



McGOEY, HAUSER and EDSALL
CONSULTING ENGINEERS D.P.C.

MARK J. EDSALL, P.E., P.P. (NY, NJ & PA)
MICHAEL W. WEEKS, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)
MICHAEL J. LAMOREAUX, P.E. (NY, NJ, PA, VT & VA)
MATTHEW J. SICKLER, P.E. (NY & PA)
PATRICK J. HINES

Regional Office
111 Wheatfield Drive, Suite 1
Milford, Pennsylvania 18337

(570) 296-2765
fax: (570) 296-2767
e-mail: mhepa@mhepc.com

Principal Emeritus:
RICHARD D. McGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA)
WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)

TOWN OF THOMPSON **TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMENTS**

PROJECT NAME: Thompson Education Center – Well Drilling Plan
PROJECT NUMBER: 95-56; 13-42
PROJECT LOCATION: Town of Thompson
DATE: 6 July 2016
REVIEWED: Well Drilling Plan Sheet 1 of 2 last revised 06-17-16
Erosion Control Plan Sheet 1 of 2 last revised 06-17-16
Email correspondence with NYSDEC last dated 06-20-16


1. Note: A revised SWPPP has not been submitted and has therefore not been reviewed to address previous technical review and NYSDEC comments.
2. In accordance with code section 250-50E(2)(a), our office would recommend the site plan show 2' contour intervals (10' intervals are currently shown).
3. In addition to the adjacent area for the NYSDEC wetlands to be staked in the area of the well sites, the adjacent area along the access road route between well heads 1, 2 and 3 should also be staked or flagged prior to the construction of the access road. The plan states that the "access road (is) to meander within 20 foot stakeout so there is a likely hood that without the stakeout or installation of orange construction fence, that a contractor would meander into the NYSDEC wetland adjacent area. This should be noted on the erosion control plan, sheet 1 of 2.
4. All three wells are shown in very close proximity to the NYSDEC wetland disturbance adjacent area. The "Well Area Detail" on sheet 2 of 2 may not be constructible as there would be possible disturbance within the adjacent area for EC measure installation. Along with the adjacent area being delineated in the field, a minimum offset should be noted on sheet 1 of 2 from the well head to the adjacent area.
5. In accordance with our last phone conversation with the applicant's representative held on 15 June 2016, notes were to be provided on the plan describing the location of the access road route will be selected to minimize site disturbance and the clearing of brush and cutting trees. Further it was discussed that the access route would be field determined and likely flagged in 200 foot increments ahead of the access road installation.

6. The applicant's engineer stated that stumps will not be removed to install the access road. This should be noted on the plan as there are notes referring to stump removal.
7. The applicant's engineer also stated that trees will be replanted in an effort to restore the access road to its original state. This should be noted on the plan.
8. Vince Pietrzak was to provide our office with the definition of site restoration to its original condition from NYSDEC.
9. Discuss the need for the full SWPPP in accordance with NYSDEC's email dated 6/20/16 and all preceding correspondence. There has been no revised SWPPP submitted which was to be clear on what Phase of Construction this SWPPP and NOI was to address.
10. The road width is not shown to scale on the 1"= 350 ft plan.
11. A table of possible property owners for well monitoring on sheet 1 was provided and is still under review by our office. Additional site plan review and approval will be required if monitoring wells are determined as warranted.
12. The detail sheet (2 of 2) appears to have generic erosion and sediment control notes that are not consistent with our understanding of this well drilling project. The notes should be revised to reflect how the access roads/ wells will be installed as part of this initial project phase as some of these activities are prohibited at this time without a full SWPPP:
 - a. Erosion Control Sequence: Note "D" refers to clearing and grubbing activities, and topsoil shall be stripped and stockpiled.
 - b. Erosion Control Sequence: Note "F" notes "after the completion of rough grading"
 - c. Etc.
13. Restoration Bond Estimate comments:
 - a. There should be a line item for removal of imported material for the well road stabilization.
 - b. The unit cost for each tree should be \$250 (min.).
 - c. Our office would recommend an addition of a 10% contingency.

Should you require any additional information or have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Respectfully submitted,

McGOEY, HAUSER & EDSALL
CONSULTING ENGINEERS, D.P.C.



Richard D. McGoeey, P.E.
Principal Emeritus
RDM/lab