



May 12, 2021

Mr. Peter Chapman
Planning Board Chairman
Village of Marcellus
6 Slocombe Avenue
Marcellus, New York 13108

**RE: Baltimore Ridge Subdivision and Site Plan – Plan and SWPPP Review Comments Response
MRB Project No. 1375.21000.000-002
CHA Project No. 067298**

Dear Mr. Chapman:

CHA, on behalf of the applicant, is pleased to submit updated site plans for the above referenced project based on comments received from MRB Group dated May 4, 2021. The following repeats those comments and indicates how each was addressed:

Site Plan:

1. Per our previous comments, the developer's engineer has provided some proposed grading around the lots, which would serve as a guide for showing how drainage will be handled collectively around the individual building lots. Additional details or refinement of this grading is needed to better clarify where drainage will be directed or collected. There are several areas on Drawing C-200 and C-201 where it would be appropriate to propose swales between the lots and incorporate drainage field inlets to drain low spots.
 - A. Side lot swales should be considered or better defined between lots 1-4, 5-10, 11-13, and 14-20.
 - B. The rear lot swale for lots 1-4 should be better defined.
 - C. Consider drainage inlets in the rear of lots 8/5, 9/6, and 10/7, as it appears that there are low spots being proposed in those areas that could cause ponding.
 - D. Based on the changes above, the proposed easements should be evaluated to assure that there is adequate room for equipment to perform any future maintenance. Easement dimension should be clearly called out on the plans.

Response: A. The Grading site plan has been updated to show more defined swales between houses.

B. In the rear of lots 1-4, the intent is to collect stormwater runoff in the area drains located in depressions. The design does not intend to flow surface water towards the proposed roadway. Additional spot shots have been added to the design plan along the property line to show the design intent.

C. Easement dimensions are now shown.

2. Easement maps and descriptions should be provided for any easement proposed to be dedicated to the Village.

Response: Maps and descriptions are shown on the survey plat plan. Formal documents for filing will be provided.

3. According to the OCDOT Comment Letter dated April 8, 2021, "The grading plan shall demonstrate that water can drain away from the proposed road, not pond, and prohibit water discharge onto S Street Road, which could create a safety hazard." Please clearly identify how the stormwater from the Station 2+00 to South Street Road will be diverted from South Street Road to comply with the OCDOT requirements.

Response: Catch basins have been added to protect South Street Road from potential runoff, directing it to the roadside ditch.

4. A note should be added to the grading plan and erosion and sediment control plan that references the Lot Development Erosion control on sheet C-602.

Response: A note has been added to the grading and erosion and sediment control plans as requested.

5. A drainage inlet detail should be added to the plans and also reference the materials required.

Response: The nyloplast area drain detail has been provided. Please see Detail #3 on Sheet C-605.

6. The location of the permanent erosion control matting proposed to line the swale on the southern property line should be called out on the grading and erosion and sediment control plans. A detail and/or specification should be added and referenced on the plans.

Response: The location of the permanent erosion control matting is shown on the grading and erosion control plans. See Detail #5 on Sheet C-602.

7. All permanent check dams should be shown on all site plan drawings not just the erosion and sediment control plans.

Response: Permanent check dams are now also shown on the Grading Plan.

8. Regarding the Downstream Flow Path detail on Drawing C-605:

- A. It appears that the existing stream drainage arrows have shifted north from the actual location of the stream. Please review and revise.
- B. There does seem to be some grading that may be required to better define the drainage ditch immediately to the south of the project site, within the OCDOT R.O.W. This would be done to avoid drainage into the adjacent property. Please review and revise.

Response: A. The stream arrows have been removed. The existing stream is now called out on the aerial.



B. We will work with OCDOT to define swale grading during the OCDOT permitting process.

9. There should be an access path established for the Infiltration Basin and Forebay. This path should be shown on the plans and will provide the Village access to inspect and maintain the stormwater management facility. An easement should also be provided to the Village around the stormwater management facility.

Response: The access path is shown on the erosion and sediment control plans. See plat plan for dedication of stormwater pond property.

10. Regarding the typical lot utility layout on Drawing C-603
- A. The sanitary cleanout locations should be provided, including one at the R.O.W.
 - B. Minimum spacing of the utilities should be called out
 - C. Valve location should be called out

Response: Typical lot utility layout details have been revised accordingly.

11. Since the electrical utility will be buried, how will the lots that do not have direct access to the utility connect? Will there be road sleeves installed during construction or will the utility company directionally drill for road crossings?

Response: To be confirmed with Utility Provider. Typically sleeves will be provided during construction at all roadway crossings to facilitate the utility installation.

12. The street light to be installed at the South Street Road entrance should be a double headed fixture. Additionally, a street light should be located at both the Dunlap Avenue Extension and Baker Road Extension intersections with the Proposed Road.

Response: Street lights have been added as requested.

13. The typical minor street roadway cross section detail on Drawing C-600 calls out incorrect dimensions. Please revise the detail to show 11' pavement lane widths and a 2'-6" wide concrete gutter, per the Village detail for a local road.

Response: Details have been revised accordingly.

14. The following details should be added to the plans:
- A. Driveway apron detail
 - B. Village standard lighting detail
 - C. Catch basin in pavement

Response: These details have been added.

15. There appear to be two different pipe trench details in the plans. Detail 10 on Drawing C-600 and Detail 3 on Drawing C-604. Please specify on the plans how these details differ and if there is a specific location



where each detail applies.

Response: Plans have been revised to differentiate trench details.

16. Dunlap Avenue and Baker Road do not have gutter system. An enhanced view of the transition between the existing Dunlap Avenue and Baker Road roadway and roadside drainage swale and the proposed Dunlap Avenue Extension and Baker Road Extension roadway and gutter system will need to be provided. Please identify a clear plan for how this transition will be achieved for both the pavement, gutters and drainage.

Response: Additional spot shots and grading have been added to these areas as shown on the grading plan. Grading and pavement improvements are shown on the plans to improve drainage at the Hillside Drive and Baker Road intersection.

17. A note should be added to the plans stating that surveyed as-built drawings are to be provided to the Village prior to the acceptance of any dedicated facilities.

Response: The note has been added accordingly.

18. A construction cost estimate needs to be submitted for the establishment of a letter of credit (or other form of security). This estimate should include the cost of all dedicated infrastructure, all stormwater management and erosion control measures. The construction subtotal should include a 10% contingency, as well as 5% for construction observation services.

Response: The cost estimate is provided as follows:

- **Mobilization / Demobilization (ESC) = \$50,000**
- **Sanitary Sewer System = \$160,000**
- **Stormwater Management System = \$130,000**
- **Roadway = \$230,000**
- **Contingency (10%) = \$57,000**

Letter of Credit Total = \$627,000

5% Construction Inspection Fees = \$31,350

SWPPP

19. It should be noted that all stormwater maintenance practices are proposed to be dedicated to the Village of Marcellus.

Response: See "Post-Construction Stormwater Inspection and Maintenance Practices" on page 14 of the SWPPP narrative.



20. A construction phasing plan and sequence of operations should be provided, describing the intended order of construction activities, including clearing and grubbing, excavation and grading, utility and infrastructure installation and any other activity at the site that results in soil disturbance.

Response: The construction sequence is provided on the erosion control plans which are provided in Appendix G of the SWPPP.

21. Please identify on the proposed drainage map, Figure 3, the high point on Baker Road Extension.

Response: Figure 3 has been updated accordingly.

22. According to the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual, January 2015, the length of overland flow used in Tc calculations is limited to no more than 150 feet for predevelopment conditions and 100 feet for post development conditions. Please review and revise the Tc worksheets.

Response: Tc routes have been updated for drainage areas 1A and 1C. Drainage area 3 remains 150' in the proposed conditions as discussed.

23. Please update the Hydraflow data per the Tc revisions.

Response: Hydraflow data has been revised accordingly.

24. The calculations and supporting information to support that the Hydro International unit will be able to function as intended at 1, 10, and 100 year storms should be provided.

Response: Please see Appendix C – Water Quality Treatment Unit Information. The total flow in the 100-year storm for the tributary area is only 0.29 cfs. The treatment unit can handle up to 15 cfs with treatment provided for up to 0.84 cfs.

25. Please include the NYSDEC Specifications that will be used on the project. Material specifications for all temporary and permanent erosion and sediment control practices should be provided.

Response: Specifications have been included in Appendix H.

26. Any infiltration test results should be included in the SWPPP. Please provide any field infiltration results for review.

Response: Infiltration rates used in the design were based on typical rates for HSG A soils. Testing will be completed once the initial site preparation, construction entrance, and tree clearing has started to verify assumed rates.

27. Please add the SHPO no effect letter to the document to demonstrate that the construction of the project will not have an effect on an historical property.

Response: See Appendix B of the SWPPP.

28. Please update if there are any revisions per the change in Tc values and resubmit a complete NOI for review.

Response: The NOI has been revised accordingly.

29. Please also make sure that all NOI is electronically submitted to the NYSDEC prior to SWPPP final approval. Please make sure all signatures are provided for the preparer and the owner/operator prior to submission.

Response: The electronic NOI submission has been initiated; however, official submission cannot be completed without the signed MS4 SWPPP Acceptance form. Signed preparer and owner/operator forms are included in the SWPPP.

30. The MS4 SWPPP Acceptance Form will need to be filled out, signed, and submitted prior to issuance of a building permit.

Response: The Acceptance Form has been completed, included in the SWPPP, and submitted separately for Village completion.

The following updates are included in this submission for review:

- Site Plan Drawings (last rev. 5/12/21)
- SWPPP (dated May 2021)
- Completed MS4 SWPPP Acceptance Form

Should you have any questions related to the submission, please do not hesitate to contact me at 315-228-0036 or bbouchard@chacompanies.com

Very truly yours,



Brian F. Bouchard, P.E.
Project Engineer V

Enclosures

Cc:

V:\Projects\ANY\K5\067298.000\07_Permitting\Local\Applications\7 - Response to comments-5-4-21\0 - Baltimore Ridge_Response-5-12-21.docx

