

Jessica Verrigni

From: Jimmie Joe Carl <jjcarl@stny.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2020 10:55 AM
To: Karl Schwesinger
Cc: 'Thomas L. Whispel Jr.'; jbverrigni
Subject: Crow Calls

Karl:

The following are my questions and comments regarding the latest submission for Crow Calls, which was received by this office on February 19, 2020.

1. In regards to indicating the locations of the proposed downspouts for the proposed building, the design engineer indicated that the Architect for the building will provide the downspout locations in the Architectural Plans. This could be covered as a Condition of Acceptance is the SWPPP Acceptance Letter.
2. In regards to the outlet control structure for the stormwater management basin, the proposed low orifi are small. In specific, two orifi are proposed to be only 1.2-inches in diameter (with each having an external screen). As per the NYSDEC Stormwater Design Manual, a minimum orifice diameter of 3 inches (with an external screen) is recommended. Given the nature of the watershed, leaves and other debris are anticipated to be directed to this stormwater management basin and could present a maintenance issue in regards to presenting a need for frequent cleanings. The location of these screens may be difficult to access for cleaning.
3. Approximately 0.43 acres of land is proposed to be diverted towards Vanderhoff Road. Instead of 4.4 acres of land draining to Point of Study #3, 4.83 acres are proposed to be drain to this point. To compensate for this proposed increase in drainage area, the Design Engineer is proposing some check dams along the ditch line. Their theory is that these check dams will slow flow down, increasing the (post-construction) Time of Concentration. This increased Time of Concentration would, in turn, result in a reduction in the associated peak flow rates. The Design Engineer is assuming that the proposed check dams would increase the Time of Concentration from 17.1 to 22.4 minutes. Supporting calculations justifying this increase in Time of Concentration are requested.
4. In regards to Sub-Area #1B, it is unclear why the post-developed CN value was decreased from the pre-developed (existing) condition.
5. A curb is now proposed along the edge of the proposed parking lot that would direct runoff from the parking lot to an adjacent fill slope, before being directed to the proposed diversion swale that would convey this runoff to the proposed bioretention filter. How will this steep slope be protected from erosion from this concentrated flow?
6. The Design Engineer is proposing to utilize NYSDOT Fine Stone Filling for the proposed swales, rip rap pads, spillways, etc. It is recommended that the gradations of the stone linings outlined in the NYSDOT specifications be reviewed and considered, when making this selection.
7. What is the status of the of the O & M Agreement?

If you have any questions or comments regarding these question and comments, please do not hesitate to contact me. Furthermore, I would be a happy to meet to discuss these in greater detail.

Sincerely – Jimmie Joe Carl, P.E.