exactly where the proposed wall needs to go, placing is further down the slope will leave an area where creep and water erosion will continue to occur and possibly cause further deterioration of the stack stone wall. Jeff Lange's new plan allows for water run off deflection away from the areas.
- Cost estimates were originally between 12 and 15 thousand, some costs were associated with the stack stone and if that is now removed, we should see lower proposals.
- As such management is in agreement with the new recommended plan as submitted on May the 4th for JP Lange Consulting.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES

Parkfairfax, Bldg 833 Common Area Slope Stabilization

- All hardscape and landscape materials from the bottom of the existing failing ledgestone wall to the limits of the work zone should be removed. The limits of the work zone will be established in the field. Any existing perennials and shrubs that can be re-used may be set aside and replanted after the work is completed. The chain link fence between buildings 833 and 835 should be removed and discarded.
- 2. Existing trees shown as to be removed are to be removed prior to the construction of the proposed wall. Stumps should be ground out or otherwise removed within the work zone.
- 3. Proposed cmu wall is to be Techo Bloc Mini-Creta Stone in Shale Grey (or equal).
- 4. Proposed cmu wall is to be constructed per the layout shown, but minimally such that a footer trench can be dug 18" wide and 18" deep. As possible, the wall should meet the building corner flush with the rear face of the building, and may be pinned or otherwise attached to the building foundation as per cmu manufacturer's specs.
- 5. New wall will be approximately 100 ff exposed, with approximately ¾ of the base course buried as foundation/footer. Proposed wall is approximately 30" tall. The wall shall start at the building corner and step down 4' away and perpendicular to the side building face, turn 90 degrees and be approximately 30 above grade until near the proposed end of the wall. It may step down as necessary to meet grade at the proposed end point.
- 6. Footer trench is to be compacted and then filled with 57A stone or according to cmu manufacturer's specs.
- 7. Proposed wall is to be back-filled with gravel and 6" drainage pipe per manufacturer standards.
- 8. As practical, the downspout extension nearest the proposed wall should be routed so as to avoid the fill behind the proposed wall as much as possible. The River Jack outfall should be downhill from (outside) the work zone in undisturbed earth.
- 9. Area between the proposed wall and the bottom of the failing ledgestone wall should be a minimum of 4' wide and be graded so as to promote positive drainage away from the building. No hardscape materials not shown on the proposed layout should be installed between the existing wall and the proposed wall.
- 10. All proposed plant material should be kept away from the building foundation; a minimum of 6" for goundcovers and perennials, and a minimum of 4' for shrubs. Any planting between the failing ledgestone wall and the top of the proposed wall should receive prior approval.
- 11. PLANT LIST

Quantity	Species	Size	Condition
2	Red Maple	3-1/2 – 4"	B&B
8	Flame Azalea	5 gal	con
20 flats	Pachysandra	4"	24 / flat

All proposed plants are to be mulched using shredded hardwood mulch. No colored or dyed mulch is to be used.

Additional Pachysandra may be added downhill from the proposed shown once the proposed shown plants are established.









JP Lange Consulting LLC TREE PRESERVATION - DESIGN - PLANNING 703-283-2338 jplangeconsulting@gmail.com



MEMO

DATE:	May	13,	2020
-------	-----	-----	------

TO: ParkFairfax Board of Directors Mark Miller, ParkFairfax General Manager

FROM: Anne Guillette, ParkFairfax Unit Owner (1631 Ripon Place, Bldg 833)

RE: Response to Revised Plan

CC: Janna Hartsock, ParkFairfax Unit Owner (1629 Ripon Place, Bldg 835)

On February 19, 2020 I approached the Board of Directors (BOD) with the intent to highlight concerns which I had repeatedly brought to the attention of Mark Miller about the need to: 1) Stabilize an erosive slope between buildings 833 and 835; and 2) Concerns about the potentially compromised "fill" on which my building/foundation stands. I was motivated to come to the Board by the desire to ensure that the building and slope maintain their structural integrity so that the building is not compromised in the future.

I presented these two (2) concerns to the BOD because I was told that there would be no resolution after years of promises that they would be addressed. As a result of prior negligence and concern that future negligence might result in far greater costs to the community at large I requested that the BOD assist in the development of effective solutions to these two (2) specific issues:

- 1) <u>"Mid-Slope Stabilization"</u> To resolve the severe slope erosion between Buildings 833 and 835; My neighbor, Janna Hartsock, and I had been promised for years that the steep and eroded slope between the buildings would be stabilized however when I inquired about the promised Spring 2020 installation date, Mark Miller stated that the work was cancelled; The *Mid-Slope Stabilization* at the front was completed in Fall 2019 however surprisingly was not continued beyond the fence despite that the slope being more steep and erosive (1:1 slope in some locations); and
- 2) <u>Requested a Geotechnical Engineer Assess the Slope and Advise on a "Below-Wall Stabilization"</u> <u>technique</u> – At the February BOD Meeting I presented a summary of the issues of progressive slope creep that happened as a result of mismanagement of stormwater drainage at my neighbor's (1633). The drain pipe was clogged and during every rain (including the very wet spring and summer of 2017) the downspout overflowed causing the water to remain close to the building for years. More than a year after submitting a request to repair the clogged drainpipe at 1633, maintenance staff finally replaced the clogged clay pipe and connected it to the yard inlet in the common area. I remember Wisdom frantically stating *"I am trying to save your building!"* After the installation of the new drain pipe, the clay soil slowly dried out over the course of a few years and as it dried out it caused the "fill" to subside and the slope to creep outward. This had an impact on my flagstone wall and stone patio, causing it to bulge out at the base and buckle in at the top. [Contrary to allegations by Mark Miller that my low-flow soaker hose which was never used was at fault!]

I came to the Board due to concerns about the integrity of the building's foundation and the "fill" around the building. <u>I specifically requested that a Geotechnical professional recommend best</u> <u>practices to address the failing slope</u> below my flagstone wall. To date a Geotechnical expert has not visited this site.

PLAN REVIEW / COMMENTS - As mentioned previously there were two (2) very specific objectives for which I was seeking resolution. Upon review of Jeff Lange's *Revised Plan* provided to me by Mark Miller on May 5, 2020 the *Revised Plan* does not fully address the concerns I raised to the Board. Nor does it

resolve many of the comments on the *Initial Plan* which I provided for the April 22, 2020 BOD Meeting. Specifically, the *Revised Plan* does not address Objective #1, the *"Mid-Slope Stabilization"* at all, nor does it adequately address Objective #2, the *"Below-Wall Stabilization."* It also does not take into consideration the surrounding undulating slopes. In addition to not resolving the main concerns, the plan did not take into account how I "use" my patio. Access to the water spigot is not possible in Lange's proposal as he removed steppers, the lower path was total eliminated so that I could no longer maintain the lower planting beds. Most egregious was not specifying how the techno-block wall is attached to the building (Lange states that the contractor shall follow Manufacturer's specifications – that is a recipe for failure!). All of my comments are highlighted in the Attachments *("Lange Revised Plan_AG Comments"* and *"Lange Construction Notes_AG Comments"*).

I am extremely disappointed about being shut out of the process by Mark Miller, particularly on something that affects me very personally and potentially impacts the value of my unit. I only hope that other unit owners do not have to face the kind of accusations and disregard from the General Manager, especially when my only goal was to ensure that building foundations do not subside with a hillside.

REQUESTED BOARD ACTION - In light of the deficiencies in the *Revised Plan* which does not adequately resolve the two (2) Objectives I raised to the Board, I respectfully request that the Board grant an <u>extension</u> to allow additional time (especially since I was shut out of the process!) in order to ensure that we have dotted all of our "i's" and crossed all of our "t's" and develop a comprehensive, well-conceived, sound solution that meets the two (2) Objectives and is cost effective.

I request an extension for:

1) A Geotechnical Engineer to consult on the best management of the slope (per my original request)

- a) ParkFairfax coordinates the site meeting with me and the Geotech Engineer; and
- b) ParkFairfax pays for **2 hours** of the Geotechnical Engineer's time 1 hour site meeting and 1 hour design review/comment.

2) Secure a Second Opinion from a Landscape Architect with expertise in this specialty area

- a) I have an appointment scheduled on **May 22nd** with a Landscape Architect/Sustainable Designer/ Horticulturalist with 35+ years of experience solving such issues. He was unable to visit on such short notice this week as he is booked 4+ weeks out.
- b) I will pay the LA to design the Plan.
- *c)* It is the expectation that ParkFairfax will pay for the installation (Cost TBD) *Note that I will pay for any work to my flagstone wall and/or patio.

TIMELINE + SUBMITTALS -

- Site Visits (Goal to complete in May)
 - May 22nd (Landscape Architect)
 - TBD (Geotech Engineer)
- Plan Development and Review (Goal to complete in June Dependent LA's schedule)
 LA will submit a "To Scale Stabilization Plan" for the Geotechnical Engineer to review/comment
- BOD Submission: July or August 2020 BOD Meeting
 Date is dependent on when LA can produce plan; Geotech Engineer can review plan and provide
 comments; LA can revise the Plan per the Geotech's comments; and LA produce Cost Estimate
 LA will submit a "To Scale Stabilization Plan" and Cost Estimate
- **Construction:** <u>September or October 2020</u> (Dependent on when LA can schedule the work)

IN CLOSING - In closing I would like to take a moment to speak to the aesthetic objectives as well. Given the historic designation and the fact that what we install now will be around for decades, beyond our time here on this planet, I believe consideration of the <u>materiality</u> is an important question to ask. So I ask: Is TechnoBlock in keeping with our Historic designation? It is important that we leave in our wake a beautiful legacy for future generations, much like the gift of a lovely landscaped environment with which we have been fortunate and blessed to experience each day. We all know why we love the ParkFairfax community, and it is important that the built environment, especially the landscape, be approached with care and attention. We are the caretakers now, and it is important that we protect it.

I am happy to answer any additional questions you might have.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Warm regards,

~Anne

BACKGROUND -

- February 19, 2020 Board of Directors (BOD) Meeting I presented concerns to the BOD and requested that the BOD assist in the development of effective solutions to these two (2) specific issues:
 - 1) <u>"Mid-Slope Stabilization"</u> To resolve the slope erosion between Buildings 833 and 835; and
 - 2) Requested a Geotechnical Engineer Assess the Slope and "Below-Wall Stabilization"
- March 5, 2020 Structural Engineers visited my unit to assess the cracks and foundation; They expressed that they had no expertise with slopes and that a Geotechnical Engineer should weigh in on the slope creep; They determined that the internal and external cracks should be monitored; They also stated that the excessive moisture near the building foundation for years likely caused the peeling paint and the 95% humidity in my unit (until the downspout was repaired at 1633); A Geotechnical Engineer never visited my unit.
- March 22, 2020 Board of Directors Meeting I attended the meeting however had nothing to report; I was unaware that Jeff Lange had developed a Plan, had provided to Mark Miller, and was getting cost estimates; I was not consulted and unaware of the Plan.
- April 17, 2020 –Jeff Lange was observing my flagstone wall and patio with a contractor; When I inquired what was going on Jeff said he was getting a cost estimate; To my dismay Jeff had developed a Plan without consulting me; I requested the Plan from Mark Miller; This was four (4) days before the BOD was to vote on a solution; Upon review of the Plan it did not address the objectives which I raised to the BOD at the February Board Meeting.
- April 22, 2020 Board of Directors Meeting I sent prepared statements to the BOD to postpone a decision as I was not involved in the process and did not agree that the proposed Plan addressed or solved the problems; The BOD agreed to postpone a decision and requested that Jeff Lange, Mark Miller and I meet to develop a mutually agreeable solution.
- April 30, 2020 I met with Mark Miller and Jeff Lange at my residence to discuss a Plan Revision; Jeff Lange was disagreeable and I had little hope that he understood the issues or how to solve them.
- May 4, 2020 Mark Miller emailed Jeff Lange's Revised Plan; The revised Plan does not address the Mid-Slope Stabilization (again), and the Up-Slope Stabilization solution creates other stormwater drainage and erosion problems.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES

Parkfairfax, Bldg 833 Common Area Slope Stabilization

- All hardscape and landscape materials from the bottom of the existing failing ledgestone wall to the limits of the work zone should be removed <u>by the Contractor</u>. The limits of the work zone will be established in the field. <u>The homeowner will remove Any</u> existing perennials and the Contractor shall <u>removes andexisting</u> shrubs to be that can be re-used may be set aside and replanted after the work-wal is completed. <u>The chain link fence between buildings 833 and 835 should be removed and discarded</u>.
- Existing trees shown as to be removed are to be removed prior to the construction of the proposed wall. Stumps should be ground out or otherwise removed within the work zone.
- 3. Proposed cmu wall is to be Techo Bloc Mini-Creta Stone in Shale Grey (or equal).
- 4. Proposed cmu wall is to be constructed per the layout shown, but minimally such that a footer trench can be dug 18" wide and 18" deep. As possible, the wall should meet the building corner flush with the rear face of the building, and may be pinned or otherwise attached to the building foundation as per cmu manufacturer's specs.
- 5. New wall will be approximately 100 ff exposed, with approximately ¾ of the base course buried as foundation/footer. Proposed wall is approximately 30" tall and steps down with the slope so that the wall height does not exceed 12" above grade at the end of wall so as to not obstruct flagstone wall behind. The wall shall start at the building corner and step down 4' away and perpendicular to the side building face, turn 90 degrees and be approximately 30" above grade until near the proposed end of the wall. A distance of 5' should be maintained from the existing stone wall. The new wall will It may step down as necessary to meet grade at the proposed end point.
- Footer trench is to be compacted and then filled with 57A stone or according to cmu manufacturer's specs.
- 7. Proposed wall is to be back-filled with gravel and 6" drainage pipe per manufacturer standards.
- As practical, the downspout extension nearest the proposed wall should be <u>re-</u>routed so as to avoid the fill behind the proposed wall as much as possible. The River Jack outfall should be downhill from (outside) the work zone in undisturbed earth.
- Area between the proposed wall and the bottom of the failing ledgestone wall should be a minimum of <u>4'-5''</u> wide and be graded so as to promote positive drainage away from the building. No hardscape materials not shown on the proposed layout should be installed between the existing wall and the proposed wall.
- 10. All proposed plant material should be kept away from the building foundation; a minimum of 6" for groundcovers and perennials, and a minimum of 4' for shrubs. Any planting between the failing ledgestone wall and the top of the proposed wall should receive prior approval.
- 11. PLANT LIST

Quantity	Species	Size	Condition
2	Red Maple	3-1/2 – 4"	B&B
8	Flame Azalea	5 gal	con
20 flats	Pachysandra	4"	24 / flat

All proposed plants are to be mulched using shredded hardwood mulch. No colored or dyed mulch is to be used.

Additional Pachysandra may be added downhill from the proposed shown once the proposed shown plants are established.

THE MID-SLOPE STABILIZATION IS NOT ADDRESSED.

THE LOWER ACCESS PATH AND ASSOCIATED GRADING IS NOT ADDRESSED.

FENCE!
Comment [A2]: Would like to keep the two trees and the large tree – can we offset 5' instead of 4'?
Comment [A3]: Is this historically appropriate for a property with historic designation?

Comment [A1]: NO - DO NOT REMOVE

Comment [A4]: This connection to the building needs to be designed, not just rely on installer to follow Manufacturer's specifications – a recipe for failure.

Comment [A5]: A cross section would be helpful to understand how this is constructed.

Comment [A6]: Do not redirect downspout – keep downspout in current location and build wall around it.

Comment [A7]: This is a steep slope and may cause more erosion. Connect the proposed pipe to the existing pipe from 1633 that ties directly into the catch basin.

Comment [A8]: I will replant my existing plants.

Comment [A9]: Prefer to select native groundcovers. Anne will select.

Comment [A10]: Not native or deep-rooted. Anne and Janna will select suitable native species.

Comment [A11]: The Mid-Slope Stabilization has not been addressed.

DO NOT REMOVE STEPPERS NEAR CORNER – ACCESS TO SPIGOT IS NECESSARY. INTEGRATE STEPS INTO THE DESIGN.

DO NOT REMOVE FENCE.



PH: 703-283-2338 EM: jplangeconsulting@gmail.com Landscape Architect, VA # 561; MD # 865 ISA Certified Arborist # MA0403A





Additional Slope Stabilization needed mid-slope on the back of the hill between Buildings 833 and 835

In the Fall of 2019, a slope stabilization project on the front of the hill between buildings 833 and 835 was finally completed. At the time, the question was raised as to why erosion control measures were stopped at the fence when the steepness of the slope (1:1 per Jeff Lange) continued across the back part of the hill. Per the below pictures, you can see how the slope has been eroding for years so that the bottom of a chain link fence is now 4 inches above the surface of the hill.

More recent requests for patio restoration at the top of this hill have obscured this issue and the solution proposed by Jeff Lange fails to address the stabilization of the mid-point of the slope. His revised plan is attached and continues to focus on slope stabilization at the top of the hill around the patio, even though in a discussion on 04/30/20 he and Mark Miller agreed that mid-slope stabilization was needed. We would like to request a revised plan that includes a mid-slope stabilization measure.

Anne Guillette, 1631 Ripon Place (Building 833) and Janna Hartsock, 1629 Ripon Place (Building 835)





JP Lange Consulting LLC TREE PRESERVATION - DESIGN - PLANNING 703-283-2338 jplangeconsulting@gmail.com



Management Response to Owners Response 5.13.20

In reading through the narrative provided by the owner, management comments below:

• Management had met with Ms. Guillette on several occasions over the years to review the slope and patio area. Although we agreed that something would need to be done it was clearly pointed out that the patio was homeowner responsibility and that any work should be done simultaneously so that a permanent solution would be effective. The patio was approved and installed in 2001.

Item 1:

- Management has provided solutions to several concerns in this area over the past few years. Work was slated to remedy the slope in front of the rear on the sides of both 1629 and 1631 Ripon on 2 separate occasions, at which time due to plantings on the slope we held off at unit owner of 1631's request. This is documented in emails which the board has received. The work was completed this past fall which was shared previously with the board. The plans for this area were clear and although it was briefly discussed at no time did management or our contractors agree to extend this work to the rear behind the fence. Thus, there was no work to cancel.
- The drain issue behind unit 1633 Ripon was fully repaired and re-piped directly into the catch basin at the bottom of the slope. Although this may have contributed to the issues and the records indicate this work was done in May of 2017 there is nothing else to suggest so.
- Unit 1633 suffered flooding and interior damages back in 2014 due to a clogged and overflowing gutter. The gutter was replaced, and interior repairs were completed.

Item 2:

- At the request of the unit owner we had the unit and the building reviewed by our structural engineers, SRG. Their report dated 3.17.20 which was provided to the Board on 3.26.20 and to Ms. Guillette on 4.17.20.
- In my email to the Board on April 22nd, we had noted the soaker hose originally when the engineers were onsite, and it was also pointed out by JP Lange. As there is a clear soil plant bed ring directly above and behind the stack stone, one could assume that some water overtime may have leeched into the areas behind the wall.
- 1. This report included both SRG's comments and comments from the geotechnical engineer, Gerry Davit of PPC. SRG's findings:

Building 833 – Unit 1631

Our assessment is similar to that of the landscape architects. The resident's patio appears to have settled and the stone retaining wall appears to have moved as well. However, the building distress did not appear to be significant enough to warrant geotechnical involvement. We

observed settlement cracks at the back-right corner of the building which may or may not be related to the slope. The corner wall appeared to be planar so we do not have cause for immediate concerns related to the building structure. We recommend repointing the cracks at the back corner and monitor for re-cracking.

One important thing to note is, if you are planning to cut into the slope at the side/rear of the building, we definitely recommend getting Gerry involved. Based on our recent experience with 525 and 527, it may not be advisable to cut into the slope with retaining walls. We weren't aware of the soaker hose – is this being actively run, or has it been removed?

The interior distress was due to paint failure in many locations. The cracking at the ceiling above the first-floor stair landing may or may not be due to settlement. We recommend restoring the interior finishes and monitor for re-cracking.

- 2. Gerry Davit's of PCC recommendations: As discussed the following items which can affect the slope creep observed:
- It is good to plant low-height bushes at the top of the slope as these are light-weight and reinforce the soil.
- It is good to plant trees in the lower third of the slope as these reinforce the soil. They are heavy though and should only be installed near the bottom of the slope.
- It is bad to overwater plants on the slope as this adds weight to the slope.
- The trench drain that was previously installed at the back of Building 833 should not make the slope creep worse as less water means less weight on the slope.
- Installing retaining walls cuts out grade, which reduces weight at the bottom of the slope. This makes the slope more susceptible to creep.

Those are general guidelines that can be followed so that any modifications do not worsen the slope stability. The following options may also be considered:

- Lower the patio and install stairs to step down from the rear door to the patio. This will reduce weight at the top of the slope, which will slow the slope creep but may not entirely eliminate it. Minimum frost depth above the building footing is required to be maintained if this option is pursued.
- Install helical piers and framing to support the patio. This alternative is costly, and the helical piers would be subject to bend over time.
- Install geogrid and stone to reinforce the slope (also costly).

The best option is probably to follow the guidelines related to plants, etc. above and for the resident to consider lowering her patio during replacement if that is something that Parkfairfax allows. These notes are based off of Gerry's input – let either of us know if you have questions.

- Gerry Davit's of PCC recommendations: As discussed the following items which can affect the slope creep observed:
- It is good to plant low-height bushes at the top of the slope as these are light-weight and reinforce the soil.
- It is good to plant trees in the lower third of the slope as these reinforce the soil. They are heavy though and should only be installed near the bottom of the slope.
- It is bad to overwater plants on the slope as this adds weight to the slope.
- The trench drain that was previously installed at the back of Building 833 should not make the slope creep worse as less water means less weight on the slope.
- Installing retaining walls cuts out grade, which reduces weight at the bottom of the slope. This makes the slope more susceptible to creep.

Those are general guidelines that can be followed so that any modifications do not worsen the slope stability. The following options may also be considered:

- Lower the patio and install stairs to step down from the rear door to the patio. This will reduce weight at the top of the slope, which will slow the slope creep but may not entirely eliminate it. Minimum frost depth above the building footing is required to be maintained if this option is pursued.
- Install helical piers and framing to support the patio. This alternative is costly, and the helical piers would be subject to bend over time.
- Install geogrid and stone to reinforce the slope (also costly).

The best option is probably to follow the guidelines related to plants, etc. above and for the resident to consider lowering her patio during replacement if that is something that Parkfairfax allows. These notes are based off of Gerry's input – let either of us know if you have questions.

- As noted, Mr. Davit clearly did not recommend cutting into the slope. After this was reviewed there was disagreement and we commissioned JP Lange Consultants to review the report and provide his comments and recommendations. He proved a first draft which was reviewed by all parties and again there was disagreement in how the scope of work should be handled.
- We then at Board direction met onsite on Thursday April the 30th to review the initial plans that JP Lange provided. Several options were discussed, and JP Lange would review and make the changes as discussed.
- JP Lange provided the revised plan on Monday May the 5th. It was then shared with all parties.
- Management provided their recommendations based on this plan to the Board on May the 6th.

• Management then received comments and recommendations from Ms. Guillette on May the 14th. Those are included in the tab.

Managements in reviewing these comments and recommendations finds several issues at hand:

- First and foremost, the area is clearly in common element areas and historically unit owners cannot dictate to the Board how work in common areas shall proceed.
- I disagree with the assessment the Mr. Lange was disagreeable, clearly there was a difference of opinion in both process and methods.
- Mr. Lange took the owners' concerns into effect when crafting the new revised plan.
- Again, when providing new comments to the revised plan, we have more disagreement.
- The Geotech engineer has already made his recommendations, which I will remind everyone does not recommend cutting a wall anywhere in that slope.

My final assessment to the Board, if they chose to proceed on any or all fronts, there should be a binding agreement that the unit owner will repair the stack stone wall and patio as stated.