

March 14, 2014

Mr. Jimmie Joe Carl  
Chemung County Stormwater Coalition  
851 Chemung Street  
Horseheads, NY 14845

RECEIVED MAR 18 2014

**Re: Responses to Comments from the Chemung County Stormwater Coalition for the proposed hotel on NYS Route 14**

Dear Mr. Carl:

***Hydrologic & Hydraulic Calculations and Modeling***

1. In the selection of CN values, are areas of existing impervious to be converted to lawn considered to be HSG A? Appropriate soil restoration should be completed in accordance with Chapter 5 of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual. Associated information should be included on the plans and the SWPPP.

**Response: A note has been added to the plans and the SWPPP to insure that proper soil restoration is completed.**

2. In regards to the development of the Stage versus Discharge relationship for the proposed infiltration basin, the model output indicates that exfiltration is based on a rate of 4 inches/hour applied to the surface area of the basin above 908 feet (thereby excluding 5840 sq. ft.). For the 100-year event (on Page 31 of the Proposed Hydrology calculations), it is unclear how a total exfiltration rate of 1.59 CFS is calculated at a water depth of 911.26 feet.

**Response: The exfiltration rate is calculated by multiplying the surface area of the pond at a given elevation by the exfiltration rate. The model was incorrect. It has been revised to be only based on the 5,840 sf bottom of the basin, this yields a rate of 0.54 cfs at all storm events.**

***Stormwater Management***

1. Only two infiltration tests were completed in the location of the proposed infiltration basin. As per Appendix D of the New York State Stormwater Design Manual 1 infiltration trench and 1 test pit is required per 200 SF of infiltration basin area.

**Response: Additional tests have been performed as requested and the results concur with the previously completed tests.**

2. The bottom elevation of the proposed infiltration basin is indicated to be 908 feet, which is approximately 3 feet below the existing ground elevation. As per the table in Appendix C of the SWPPP, it appears that the infiltration tests were conducted at depths lower than the bottom elevation of the proposed basin (6.1 feet, 5.9 feet, 10 feet, and 10.1 feet). Are these completed infiltration tests representative of the proposed conditions?

**Response: Test pit depths were based on the bottom of the test pit being 2ft below the bottom of the proposed practice, per NYSDEC.**

3. Were soil profiles determined at various locations, via test pits or borings? Could there be a soil layer that would restrict/limit infiltration rates from the infiltration basin?  
**Response: Boring logs for the proposed test locations did not indicate any restrictive soil layers. A copy of the report has been sent to Chemung County Stormwater Coalition.**
4. What is the elevation of the seasonally high groundwater in the vicinity of the proposed infiltration basin? The vertical separation between groundwater and the bottom of the proposed infiltration basin (including the forebay) should be verified/determined and, in turn, compared to the minimum separation requirements outlined in the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual.  
**Response: Based on the Geotechnical Report Groundwater may be encountered at depths as shallow as 8 feet below existing grade. The bottom of the proposed basin is approximately 4 feet below existing grade therefore adequate separation should be provided.**
5. What are the estimated times to drain for the proposed infiltration basin?  
**Response: The pond can drain after the 100 year storm in 36 hours.**
6. What size rip rap shall be utilized for the proposed infiltration basin?  
**Response: Rip-Rap shall be NYSDOT medium stone fill.**
7. Are catch basins with sumps and hoods proposed to reduce sediment and pollutants (such as oils) being directed to the proposed infiltration?  
**Response: Not at this time.**

### **Stormwater Conveyance**

1. Mapping, denoting the individual drainage sub-areas to the various proposed stormwater inlets, is requested. Also, the respective area and hydrologic parameters of each of these sub-areas is also requested.  
**Response: The storm sewer drainage map has been provided with the resubmittal along with hydrologic parameters for each area.**
2. As per the submitted Storm Sewer Sizing calculations, it appears that the proposed storm sewer is designed to accommodate a 10-year storm event. How will peak storm flows beyond the capacity of the proposed storm sewer be conveyed to the proposed infiltration basin? The proposed infiltration is intended to accommodate up to a 100-year storm event.  
**Response: During the 100-year storm event the sewers will surcharge and pond onsite until water levels subside and they can drain the ponded water to the basin. Refer to the stormwater calculations for the 100 year storm.**
3. The type of storm sewer pipe should be clearly indicated on the plans. On the Utility Plan, the pipe is designated as "CPP". Does this refer to Corrugated Plastic Pipe? If so, will the Corrugated Plastic Pipe have a smooth bore interior? Under the Storm Sewer Section of the General Notes (Sheet C000), the use of Corrugated Metal Pipe (CMP) is noted. Is CMP proposed for this project?

---

**Response: The proposed pipe will be ADS N-12 pipe with a smooth interior, labels have been revised to note SLCPP.**

4. It is unclear if the impacts of the tailwater, presented by the proposed infiltration basin (including the forebay), were taken into account in the hydraulic calculations for the proposed storm sewer. It appears that the proposed storm sewer system, as presently designed, would be prone to surcharge due to the tailwater offered by the infiltration basin. The invert elevation of the proposed storm sewer discharge to the proposed forebay is shown to be 4 feet below the elevation of the overflow from the forebay.

Furthermore, the top of grate elevation of a number of proposed stormwater inlets within the parking area is 911.5 feet, only 0.3 feet above the spillway elevation of the proposed infiltration basin. This should be considered by the applicant's engineer, as this could result in the following.

- Restriction of the hydraulic capacity of the conveyance system.
- Increased sedimentation/deposition within the collection system.

**Response: The Storm sewers have been analyzed with a tail water equivalent to the 10 and 100 year storm event. The system can convey both the 10 and the 100 year storm without drainage leaving the site undetained from these structures.**

5. The storm sewer from CB #1 is proposed not to discharge to a forebay, contrary to the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual.

**Response: Site layout has been changed, all pipes now enter the forebay.**

#### ***Status of NYSDOT Review and Plan Acceptance***

1. What is the status of the review and acceptance of the proposed drainage plan for this project, as it relates to the relocation of the NYSDOT's existing 30-inch diameter storm sewer? Will the proposed relocation/rerouting of this storm sewer result in a reduction of the hydraulic capacity of that storm sewer?

**Response: There will no longer be a relocation of the NYSDOT pipe.**

2. What is the status of NYSDOT's approval to construct within their existing easement on the western side of the project property?

**Response: There will no longer be a relocation of the NYSDOT pipe, as such the existing easement will remain.**

#### ***Post-Construction Operation & Maintenance of Stormwater Management System***

1. In accordance with the Village's Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Ordinance, a formal, signed enforceable operation and maintenance agreement for the stormwater collection and management system shall be provided by the Applicant. Furthermore, this agreement must reference and include an approved Operation & Maintenance Plan.

This agreement shall be binding on all subsequent landowners and recorded in the office of the County Clerk as a deed restriction on the property. Also, the Applicant shall convey to the Village

easements and/or rights-of-way to assure access for periodic inspections by the Village or their representatives (and for maintenance if required). These agreements, as well as the Operation & Maintenance Plan, shall be subject to the review and approval of the Village of Horseheads, their attorney, and Chemung County Stormwater Coalition.

**Response: Comment is noted, can you provide a copy of the agreement that will be required.**

2. The O & M Plan should also outline requirements/actions associated with the following items.

- Routine mowing of infiltration basin
- Actions to be taken if standing water persists over 48 hours within infiltration basin
- Inspection and removal of sediment/deposition within storm sewers

**Response: These items have been added to the O & M Plan.**

3. Information, regarding the maintenance of dumpsters and the associated dumpster areas to prevent contaminants from being exposed to precipitation and entering runoff, should be provided in the O & M plan.

**Response: These items have been added to the O & M Plan.**

4. In the submitted O & M Plan, various O & M tasks are noted as being required to be completed on a monthly basis. It appears that certain tasks, such as the inspection of the inlet grates, should occur at a more frequent interval, including after rainfall events.

**Response: The frequency of the noted tasks can be modified as stated above.**

### ***Erosion & Sediment Control***

1. How many acres will be disturbed at one time?

**Response: No more than 5 acres**

2. The "Sequence of Construction" on Sheet C000 of the plans does not match the "Construction Sequence" on Page 10 of the SWPPP. Is the use of temporary sediment basins proposed?

**Response: The Sequence of contractions has been revised to match. Temporary sediment basins are not proposed.**

3. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should include the locations of the proposed concrete wash-out area, the temporary stabilized construction entrance, temporary sediment basins, and stone check dams (in addition to the silt fence).

**Response: These items have been added to the plans as applicable.**

### ***Miscellaneous***

1. This review pertains only to stormwater management. The Applicant is responsible to obtaining all necessary approvals, including those from the Village of Horseheads, the Chemung County Sewer District, and the New York State Department of Transportation.

**Response: Comment is noted.**

our people and our passion in every project

- 
2. In accordance with the SPDES Stormwater General Permit for Construction Activity, documentation must be included in the SWPPP that the proposed construction activities will not adversely affect a property that is listed or is eligible for listing on the State of National Register of Historic Places (including archeological sites). As per Appendix T of the SWPPP, the site is located in an Archeo Sensitive Area. Has SHPO reviewed this project and provided an associated letter?

**Response: A no effect letter has been obtained from SHPO and is included in the SWPPP.**

Please feel free to contact me at (585) 232-5135 x 352 if you have any questions or concerns regarding the above responses.

Sincerely,



Justin Lattierre  
Project Engineer