

May 16, 2014 Site Plan Phase Documents
Review for Wilmot Casino and Resort



Engineers • Environmental Scientists • Planners • Landscape Architects

Celebrating over 50 years of service

MEMORANDUM

TO: Town of Tyre
 Ronald F. McGreevy, Supervisor **JN. 1650.001.001**

FROM: Adam Cummings, P.E., BCEE

DATE: 16 May 2014

SUBJECT: Site Plan Phase Documents Review for Wilmot Casino and Resort,
 Town of Tyre, Seneca County, New York

Staff from B&L have reviewed the documentation referenced below and have the following questions/comments for the applicant regarding the SEQRA, Development Plan, and Site Plan documents as well as responses from the applicant related to our previously submitted comments provided on separated Memorandums, entitled “Development Plan Phase Documents Review for Wilmot Casino and Resort, Town of Tyre, Seneca County, New York” and “Preliminary Site Plan clarification requests and comments for Wilmot Casino and Resort, Town of Tyre, Seneca County, New York”, both dated April 9, 2014.

Submittal Documents provided for review:

- SEQRA Documentation and Engineer’s Report, prepared by BME and dated March 2014
- Appendices to Engineer’s Report, prepared by BME and dated March 2014
- Development Plans (six sheets), prepared by BME and dated March 2014
- Revised Engineer’s Report, prepared by BME and dated April 2014
- Revised Appendices to Engineer’s Report, prepared by BME and dated April 2014
- Site Plans (10 sheets), prepared by BME and dated April 2014

Engineer’s Report comments:

1. **Page 9** - Table 3 indicates that the Pond A bottom is 500.0 ft. The site plans and details indicate a bottom pond elevation (below permanent pool) of 494.0 ft. It is our belief that the pond bottom elevation should be revised to 494.00 ft with the pond permanent pool elevation of 500.00 ft. Please confirm or clarify this discrepancy.
2. **Page 10** - Table 4 indicates that the Pond B bottom is 500.0 ft. The site plans and details indicate a bottom pond elevation (below permanent pool) of 494.0 ft. It is our belief that the pond bottom elevation should be revised to 494.00 ft with the pond permanent pool elevation of 500.00 ft. Please confirm or clarify this discrepancy.





3. **Page 11** – It is stated that construction details for individual [stormwater management] practices will be provided with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during the time of construction document preparation. At that time, the NYSDEC's Runoff Reduction Worksheets (available at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/8694.html>) should be utilized to document green infrastructure requirements as part of the SWPPP.
4. **Page 6 and Appendix A - Figure 04** - It appears that proposed drainage area I-C is only tributary to a proposed bioretention area prior to discharge directly to the existing wetland. Please indicate if this practice will provide required water quality and water quantity treatment of the tributary runoff.
5. **Page 11 and Appendix A** - The water quality volume required on Page 11 (94,351 cf) does not match the Appendix A WQv totals (94,772 cf): 64,948 cf (SWMF A) and 29,824 cf (SWMF B) in the Phase II calculations preceding the hydrograph plots. The total water quality volume reported in this section also appears to only be calculated for drainage within areas A-1a and B-1. There is development in other subareas that needs to be accounted for in the WQv calculations.

It is noted that additional WQv calculations are provided in Appendix A (following the hydrograph plots). Please clarify which of the WQv calculation sets is correct. We respectfully suggest that the calculations that are not utilized in the design of the stormwater management facilities for this development be removed from the report.

6. **Page 18** – The report references the 1997 Ten States Recommended Standards, it is recommended that the updated to 2004 version be used as a reference. Please review the 2004 version and revise the calculations, if necessary.
7. **Appendix A** - Proposed area A-1A indicates 0.8-acres of row crops located in two different hydrologic groups. Where will these be located on the developed portion of the site? Please provide further description of these areas. If this is incorrect, please revise and resubmit the resulting calculations.
8. To prevent fats, oil, or grease (fog) issues within the pump station infrastructure it is recommended that grease interceptors be installed on laterals from food service facilities.

Site Plan comments:

1. **Drawing 09** -Intersection configuration shown at Route 414/Exit 41/Petro does not match the TIS proposed configuration. Specifically, the TIS proposes a westbound thru/left and a westbound thru/right. The Site plan depicts a westbound left only and a westbound thru/right. According to the TIS, the capacity provided by two westbound through lanes is critical to the performance of this intersection.



2. **Drawing 09** -The downstream westbound travel lanes at Route 414/Exit 41/Petro (between the intersection and the toll plazas) are shown merging into one travel lane. In speaking with McFarland Johnson, this is not how the traffic analysis was modeled. The gore area would need to be re-stripped to avoid the lane merge.
3. **Drawing 09** - The intersection configuration shown at Route 414/Site Entrance does not match the TIS proposed configuration. Specifically, the TIS proposes a single southbound thru/left, a northbound thru, and a northbound right only. The site plan depicts a southbound thru, a southbound left only, a northbound thru/right, and a northbound right only. The Synchro model and capacity results do not reflect the intersection configuration as shown on the site plan.
4. **Drawing 09** – As the NYSDOT Region 3 mentioned in their recommended mitigation measures, further explanation of internal circulation for the area on the entrance drive towards the parking garage. The applicant submitted a letter dated, May 9, 2014, where Response No. 5 directly addresses this comment. We are in agreement that a free flow situation for vehicles entering into the site must be provided and will continue to review a suitable plan is developed during the highway work permit stage with the applicant to ensure that the free flowing movement of vehicles from NYS Route 414 is achieved to avoid backups onto NYS Route 414. We concur that this concern can be mitigated with several standard practices. One of which, does include the appropriate selection, location, and use of traffic control devices (i.e. stripping, signage, and manned traffic direction practices). It is acknowledged that this mitigation does have several solution options and it is at the discretion of the private land owner to install, employ, and manage the mitigation options to ensure that traffic backups onto NYS Route 414 do not occur, we respectfully recommend further investigation into eliminating the western driveway into the parking garage and relocate it to the northern side of the parking garage. This alternative appears conceptually to provide many benefits including: elimination of the large retaining wall to the north of the parking garage driveway near the Federal Wetland Area, increased avoidance distance from the isolated wetland areas thus providing additional safeguard space around this feature, and elimination of a branch of the intersection configuration for vehicles entering the site that will promote better internal traffic circulation.
5. **Drawing 09** – Please show the approximate location of dumpster or refuse storage areas. None are depicted on the plans that were received.
6. **Drawing 09** – Please show the anticipated snow storage areas as none are depicted.
7. **Drawing 09** – Please identify where oversize vehicles, such as recreational vehicles, tow campers, limousines, etc. will be parked on the site.
8. **Drawing 09** – Bus parking (15 spaces) is identified on the western side of the proposed casino building. It appears that the maneuvering space for these buses is restricted by the nearby concrete islands. We suggest that the travel lane, which is currently 24 feet in width, be increased to promote improved maneuvering area for the bus traffic entering and exiting the parking spaces. The loss of a minor amount of parking spaces will be negligible.
9. **Drawing 09** – The main parking area due west of the proposed casino only has one ingress/egress point. We recommend adding a second one to promote better, safer, more efficient circulation for this lot. One suggestion would be to add an ingress/egress driveway



Site Plan Review for Wilmot Casino, Tyre, NY
Page 4

along the west edge of the parking lot, which will not impede traffic entering the site from the main entrance.

10. **Drawing 11** – The 48” HDPE pipe between structures D3 & D2 appears to have a vertical conflict with the 24” HDPE pipe between structures DE-2 & DE-1. Please verify these pipe elevations.
11. **Drawing 11** – For structure DA-1, the 24” HDPE pipe is shown to enter the structure 15” below the rim elevation. Please check/verify these elevations and adjust as necessary.
12. **Drawing 11** – Will the two stormwater management facilities be fenced?
13. **Drawing 11** – Please confirm should be provided that site soils will require phosphorus containing fertilizer as currently specified.
14. **Drawing 11** – A private water supply well is depicted in the westernmost parking area. Proper closure and abandonment of this well is recommended.
15. **Drawing 11** – Utility Note No. 12 should read “All sanitary sewer must be in compliance with the specifications and sewer policy of the Town of Seneca Falls.”
16. **Drawing 13** - Consideration should be given to extending silt fence around the northern perimeter of SWMF-A to ensure protection of the adjoining property from potential sediment impacts during construction of the SWMF. The silt fence depicted to the east of the proposed parking garage near drainage inlet DC-1 should also be considered for extension further to the south to the property line to ensure protection from potential sediment impacts during construction of the roadway and underground utilities.
17. **Drawing 16** – The Typical Storm Sewer Building Lateral and Typical Sanitary Sewer Building Lateral details both reference a Connection to House. It is likely that this should be revised to state Connection to Building as there are no residential uses proposed for this mixed use development. Please confirm.