



**TOWN OF WAWAYANDA
PLANNING BOARD
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMENTS**

PROJECT NAME: DOLSONTOWN CORRIDOR FGEIS
PROJECT NO.: 22-01
PROJECT LOCATION: Marangi - SBL# 6-1-3.31 & 3.32
Simon - SBL# 6-1-107 & 90.1
RDM #3 - Dewpoint South - SBL# 4-1-50.32
RDM #4 - Dewpoint North - SBL# 4-1-50.2
RDM #5 - Dolsontown East - SBL# 1-1-52.1, 1-1-4.2 & 6-1-3.2
REVIEW DATE: 14 DECEMBER 2022
MEETING DATE: TBD
PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE: COLLIERS ENGINEERING

THE FOLLOWING IS A REVIEW OF THE DRAFT FGDEIS SUBMISSION.

1. Section 2 Community Character Comment C-4 and C-5: The applicant should identify whether more of the entities involved in the Dolsontown Corridor project has obtained ownership of one or more of the residential uses on Caskey Lane.
2. Section 3 Traffic Comment C-4 and C-5, Response R-4 and R-5: The applicant should address whether NYSDOT has accepted the revised traffic layout in a conceptual nature. Are adequate right of way lands available for proposed changes? Are signal improvements required at the intersection based on the revised layout? Response to this comment should be expanded.
3. Traffic Comment C-6: Comment was not directed at the lane width rather the alignment of the lanes. Comments from DOT concerning the intersection lane alignment being not in compliance with the uniform traffic control devices. They should be further expanded.
4. Traffic Comment C-9 and Response C-9: While Sunrise Drive alternative was not on the adopted scope, the Lead Agency requested an additional alternative analysis for access to the site. More detailed response or schematic plans should be provided in response to the Lead Agency's request for the alternative analysis. Alternative analysis are often not identified within the scope and flow from the iterative Environmental Impact Statement process.
5. Traffic Comment C-11 Response C-11: We find the response vague. It is anticipated that all traffic improvements will be online prior to the issuance of the first Building Permit for the project within the corridor. It is unclear if the applicant project sponsors intend to perform necessary construction of the improvement or are deferring to some other entity or the Town of Waywayanda. More definitive schedule of the improvements and commitment to perform the improvements should be incorporated into the response.

NEW YORK OFFICE

33 Airport Center Drive, Suite 202, New Windsor, NY 12553
845-567-3100 | F: 845-567-3232 | mheny@mhepc.com

PENNSYLVANIA OFFICE

111 Wheatfield Drive, Suite 1, Milford, PA 18337
570-296-2765 | F: 570-296-2767 | mhepa@mhepc.com

6. Traffic Comment C-32 Response C-32: identifies that the existing geometry of Dolsontown Road does not support a posted speed limit of 45mph. It is unclear how the roadway intersections will function if speed reductions are not granted in the Dolsontown Road Corridor. This should be further explained.
7. Traffic Response C-35: identifies a 6-ton weight limit. Town Board/Town Highway Superintendent action would be required to modify the weight limit on the roadway. This should be further addressed and incorporated into appropriate responses.
8. Traffic C-37, R-37: says comment noted is not appropriate the discussion of a Town Roadway Improvement District should be further expanded. It is unclear currently if the Town of Waywayanda is prepared to undertake such an improvement district.
9. General Comment: The applicants may wish to address the modification to the car wash entrance drive currently before the Planning Board.
10. Section 5-2 – Oder, Noise & Lights: identifies noise receptor 2. Additional discussion regarding what noise receptor 2 is and its proximity to 1081 Dolsontown Rd should be depicted.
11. Response 5 - Oder, Noise & Lights: should state that the project will be analyzed for potential visual impacts to the Heritage Trial Dorrning, individual site land reviews for each project, landscaping plans will be required, and lighting plans will be reviewed.
12. Response 7 - Oder, Noise & Lights: should identify where the updated noise evaluation can be found.
13. Section 6 - Air Pollution: No comments on responses.
14. Section 7 - Monhagan Brook – Response: 2 should identify that the project will be required to be operated under a NYSDEC Multi-Sector Permit. Monitoring the stormwater discharges will be required under that permit.
15. Section 8 - Wetlands – Response: 1 the phrase “it is our understanding” should be replaced with a more definitive statement. 2 should state the subject wetlands are not currently state regulated wetlands.

16. Response R-10 – Wetlands: should be further clarified regarding jurisdictional wetland determination by the Army Corp of Engineers.
17. Wetlands: A response should clarify whether Federal jurisdiction impacts are going to occur on any or all of the sites that identify appropriate nationwide permits including permit thresholds.
18. Section 9 – Endangered species R-3: should refer to the use of dark sky compliant lighting.
19. Section 10 – Archeological Resources – Response R-7: A response from natural resource consults should be incorporated to address the comment.
20. Section 13 – Waste Water Response: 1 should identify any potential pretreatment comment and pretreatment permit standards for discharge or wastewater to the Town’s collection system.
21. Section 13 - Water & Waste Water: 4 & 5 identifies the document. This document should be identified by name.
22. Response 6: identifies the document shall be updated and should state if the document has been updated and referred to the name of the document.
23. Response R7: should identify the name of the document.
24. Section 14 - Stormwater Comment: are to regarding the bio retention areas. Plans should be updated identifying the stone diaphragm.
25. Stormwater - R6: should identify the corrected area
26. Stormwater - R8: identifies the NOI shall be updated. Response to all stormwater comments should provide updated plans and reports to address the comments and be included in the Appendix.
27. General comment: The response to numerous comments identify that they will be addressed in the next SWPPP submittal period. This should be addressed at this time and included in SWPPP in Appendix.

Respectfully submitted,

MHE Engineering, D.P.C.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Patrick J. Hines". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'P'.

Patrick J. Hines

Principal

PJH/ltn