

# T.G. MILLER P.C.

*Engineers and Surveyors*

David A. Herrick, P.E.  
Frank L. Santelli, P.E.  
Andrew J. Sciarabba, P.E.  
Steven R. Flowe, P.E.  
Lee Dresser, L.S.  
Darrin A. Brock, L.S.  
Edward D. Ripic, Jr., L.S.

October 20, 2014

Mr. Tom Ellis, Chair  
Town of Lansing Planning Board  
PO Box 186  
Lansing, New York 14882

Re: Cayuga Farms, Preliminary Plan

Dear Mr. Ellis,

As requested, I reviewed the set of drawings (Sheets T-1 through ST-18) prepared by Timothy C. Buhl, P.E. dated September 7, 2014 together with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated September 2014 and the draft Full Environmental Assessment Form. I offer the following comments for Planning Board consideration:

#### Water/Sewer

1. On page 5 of the SEQR FEF it should be indicated that expansion of the Town's water district will be necessary. I understand the extension of the Consolidated Water District boundary to include the entire lands of the development will be considered by the Town Board. The NYS Department of Agriculture & Markets has advised the Town there are no lateral restrictions for this property and no requirement to submit a Notice of Intent.
2. The drawings continue to show a 'municipal' water main extension. If the project will be served with one connection to the Town's water main then the drawings will have to be altered to show the master meter connection and private interior distribution mains. I understand that Mr. Buhl has suggested to the Code Enforcement Office that the Owner's preference may be to dedicate the mains to the Town. I suggest that the Town Board in consultation with SCLIWC make the formal determination of municipal versus private system.
3. With respect to the private sanitary sewage disposal system, the NYSDEC should be completing all conceptual design reviews and providing their comments to the Town prior to consideration of any SEQR Positive/Negative Determination. I was provided a marketing binder of the Orenco Systems, Inc. Decentralized Wastewater Systems which includes information on multiple treatment techniques and options but there is nothing specific to this project.
4. I still recommend that an Engineer's Report is needed to adequately and correctly describe what is being proposed for the water and sanitary sewer systems. With respect to the sewer system, if a Town benefit district must be created to 'backup' the private operation and maintenance responsibilities then a clear description of the system design, capacity, operation, etc. will be needed. All of this information is generally included in an Engineer's Report.

#### Storm Water Management

1. The stormwater management strategy has shifted away from the use of infiltration basins, as previously designed, and has moved to using wet ponds. Minimum runoff reduction requirements are indicated to have been satisfied with the use of bioretention filters. This revised strategy as described in the SWPPP together with and the associated drawing details are sufficient for purposes of conducting an environmental review.
2. Prior to final approval of the SWPPP an explanation must be provided addressing differences between the bioretention details shown on drawing ST-12 and the calculations in the Appendix J of the SWPPP.

Specifically, the drawing details indicate a perforated 4-inch under drain will be installed near the bottom of the filter cross section; however the calculations in Appendix J do not reflect this outlet device. The use of an underdrain is necessary given the underlying soils so the calculations of Appendix J need to be explained. The site grading also needs to clearly identify where the 4-inch underdrains actually 'day light'.

3. Impervious surfaces such as roofs and drives are proposed to drain into specific bioretention areas. Some of the bioretention areas are quite removed from the building roofs they are intended to treat. The drawings must clearly depict how downspouts from building roofs (front and back in some cases) will be piped to the respective bioretention areas. This will be important when the Town compares the original design with the as-constructed condition.
4. I still suggest the Town question the proximity of the new buildings to existing drainage channels and the potential for those channels to flood. Specifically, what is the capacity of the existing drainage channels and under what rainfall events might these channels overflow? The road profiles indicate 36-inch CMP at the channel crossings. How have these been sized?
5. Long-term maintenance of the permanent practices is described in the SWPPP and also on page 12 of the NOI as transferring to the Town. Given the layout and character of this rental housing project, I recommend all future maintenance of the practices should remain with the landowner and only emergency access agreements/easements be offered to the Town.

I can attend the October 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting, if helpful to answer any questions regarding this review. Thank you.

Respectfully,



David A. Herrick, P.E.

Cc: J. French, Highway Superintendent  
K. Miller, Supervisor  
M. Long, Planning Consultant  
L. Day, CEO  
L. Moynihan Schmitt, Esq.  
G. Krogh, Esq.