

March 9, 2018

Mr. Timothy W. Wales, PE
City Engineer
City of Saratoga Springs
City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

**Re: City of Saratoga Springs – Site Plan Review – PB App. No. 17.075
Belmonte Builders – Spencer Subdivision**

Dear Mr. Wales:

We are in receipt of revised documents and responses to our initial comments on the above referenced project. The following documents have been submitted by Environmental Design Partnership, LLP in response to our January 31, 2018 comments: Comment response letter, dated February 5, 2018, Update Plans, Revised February 1, 2018, and SWPPP with Stormwater Management Narrative, Revised February 2018.

Our initial comments are provided below for your reference, followed by the current status of comment resolution in bold type.

SWPPP Review

SWPPP Report

1. Page 5 – Section H – Please provide correspondence for Historical places.

A Phase 1B Archaeological Survey has been provided. Please provide correspondence with OPRHP concerning this issue. Comment Addressed.

2. Page 7 – Number 3 – Stormwater ponds are listed to be used as temporary sediment basins during construction. Please review.

Comment Addressed.

3. Page 8 Item I - Is rip-rap proposed to be used? Please review.

Comment Addressed.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT NARRATIVE

4. Page 4 – Please provide table for the other analysis points under existing conditions.

Tables have been added. Comment Addressed.



5. Page 7 – Why is Chapter 9 of the NYS SWDM referenced? Chapter 9 is for redevelopment projects. Please review.

Comment Addressed.

6. Please provide infiltration test results. Please insure that the testing was done in compliance with the NYS SWDM.

During the Conference Call with the City, it was determined that infiltration testing could be completed when limited clearing has begun. Please note that infiltration testing must be done according to NYSDEC standards and the rates must meet the design criteria provided. If the rates do not meet the design criteria, work shall be stopped until an alternative design is approved.

7. In general, please provide a summary table for the stormwater runoff for each subarea (analysis point) under existing and proposed conditions per the SPDES General Permit GP 0-015-002, Part III.B.2.c.iv.

Tables have been provided. Comment Addressed.

8. Who will own the chambers within the Right-of-Way? Has a discussion with the City of Saratoga Springs regarding this occurred? The City may wish to have the chambers located outside of the public ROW.

During the Conference Call with the City, it was determined that a “Home Owner’s Association” would be created and responsible for the maintenance, etc. associated with all of the stormwater practices located outside of the Right-of-Way. Restrictions will be required to insure the practices cannot be removed. Additionally, the City Engineer made it clear that the City will not treat, store, etc. any stormwater from private property. All stormwater from outside the Right-of-Way cannot be directed to the City Right-of-Way.

9. Please discuss in detail how Water Quality/RRv, the Channel Protection Volume, etc. are provided in subcatchments OS-6, OS-7 AND A-1.

Please see response to comment #8. EDP has provided practices to treat and attenuate the runoff. Comment addressed.

10. Using chambers for sediment removal/pretreatment will make sediment removal from the chambers extremely difficult. This practice will need to be discussed directly with the City if they are to take ownership of the practices within the ROW.

The City has asked the Engineer to review the proposed practices within the Right-of-Way (chambers) since the City doesn’t necessary like maintaining them.



11. For the 10-year and 100-year storm events, please provide a table that includes the various subareas/analysis points. Please provide the peak runoff rates for the various Design Points under existing and proposed conditions.

Comment addressed.

12. For the Water Quality Calculations (Attachment A), please provide the sizing calculations for each practice. For example, please provide calculations for the “shallow grass depressions” Please use the GI Excel Worksheets provided by NYSDEC where appropriate. It may be appropriate to run the HydroCad model using the Water Quality Storm event as well.

Comment addressed.

13. Please discuss what Pond 1P: Roof Top Disconnect under proposed conditions within the HydroCad model is?

Comment addressed.

14. Please discuss the number chambers provided for within each “chamber system”. Is the “first set” of chambers providing water quality while the remaining chambers are providing water quantity control? Or is the first set of chambers providing pretreatment?

Comment addressed.

15. For each subarea where chambers are proposed, please provide a summary of the number of proposed chambers and a brief discussion of how each system will operate.

Comment addressed.

16. For each Post-Construction Stormwater Practice, a Maintenance Plan must be presented and yearly inspections be completed with reports provided to the City Engineer.

The SWPPP must include documentation that requires all stormwater practices be inspected by a licensed engineer on a yearly basis and a stamped report provided to the City. This will need to be included in the Home Owner’s Association agreement with the City.

PLANS

17. Sheet 4 – Please provide the number of chambers for each practice.

Comment addressed.



18. Sheet 4 – Behind lot 18,19, 20,21 and 22 – Is this supposed to be a depression? If so, please revise grading accordingly.

Comment addressed.

19. Sheet 4 – Why is the TF of CB 5 and CB 6 different? Why is the TF for CB 3 and CB 4 different?

Please provide all rim and inverts for all drainage structures on the profile or on another drawing.

20. Sheet 7 – Please note that the disturbance must be under 5 acres at any one time.

The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan indicates 5.36 Acres and 5.48 acres of disturbance. Please limit disturbance to less than 5 acres.

21. Sheet 7 – Please make the Stabilized Construction Entrance a minimum of 24' wide.

Comment addressed.

22. Sheet 8 – The Bituminous Pavement Detail text is “cut-off” at the top of the sheet.

Comment addressed.

23. Page 10 – Please provide a detailed layout for each chamber system. Include at a minimum the number of chambers and pipe entrance elevations.

Comment addressed.

NEW COMMENTS

24. Notice of Intent indicates 0.08 pre & post development stormwater runoff rates for a 100-yr. storm event. The report does not indicate the same. Please review.

Comment addressed.

25. Notice of Intent - #38 – The City of Saratoga Springs will not be responsible for stormwater practices located outside of the Right-of-Way.

Comment addressed.

26. Notice of Intent – Please review #39 – Total area of roof disconnect indicated to be 7.39 acres. Total disturbance is 5.36 acres in NOI. Page 6 of Stormwater Management Narrative indicates 4.36 acres of development. Please review all numbers in the NOI and in the report



to insure all numbers are consistent.

Comment addressed.

27. Notice of Intent #43 – Please indicate yes.

#43 still indicates the project is not subject to the requirements of a regulated, traditional land use control MS4. Please revise.

28. Please note that all stormwater practices located outside of the right-of-way will require deed restrictions to insure homeowners, etc. do not remove them. Additionally, maintenance of the practices will need to be determined and a maintenance agreement developed.

During the Conference Call with the City, it was determined that a “Home Owner’s Association” would be created and responsible for the maintenance, etc. associated with all of the stormwater practices located outside of the Right-of-Way. Restrictions will be required to insure the practices cannot be removed. Additionally, the City Engineer made it clear that the City will not treat, store, etc. any stormwater from private property. All stormwater from outside the Right-of-Way cannot be directed to the City Right-of-Way.

29. Pond 2P provides 0.03’ of freeboard while Pond 4P provides 0.09’ of freeboard for the 100-yr storm. If another storm event occurs before the stormwater infiltrates, should some type of overflow be provided to insure downstream owners are not directly impacted?

Comment addressed.

30. Please provide information how the “pond” surface areas were determined when only 2’ contours are provided.

Comment addressed.

31. Notice of Intent indicates 2.02 acres of new impervious in disturbed area. Page 13 of the Stormwater Management Narrative indicates 1.87 acres. Please review.

Comment addressed.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Clark Patterson Lee

Matthew T. Smullen, P.E.

Principal