



To: Town of Amenia Planning Board

Date: January 8, 2015

Memorandum

Project #: 29011

From: Amanda DeCesare, P.E.

Re: MDP and Site Plan Phase 1 Comments
Silo Ridge Resort Community

Silo Ridge Ventures, LLC (the "Applicant") and its professional consultants respond to the October 13, 2014 comment letter of Julie S. Mangarillo, P.E., CPESC, as follows (responses are presented in the same order as the comments; please note the gaps in the numbering are consistent with those in the comment letter)¹:

Section 1

1. There are many inconsistencies among the project documents such as the MDP booklet, MDP drawings, site plan drawings, water and wastewater drawings and other documentation. These inconsistencies need to be resolved.

Response JSM-1.1: Comment noted. The Amended MDP, Amended MDP Drawings, Site Plan Drawings and other supporting documents have been revised to be consistent with one another.

2. Under proposed conditions, there will be significant disturbance of steep slopes, including slopes greater than 30% slope, particularly for single-family homes in Estate Home lots. MDP drawing LA-3 "Site Paving & Site Walls" states "retaining walls shall be restricted to a maximum height of 6'-0". Where greater grade change needs to be accommodated, multiple, lower, stepped walls may be used, and shall be softened with plantings." Site Plan Phase 1 drawing S1.01 "Site Retaining Wall Sections and Details" include details for retaining walls 8 feet and 11 feet high, in addition to 4 feet and 6 feet high. Current grading plans show retaining walls in excess of the 11 foot retaining wall included on drawing S1.01. Additional consideration should be given to further reducing disturbance on slopes steeper than 30% and design of retaining walls. For lots with multiple retaining walls, such as E-47 and E-48, provide cross-section views through the lots and retaining wall top and bottom elevations to better evaluate the proposed conditions.

Response JSM-1.2: The design for the Estate Home area has been revised to provide that no single retaining wall exceeds eight (8) feet in height. All grading has been revised on Site Plan Drawings C6.01 to C6.14. It is noted that the Village Green lodge buildings have retaining walls approximately 11'-0"

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all references to: (i) the "Amended MDP" are to the Amended Master Development Plan dated January 2015; (ii) the "Addendum to EAF" are to the Addendum to Environmental Assessment Form dated January 2015; (iii) the Site Plan Drawings are to the plans and drawings last dated January 8, 2015; (iv) the Preliminary Subdivision Plat and Subdivision Drawings are to the plans last dated January 8, 2015; and (v) to the "Amended MDP Drawings" is to the drawings accompanying the Amended MDP narrative, all last dated January 8, 2015.



Memorandum

high as part of the transition to the formal green behind them; these walls are to provide access to the underground parking garages for the Condo buildings at the Village Green.

Cross-section views through Estate Home lots with multiple retaining walls have been added – please refer to Site Plan Drawings C6.40-C6.42.

Please refer to the Silo Ridge Resort Community: Estate Home Design Standards Letter to the Planning Board from Peter J. Wise, dated January 14, 2015 which addresses the applicant's permission to disturb steep slopes and its continued efforts to seek ways to reduce disturbance.

Additionally please refer to Response MWK-3 which shows the decrease in total site disturbance when comparing the current approved October 2009 master development plan to the Amended MDP.

3. The southern parcels are mentioned in some documents, such as archeological report and breeding bird survey. The Phase 1 Environmental Assessment conducted in 2007, with addendum in 2008 and tank closure report in 2014 does not include documentation of the close-out of the private landfill. Now that there is the easement and lot line revision on the southern parcel, documentation of the landfill close-out and monitoring is to be provided.

Response JSM-1.3: The improvements on the Harlem Valley Landfill Corp. property have been designed so that there will not be any disturbance or other impacts to the existing landfill. The lot line adjustment and easement do not affect the current or future maintenance or operation of the landfill. Landfill close-out and monitoring documentation is therefore not necessary.

Please refer to Letter from Roy T. Budnick & Associates, Inc. dated December 19, 2014, in Appendix E of Volume V: Response to Comments.

4. A waiver has been requested for providing the minimum sight distances at intersections as specified in Subdivision Code §105-22.F. Visibility at intersections and having adequate stopping and turning sight distance is important for vehicle and pedestrian safety. The maintenance of sight distance is included in the 8/18/2014 letter from the Amenia Fire Company. We recommend the Applicant comply with the minimum sight distance requirements.

Response JSM-1.4: The required sight lines for rural roads are shown on Site Plan Drawings C5.01 to C5.08. Waiver of Section 105-22(L)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations is requested for the intersection of Wood Duck Road with Pheasant Run (Site Plan Drawing C5.02); please refer to memorandum regarding Supplementary Planning Board Approvals, Waivers, and Determination pursuant to §121-18.C(7) of the Town Zoning Code, dated February 5 2015, in Appendix O of the Addendum to the EAF..

5. Provide justification for the requested waivers. Some requested waivers may allow for reduced impacts.

Response JSM-1.5: Please refer to memorandum regarding Supplementary Planning Board Approvals, Waivers, and Determination pursuant to §121-18.C(7) of the Town Zoning Code, dated February 5 2015, in Appendix O of the Addendum to the EAF.

6. Field change procedure: Field changes are commonly needed during the course of construction. A procedure should be put into place for the Town to manage requested field changes and determine when a requested field change is significant enough to require Planning Board approval for a Site Plan amendment.



Memorandum

Response JSM-1.6: Comment noted. Please refer to Change Request Protocol – Site Work document dated February 3, 2015.

7. The proposed water and wastewater systems will require testing prior to start of operations. The Planning Board should determine what level of participation the Town will have regarding the utility testing. For example, does the Planning Board want a Town representative to witness all of the utility testing? If so, a procedure will have to be put in place to ensure the Applicant is aware of this requirement and can coordinate test scheduling.

Response JSM-1.7: Comment noted.

The facilities of the sewage-works corporation must be inspected by a licensed professional engineer retained by the Town, at the Applicant's expense.

8. Comments regarding the Design Guidelines for the Estate Homes will be issued under separate cover.

Response JSM-1.8: Comment noted. The Applicant worked with the Town's consultants to develop Design Standards for the Estate Homes. Please refer to the Design Standards for Estate Homes, Appendix K of the Amended MDP.

9. Comments regarding the Subdivision Plat will be issued under separate cover.

Response JSM-1.9: Comment noted.

All comments regarding the Preliminary Subdivision Plat in the Memorandum and Review Chart provided by Julie S. Mangarillo dated October 28, 2014 are addressed on the revised Subdivision Drawings – please refer to the Subdivision Drawings in Appendix A of Volume IV: Subdivision.

10. Notice of Intent (NOI) Page 12, #39 – Provide justification for not meeting 100% RRv.

Response JSM-1.10: A note has been added to Notice of Intent (NOI) Page 12, #39, referring to the section of the SWPPP that justifies not meeting the 100% RRv.

11. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) page 10 regarding use of golf course and NYSDEC regulated wetland adjacent area as drawing flow to filter strip - Provide confirmation that contributing area is not too steep and otherwise meets the design criteria for the green infrastructure practice of "Sheetflow to Riparian Buffers or Filter Strips".

Response JSM-1.11: Page 10 of the SWPPP has been revised to confirm that the contributing area adjacent to the NYSDEC regulated wetland is not too steep and otherwise meets the design criteria for the green infrastructure practice of "Sheetflow to Riparian Buffers or Filter Strips".

12. Include an explanation in the SWPPP narrative how the impervious surfaces for Estate Homes that are subject to change based on future homebuyer preference were addressed in the SWPPP calculations. This explanation could be included under "Step 5" on page 12 or "Hydrologic Analysis" on page 13.

Response JSM-1.12: The following text has been added to the "Hydrologic Analysis" section on Page 13 of the SWPPP:



Memorandum

"In order to assure that the maximum allowable impervious coverage is accounted for on all lots (including the Estate Home lots), the hydrologic analysis uses the Maximum Lot Coverage % for each residence type from the Silo Ridge Community MDP Bulk Design Standards in the Amended MDP."

13. SWPPP pages 18 & 24 – Include that approval is needed prior to disturbing more than 5 acres at any one time.

Response JSM-1.13: The following text has been added to SWPPP pages 19 & 25: "Please note that NYSDEC approval is required prior to disturbing more than 5 acres at any one time."

14. Recommend taking credit for SWM #11 as an infiltration practice in NOI and SWPPP.

Response JSM-1. 14: The NOI and SWPPP have been revised to take credit for SWM#11 as an infiltration basin.

15. Testing of soils for infiltration practices needs to be completed during design, not during construction. Infiltration testing is to conform to requirements in Appendix D of NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual.

Response JSM-1.15: Soil testing was performed by TransTech Engineering Services, PC in October 2013. The Geotechnical Engineering Report, dated October 14, 2013 is included in Attachment D of the SWPPP. It should be noted that the infiltration basins are part of the approved golf course work and received a permit from NYSDEC. This work is currently under construction.

16. SWPPP Appendix E, sandfilter calculations: Are these designed "offline"? Spread Drawing indicates no overflow weir provided.

Response JSM-1.16: Yes. The underground sand filters were designed as "offline". Field inlets or drainage manholes just upstream of the underground sand filters are designed as diversion structures to divert the water quality flow to the underground sand filters and bypass the high flow from the underground sand filters. The smaller outlet pipe at the lower elevation in the diversion structure is to divert the low flow while the larger outlet pipe with higher elevation is to bypass the higher flow.

17. Provide hydraulic grade line analysis of pipe storm drainage system.

Response JSM-1.17: Hydraulic grade line analysis of the closed storm drainage system has been provided in Attachment F of the SWPPP.

18. Provide details and restrictions for concrete truck wash-out, both in the SWPPP and the drawings, C14.04.

Response JSM-1.18: Page 38 of the SWPPP includes restrictions for concrete trucks and Site Plan Drawing C14.03 have been revised to include concrete washout details.

19. How will the NOI and Notice of Termination (NOT) be handled for individual estate lots that are sold off?

Response JSM-1.19: The NOI and NOT cover the entire project and will not be severed for individual project components. The SPDES Permit will remain open until all construction of the Modified Project is complete.



Memorandum

20. In reference to Subdivision Code §105-25.E, who will be responsible for maintenance and operation of the water treatment and wastewater treatment facilities and appurtenances? Will the proposed transportation corporation have its own trained and licensed staff? Will a 3rd party, licensed contractor be hired to operate the facilities?

Response JSM-1.20: The duly formed water works and sewage works corporations will engage qualified third-party contractors to operate the facilities.

21. Have requirements from the "New York State Design Standards for Intermediate Sized Wastewater Treatment Systems" dated March 5, 2014 been met, particularly for separation distances of wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) from property lines and residences?

Response JSM-1.21: The wastewater treatment plant ("WWTP") has been relocated to the south to the Golf Maintenance Facility area on the Harlem Valley Landfill Corp. property. This location complies with NYSDEC requirements and has been thoroughly discussed with NYSDEC, Region 3.

22. Provide water and wastewater connections to individual buildings. For areas of steep slopes, utility connections are to be coordinated with driveways to minimize disturbance.

Response JSM-1.22: Water and wastewater service connections are now shown to each lot. Coordination of wastewater services for the estate homes has been discussed with the Planning Board and its consultants, for those with services proposed through non-ADA areas, a sewer envelope will be identified on the plans.

Please refer to the revised Water Distribution System Plans (Site Plan Drawings C7.01 to C7.13) and the revised Wastewater System Plans (Site Plan Drawings C9.01 to C9.13).

23. The proposed hydrant included on Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C10.16 is to be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department.

Response JSM-1.23: Comment noted. The Applicant sent the fire hydrant drawing to the Amenia Fire Company chief on 10/29 for review and approval and received an email response on October 30, 2104 – please refer to Appendix L.3 of the Addendum to the EAF.

The Applicant has also met with the Wassaic Fire Company and revised the site plans according to comments received to date – please refer to Appendix L.5 of the Addendum to the EAF.

24. Provide notes for utility testing requirements and standards on the drawings.

Response JSM-1.24: Please refer to General Water Notes on Site Plan Drawing C7.01, General Wastewater Notes on Site Plan Drawing C9.01 and Site Plan Drawing C10.05.

25. Refer to "Groundwater Exploration and Pumping Test Program", prepared by LBG, dated August 2014:

- a. Has the design engineer for water and wastewater system (Cedarwood Engineering) been provided with updated water and wastewater design flows?

Response JSM-1.25.a.: The water and wastewater design flows are based on the Amended MDP and have been provided to Cedarwood Engineering by the appropriate design engineer. Please refer to



Memorandum

Appendix I.1: "Silo Ridge Projected Water Demand" and Appendix I.2: "Silo Ridge Projected Wastewater Flow", of the Addendum to the EAF.

- b. Similarly, Appendix J "Updated Wastewater Demand" of the Addendum to the EAF should be updated to be consistent with the design flows from this report.

Response JSM-1.25.b.: Appendix I.2: "Silo Ridge Projected Wastewater Flow" of the Addendum to the EAF provides updated information on the wastewater demand and has been revised accordingly.

- c. The report references that the Dutchess County Department of Health approved various aspects of the test program. If the DOH provided letters, those should be included in the report.

Response JSM-1.25.c.: Correspondence with DCDOH is provided in Volume VI: Additional Project Coordination – Section 7. Please note that DCDOH had no comments regarding the test program.

- d. Based on the report, some of the wells selected for water supply need additional testing or treatment. Follow-up documentation will have to be provided to the Town.

Response JSM-1.25.d.: The Applicant will comply.

- e. There are more wells on-site than will be used for water supply or irrigation. How will the other wells be handled? Provide information on decommissioning.

Response JSM-1.25.e.: Site Plan Drawings C3.01 to C3.11, C4.01 to C4.14, and Water System Plans C7.01 to C7.13 have been revised to identify the existing wells to be used for the water supply and irrigation and those to be abandoned. Wells to be abandoned will be decommissioned in accordance with New York State Department of Health guidelines.

- 26. Provide a plan for water supply that shows existing well locations and identifies which wells will remain in use and which will be decommissioned. Some information on existing wells is included within the individual site plans and in the "Groundwater Exploration and Pumping Test Program" prepared by LBG, dated August 2014. However, a single plan showing which wells are proposed for use and which are proposed to be decommissioned will be beneficial. Wells proposed for continued use should be labeled as drinking water supply, irrigation or monitoring wells.

Response JSM-1.26: Please refer to Response JSM-1.25.e.

- 27. Show locations of existing septic system(s) for main building and maintenance building on Site Plan Phase 1 existing conditions drawings. How will existing septic system(s) be decommissioned?

- a. Refer to Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), prepared by IVI Due Diligence Services, Inc., dated June 8, 2007 – Page 26 states "Inasmuch as hazardous materials are used on-site on a regular basis the potential exists that deleterious materials have been introduced into the SSDS [subsurface sewage disposal system]. As such, testing of the septic tank, leach fields, and distribution boxes for contamination would be prudent." Has this testing been performed? If so, the ESA is to be updated.

Response JSM-1.27: The leach fields at the existing Clubhouse have been abandoned as part of the approved golf work. The demolition plans have been revised to show that the septic tanks for the existing Clubhouse will be abandoned in compliance with applicable local, state and federal



Memorandum

requirements. The tanks were pumped clean in August 2014 and no hazardous materials were encountered.

The demolition plans have been revised to also show that the existing septic tanks and leach fields for the golf maintenance building will be removed or abandoned in compliance with applicable local, state and federal requirements.

Please refer to Site Plan Drawings C3.03 and C3.04. A note has also been added to each sheet that "All testing will be performed in accordance with local, state and federal requirements".

28. Refer to "Water Budget Report for the Combined Irrigation Pond", prepared by The Chazen Companies and LBG, revised 8/21/2014:

- a. There is conflicting information in the report regarding which scenario will use more water; 'established' or 'grow-in.' Refer to section 2.3 "a golf course requires significantly more water during the "grow-in" phase than once the turf is established." Compared to section 4.3 "It should be noted that the entire golf course and common landscaped areas will not be growing in simultaneously. Therefore the grow-in irrigation demands depicted in the appendices are conservatively overestimating the actual grow-in irrigation needs." However, Table 2 in Section 5 shows under 'dry year' conditions, there will be less irrigation volume available for 'established vegetation' compared to 'grow-in'. Clarify this analysis.

Response JSM-1.28: The tables in Appendix E of The Chazen Companies's June 2008 "Water Budget Report for the Combined Irrigation Pond" show the estimated water usage during the "grow-in" period and the "established" period for the project. The irrigation water usage is divided into two sections: Golf Course irrigation water use and landscaping irrigation water use within the Silo Ridge Resort Community. Under the "grow-in" phase, the irrigation water usage is higher for the golf course than during the "established" phase. However, because of the phased development of the project, the landscaping irrigation during the "grow-in" phase of the golf course is zero, therefore, the combined "grow-in" irrigation water demand (golf course plus landscaping irrigation) for the project is lower during the "grow-in" phase than during the "established" phase.

The higher "established" versus "grow-in" irrigation water demands are also discussed in LBG's January 2015 report "Silo Ridge Resort Community, Water Budget Report for Combined Irrigation Pond, Anemia, New York".

29. The Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP), dated June 2007 prepared with Audubon International has many recommendations and requirements, including regarding the layout of the maintenance facility. Many of these recommendations do not appear to be incorporated into the current plan. In particular, refer to Section 9.0 "The Natural Resource Management Center (Maintenance Facility)" and Appendix VII "Maintenance Facility Best Management Practices." An updated NRMP should be provided to reflect the current proposal. A letter or other documentation from Audubon International is to be provided stating the revised site plan has been reviewed and is acceptable.

Response JSM-1.29: Please refer to Response MWK-8.

30. Section 9.0 [of the NRMP] has requirements for the interior of the pesticide storage and mixing building, such as a concrete floor, keeping the building locked, good ventilation, locating the light switch and fuse box on the



Memorandum

exterior of the building, among others. These requirements should be included within the site plan as a series of notes. These recommendations will have to be incorporated into the floor plans for the buildings.

Response JSM-1.30: Section 9.0 of the NRMP provides the requirements for the interior. Site Plan Drawing C4.14, references Section 9.0 of the NRMP. Additionally Site Plan Drawing C4.15 has been added and includes the important text from Section 9.0 of the NRMP, thus making the NRMP part of the plan set.

The NRMP recommendations will also be included on the plans submitted for a building permit.

31. Provide additional notes and labels on Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C5.11, the site plan for the maintenance facility to coordinate with the NRMP and drawing A3.15 "Maintenance Facility Building Elevations". For example, A3.15 shows the fuel island will have a canopy, in accordance with the NRMP. This should be labeled on the site plan. The fuel island is to have a concrete pad, instead of asphalt and protective bollards. These features are to be labeled on the site plan. C5.11 seems to show the 'equipment wash area' is open, while A3.15 seems to show it is covered. This should be clarified. Any drains are to be connected to the sanitary sewer system, not the storm drainage system. This should be shown on the wastewater drawings.

Response JSM-1.31: All plans have been revised to show the current Golf Maintenance Facility area layout – please refer to Site Plan Drawings C4.14 and A3.41.

Per the NRMP all the drains will comply with the following:

- Chemical Mixing Area: The Chemical Storage area will have a concrete floor sloping to separate floor drains in the chemical storage, mixing, and filling areas attached to a self-contained pumping system to remove any spills/cleaning within the building, and wastewater will be stored in a holding tank to be utilized periodically for areas such as the driving range. All materials within the building will be contained and not go into any storm or sanitary piping system.
 - Wash Bay: Will have a sloped concrete floor with a floor drain, located at the low point that captures, circulates and cleans waste water through a water/oil separator, sand filters. The water will be for re-use at the wash bay through the use of a storage tank/pumps contained internal to the wash bay area. The solid waste from the wash bay is filtered and removed periodically and is either recycled or put into a dumpster for removal offsite. The bay area will be covered and raised to keep any rain water from entering the system. An emergency overflow pipe will go to a basin and no waste water goes into any storm or sanitary system piping.
 - Fuel Island: The pad will be elevated and covered to direct rain water away from the area and adjoin the wash bay area. Any fuel spills will go through the water/oil separator and be filtered and removed. The fuel tanks will be a self-contained Convault type system with a concrete shell for protection. There is no connection to any storm drain or sanitary system piping.
32. C5.11 has "Chemical Storage Container" and "Fertilizer Storage" labeled. Indicate where the pesticide mixing will take place.

Response JSM-1.32: Site Plan Drawing C4.14 references the NRMP, which identifies where mixing will occur.



Memorandum

33. The NRMP refers to holding tanks that can store rinse water and be re-used (page 9-3). Are these holding tanks located in the "Chemical Storage Container" or other location?

Response JSM-1.33: The Chemical Storage area will have a concrete floor sloping to separate floor drains in the chemical storage, mixing, and filling areas attached to a self-contained pumping system to remove any spills/cleaning within the building, and wastewater will be stored in a holding tank to be utilized periodically for areas such as the driving range. All materials within the building will be contained and not go into any storm or sanitary piping system. The holding tanks are within the building.

34. The water/wastewater plans are to show water and wastewater lines to maintenance buildings, such as where the pesticide mixing will take place, to provide necessary emergency showers and eye wash stations.

Response JSM-1.34: Please refer to revised Site Plan Drawings C7.10 and C9.10.

35. Provide additional design information for the "soil bays" shown on C5.11. Provide screening for the dumpster shown on C5.11.

Response JSM-1.35: The Golf Maintenance Facility area layout has been revised in accordance with Section 9.0 of the NRMP – please refer to Site Plan Drawing C4.14. Soil bay details have been added to Site Plan Drawing C14.04. Landscape plans have been revised to provide screening of the Golf Maintenance Facility – please refer to Site Plan Drawing L3.14.

36. Update Site Plan Phase 1 Landscape drawing L3.25 area of disturbance/restoration to be consistent with the other site and grading plans. Drawing C7.11 shows disturbance up to and onto the Route 22 right-of-way at the golf maintenance facility. The corresponding landscape drawing, L3.25 labels that area as "existing vegetation to remain."

Response JSM-1.36: All plans have been revised to provide additional screening – a combination of berms and new native trees – has been added within the "green buffer" along Route 22. Additionally, the grading and drainage plans have been revised to show a single discharge point for the stormwater system as per Town recommendation. Please refer to Site Plan Drawings C6.14 and L3.14.

37. Include other recommendations/requirements from the NRMP not specifically listed here in the site plan drawings.

Response JSM-1.37: Please refer to JSM-1.30.

38. §105-21(3) requires lots to have "a depth of undisturbed usable soil with respect to seasonal or prolonged high-water table and bedrock of not less than four feet." Provide this information or request a waiver with justification as to why this requirement does not have to be met.

Response JSM-1.38: Requirements under Section 105-21(3) are intended to regulate potential issues with septic systems, which the applicant is not proposing for the Modified Project. Nevertheless, waiver of Section 105-21(3) of the Subdivision Regulations is requested; please refer to memorandum regarding Supplementary Planning Board Approvals, Waivers, and Determination pursuant to §121-18.C(7) of the Town Zoning Code, dated February 5 2015, in Appendix O of the Addendum to the EAF.



Memorandum

Section 2

1. The main loop road, from the Main Entrance to the secondary entrance on Route 22 by the proposed Golf Maintenance Building should be brought into conformance with the NYS Fire Code for maximum grade of 10%.

- a. **The 8/18/2014 letter from the Amenia Fire Company will permit road grades in excess of 10% but not to exceed 13%. Provide a note on MDP drawing RI-1 "Roadway Identification Plan" to require any changes to proposed road grade for Phase 1 to be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department, as well as site plans for future phases 2 and 3.**

Response JSM-2.1: A note has been added to Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.

2. Gates are proposed at both ends of the main loop road. Provide details on how emergency vehicles will be able to open the gates.

- a. **A note has been provided on Site Plan drawing C5.11, but it does not specify how emergency responders will be able to access the gate at the secondary entrance. The 'response to comments' indicates an access pass will be provided to emergency services. This is to be included in the note. Include this information on MDP drawing RI-1.**

Response JSM-2.2: Site Plan Drawing C4.14 has been revised accordingly and a note has been added to Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.

3. For driveways that exceed 500 feet, provide required turn around and turn-outs per Amenia Town Code and NYS Fire Code Section 510.

- a. **Information has been provided for Site Plan Phase 1. Add a note to MDP drawing RI-1 that designs for turn-arounds and turn-outs will be provided during site plan review for Phases 2 and 3.**

Response JSM-2.3: Turn-outs have been designed and have been approved for Phase 1 by the Amenia and Wassaic Fire Departments – please refer to Appendices L.4 and L.5 of the Addendum to the EAF. A note regarding Phase 2 (there is no longer a third phase) has been added to Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.

4. For Site Plan review – Provide driveway profiles showing conformance with §105-22.I thru M, including all driveways are to slope down and away from the road for a minimum of 20 feet at a maximum slope of 2% and maximum allowable driveway slope of 12%.

- a. **For driveways that cannot meet driveway slope requirements, a trench drain is proposed. Include the sample driveway profile in the 'Design Guidelines for Estate Home Sites' as well as details on how to connect the trench drain to the overall project drainage system.**

Response JSM-2.4: Waivers of Section 105-22.L(2), (4) and (5) of the Subdivision Regulations are requested; please refer to memorandum regarding Supplementary Planning Board Approvals, Waivers, and Determination pursuant to §121-18.C(7) of the Town Zoning Code, dated February 5 2015, in Appendix O of the Addendum to the EAF.



Memorandum

The Design Standards for Estate Homes, Appendix K of the Amended MDP, includes the following requirement:

Design Standard 3.o. "Provide driveway profile showing existing and proposed grades. Driveway grade shall not exceed 15% grade. If the driveway does not slope down and away from the road for 20 feet a trench drain or approved equal shall be provided at the bottom of the driveway. Provide proposed engineering details on the trench drain and how it will be tied into the drainage system for the road."

Additionally, Site Plan Drawing C14.02 has a "Trench Drain (Type A)" detail.

7. Per the 2010 Fire Code of New York State, fire apparatus roads must have a minimum unobstructed width of 20 feet ...
 - a. **Road cross-section details have been provided on Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C14.06. However, the details show tree branches encroaching on the 20 foot clear width. The details are to be revised to show the unobstructed clear width of 20 feet for a minimum unobstructed vertical clearance of 13 feet, 6 inches per NYS Fire Code 503.2.1. Additionally, show and label the road right-of-way on the detail.**

Response JSM-2.7: No waivers from the 2010 Fire Code of New York State are required. The plans have been revised to show the unobstructed clear width and vertical clearance even on the roads that are not "fire apparatus roads" under Section 503. Please refer to Site Plan Drawing C14.07.

10. Public scenic overlook parking lot – The side slope of the driveway is very steep. Guiderail on the downhill side will most likely be required. Provide a profile of the driveway to the parking lot.
 - a. **Boulders are proposed on the downhill side to act as guiderail. A driveway profile has been provided on Drawing C5.25 for the Overlook driveway. The vertical curve of 100 feet long seems too short for the change of grade from 12% to 1%. The severity of the change in grade could cause a long vehicle, such as a fire truck, to 'bottom out'. Further, the profile should be updated to reflect the revised grading shown on drawing C7.02.**

Response JSM-2.10.a.: The driveway to and location of the proposed Artisan's Park Overlook has been revised. The revised driveway profile has been provided – please refer to Site Plan Drawing C4.28.

- b. **Some other vertical curve lengths provided in the road profiles (C5.21-C5.25) similarly seem too short for the differences in grade entering and exiting the curves. These should be given another look.**

Response JSM-2.10.b.: The road profiles have been revised. All "k values" for the vertical curves have been reviewed based on the appropriate design speed. Please refer to Site Plan Drawings C4.21 to C4.28.

11. ... Golf Academy.... Due to steep side slope, guiderail may be needed [along emergency access].
 - a. **No guiderail or other barrier has been proposed along the downhill side of the access path to the Golf Academy. Consideration should be given to guiderail or boulders as proposed at the Overlook driveway along the downhill side of the access path. Label the emergency access path on MDP drawing RI-1.**



Memorandum

Response JSM-2.11: The plans have been revised accordingly. A combination of a wooden post guiderail with boulders is now proposed along the downhill side of the access path. Please refer to Site Plan Drawings C4.12 and L1.12.

The emergency access road has been labeled on Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.

17. During the 1/16/2014 conference call to discuss road layout, a turn-around near the end of Road D was requested. This has not been provided.

- a. **A driveway near the end of Road D has been widened to allow for emergency vehicle turnaround. A note regarding this has been added to MDP Drawing GP-2. This note is to be added to MDP Drawing RI-1.**

Response JSM-2.17: The use of the private driveway near the end of Road D is no longer necessary for emergency vehicle turnaround. Turn-outs have been designed and have been approved for Site Plan Phase 1 by the Amenia and Wassaic Fire Departments – please refer to Appendices L.4 and L.5 of the Addendum to the EAF.

Additionally, please note that the South Lawn lots are now part of the Phase 1 site plan and a note regarding Phase 2 has been added to Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.

21. The Estate Homes at the south end of the project, E-30 to E-33, appear to share a common driveway. Because this driveway is so long and provides access to multiple homes, provide a driveway profile. Due to the length of this common driveway, provide a turn-around and pull-offs per the NYS Fire Code Section 511.

- a. **As these houses are in Phase 2, the final design can be addressed during site plan review. Refer to 5/20/2014 comment #3, above.**

Response JSM-2.21: The south end of the Estate Home neighborhood has been redesigned and is now part of Phase 1. There are no driveways in excess of 500 feet.

Additionally, the Amenia Fire Company has accepted the design of all roads, driveways, hammerheads, and other proposed site features within their jurisdiction. The Applicant has also met with the Wassaic Fire Company and revised the site plans according to comments received to date. Please refer to Appendix L of the Addendum to the EAF for Fire Department Correspondence.

26. Per §121-30.I, provide sight triangles at road intersections, 50 feet from the corner as shown in the code. The sight triangles should be shown on the individual site plans and landscape plans to ensure proposed landscaping does not interfere with traffic safety. Similarly for visibility at intersections, refer to §105-22.F.

- a. **Per §105-22.F, for a design speed limit of 35 mph or less, the minimum sight distance at an intersection is 250 feet. The Applicant has requested a waiver from §105-22.F in the letter dated 8/6/2014 prepared by DelBello Donnellan Weingarten Wise & Wiederkehr, LLP. However, visibility at intersections and having adequate stopping and turning sight distance is important for safety. The maintenance of sight distance is included in the 8/18/2014 letter from the Amenia Fire Company. We recommend the Applicant comply with this requirement.**

Response JSM-2.26: Please refer to Response JSM-1.4.



Memorandum

Sight distances at the site entrances comply with the minimum required by NYSDOT for the applicable design speed, which is more stringent than §105-22.F of the Subdivision Regulations (250').

27. Provide road design information for Vineyard of project.

- a. **As the Vineyard section of the project is in Phase 3, the final design can be addressed during Phase 3 site plan review. Refer to the note for MDP drawing RI-1 in 5/20/2014 comment #3, above.**

Response JSM-2.27: A note has been added to Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.

32. Per Town Subdivision Code §105-25.B.(2)(c)[2] "The drainage system shall be large enough to accommodate potential runoff from the entire upstream drainage area whether inside or outside of the subdivision. The Town Engineer shall approve the design and size of the drainage facilities based on anticipated runoff from a fifty-year storm under conditions of total potential development permitted by the Zoning Law in the watershed." Per NYSDEC regulations, peak discharge from the 100-year storm under developed conditions cannot exceed the peak discharge under existing conditions. Confirm other stormwater infrastructure, such as piping and swales are designed to handle runoff from the 50-year storm under full build-out conditions.

- a. **The response to consultants' comments indicates the requirement to accommodate the 50-year storm has been met. This information should be included in the SWPPP narrative or other appropriate project documentation.**

Response JSM-2.32: Language has been added to the SWPPP under the "Hydrologic Analysis" section stating that the drainage pipe and drainage swales have been designed to handle the 50-year storm runoff.

36. Page 5, #15 & 16 [of the SWPPP Notice of Intent]– Response indicates runoff does not enter separate storm sewer system. Confirm that no runoff enters NYSDOT drainage systems along Route 44 and/or Route 22. Site Plan drawing C7.11 shows a proposed point discharge from the WWTP parking lot into NYSDOT right-of-way.

- a. **Response to NOI #16 states "Note: Runoff that is entering the NYSDOT drainage system occurs for BOTH EXISTING & PROPOSED conditions. Runoff from proposed development is treated before discharging into the NYSDOT drainage system." Recommend response to #16 be simplified to "NYSDOT," since new point discharges are proposed. However we defer to NYSDEC's review.**

Response JSM-2.36: The answer to NOI #16 has been revised to be "NYSDOT" as recommended.

39. Page 11, #36 [of the SWPPP Notice of Intent] – Regarding Channel Protection Volume (Cpv), provide documentation that response is acceptable to NYSDEC.

- a. **We defer to NYSDEC's review of response.**

Response JSM-2.39: Comment noted.

40. Page 13, #40 [of the SWPPP Notice of Intent] – Presumably additional DEC permits will be required for wastewater treatment discharge among others.



Memorandum

- a. **The list of additional DEC permits should be reviewed by the Applicant. A 'solid waste' permit is selected, indicating solid waste (garbage, etc) could be stored on site. Similarly, no permit is selected for the discharge from the WWTP. Revise the responses to coordinate with permits requested from NYSDEC.**

Response JSM-2.40: Based on the pre-application meeting with the DEC, the following permits will be required for this project and are identified on #40 of the NOI:

- Protection of Waters Permit (6 NYCRR Part 608);
- Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification;
- Water Withdrawal Permit (6 NYCRR Part 601); and
- ACOE Nationwide Permit.

Please note that the project will not require a wetlands permit from DEC (6NYCRR Part 664, Article 24).

43. Section IV "Project Description" [of the SWPPP text]

- c. Page 9, Peak runoff values in NOI is for 1 of the 4 design points, not the entire project. Provide total peak runoff for entire project. Or provide discussion as to why the peak runoff values for only 1 discharge point was provided in the NOI.
- i. **Page 14 of the SWPPP provides peak discharge values for all 4 design points. Include a "total" peak discharge that is the sum of the 4 design points. This value should match the value provided in the NOI on page 11, #37.**

Response JSM-2.43: The peak discharges from all four design points were totaled and are now included in Table 1 and 2 of the SWPPP dated January 2015, as recommended. Please refer to Page 14. The numbers are consistent between the NOI and SWPPP.

48. Section X Spill Prevention Plan and Response Procedures, Pages 30 and 32 "Fertilizers" [of the SWPPP text] – include a reference to the 'NYS Dishwasher Detergent and Nutrient Runoff Law' which regulates use of fertilizers. Also include restrictions required in the Aquifer Overlay District (§121-15) and any restrictions from the Habitat Management Plan.

- a. **The additional notations have been provided. The response to consultants' comments included that the NRMP (Natural Resources Management Plan) would be similarly referenced. The reference to the NRMP could not be located in the SWPPP.**

Response JSM-2.48: The SWPPP dated January 2015 has been revised to reference the NRMP – please refer to Page 35.

57. Provide details regarding how discharges from footing drains and roof drains for structures will be managed.

- a. **A note has been added to Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C7.00. Details have been provided for footing drains and for roof drains directly connected to the drainage system on drawing C14.02. Add a detail to show disconnection of roof runoff, with energy dissipater (splash block).**

Response JSM-2.57: Splash Block Detail has been added to Site Plan Drawing C14.03.



Memorandum

58. Flood Plain Impacts – Project now includes filling of flood plain area to plant trees in the NYSDOT right-of-way at the main entrance to the site. Any work within the flood plain requires a permit per Town Code Chapter 67 "Flood Damage Prevention". The location of this proposed fill is in proximity to a culvert that carries the Amenia Brook below Route 22. Reducing the flood plain storage capacity could have potentially significant impacts to properties upstream and downstream of the culvert. Provide a detailed analysis of the potential impacts of filling this portion of the flood plain. Provide documentation that the NYSDOT has approved the filling and planting of trees within Route 22 right-of-way.

- a. **It is our understanding an application has been made to NYSDOT. In the response to consultants' comments there are conflicting responses as to whether the Floodplain Development Permit application has been submitted or if it will be submitted. Provide the required documentation in accordance with Chapter 67.**

Response JSM-2.58: The application for Floodplain Development Permit under Town Code Chapter 67 is submitted in Section 10 of Volume VI: Additional Project Coordination.

59. AQO - Provide the information required by §121-15 for the Aquifer Overlay District (AQO) including recharge and consumption of water calculations. The AQO has additional restrictions on storage of fertilizers and chloride salts. Provide information to show the project will be in conformance with these requirements.

- a. **Calculations for recharge and consumption of water in accordance with the Aquifer Overlay District could not be located.**

Response JSM-2.59.a.1.: Under Section 121-15.F of the Zoning Code, the natural recharge rate for a parcel shall be determined by identifying the soil types on the property, classifying them by hydrogeological soil groups (A through D, A/D and C/D), applying a recharge rate of 20.2 inches/year for A and A/D soils, 14.7 inches/year for B soils, 7.6 inches/year for C and C/D soils and 4.2 inches/year for D soils, and multiplying the recharge rate(s) by the number of acres in the parcel for each soil group.

Based on Figure 2 "Hydrologic Soils Group, Silo Ridge" from the May 2007 report of The Chazen Companies titled "Silo Ridge Resort Community, Aquifer Development and Pumping Test Report", there are 25.7 acres of A/D soil, 187.7 acres of B soil, 441.9 acres of C and C/D soil and 7.2 acres of D soil underlying the Silo Ridge property. The table below shows the calculated recharge for each of the soil types:



Memorandum

Soil Type	Recharge (inches per year)	Recharge (gallons per day per acre)	Acreage (acres)	Recharge (gallons per day)
A and A/D	20.2	1,503	25.7	38,627
B	14.7	1,094	187.7	205,344
C and C/D	7.6	565.4	441.9	249,850
D	4.2	312.4	7.2	2,249
Total Recharge				496,070

Under Section 121-15.G, water consumption is the net loss of liquid phase water through site activities, plus the water needed to dilute wastewater and other discharges to a concentration equal to 50% of the New York Title 6, Part 703, groundwater standard. The following table shows the calculation of water consumption:

Use	Gallons per Day	Multiplied by Dilution Factor	Project Specific Value	Consumption per Day
Irrigated Land (nonagricultural)	Irrigated acres x 4,000 ¹ (or adjusted for vegetation with other water requirements)	X1	350,000 gpd – calculated peak demand for project specific vegetation requirements	350,000 gpd
Uses with surface water discharge	Site activity use x 0.2	X1	Site activity use is 125,570 gpd X 0.2	25,114 gpd
Residential uses with subsurface water discharge ²	70 per capita	X6	NA	NA
Nonresidential uses with subsurface water discharge ²	Daily use	X6	NA	NA



Memorandum

¹ Applicable for vegetation requiring one-inch-per-week irrigation. May be adjusted for vegetation with other water requirements.

² Calculate use per NYSDEC intermediate wastewater disposal guide. Discharge must not exceed NYSDEC Title 6, Part 703, effluent.

NA = not applicable for this project

Based on the above calculations, the Modified Project total calculated recharge of 496,070gpd is approximately 120,956gpd more than the consumptive demand of 375,114gpd.

Response to consultants' comment regarding fertilizer storage references the Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP). The NRMP has numerous requirements and recommendations for the layout of the Maintenance Facility and storage of fertilizer, pesticides and other chemicals. Have the requirements and recommendations of the NRMP been followed? Has the NRMP been updated for the current project?

Response JSM-2.59.a.2.: Please refer to Response JSM-1.30.

Has the special permit request for storage of more than 500 lbs of fertilizer been submitted to the Planning Board?

Response JSM-2.59.a.3.: The special permit was requested in correspondence from the Applicant's counsel to the Planning Board dated August 6, 2014. Please refer to Response DE-101.

- b. The site plans C5.01-C5.11 and drawing C14.05 show proposed 1000 gallons underground propane tanks. Per §121-15.D.4 "installation of any underground fuel tank or tanks, whose combined capacity is less than 1,100 gallons, is prohibited..." How will this restriction be addressed?**

Response JSM-2.59.b.: The plans have been revised to show 1,990 gallon underground propane tanks.

62. Provide an existing conditions plan for water supply that shows existing well locations and identifies which wells will remain in use and which will be decommissioned. Provide information on how existing wells will be properly decommissioned.

- a. Some information on existing wells is included within the individual site plans and in the "Groundwater Exploration and Pumping Test Program" prepared by LBG, dated August 2014. However, a single plan showing which wells are proposed for use and which are proposed to be decommissioned will be beneficial. Wells proposed for continued use should be labeled as drinking water supply, irrigation or monitoring wells.**

Response JSM-2.60: Please refer to Response JSM-1.25.e.

64. Per Town Subdivision Code §105-25.B "Underground improvements ... and public franchise utilities shall be placed in the road right-of-way between the road paving and the right-of-way line in order to simplify location and repair of the utility lines." And §105-25.C "Utility and drainage easements. Where topography or other conditions make inclusion of utilities or drainage facilities within road rights-of-way impractical, perpetual



Memorandum

unobstructed easements at least 20 feet in width for such utilities shall be provided across property outside the road lines and with satisfactory access to the road. Ownership of these easements shall be indicated on all reservations and on the final subdivision plat."

- a. Response to consultants' comments states "Comment noted. The Applicant will seek a waiver." We defer to the Planning Board attorney regarding easements.**

Response JSM-2.64: All subdivision plans have been revised to provide the required easement widths in accordance with Section 105-20(G) and Section 105-25(C) – please refer to Subdivision Drawings PL5.01, PL6.01 to PL6.03, and PL7.01 to PL7.03 and PL8.01 to PL8.03. No waivers are required.

65. Refer to Town Subdivision Code §105-25.E for transportation corporation requirements. §105-25.E (6) Provide results of 72-hour well capacity test.

- a. Include in the "Groundwater Exploration and Pumping Test Program", prepared by LBG, dated August 2014 or other appropriate document that the requirement of well capacity of 600 gallons per dwelling unit over 72 hour period has been met.**

Response JSM-2.65: The average water demand estimate for the Modified Project has been calculated based on 600 gallons per day per dwelling unit, as required under Section 105-25.E of the Subdivision Regulations.

The average water demand for the Modified Project (including potential future uses) using the 600 gpd per dwelling unit multiplier results in a combined average water demand estimate of about 118.8 gpm.

The yields of proposed potable supply Wells 2, 11, and 31 demonstrated during the 72-hour pumping test were 150 gpm, 65 gpm, and 158 gpm, respectively. The combined yield of Wells 2 and 11 of 215 gpm, with the best well (Well 31) out of service, is more than sufficient to meet the water demand of the Modified Project calculated based on the 600 gpd per dwelling unit multiplier.

66. Town Subdivision Code §105-30.A, "When public franchise utilities are to be installed, the Applicant shall submit to the Planning Board written assurances from each public utility company..." Provide the written assurances.

- a. Response to consultants' comments indicates documentation will be provided.**

Response JSM-2.66: Comment noted. The water works and sewage works corporations have not yet been formed.

The Applicant is working with NYSEG to supply electric to the site. A communications provider has not been determined yet.

67. Provide copies of Department of Health applications and permits.

- a. Response to consultants' comments indicates documentation will be provided.**

Response JSM-2.67: Correspondence with DCDOH is provided in Volume VI: Additional Project Coordination – Section 7.



Memorandum

68. With WWTP no longer providing treatment for hamlet of Amenia, has consideration been given to relocating WWTP onto main Silo Ridge property to reduce number of utility crossings beneath Route 44?
- a. **Applicant's response states "...Applicant considered relocation, but the proposed location is preferred and approved." Based upon the steep slope disturbance, visibility of the facility and potential disruptions to traffic on Route 44 during construction and future delivery and removal of large pieces of equipment, additional consideration should be given for relocation or additional justification as to why this is the best location should be provided.**
 - b. **Recommend use of retaining walls to reduce disturbance on steep slopes.**
 - c. **Provide truck-turning analysis to confirm tractor-trailers will be able to enter, turn around and exit the WWTP without having to back up onto Route 44. Similarly, provide truck-turning analysis for the water treatment building.**
 - d. **Provide sight distance analysis for the proposed WWTP driveway, taking into consideration the slope of Route 44. Landscape screening will have to be carefully planned and maintained to prevent interference with sight distance.**

Response JSM-2.68.a.-d.: See Response JSM-1.21. These comments are no longer applicable.

71. There are proposed disturbances within the easement. Are these disturbances permitted?
- a. **Response to consultants' comments indicates permission will be sought.**

Response JSM-2.71: The WWTP has been relocated. Comment is not applicable.

103. In the MDP for overall existing conditions and overall site plan as well as Site Plan drawing set, on overall plan sheets, C2.00, C3.00, C5.00, C7.00, etc include property information for all properties, including individual parcels owned by the Applicants and all abutting parcels. Include owner name, acreage, tax map number and any other identifying information.
- a. **The majority of abutting properties are properly labeled on the drawing sheets. Dutchess County eParcel website shows the smaller rectangle shown on the Town of Amenia landfill property, TM 7066-00-882575, is a separate parcel, TM 7066-00-885633. This should be labeled as such on the drawings.**
 - b. **Additionally, provide parcel labels for parcels on opposite side of the roads, in particular the Dutchess County Department of Public Works (DPW) property proposed to receive landscape screening and the property at the corner of West Lake Amenia Road and Route 44.**

Response JSM-2.103: The plans have been revised accordingly.

119. LA-2 "Site Lighting" the 2nd bullet under 'High Brightness and Glare' states "Street, path and area lighting poles will not exceed 20' in height." Per §121-38.A.4.d "Lighting within parking lots shall be on low poles of 12 feet to 15 feet maximum height, with color-corrected lamps and cut-off luminaries designed to minimize glare and light pollution... Sidewalks leading from parking lots shall be lit with bollard lighting and indirect illumination of buildings and vegetation." Revise lighting pole height to 12 to 15 feet high. Refer also to §121-40.L and §121-65.B.7 for additional lighting requirements and restrictions. Include discussion of lighting for



Memorandum

public scenic overlook parking lot, WWTP and Golf Maintenance Building parking lot. Expand the 'Village Core Lighting Plan' or provide additional plans to include lighting of parking lots by the Winery, WWTP and Golf Maintenance Building.

- a. **Photometric Plans (SL1.00 to SL1.06) for Phase 1 have been provided. MDP drawing LA-2 no longer has text regarding light pole height. Per response to consultants' comments, light poles are no longer proposed. However, MDP drawing LA-2 still has precedent images of light poles.**

Response JSM-2.119.a.: All references to pole lighting, including pole lighting images, have been removed from MDP Sheet LA-2 and the Amended MDP.

- b. **Photometric drawings provided for the larger parking lots (Activity Barn, Maintenance Building, Sales Building) show dark areas in the center of the parking lots. The Applicant may want to reconsider use of light poles in these areas.**

Response JSM-2.119.b.: Please refer to Response MAJ-30.

124. ENV-4 and 5 – Provide details on how buffers will be demarcated in the field.

- a. **Details are provided on Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C14.01. Additional notes regarding demarcation are provided in the response to consultants' comments. This additional information should be added to the detail on C14.01. Also, recommend removal of references to Franklin County.**

Response JSM-2.124: The additional information has been added to the Conservation Buffer Marker and Water Quality & Cultural Resource Buffer Marker details on Drawing C14.01.

The reference to Franklin County has been removed.

137. Individual Site Plan and Grading and Drainage Sheets have references to "proposed stream restoration" (C5.01 & C7.01; C5.08 & C7.08) and "proposed floodplain restoration" (C5.03 & C7.03). Provide additional details on the proposed restorations or a reference to where additional information can be found.

- a. **Response to consultants' comments indicates schematic details from the FEIS have been provided on Landscape Plans L3.01 and L3.03. L3.01 has a note to refer to the 'Master Development Plan Floodplain Restoration Planting List'. This list is in appendix G of the MDP Booklet. Drawings L3.03 and L3.08 do not include any references to the proposed stream restorations. Drawings C5.01, C5.03, C5.08, C7.01, C7.03 and C7.08 include a note "refer to draft schematic floodplain restoration planting (Figure 3.2-2)" or similar. This Figure 3.2-2 is also referenced on the Title Drawing of the Site Plan Phase 1 drawing set. However that Figure will be difficult for the site or landscaping contractor to find and implement. The proposed floodplain and stream restorations are important projects that require careful implementation. The details for the restorations should be fully incorporated into the site plan drawing set. Provide improved notes or details within the Site Plan drawing set regarding the proposed stream and floodplain restoration projects.**

Response JSM-2.137: The landscape plans have been revised to show all restoration work as part of Phase 1 – please refer to Site Plan Drawings L3.01, L3.03 and L3.09 for locations and details.



Memorandum

138. Individual Grading and Drainage sheets (C7.01-C7.11) show ... areas where site work extends beyond the limits of the project. For example, there is proposed grading in the Route 44 right-of-way,... in the NYSEG easement, and outside of the...proposed easement for maintenance building... These areas need to be reviewed and revised. The proposed easement...may need to be expanded to include the associated site work.

- a. **The Applicant is seeking permission from NYSDOT for work within the Route 44 and Route 22 rights of way. It is our understanding the Applicant is seeking permission for work within the NYSEG easement. There remains proposed grading outside of the easement for the maintenance building, shown on C7.07 and C7.11. There are multiple notes stating "All proposed work outside the proposed easement shall be coordinated and permitted by the owner." How has the grading outside of the proposed easement been incorporated into the overall metrics for the project, such as area of disturbance and cut and fill volumes?**

Response JSM-2.138: The WWTP has been relocated. Comment is not applicable.

However, please note that the limit of disturbance calculation includes all proposed work for the project.

142. C7.10 shows a point discharge of stormwater into NYSDOT right-of-way. This will have to be approved by NYSDOT. *This should also be included in the narrative of the SWPPP and the Notice of Intent (NOI) regarding discharge to an MS4...*

- a. **Information regarding discharge to an MS4 (NYSDOT) could not be located within the SWPPP narrative.**

Response JSM-2.142: Language regarding discharge to the NYSDOT right-of-way has been added to the SWPPP under the Hydrologic Analysis section – please refer to page 13. Answer #16 in the NOI also has been revised to be "NYSDOT".

147. Individual E&SC Plans (C12.01 – C12.08) Include buffers and stream protection overlay boundary.

- a. **The stream corridor overlay boundary and regulatory buffer, 100 foot adjacent area for NYSDEC wetland are included on the E&SC drawings. Based on conversations with the Applicant's representatives, the water quality buffers and conservation buffers as shown in the Habitat Management Plan have not been included on the E&SC plans for clarity because the additional buffer boundaries create too much 'clutter' on the drawings. For water quality buffers and conservation buffers that are not proposed to be disturbed during construction, provide a method to protect the buffer during construction activity, such as silt fence or orange construction fence.**

Response JSM-2.147: The plans have been revised to show orange construction fence along buffers not to be disturbed.

156. Per MDP LA-3 "all materials used for wetlands crossings will be reviewed and approved during the Site Plan review." Site Plan C14.02 "Civil Site Details 2" includes two examples for Road E bridge crossing, but no technical details. Details for an arch culvert are also shown. It is not clear where this arch culvert is proposed to be located. Provide details for all wetland and stream crossings. Bottomless box culverts are preferred over bottomless arch culverts for use by wildlife, per Findings Statement dated January 8, 2009, page 44.



Memorandum

- a. **Additional details on wetland crossing have been provided on drawing C14.03. We defer to the Planning Board Environmental Consultant regarding appropriateness of proposed crossings.**

Response JSM-2.156: Comment noted.

157. Retaining Walls – Multiple retaining walls are proposed throughout the project. In particular, around the WWTP building. Provide design details and calculations for all retaining walls greater than four (4) feet in height.

- a. **A number of the estate homes have steep slopes and high retaining walls to compensate. MDP drawing LA-3 "Site Paving & Site Walls" states "retaining walls shall be restricted to a maximum height of 6'-0". Where greater grade change needs to be accommodated, multiple, lower, stepped walls may be used, and shall be softened with plantings." Site Plan Phase 1 drawing S1.01 "Site Retaining Wall Sections and Details" include details for retaining walls 8 feet and 11 feet high, in addition to 4 feet and 6 feet high.**

- b. **Based on contours, retaining walls exceed even the 11 foot height. For example Lots E-47 and E-48. Provide cross-section views through the lots and retaining wall top and bottom elevations to better evaluate the proposed conditions.**

- c. **Provide additional information on retaining walls.**

Response JSM-2.157.a.-c.: Refer to Response JSM-1.2.

169. Page 15 [of the Addendum to EAF] "Low Impact Design" use of pervious materials will have to be quantified on the site plans and in the SWPPP.

- a. **Quantification of use of pervious materials could not be located within the SWPPP.**

Response JSM-2.169: The SWPPP has been updated to include the use of pervious material – please refer to Attachment G for detailed calculations.

170. Page 35 [of the Addendum to EAF] Steep Slope Regulations – Include disturbances on slopes 15 – 30% [Updated location: Page 32, Section V "Compliance with Zoning Requirements" "Section 121-36(A). Steep Slope Regulations"]

- a. **Response to consultants' comments indicates text was revised. Inclusion of disturbances on slopes 15-30% in addition to disturbance on slopes greater than 30% could not be located in this section. It is acknowledged that disturbances on slopes 15-30% have been added to Table 3 of the Addendum to the EAF.**

Response JSM- 2.170: The Addendum to EAF has been revised to discuss disturbances to both categories.

173. Appendix D.4 [of the Addendum to EAF] Floodplain Comparison Plans: Include a comparison of flood water storage volume.

- a. **Include the "Floodplain Disturbance Volume (cy)" from Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C7.01.**



Memorandum

Response JSM-2.173: The floodplain disturbance volume has been included in Appendix D.4 Floodplain Comparison Plans.

Section 3

1. Drawings that have been updated in 8/11/2014 set, but did not receive revision date, include: MDP: SP-2, SP-7, SP-9, P-1, P-2, C-1 [P-1 and P-2 have revision date on cover Drawing but not individual sheets] and Site Plan Phase 1 set P1.01 and P1.02.

Response JSM-3.1: Comment noted. All plans have been updated to show the latest revision date.

2. Existing conditions drawings, MDP SP-1, Site Plan Phase 1 C2.00-C2.09 and other drawings: The majority of abutting properties are properly labeled on the drawing sheets. Dutchess County eParcel website shows smaller rectangle shown on the Town of Amenia landfill property, TM 7066-00-882575, is a separate parcel, TM 7066-00-885633. This should be labeled as such on the drawings. Additionally, provide parcel labels for parcels on opposite side of the roads, in particular the Dutchess County Department of Public Works (DPW) property proposed to receive landscape screening and the property at the corner of West Lake Amenia Road and Route 44.

Response JSM-3.2: See Response JSM-2.103.

3. MDP SP-3 "Program Details" – include wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and water treatment building in "Silo Ridge Amenity Building Summary"

Response JSM-3.3: Amended MDP Drawing SP-3 has been revised. The WWTP and water treatment building information has been added to the "Silo Ridge Amenity Building Summary" table.

4. MDP SP-4 "Open Space Plan" – Areas that will be disturbed or graded, but will be returned to vegetation should be shown as the light green "non-golf open space" instead of "natural woodlands/wetlands". For example, the eastern side of Road D of 'South Lawn,' additional proposed disturbance for the WWTP, stormwater management, SWM #8 by Vineyard Commons, grading along west side of Road E on either side of the water treatment building, and grading along west side of Road E between Lots E-48 and E-49.

Response JSM-3.4: Amended MDP Drawing SP-4 has been revised accordingly.

5. MDP Drawing SP-9, Site Plan Phase 1 L3.31-L3.32 depict the front yard setback from the edge of the road pavement, while L3.33 depicts the front yard setback from the property line. It does not appear the front yard setback distance is depicted in accordance with the Town of Amenia definition in §121-11.B regarding front yard setback footnote 6 "measured from centerline of road." The definition of how to measure the front setback will be governed by the approved MDP bulk regulations, however, it should be consistent across all drawings.

Response JSM-3.5: All drawings have been revised to depict the front yard setback "measured from face of curb/road edge to face of building/porch face not including protruding steps" as is required under the current approved MDP Bulk Design Standards.

6. MDP Drawing RI-1 "Roadway Identification Plan" – Additional labeling and notes required.



Memorandum

- a. Copy note from GP-2 "Driveway width at Lot SL-27 shall be designed to allow for an emergency vehicle turnaround". Specify the turnaround is for Road D.
Response JSM-3.6.a.: Please refer to Response JSM-2.17. No note is required.
 - b. Show and label the emergency access road between the Sales Building and the Activity Barn parking lot.
Response JSM-3.6.b.: The plans have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.
 - c. Label the oversized cart path to the Golf Academy building as an emergency access road.
Response JSM-3.6.c.: The plans have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.
 - d. Add a note that driveway turn-outs for Phases 2 and 3 will be designed at that time. Road widths and road slopes for Phases 2 and 3 are to be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department at that time.
Response JSM-3.6.d.: The plans have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Amended MDP Drawing RI-1.
7. MDP GP-1 "Grading Plan 1" – Missing edge of pavement for Route 44. Add notes requiring NYSDOT approval for work within NYSDOT right-of-way similar to Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C5.11.
Response JSM-3.7: The plans have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Amended MDP Drawing GP-1.
 8. MDP GP-2, Note #1 – Specify the turnaround is for Road D. Add notes requiring NYSDOT approval for work within NYSDOT right-of-way similar to Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C5.02.
Response JSM-3.8: Please refer to Response JSM-2.17. The plans have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Amended MDP Drawing GP-2.
 9. MDP SW-1 "Overall Stormwater Management Practice Identification Plan" – Recommend giving stormwater management practice SWM #6 – the ponds on either side of the main entrance, separate designations, such as 6A and 6B in order to be able to identify them individually.
Response JSM-3.9: The label has been revised. Separate designations are not appropriate, as the pond constitutes a single management practice. Please refer to Amended MDP Drawing SW-1.
 10. MDP U-1 and U-2 - Update to be consistent with water and wastewater plans. Provide missing edge of pavement for Route 44 and Route 22. Label Routes 22 and 44. Add "s" to "vernal pool" to have "vernal pools". Label NYSEG easement.
Response JSM-3.10: The plans have been revised to be consistent. The missing labels have been added to be consistent with the other plans. Please refer to Amended MDP Drawings U-1 and U-2.
 11. MDP U-1 "Sanitary Sewer System Master Plan" – Check if colors for gravity sewer system and sanitary forcemain are reversed.



Memorandum

Response JSM-3.11: Amended MDP Drawing U-1 has been revised accordingly.

12. MDP U-2 "Overall Water Supply System Master Plan" – Show and label water supply wells.

Response JSM-3.12: The water supply labels have been added to Amended MDP Drawings U-1 and U-2.

13. Site Plan drawing C1.01 "Legend and General Notes",

- a. Under 'General' #14, update references to EPA to refer to NYSDEC and SPDES regulations.
- b. Under 'General' #15 revise wording to reference Town of Amenia Code Section §121-68 in addition to §105-28B.
- c. Under 'Demolition' include a note requiring the contractor to obtain a demolition permit prior to demolishing any structures.
- d. Under 'Erosion Control' #13 and #32, include the more aggressive stabilization time frame if more than 5 acres are authorized to be disturbed at one time.

Response JSM-3.13: All notes have been revised accordingly.

14. There is no individual existing conditions drawing for the area for the proposed wastewater treatment plant, similar to C2.01 to C2.10

Response JSM-3.14: The WWTP has been relocated. Comment is not applicable.

15. C2.01 – Add "West" to "Lake Amenia Road".

Response JSM-3.15: The plans have been revised accordingly.

16. C2.01 and C2.02 – label existing NYSDOT culverts

Response JSM-3.16: The plans have been revised accordingly.

17. C2.01, C3.01, C5.01, C12.01 – Consistently show and label 'Floodway' line.

Response JSM-3.17: The plans have been revised accordingly.

18. C2.03, C3.03, C5.03, C7.03, C12.03 – Consistently show and label 'Floodway' line, 'Floodplain' line, and Stream Corridor Overlay (SCO) line.

Response JSM-3.18: The plans have been revised accordingly.

19. C2.03 – Label existing septic system for existing maintenance building.

Response JSM-3.19: The plan has been revised accordingly.

20. C2.04 – Label existing septic system for existing main building.

Response JSM-3.20: The plan has been revised accordingly.



Memorandum

21. C2.09 – Label wetland or provide other reference on south side of entrance road. Add property label to TM 7066-00-969308, N/F Whalen Leasing. Label culvert crossing Route 22.

Response JSM-3.21: The plan has been revised accordingly.

22. C2.10 “Overall Zoning Boundary Overlay Plan” – Check Aquifer labels, they may be reversed.

Response JSM-3.22: The plan has been revised accordingly.

23. C3.01 – Label culvert removal per MDP drawing ENV-4.

Response JSM-3.23: The plan has been revised accordingly.

24. C3.02 – update base drawing. Add note regarding work within DOT right-of-way similar to C5.02.

Response JSM-3.24: The plan has been revised accordingly.

25. C3.09 – Add notes regarding work within DOT right-of-way. Label NYSEG easement

Response JSM-3.25: The plan has been revised accordingly.

26. C5.01, C7.01 – Provide improved reference to stream restoration work to make it easier to find. Refer to 5/20/2014 comment #137, above.

Response JSM-3.26: Please refer to Response JSM-2.137.

27. C5.02 – Limits of disturbance line overlaps “Public Overlook” text.

Response JSM-3.27: The plans have been revised accordingly.

28. C5.03, C7.03 - Provide improved reference to floodplain restoration work to make it easier to find. Refer to 5/20/2014 comment #137, above.

Response JSM-3.28: Please refer to Response JSM-2.137.

29. C5.04 – Specify material for emergency access road to Golf Academy, such as asphalt. Label Clubhouse and Fitness Center.

Response JSM-3.29: The plans have been revised accordingly.

30. C5.05 – Label wetland QQ. Show the “existing trail to be abandoned” within the NYSDEC wetland buffer, similar to C3.05.

Response JSM-3.30: The Wetland QQ label has been revised accordingly. The existing trail is shown and labeled “to be abandoned”.

31. C5.08 - Show the “existing trail to be abandoned” within the NYSDEC wetland buffer, similar to C3.08. Provide improved reference to stream restoration work to make it easier to find. Refer to 5/20/2014 comment #137, above.

Response JSM-3.31: The existing trail is shown and labeled “to be abandoned”.

Please refer to Response JSM-2.137.



Memorandum

32. C5.10 - Add notes regarding work within DOT right-of-way at WWTP entrance, similar to C7.10.

Response JSM-3.32: The WWTP has been relocated. Comment is not applicable.

33. C5.11 – Provide additional labeling of features and coordination with A3.15 and L3.25 as discussed above under “NRMP”.

Response JSM-3.33: The plans have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Response JSM-1.30.

34. C7.02 – Provide note regarding work within DOT right-of-way similar to C5.02. Label culverts that are under Route 44.

Response JSM-3.34: The plan has been revised accordingly.

35. C7.03 – Confirm label for “12’x12’ box culvert (under Route 22)” is pointing to correct location.

Response JSM-3.35: The plan has been revised accordingly.

36. C7.04 – Label Clubhouse, Fitness Center and Water Treatment Building.

Response JSM-3.36: The plan has been revised accordingly.

37. C7.05 – Label wetland QQ. Show the “existing trail to be abandoned” within the NYSDEC wetland buffer, similar to C3.05.

Response JSM-3.37: The Wetland QQ label has been revised accordingly. The existing trail is shown and labeled “to be abandoned”.

38. C7.08 - Show the “existing trail to be abandoned” within the NYSDEC wetland buffer, similar to C3.08. Provide improved reference to stream restoration work to make it easier to find. Refer to 5/20/2014 comment #137, above.

Response JSM-3.38: The existing trail is shown and labeled “to be abandoned”.

Please refer to Response JSM-2.137.

39. C12.01 – Label stream restoration work. Include additional notes for minimization of sediment during removal of culvert and bridge, as shown on MDP ENV-4, such as only performing work during low-flow period.

Response JSM-3.39: Stream restoration work has been labeled and additional notes have been added. Please refer to Site Plan Drawing C12.01.

40. C12.02 – Update base drawing and limits of disturbance. Label Route 44 culverts.

Response JSM-3.40: The plans have been revised accordingly.

41. C12.03 – Label Floodplain restoration work. Label Route 22 culverts.

Response JSM-3.41: The plans have been revised accordingly.

42. C12.05 - Show the “existing trail to be abandoned” within the NYSDEC wetland buffer, similar to C3.05.

Response JSM-3.42: The existing trail is shown and labeled “to be abandoned”.



Memorandum

43. C12.08 - Show the "existing trail to be abandoned" within the NYSDEC wetland buffer, similar to C3.08. Label stream restoration work.

Response JSM-3.43: The existing trail is shown and labeled "to be abandoned".

Please refer to Response JSM-2.137.

44. C13.01 – "General Construction Sequencing Notes" – Check numbering.

- a. Slopes: "f" states "all graded slopes greater than 2H:1V shall use a rolled erosion control product..." The SWPPP and Drawing C12.00 Note #6 requires erosion control matting for slopes 4:1 or steeper. Revise this note to comply with 4:1 requirement.

Response JSM-3.44: The note has been revised accordingly.

45. C14.01 "Civil Site Details 1"

- a. Addendum to EAF has a reference to pervious cart paths. If pervious cart paths are proposed, provide a detail. Indicate on Site Plans where the pervious cart paths are proposed.

Response JSM-3.45.a.: The Addendum to the EAF has been revised to remove reference to pervious cart paths.

- b. "Conservation Buffer Marker" – add additional notes, such as 'minimum of 1 sign per house lot' and 'for water quality buffer a minimum of 1 sign ever 200 feet' from response to consultants' comments. Remove references to Franklin Township.

Response JSM-3.45.b.: Notes regarding distance have been added to the detail and reference to Franklin County has been removed.

46. C14.02 "Civil Site Details 2"

- a. Provide a detail for disconnection of roof runoff, with energy dissipater (splash block).

Response JSM-3.46.a.: Splash Block Detail has been added to Site Plan Drawing C14.03.

- b. 'Curb Inlet' and 'Field Inlet' – remove references to NJDOT and replace with NYSDOT.

Response JSM-3.46.b.: The details have been revised accordingly.

- c. For 'Yard Inlet Details' and 'Underground Sand Filter Detail' add "drains to waterways" on the grate similar to 'Curb Inlet' detail.

Response JSM-3.46.c.: The detail has been revised accordingly.

- d. For 'Drain Manhole' specify the lid is to be labeled 'storm drainage' or similar to differentiate it from sanitary sewer manholes.

Response JSM-3.46.d.: The detail has been revised accordingly.

47. C14.04 – Add detail for concrete wash-out area. Include notes restricting location of concrete wash-out, such as within a certain distance of waterbodies.



Memorandum

Response JSM-3.47: Please see response JSM-1.18.

48. Update Site Plan Phase 1 Landscape drawing area of disturbance/restoration to be consistent with the other site plans. For example, drawing C7.11 shows disturbance up to and onto the Route 22 right-of-way at the golf maintenance facility. The corresponding landscape drawing, L3.25 labels that area as "existing vegetation to remain."

Response JSM-3.48: All plans have been revised and made consistent.