

## MEMO

Title: Village of Dobbs Ferry Planning Board, Engineer Comments design team responses  
Project: The Masters School Innovation and Entrepreneurship Center

Date: August 30, 2021

To: Anthony Oliveri , P.E.  
Dolph Rotfield Engineering

From: Jennifer Olson, AIA, LEED AP, Director, Marvel  
Cc: Edward Biddle, The Masters School

Upon receipt of the comments from Mr. Oliveri dated July 29, 2021, the design team offers the following responses:

Engineer comment:

1. Relocation of the existing 10" sanitary sewer may require Westchester Health Department approval, it is our understanding that a determination is being sought by the design engineer. In any case a profile should be included on the plan as well as standard leakage testing requirements in conformance with current Health Department standards.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: No response received from Westchester Health Department regarding relocation of existing 10" sanitary sewer. Profile added to plans, refer to C-701.*

Engineer comment:

2. As discussed at the July Planning Board meeting, curb repairs identified on Clinton and Estherwood Avenues as well as any needed restoration within the Village ROW should be made a condition of site plan approval and notes added to the site plan.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: Clinton Avenue repairs noted on Notes (C-101) and Construction Access Plan (C-502). Estherwood Avenue repairs to be defined by Village.*

Engineer comment:

3. As now noted on the plan, the staging or queuing of construction vehicles within the Village ROW shall be prohibited, this should be made a condition of any approval.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: Refer to C-502 showing accommodation of full tractor trailer on site, and notation for no queuing within Clinton Avenue.*

Engineer comment:

4. The construction entrance should indicate that the sidewalk is to remain during construction, the stabilized construction entrance stone should begin behind the sidewalk.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: Noted on plan, refer to C-502.*

Engineer comment:

5. The applicant indicated need for space outside the entry gate for a 53' trailer. The complete length of a 53' trailer with the cab is at least 73'.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: This is updated, please refer to C-502.*

Engineer comment:

6. A staging plan for use of a crane if necessary, during construction should be submitted for review prior to Building Permit issuance.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: Noted.*

Engineer comment:

7. The construction fence (chain link) should be provided with a dust screen.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: Noted on plan, refer to C-502.*

Engineer comment:

8. It is noted that the SWPPP submitted is in draft form, a final more complete SWPPP must be submitted, signed and sealed by the design engineer for review.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: SWPPP provided with this submission is signed and sealed.*

Engineer comment:

9. The site limitations cited in the SWPPP to justify not providing 100% RRv are not sufficient reason considering the overall parcel area of 96 acres.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: 100% RRv is provided.*

Engineer comment:

10. A tabular summary of pre vs post stormwater runoff rates and volumes for the various storm events must be included in the SWPPP narrative.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: Requested table is provided.*

Engineer comment:

11. Additional report information from the HydroCAD model must be included to properly review the provided calculations, including but not limited all nodes and routing diagrams, watershed summaries, time of concentration calculations, etc.
  - *Team response August 30, 2021: Requested software output is provided.*

Engineer comment:

12. The provided drainage maps must depict the time of concentration path and flow types assumed and calculated.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Paths and flow types are depicted.*

Engineer comment:

13. The close proximity of the stormtech chamber to be used for the “building perimeter drain” to the main infiltration gallery is not recommended.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Infiltration chamber for building foundation drain has been relocated away from the building.*

Engineer comment:

14. In general, the plan must note all pipe sizes, materials, slopes, inverts that are proposed.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Refer to C-600, C-700, and C-701.*

Engineer comment:

15. A site-specific detailed layout, cross section and details for the proposed stormtech infiltrators must be included on the plans. Expected elevations for each storm event modelled should be indicated.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Elevations are shown on site-specific layout in SWPPP appendices.*

Engineer comment:

16. The stormtech isolator row is not called out on the plan.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Updated, refer to C-600.*

Engineer comment:

17. The stormtech manifold piping is not labelled as to size, slopes, inverts etc.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Refer to site-specific layout, included with SWPPP.*

Engineer comment:

18. A detail for the proposed outlet control structure must be included with inverts and pipe sizes labelled and indication of each storm event elevation; as well as storm manhole MH-1, which appears to split the flow between the bioretention pond and the infiltrator system – if this is the case it must also be included in the HydroCAD model.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Storm manhole MH-1 receives underdrain effluent from the bioretention, along with roof drainage from leaders.*

Engineer comment:

19. Soil infiltration testing and deep test pit data and logs must be submitted for review. All testing must conform with NYSDEC design guidelines; if not already completed, notify this office when performing.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Soil boring and infiltration test data included with SWPPP.*

Engineer comment:

20. The provided sequence of construction should be listed on the plans and in the SWPPP.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Refer to C-101.*

Engineer comment:

21. Inspection port locations should be indicated on the plans.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Inspection port(s) noted on plans, refer to C-600.*

Engineer comment:

22. Post-construction maintenance notes should be listed on the plans.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Notes have been added, refer to C-101.*

Engineer comment:

23. As noted previously, a draft Contractor Certification form which contains the statement and information required by the General Permit should be submitted for review and contained in the SWPPP.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Form included with SWPPP.*

Engineer comment:

24. As noted previously the SWPPP should include information to demonstrate compliance with Table 5.3 Soil Restoration Requirements of the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: SWPPP updated to include Soil Restoration notes.*

Engineer comment:

25. As noted previously, the existing water line material should be listed; use of PVC for the proposed water service relocation should be reviewed by the building department.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: Existing material is listed on C-700. Building department of PVC is noted.*

Engineer comment:

26. As noted previously, for the proposed sewer pipe, ductile iron pipe (DIP) should be considered in lieu of cast iron pipe (CIP) which is still noted on the plan.

- *Team response August 30, 2021: DIP is proposed. Refer to C-700.*