



October 26, 2022

NYSDOT  
Mr. Richard Stevens  
476 Maple Street  
Big Flats, NY 14814

RE: Dandy Mini Marts  
Lansing (T), Tompkins (Co.), NY  
FE Project 2020-062

Dear Mr. Richard Stevens:

This is our response to the comments provided on June 10, 2022, for the above-referenced project. The following is an item-by-item response, numbered in accordance with your original comments.

General Comments:

*C1 Please submit a detailed workup of the trip volumes included on stage one of the PERM-33-COM.*

**R1 Please see Traffic Impact Study dated October 2022 performed by SRF Associates and Passero Associates.**

*C2 All plan sheets detail the “assumed highway boundary”. This should be surveyed and determined to be the actual highway boundary, not assumed.*

**R2 The term “Assumed Highway Boundary” that is shown on both our map and the Weiler Associates boundary map used refers to the fact that there is no highway taking in that area, and the parcel goes to the centerline of the highway. The assumed highway boundary is 33 feet from centerline of the highway.**

*C3 Has the Town mentioned if they want you to install sidewalks?*

**R3 Please see revised Plan Sheet C3 for added sidewalks along the property line. The Town has requested the sidewalks as part of there Scenic Byway plan.**

*C4 Sheet C15, C16, and C17 all have superseded standard sheets. The details on sheet C18 should adequately cover your WZTC needs within the NYSDOT ROW. Please eliminate sheets C15 - C17.*

**R4 Sheets C15-17 have been eliminated. Sheet C18 is now revised Plan Sheet C16.**

*C5 Sheet C19 is labelled as “truck turning plan”, there do not appear to be any turning movements shown on the plans.*

**R5 Please see revised Plan Sheets C18 and C19 for truck turning and passenger vehicle turning movements.**

*C6 Please provide a photometric plan. Note that light spillage is not allowed within the NYSDOT ROW.*

**R6 Please see revised Plan Sheet C8 for photometrics plan.**

*C7 Heavy duty shoulder recon detailed on sheet C9 is not called out on any of the plan sheets. Please update or add a plan sheet that calls out the shoulder recon per the attached driveway plan 50-10. Please reference the sheet in the detail so it is easier to find.*

**R7 Please see revised Plan Sheet C3 for added shoulder reconstruction note. Also please see revised Plan Sheet C10 for “Shoulder Repair Pavement Sections” detail.**

Utility Comments:

*C1 Water connection given, does not say by others, Please clarify if this work is to be done by this development or more commonly the utility owner.*

**R1 Please see revised Plan Sheet C5 for added note.**

*C2 Electric, telephone, and internet all appear aerial. Again it does not say being done by others, so need clarification on this.*

**R2 Please see revised Plan Sheet C5 for added note.**

*C3 Full septic design should be done as part of store build if being mentioned as a 100 percent future expansion area, this tells me that there is a certainty that this will become needed. One permit is better than two, not sure if they would need a second; but, at least its out there. The southern section of the map is not given so I don't know what is there for referencing if anything.*

**R3 A full design was submitted as part of the previous submission and this submission. This will be reviewed by either the local health department or the State Health Department. It is a State requirement to have an area for 100% expansion in case the initial absorption field fails. A permit is not required for the 100% future expansion.**

*C4 I didn't really see any inflows or outflows clearly shown on the plans for the storm storage area. Just into and out of the storage area itself. There was one spot it looked like it was there intent but I didn't see it called out.*

**R4 All flows will enter the storm chamber area through DMH-1 and the proposed Crystal Streams Unit. All outflows will outlet through DMH-2.**

Environmental/Landscaping Comments:

*C1 Other than for the proposed driveways, the site appears to be large enough to eliminate most of the proposed grading on the ROW along NY Route 34B (Ridge Road). Grading within the ROW limits can limit what can be done in future roadway work such as adding sidewalks, drainage improvements or turning lanes. Otherwise, a retaining wall may be warranted. It also appears that the proposed CB and proposed curbing is directly above the existing waterline.*

**R1 Please see revised Plan Sheet C4 for updated grading that has been kept out of the NYS ROW, relocated curb line, and relocated CB-3 to be outside the existing waterline path.**

*C2 The proposed sidewalk leading to/from the intersection requires a cast iron detectable warning unit; Item 608.21000003. The type of curb ramp shall be shown on the plans; refer to Standard Sheets 608.01.*

**R2 Please see revised Plan Sheet C3, cast iron detectable warning surfaces have been added.**

*C3 As with planting multiple trees of the same species is not appropriate, cherry trees in general a very susceptible to diseases. Therefore, any trees planted in the ROW shall be either crabapples, serviceberry, or hawthorn or non-flowering tree varieties that will fit the site location; overhead utilities. Additionally, the trees proposed for the ROW shall be no larger than 2.0" in caliper to help in the success and survivability of the tree.*

**R3 Please see revised Plan Sheet C7, all trees within ROW have been revised to Service Berry.**

*C4 The erosion and sediment control plan shall include temporary mulch for the disturbed areas within the ROW, etc. All disturbed areas shall receive straw mulch at the end of each work week, at a minimum, until final grading can occur. Once final grading is completed the area(s) shall receive permanent seed within 48 hours of final grading.*

**R4 Please see revised Plan Sheet C14 for added NYSDOT ROW Notes.**

*C5 Does the proposed SPDES treatment satisfy the requirements of the regulated MS4?*

**R5 Yes, the SPDES will satisfy all MS4 requirements.**

*C6 Does this development satisfy any NYSDEC requirements for being close to Minnegar Brook?*

**R6 Yes, the project will satisfy all NYSDEC requirements for being close to Minnegar Brook.**

*C7 There is a well sited on C3 near a proposed CB along NY Route 34B. Does this well only service this property and will no longer service this property? In other words, does anyone else rely on this well? Will this well be terminated and "removed"?*

**R7 This well will be abandoned in place and capped. This well does not serve any other property.**

Page 4  
Mr. Richard Stevens  
October 26, 2022

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (607) 734-2165, ext. 237.

Sincerely,

FAGAN ENGINEERS & LAND SURVEYORS, P.C.



Brian Grose, EIT  
Staff Engineer

L:\PROJECTS\2020\2020-062\Approvals\NYS DOT\2022-10-26 Lansing Dandy Mini Mart Response Letter.doc