

November 18, 2022

Mr. Doug Finch, Town Manager
Town of Canandaigua
5440 Routes 5 & 20 West
Canandaigua, New York 14424

RE: DIVERSIFIED EQUIPMENT LLC – 1947 STATE ROUTE 332
SINGLE-STAGE SITE PLAN & SWPPP REVIEW
TAX MAP NO. 56.00-1-13.210
CPN NO. 22-029
MRB PROJECT NO.: 0300.12001.000 PHASE 287

Dear Mr. Finch:

MRB has completed a review of the submitted Site Plan regarding the above referenced project, dated October 26, 2022; Engineer's Report dated October 26, 2022; and project SWPPP dated October 26, 2022, all prepared by Marks Engineering. We offer the following comments for the Planning Board's consideration. A brief written response to each comment should be provided by the design engineer.

Site Plan & General Comments

1. Construction erosion control note 8 and landscape note 9 should be revised to specify a zero phosphorus fertilizer (middle number should be zero). The SWPPP narrative should also be revised accordingly.
2. Is a fence gate still proposed? If so, it should be shown on the plans and labeled. If still proposed, the detail or label should also note the height of the gate.
3. The spillway between the forebay and deep pool of the pond should be relocated to provide the longest feasible flow path. The SWMF should include an aquatic bench meeting the requirements of the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual (SWMDM), as well as a maintenance access drive extending to the emergency spillway, outlet control structure, and forebay. Also, a low flow orifice is required to be provided. Pond storage is limited to the volume below the lowest effective outlet orifice/pipe (currently top of grate, 722).
4. The northern most check dam is not shown within the swale and should be adjusted accordingly.
5. The proposed landscaping areas should be included within the limits of disturbance.
6. The dry swale detail should include an approved soil mix. The detail should show an underdrain unless infiltration testing demonstrates sufficient infiltration capacity. If an underdrain is required, the plans should show the discharge

point(s). Bottom width (width of soil media), and minimum depth should also be indicated. Soil exploration will be required prior to installation to ensure that proper groundwater separation requirements are met.

7. The response letter indicates that table 4.6 from the NYS Blue Book was added to the plans as requested, however we were unable to locate said table in the plan set. Please add said table to the plan set.
8. Some of the Town Standard Details are not displaying properly. Please review and ensure that all details display properly in the prints.
9. Please label the photometric contours on the lighting plan. Also, full manufacturer cut sheets should be provided for all proposed exterior lighting. Lastly, we were unable to locate the note referencing that all exterior lighting shall comply with section 220-77 of the Town Code. Please add said note to the lighting plan.
10. A typical detail should be provided for the proposed precast concrete barriers.
11. The stone diaphragm should include cleanouts.
12. A note should be added to the plans indicating that goods display shall only be allowed under the cover of the building roof and only during working hours.
13. The following notes regarding phosphorous use should be added to the plans:
 - No Phosphorous shall be used at planting time unless soil testing has been completed and tested by a Horticultural Testing Lab and the soil tests specifically indicate a phosphorous deficiency that is harmful, or will prevent new lawns and plantings from establishing properly.
 - If soil tests indicate a phosphorous deficiency that will impact plant and lawn establishment, phosphorous shall be applied at the minimum recommended level prescribed in the soil test following all NYS DEC regulations.

SWPPP Comments

14. The following comments pertain to the hydrology modeling:
 - a. The indicated scale on the drainage maps does not appear to be correct, even when accounting for the PDF page size being half scale. Please check the scale and include a scale bar. Due to the scale being incorrect, we were unable to check the time of concentration calculations. Time of concentration calculations will be checked upon receipt of revised drainage mapping.
 - b. The time step (DT) should be set to 0.01, and the time span should be set to extend to at least 36 hours.
 - c. Existing and proposed subcatchments 1-3 all contribute to the existing pond. The existing pond, and these contributing areas appear to be outside of the limits of disturbance and bypass the site. As such, these

areas do not appear to need to be included in the modeling. Consider removing these nodes to keep the modeling concise.

- d. Pond 8P New SWMF: the entrance loss coefficient appears to be incorrect for the outlet pipe. Also, the emergency spillway is labeled as 10x10 on the plans, whereas the spillway is 10x15 in the model. Please resolve this discrepancy.

15. The following comments pertain to the WQv/RRv calculations:

- a. On sheet 2 of 2, under WQv total, a volume is included labeled "WQv provided by excess CPv." CPv is not equivalent to WQv and should not be included. WQv provided by a SWMF should be calculated in accordance with the SWMDM.
- b. The final 14' of dry swale 1 exceeds the slope limit of 4%. The dry swale should be revised to stay at or under 4% slope.
- c. A portion of the drainage area for dry swale 2 enters the swale very near the end, bypassing most of the treatment. The dry swale should be extended or shifted to provide additional length past this discharge point into the swale.

16. Please note that the CPv calculations were not reviewed as the time of concentration calculations in the hydrology modeling could not be reviewed, and as the SWMF not including a low flow orifice. The CPv calculations will be reviewed upon receipt of revised hydrology modeling and plans.

17. The following comments pertain to the draft NOI:

- a. The federal tax ID should be provided.
- b. The acreage of disturbance should be updated based on the site plan comments above.
- c. Question 8: a typo exists in the year of the construction end date.
- d. Question 15 should be answered "yes," and question 16 should indicate New York State Department of Transportation.
- e. Question 26: sediment traps and storm drain inlet protection are both checked, however these measures do not appear to be proposed on the plans.
- f. In table 1, 1.3 acres of impervious area is indicated to be directed to the proposed wet pond, however the hydrology modeling indicates that only 0.8 acres of impervious area is directed to the SWMF. Please resolve this discrepancy.
- g. As the full WQv is not reduced by RRV providing practices (RRv does not equal the required WQv), question 39 should be answered and should summarize the specific site limitations for not reducing 100% of the required WQv.

18. A copy of the NYS SHPO no impact letter should be included in the SWPPP to demonstrate compliance with that portion of the requirements of GP-0-20-001.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns regarding any of the above comments please contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lance S. Brabant", is written over the printed name.

Lance S. Brabant, CPESC
Director of Planning & Environmental Services