Jacobson

April 15, 2019

Mr. Thomas LaPerch, Chairman
Town of Southeast Planning Board
One Main Street
Brewster, NY 10509

Re: Commercial Campus at Fields Corner
NY 312 & Pugsley Road
Preliminary Draft FEIS Review
NLJA #0001-0432

Dear Mr. LaPerch:

As requested, we have reviewed the following information received for the subject project at our office through March 19, 2019:

Item 1: Set of sixty (60) drawings entitled "Site Plan Approval Drawings Commercial Campus at Fields Corner, Putnam County, NY 312 & Pugsley Road, Town of Southeast, New York", dated 11/06/2017, last revised 03/18/19, scales as noted, prepared by JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC.

Item 2: Set of six (6) drawings entitled "Commercial Campus at Fields Corner, NY 312 & Pugsley Road, Town of Southeast, New York", dated March 18, 2019, scales as noted, prepared by Evans Associates Environmental Consulting, Inc.

Item 3: Report entitled "Final Environmental Impact Statement, Commercial Campus at Fields Corner, NY 312 & Pugsley Road, Town of Southeast, Putnam County, NY – Volume I", prepared by JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC, dated February 22, 2019.

Item 4: Report entitled "Final Environmental Impact Statement, Commercial Campus at Fields Corner, NY 312 & Pugsley Road, Town of Southeast, Putnam County, NY – Volume 2 Correspondence Appendices A & B", prepared by JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC, dated March, 2019.

Item 5: Report entitled "Final Environmental Impact Statement, Commercial Campus at Fields Corner, NY 312 & Pugsley Road, Town of Southeast, Putnam County, NY – Volume 3 Numbered Appendices 1-1 to 17-2", prepared by JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC, dated March, 2019.

Nathan L. Jacobson & Associates, Inc.
Nathan L. Jacobson & Associates, P.C. (NY)
86 Main Street P.O. Box 337 Chester, Connecticut 06412-0337
Tel 860.526.9591 Fax 860.526.5416

Item 6: Report entitled "Final Environmental Impact Statement, Commercial Campus at Fields Corner, NY 312 & Pugsley Road, Town of Southeast, Putnam County, NY – Traffic Data Appendix 4.A Parts A-M", prepared by JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC, dated March, 2019.

Item 7: Report entitled "Final Environmental Impact Statement, Commercial Campus at Fields Corner, NY 312 & Pugsley Road, Town of Southeast, Putnam County, NY – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Appendix 5.A", prepared by JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC, dated March, 2019.

Item 8: Report entitled "Final Environmental Impact Statement, Commercial Campus at Fields Corner, NY 312 & Pugsley Road, Town of Southeast, Putnam County, NY – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Appendix 5.B", prepared by JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC, dated March, 2019.

This review letter is in addition to the comments noted in our April 5, 2019 review letter. While our previous letter provided technical comments with regard to the proposed project. This letter focuses on reviewing and addressing comments within our prevue as outlined in the FEIS.

We have the following comments:

SURFACE WATER AND WETLANDS

1. Response 6-4: The comment refers the stormwater management measures and plans and their compliance with applicable standards. Our office has provided comments regarding the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan in previous correspondence and will provide additional comments as necessary based on follow up comments from the Applicant.

2. Response 6-9: These comments refer to direct and indirect impacts to wetlands and watercourses within the watershed of the Middle Branch Reservoir. The response notes several stormwater management practices are being utilized and their design follows the regulations developed by the NYCDEP for the protection of the reservoirs.

3. Response 6-10: The response discusses the functions of a stormwater basin, particularly regarding the removal of pollutants and the control of insects, primarily mosquitos. A discussion should be provided as to what design changes have been made and how it has improved the natural buffer near Twin Brook.

4. Response 6-11A: This response discusses the changes made to the drawings to identify a construction sequencing plan. The construction phasing shown on sheets C-410 and C-421 is still

preliminary in nature. More detailed plans that would take into consideration specific erosion and sediment control measure and establishment of vegetation, should be developed for each phase.

5. Response 6-11B: This response discusses the locations of temporary stockpile locations throughout the site. The drawings identify 3 specific stockpile locations and 6 construction phases. At a minimum, each individual phase should include the location of at least one topsoil stockpile. The proposed number of topsoil stockpile areas in insufficient for the number of phases proposed.

6. Response 6-11C: This response has adequately addressed the comment regarding installation techniques for sedimentation control fence.

7. Response 6-13: This response identifies that a Storm Water Pollution Plan has been prepared to address concerns regarding water quality on site both during and after construction.

8. Response 6-14: Regarding the potential for additional phosphorus loading to the Middle Branch Reservoir. Phosphorus Loading Calculations have been provided in Appendix G of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

9. Response 6-20: Residents of Hunters Glen have concerns that the clearing and grading necessary for the construction of stormwater management practices may result in visual and acoustic issues. While the response explains the need for the stormwater measures and the vegetative cover of the location chosen, it should also evaluate alternative locations for the basins and why they may or may not be feasible.

10. Response 6-21: This response is in regards to concerns regarding excessive runoff from large impervious surfaces. The response correctly notes that the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan has been designed to provide channel protection, overbank flood control and extreme storm control.

11. Response 6-24: The comment requests that the soil boundaries be placed on the existing conditions plan, proposed grading plan and the erosion control plan. The response indicates that the soil boundaries have been placed on the Existing Conditions Plan. Additionally, the soil boundaries have been placed on the pre and post development watershed maps. Soil boundaries would also be beneficial on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

12. Response 6-25: This response has adequately addressed the comment regarding text modifications in the DEIS.

13. Response 6-26: This response notes that the rainfall distributions have been revised to utilize data from the Northeast Regional Climate Center.

14. Response 6-27: This comment discusses the potential impact to wetland LC-28 as a result of development areas along the west side of Pugsley Road. The response notes that the impervious coverages that contribute to this wetland has been virtually eliminated and the natural forested buffer is to remain.

15. Response 6-30: This comment discusses the NYS Attorney General letter from August 23, 2018 and the Watershed Inspector General's review. The response indicates that the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan has been revised to address comments from the Watershed Inspector General.

16. Response 6-31: This response acknowledges the concerns of a resident regarding impacts to drinking water.

17. Response 6-37: this response notes that hay bales have been removed from the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan at the request of the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP).

18. Response 6-38: The response identifies that no floor drains have been proposed for the facilities except for a maintenance drain in each building that will drain to a holding tank. Additional information should be provided, regarding location, size and function for any holding tanks proposed.

19. Response 6-39: The response acknowledges the NYCDEP request that amendments be considered for the SWPPP to reduce impervious surfaces and avoid earthwork on steep slopes. This response could be expanded with a brief summary of the amendments to the SWPPP.

20. Response 6-40: This response notes that hydrodynamic separators have been proposed as part of the process to treat the stormwater. The design calls out specific models based on the water quality volume calculations.

21. Response 6-46: This response acknowledges the NYCDEP requirement regarding the coverage under the current SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002).

22. Response 6-49: The third bullet statement on page 7 of the SWPPP was removed at the request of the Watershed Inspector General.

23. Response 6-50: The comment and response for this item is confusing. Detail 77 on sheet C-905 details outlet control structures. No detail entitled Rip-Rap Outlet Protection has been included within the set of detail sheets. Detail 80 on sheet C-905 entitled Rip-Rap Apron/Energy Dissipator is provided, but no specific dimensions have been provided. Please revise accordingly.

24. Response 6-51: This response acknowledges that the SWPPP has been revised to state that permanent vegetative cover shall consist of a minimum of 80% vegetative cover.

25. Response 6-52: The soil restoration table contained within the SWPPP has been placed on the Erosion and Sediment Control Drawings.

26. Response 6-53: This response that corrections have been made to the SWPPP and Erosion and Sediment Control Drawings regarding “denuded area” being left exposed for no more than 7 days.

27. Response 6-54: This response acknowledges that a narrative regarding phosphorus impaired watersheds has been added to the SWPPP.

28. Response 6-55: This is in response to the request for elimination of the use of silt sacks and the use of an approved inlet protection devise. It is noted that a “Manufactured Insert Inlet Protection” Details should be provided for the selected system.

29. Response 6-56: The response notes that a Temporary Sediment Basin Detail has been added to the construction details along with a dewatering device detail. Future SWPPP submission should include sediment calculations for each temporary sediment basin and a schedule for cleaning.

30. Response 6-57: This response notes that the Construction entrance detail on sheet C-900 has been revised to show a proposed width of 24’. However, the text included in the SWPPP on page 47 Item 2 has not been changed.

31. Response 6-58: This response addresses comments regarding items to correct on Sheets C-401 and C-405. We have identified items that have not been addressed. Specifically, the temporary Sediment Basin detail does not provide specific information for the individual sediment basins. Additionally, the detail makes reference to drawing CD-7. Drawing CD-7 is not included in the set of drawings. While proposed stockpile areas have been identified on the drawings, these stockpile areas must be in harmony with the Sequence of Construction. Each distinct phase will require and area to stockpile topsoil so that each phase may be properly graded and vegetated prior to moving to the next phase. As such, the locations and quantity of topsoil stockpile locations should be revisited.

32. Response 6-59: this response noted that the hydrologic model has been revised to utilize rainfall distributions from the Northeast Regional Climate Center.

33. Response 6-60: Notes that revisions have been made to sheet flow cover types as recommended by the Watershed Inspector General. Land descriptions for shallow concentrated flow, however

were left as paved or unpaved based on the Stormwater Management Design manual. The use of paved vs. unpaved cover for shallow concentration determination is acceptable.

34. Response 6-61: Discrepancies have been resolved between the hydrologic model output and reported figures in the SWPPP tables of information.

35. Response 6-62: Adjustments have been made to the watershed boundaries and time of concentration flow paths. We have reviewed the pre & post development drainage area maps and have provided comments in our 4/5/19 review letter.

36. Response 6-64: A table has been provided for information specific to the outlet control structure for each stormwater basin. It is our recommendation that individual cross-sectional details be provided for each stormwater basin.

37. Response 6-65: The underground detention storage facility system (Stormtech MC-3500) that this comment referred to has been removed from the drawings.

38. Response 6-67: Hydrodynamic separators have been proposed in place of sediment forebays. Details with location specific information has been provided on the drawings.

39. Response 6-68: Water quality volume calculations as provided in Appendix E of the SWPPP have been reviewed. Peak flow rates and water surface elevations have also been reviewed.

40. Response 6-69: Clarification has been provided as to the method of calculating the infiltration rate for basin 3B-1. Site specific infiltration rates were used as opposed to hydrologic soil group information. This is the preferred method for determination of the infiltration rate.

41. Response 6-70: The response identifies that soil testing has been performed at the location of the proposed infiltration basin and is included in Appendix D of the SWPPP. We have reviewed this data with regard to the proposed basin locations.

42. Response 6-71: This is in response to a comment regarding phosphorus loading calculations and a shortfall in phosphorus treatment for the site as reviewed. Phosphorus loading calculations have been submitted for both the existing and proposed sites. The calculated existing phosphorus loadings for the site falls within the high and low ranges for the proposed condition. Phosphorus is a major concern to reservoir systems and as this project design evolves, we anticipate that these proposed phosphorus loadings will change and that these calculations will be revisited prior to final design.

43. Response 6-72: This is in response to a discussion regarding the configuration of sediment forebays with regards to its corresponding detention/infiltration basin. The Applicant has chosen to propose

the use of hydrodynamic structures in place of sediment forebays. While hydrodynamic structures can be an efficient means of sediment and pollutant removal, diligent maintenance is key to their proper function.

44. Response 6-73: This is response to a comment that discusses a margin of safety value for phosphorus loadings. The Applicant has noted that standard stormwater practices and green infrastructure practices have been utilized to treat on and off-site runoff. As noted in comment 42, We would expect that the pollutant loadings will be modified as the proposed project is modified. Ultimately, the final design will be required to comply with NYCDEP and NYSDEC standards.

GEOLOGY, SOILS AND TOPOGRAPHY

45. Response 7-2: This is in response to our comment regarding cut and fill amounts for the project. The Applicant's engineer has stated that the site is intended to be a balanced site with 662,000 cubic yards of both cut and fill. We would note that an appropriate fluff factor should be accounted for in the cut volume.

46. Response 7-3: This response discusses the use of a skimmer dewatering device to aid in the removal of sediments from site runoff during construction. We would note that the ultimate function of such a device is based on frequent inspections and determination of a maintenance schedule based on actual site conditions.

47. Response 7-6: The response addresses the comment that slope stabilization methods, as recommended by a geotechnical engineer, have been placed on the detail sheet.

48. Response 7-7: The response addresses a comment from the NYCDEP regarding the recommendation for additional soils testing for determining a suitable location for a subsurface sewerage disposal system. Additional testing was performed and witnesses by the Putnam County Department of Health. This response is referred to the NYCDEP.

49. Response 7-8: This response addresses comment from the NYCDEP regarding suitable areas for stormwater infiltration based on observed seasonal high groundwater levels. The Applicant's Engineer has noted that where infiltration in not feasible, rainwater harvesting and alternative methods of treatment have been used. While we concur with the treatment methods proposed to avoid high groundwater, this response is referred to the NYCDEP.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Jacobson

Very truly yours,

NATHAN L. JACOBSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

Joseph M. Dillon, P.E.

JMD:jmd

cc: T. Hay
M. Levine
S. Coleman
W. Stephens, Jr.
M. Bruen
M. Stancati
A. Ley
JMC