



October 21, 2020

Town of Dryden – Planning Board
93 East Main Street
Dryden, New York 13053
Attn: Ray Burger – Code Enforcement Officer

Re: Maifly Development - Planning Board Meeting (submitted via email)
5 & 9 Freese Road
Dryden, NY

Dear Ray,

On behalf of our client, Maifly Development, we are submitting the enclosed information in response to the written comments from Planning Board member David Weinstein dated October 19, 2020 which you provided via email.

EAF Comments from Planning Board Member David Weinstein dated October 19, 2020

1. *D.1. Project Development (Page 3)*

Total acres is listed as 4.7 acres. However, on page 9, E.1.b, Land Uses and Covertypes, in column "Acreage After Project Completion", the acres listed added up to 4.3 acres, not 4.7.?

Response: Land use cover types originally included in E.1.b were associated with those covertypes to be physically disturbed. Areas otherwise not disturbed were not originally included. This table has been updated to reflect a total acreage equal to the "Project Site" acreage of 4.7 acres. This update does not change the identified "Change" in cover types.

2. *D.2.j. Project Operations (Page 7)*

Increase in traffic? The Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, under "220. Multifamily Housing Low-Rise" in a General Urban/Suburban setting/location indicates the number of PM trips per residential should be 0.56, and for "210. Single Family Detached Housing" it is 0.99 per unit. In this instance, that means during the PM, there will be 15 trips from the Multifamily apartments, and 15 trips from the Single Family Detached houses, or a total of 33 trips. Assuming that the Trip Generation table in the 10th Edition of this Manual has not changed from the table in the 9th Edition:

Using either the anticipated number of people in these 104 units (121 people) or vehicles, based on 91 parking spaces, we get the following number of trips generated:

Their numbers, 32 in the AM and 37 in the PM serious low-ball the expected numbers, which based on the number of vehicles 35% higher in the AM and 52% in the PM.

Therefore, the marking of this question as “NO”, no substantial increase in traffic, should be reconsidered based on this more appropriate estimate of the trip generation.

Response: Refer to enclosed correspondence from SRF & Associates. Information presented in the FEAF will remain.

3. *D.2.j.iii Project Operations (Page 7)*

The number of parking spaces needs to be changed from “100” to “91”

Response: This field in the EAF has been updated.

4. *D.2.l. Project Operations (Page 7)*

Hours of operation during construction should be limited to 8AM to 6PM since this is in a residential area.

Response: The aforementioned response has been updated from “as required by the town” to 8AM to 6PM as suggested.

5. *D.2.n. Project Operations (Page 8)*

Lighting – Needs to be adjusted to follow the County’s recommended outdoor lighting restrictions.

Response: The response to this section has been updated to include a max CCT of 2,700K as recommended by County Planning.

6. *E.1.b Land uses on and surrounding the project site (Page 9)*

As mentioned previously, the acres listed under “Acreage after project completion” add up to 4.3 acres, not 4.7 as was listing in D.1.b (Page 3)

Response: Land use cover types originally included in E.1.b were associated with those cover types to be physically disturbed. Areas otherwise not disturbed were not originally included. This table has been updated to reflect a total acreage equal to the “Project Site” acreage of 4.7 acres. This update does not change the identified “Change” in cover types.

7. *E.2.e. Natural Resources (Page 11)*

The answer given to this question is of little use without consideration of the fill material covering the site to a depth of 20’ to 30’. The fill that really determines most of the soil properties.

Response: The response to this section on the EAF also states that the data provided is “according to NRCS soils data, not considering fill placed on site”. This response will remain.

8. *E.2.h.iv Natural Resources – Water Bodies (Page 11)*

Fall Creek, a Class A stream, should be mentioned under “Streams”.

Also, the border of Fall Creek in this area is listed on the Tompkins County Natural Resource Inventory as a wetland.

This area is also listed on Federal wetland maps as a 3.36 acre Riverine habitat is classified as a R3USA. The section in between Fall Creek and this development is probably an acre.

Response: EAF E.2.h.iv states...“For each identified wetland and waterbody on the project site, provide the following information”. Fall Creek is not on or within the project site or subject parcels at all which is why the field for stream identification is not listed.

9. *E.2.k Natural Resources – 500-year floodplain (Page 11)*

The latest FEMA maps indicate that the area where the house to be removed resides is in the 500-year floodplain. However, since this area will be covered by 20’ to 30’ of fill, I guess there is no reason to suggest that it will still be in that floodplain. The fill will merely disrupt the normal functioning of that floodplain if a 500-year event happens.

Response: The assertion that the 500-year flood plain encumbers the project site is false. The map provided by commentor does not illustrate a 500-year flood plain within the map view. Further, the 100-year flood plain does not encumber the parcel either. We are enclosing an enlarged view of the parcel area taken from the Tompkins County Natural Resources Inventory database clearly illustrates that neither the 500 nor 100-year flood plains encumber the project site.

So we may continue our coordination and review with the Town of Dryden, we are providing the following information.

- This letter
- Letter from SRF & Associates date 10/21/20
- Tompkins County Natural Resource Inventory Map of project area

We look forward to discussing this project at the October 22, 2020 meeting. If you have any questions or need additional information please do not hesitate to contact our office. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,



Adam M. Fishel, PE, CPESC
Marathon Engineering

cc: Matt Durbin – Maifly Development

Planning Board Submittal
Maifly Development – 5 & 9 Freese Road
10/21/20