

18 September 2020



Frank Lodato, Chairman
c/o Ms. Trish Sena, Secretary
Borough of Tinton Falls Planning Board
556 Tinton Avenue
Tinton Falls, NJ 07724

**Re: Response to Comments T&M Associates
1251 Jumping Brook Road - Block 128.03, Lot 47
PB 2020-12
Completeness & First Engineering Review
Borough of Tinton Falls, Monmouth County, NJ
Langan Project No.: 100775501**

Dear Chairman Lodato and Board Members:

This letter is in response to comments received from T&M Associates in a letter dated 12 August 2020. The comments are identified in italics and Langan's responses are in bold.

A. Project Description

Lot 47 (50.69 acres) is currently in use as a driving range and Par-3 golf course. The subject property is located in the IOP (Industrial Office Park) Zone of the Borough with frontage along Jumping Brook Road. With this application, the applicant seeks preliminary and final major site plan approval for the construction an Amazon Delivery Station consisting of an approximately 113,016 square foot warehouse distribution building, along with utilities, site lighting improvements, 229 car parking spaces, 713 van parking spaces, 11 truck loading spaces, 5 detention basins, related landscaping plantings, and associated infrastructure improvements.

Response: Since the initial submission, the site layout has been updated in order to accommodate for electrical vehicle charging equipment, and modifications to stormwater management basins. The site redevelopment now consists of the construction of an approximately 113,016 SF shipping and receiving building, 231 car parking spaces, 670 van parking spaces, and 11 truck loading spaces. Refer to Drawings CS100 through CS103.

LABOR

FILE COPY



RECEIVED
JAN 22 1960
68300-12

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

B. Fees

The fees established through the Borough Development Application Fee Schedule as related to the subject application are as follows:

	<u>Administrative Fee</u>	<u>Escrow/Professional Fee</u>
Preliminary Site Plan	\$8,000.80	\$117,612.00
Final Site Plan	\$4,000.40	\$0 (No Fee)
Design Waiver	\$0 (No Fee)	\$500.00
Bulk "C" Variance	\$600.00	\$1,000.00
G.I.S. Fee	\$147.00	\$0 (No Fee)
Publication Fee	\$30.00	\$0 (No Fee)
Fire Prevention	\$100.00	\$0 (No Fee)
Total Fees	\$12,878.20	\$119,112.00

The applicant has posted all necessary escrow fees and \$12,451.20 in administrative fees. The required administrative fee is \$12,878.20. The applicant shall post the remaining \$427.00 prior to the Planning Board meeting.

Response: The applicant agrees to post the remaining fee, prior to the Planning Board meeting.

C. Technical Completeness Review

1. The applicant has requested various submission waivers. Based on our review of the submitted materials, we have no objection to these waivers. I therefore recommend the application be considered complete from an engineering standpoint and scheduled for the next available Planning Board meeting.

Response: This comment has been acknowledged.

D. Required Variance & Design Waiver

1. The following bulk 'c' variances are required.
 - a. Section 40-29.D.2 of the Ordinance states that all critical environmental areas shall be preserved and not built upon, whereas the applicant is proposing to build on an area with slopes in excess of 15%, as well as filling existing freshwater wetlands.

Response: The zoning table on Drawing GI101 has been revised to indicate that the project does not comply with Section 40-29.D.2 of the Ordinance. Refer to Item #3 in the list of requested variances / waivers. We respectfully request for relief from Section 40-29.D.2.

- b. *Section 40-33.D.5.n of the Ordinance states that walls or fences along the side or rear yard shall not exceed six (6) feet in height, whereas the applicant is proposing a 10.88 foot high retaining wall along the northwestern side of the site.*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged and is shown on Drawing GI 101.

- c. *Section 40-34.M.3.c(4) of the Ordinance states that a single ground sign is permitted for each site, whereas the applicant is proposing to install three ground signs at this time.*

Response: The zoning table on Drawing GI101 has been revised to indicate that the project does not comply with Section 40-34.M.3.c(4) regarding the amount of ground signs proposed. We respectfully request for relief from this requirement.

- d. *Section 40-34.M.3.c(4) of the Ordinance states that ground signs are to be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the property line, whereas the applicant is proposing to install three ground signs 10 feet from the property line.*

Response: As discussed at the TRC meeting on 2 September 2020, the ground signs were moved further from the property line, where practical, but are still unable to meet the 20 FT setback requirement.

The ground sign furthest to the west is unable to be moved further into the site, as it would require the removal of the proposed rain garden. The ground sign located near the truck and van entrance was moved 5 FT further into the site, but is unable to be moved further into the site, as it would be obscured by the van parking spaces. The ground sign furthest to the east, for the van parking spaces, was moved back 5 FT but was unable to be moved further into the site, as it would be located within the grading associated with the stormwater basin. The ground sign furthest to the west is approximately 27 FT from the curb, and the other two ground signs are 30 FT from the curb

These ground signs are critical to the tenant's operations and safe traffic operations, as they provide key directional information to all the employees who will be entering the site. Therefore, we request relief for the ground sign setback.

- e. *Section 40-34.N.4 states that two directional signs in the parking areas are permitted and that each sign shall not exceed two square feet, whereas it appears the applicant is proposing the following directional signs:*
- i 20 square foot "Yard Rules" sign
 - ii 6 square foot "Truck Entrance" sign
 - iii 6 square foot "Exit" signs

- iv 20 square foot Wayfinding signs
- v 1.5 square foot "Visitor Parking" signs
- vi 1.5 square foot "Vendor Parking" signs
- vii 1.5 square foot "Customer Parking" signs
- viii 9 square foot "Muster Area" sign

The sign tables at the bottom of Sheet 11 should be revised to indicate the total number of each signs so the variance intensity can be properly reviewed. We also note that many of the wayfinding signs appear to be significantly oversized for the amount of text/graphics indicated on the sign. The size of the signs should be reduced where possible.

Response: Directional signs are key to the tenant's operations and safe on-site traffic flow. A variety of directional signage has been proposed throughout the site, and the counts for each directional sign have been added to Drawing SS 501. A variance request has also been added to the zoning table on Drawing GI 101 for the size and number of signs.

In addition, the sizes of the wayfinding signs (AS-16's) have been reduced where possible, as discussed at the TRC meeting on 2 September 2020. Refer to Drawing SS501.

- f. Section 40-35.G.1 of the Ordinance states that the maximum permitted lot area for warehouse uses is 10 acres, whereas 50.7 acres is proposed.

Response: This comment has been acknowledged and is shown in the zoning table on Drawing GI 101.

- g. Section 40-35.G.2 of the Ordinance states that the minimum percentage of gross floor area used for warehousing shall be 90% of the total building area. Therefore, 101,714.40 square feet is permitted for warehousing, whereas the applicant indicates 100,916 square feet is proposed. A bulk 'c' variance is therefore required. The applicant shall confirm the total square footage of both office and warehouse space.

Response: The final square footage for the office area has been adjusted and is now 8,606 SF, which equates to 7.6% of the total building area. Therefore, a bulk 'c' variance is no longer required for Section 40-35.G.2.

- 2. The following design waivers are required:

- a. Section 40.26.G.7 of the Ordinance states that nonresidential uses shall be permitted up to two driveways when the lot width exceeds 500 feet, the driveways are at least 200 feet apart, and the driveways meet the required setbacks from intersecting streets and adjacent property lines. The applicant is currently proposing four driveways, three of which do not meet the required 200 feet separation distance when measured from edge of driveway to edge of driveway.

Response: The zoning table on Drawing GI101 has been revised to indicate that the proposed driveways do not meet the separation distance requirement under Section 40.26.G.7. We respectfully request for relief from Section 40.26.G.7.

- b. Section 40-26.N.1.e of the Ordinance states that the maximum height of any freestanding light shall not exceed 18 feet, whereas a number of 25 foot freestanding light fixtures are proposed at the rear of the site.

Response: This comment has been acknowledged and is listed on Drawing GI 101.

- c. Section 40-26.N.1.h of the Ordinance states that the maximum permitted illumination at property lines shall be 0.1 footcandles. Based on the provided lighting plan it appears spillage does occur over the front property line along Jumping Brook Road, however the indicated lighting intensity at the property line from the lighting chart is 0 footcandles. The applicant shall revise the lighting chart to indicate the true illumination levels at the property line. It appears levels up to 3.3 footcandles are proposed at the property line. A design waiver is most likely required. We note that spillage occurs within the driveway and should not adversely impact neighboring properties.

Response: The zoning table on Drawing GI101 has been revised to indicate that the proposed illumination along Jumping Brook Road exceeds the permitted amount in Section 40.26.N.1.h. We respectfully request for relief from Section 40.26.N.1.h.

- d. Section 40-26.N.1.j of the Ordinance states that for all nonresidential uses, the maximum permitted light intensity at any location shall not exceed 4.0 footcandles, whereas 7.2 footcandles is proposed. Additionally, the maximum average permitted for the entire site is 2.0, whereas 3.1 footcandles is proposed.

Response: This comment has been acknowledged and is listed on Drawing GI 101.

- e. Section 40-26.Q.2.a of the Ordinance states that a minimum of 10% of the surface parking shall be landscaped and include one (1) shade tree for every five (5) parking spaces, whereas the proposed landscaping plan does not meet this requirement.

Response: This proposed development does not comply with the specific requirement outlined above, but generally provides landscaping around the parking lots in an effort to enhance the parking lot areas. This relief is listed on Drawing GI 101.

- f. Section 40-26.R.3 of the Ordinance states that standard institutional and light industrial/warehouse loading space shall measure at least fifteen (15) feet wide by sixty (60) feet long, with height clearance of no less than twenty (20) feet. As is

currently shown, the proposed loading spaces measure 12 feet wide by 60 feet long, and therefore do not meet the width requirement.

Response: The zoning table on Drawing GI101 has been revised to indicate that the proposed loading spaces do not comply with Section 40-26.R.3 of the Ordinance. The proposed loading space size is consistent with the tenant requirements and their other facilities which are similar in nature. Therefore, we respectfully request for relief from Section 40-26.R.3.

E. Site Requirements & Parking

1. For warehouse uses, Parking Schedule 1 of Section 40-39 of the Ordinance requires a minimum of one space per 5,000 square feet of G.F.A. The following is a summary of the required parking spaces:

1 parking space per 5,000 square feet G.F.A.
@ 100,916 square feet G.F.A. 20.18

For office uses, Parking Schedule 1 of Section 40-39 of the Ordinance requires a minimum of one space per 250 square feet of G.F.A. The following is a summary of the required parking spaces:

1 parking space per 250 square feet G.F.A.
@ 12,100 square feet G.F.A. 48.40

There are 69 total parking spaces required, whereas 229 traditional car spaces are proposed. It appears the applicant is proposing an adequate amount of parking spaces; however, testimony shall be provided on the anticipated parking demand and the reason for the surplus in parking supply.

Response: The total number of parking spaces has been updated on the cover sheet to include fleet vehicles, and is now calculated to be 567. There are 901 parking spaces proposed onsite, which is required based on tenant projections. Additional testimony will be provided regarding number of parking spaces in relation to the tenant's operations.

Per the applicant, the total number of associates working at the proposed site will be 177. The associate parking demand based on the Trip Projection table in the appendix of the traffic report is 126 parking spaces, including consideration for shift offsets. The site plan provides 229 associate parking spaces, which is 10 more spaces than appear to be required.

Response: Based on tenant projections, the maximum number of associates onsite at any given time is approximately 200. There are 7 ADA spaces (which are not anticipated to be used at all times) and 14 customer / vendor / visitor parking spaces. An additional buffer of less than 5% is provided, in the event that there is some additional overlap between the shifts.

The plans also indicate a total of 713 van parking spaces to be used for the delivery vans and the drivers' personal vehicles. Additional testimony shall be provided on how these spaces will be utilized and how long the vans will remain parked at the site.

Response: As discussed with your office during the TRC meeting on 2 September 2020, van drivers will enter the site with their personal vehicles, park their personal vehicles in an available van parking space, pick up a van, and proceed to the van queuing area. As such, the vans will be parked onsite at all times, except when out on a delivery route. Testimony will be provided as requested.

The total number of van drivers working at the proposed site will be 195 based on the Trip Projection table in the appendix of the traffic report. Each van driver will require one space for their personal vehicle and one space for their assigned van. Based on this, the van parking demand would be 390 parking spaces, assuming every van driver took their own vehicle to work. The site plan appears to provide 713 van parking spaces, which is 323 more spaces than would be required.

Response: Based on tenant projections, the maximum number of vans operating at the site on any given day is approximately 511. There are 670 van parking spaces proposed onsite, which leaves 159 extra van spaces. These van spaces will be used for van drivers to park their personal vehicles. Approximately 2.5 waves are left open for van personal parking spaces. As vans are taken out for the delivery route, additional van spaces become available and are used for later shifts to park their personal vehicle.

The Engineer shall provide testimony regarding the anticipated parking demand and why such a large surplus of parking spaces is being provided (426 over what is required). There is a concern with the reported number of employees and new trips being underestimated. We understand there may be an increase during the holiday season; however, the proposed number of parking spaces still appears to be significantly more than required.

Response: Testimony will be provided regarding the anticipated parking demand on site.

2. For warehouse uses, Loading Schedule 1 of Section 40-39 requires a minimum of one loading space for the initial 5,000 square feet of G.F.A. and one additional loading space for every 40,000 square feet of G.F.A. that follows. The following is a summary of the required loading spaces:

1 loading space for the initial 5,000 square feet G.F.A. Plus 1 loading space for each additional 40,000 square feet G.F.A.
@ 113,016 square feet GH.F.A.

3.7 spaces → 4 spaces

There are 4 total loading spaces required, whereas 11 loading spaces are proposed. It appears the applicant is proposing an adequate amount of loading spaces; however, testimony shall be provided on the anticipated loading demand and the reason for the surplus in loading spaces.

Response: The number of loading docks is required to meet the tenant's operational needs. Approximately 9 dock doors will be utilized to receive incoming packages. The remaining 2 docks will be used for reverse logistics, for those packages that need to be sent back to the fulfillment centers. Additional testimony will be provided regarding the proposed number of loading docks.

3. *The Engineer shall indicate how many fleet vehicles are proposed or will be permitted on site (i.e. how many vans will be stationed at the site). All fleet vehicles shall be added to the parking requirement per Section 40-39.B.4 of the local Ordinance.*

Response: Based on tenant projections, the maximum number of fleet vehicles operating at the site on any given day is 511. The fleet vehicles have been added to the zoning table on Drawing GI 101.

As per Section 1106 of the 2018 New Jersey International Building Code, where parking is provided, accessible parking spaces shall also be provided in compliance with table 1106.1. Based on table 1106.1, given that 229 car parking spaces are provided, 7 ADA accessible parking spaces are required. The applicant is currently proposing 10. The applicant appears to be providing an adequate number of ADA accessible spaces.

As per Section 1106.5 of the 2018 New Jersey International Building Code, for every six or fraction of six ADA accessible spaces provided, a van accessible space must be provided. Based on the 10 proposed ADA accessible spaces, 2 van accessible spaces are required. The applicant is currently proposing two van accessible spaces and appears to be meeting the requirement.

Response: The site plan has been revised to provide 7 ADA accessible parking spaces. Two of the 7 spaces are van accessible spaces. Refer to Drawings CS102.

4. *The site plans indicate a total of 60 Van Loading Spaces, 60 Queuing Spaces, and 11 Loading Dock Spaces. The Engineer shall provide testimony regarding how these spaces will operate and what portion of the spaces are anticipated to be in use at any given time.*

Response: Testimony will be provided regarding the proposed the 60 Van Loading Spaces, 60 Queuing Spaces, and 11 Loading Dock Spaces during the Planning Board Hearing.

5. *Testimony shall be provided regarding the proposed Delivery Station's use and operation. The Engineer shall be prepared to discuss the following:*
- a. *Hours of operation*
 - b. *Number of Employees (total and maximum per shift)*
 - c. *Designated personal vehicle parking for associate employees*
 - d. *Designated personal vehicle parking for delivery van drivers*
 - e. *Designated van storage parking during off-shift hours*
 - f. *Flex driver parking/waiting area*
 - g. *Non-staff parking*
 - h. *Delivery Schedule and types of delivery trucks*
 - i. *Time to service one delivery van (empty cargo to full cargo)*
 - j. *Time to unload one delivery truck (full cargo to empty cargo)*

Response: Testimony will be provided regarding the operations at the proposed delivery station.

6. *The Signing and Striping Plan shows 10 parking spaces labeled for "Visitor Parking". The Applicant shall clarify what type of visitor is expected at the site and whether self-pickup will be allowed.*

Response: There are 6 visitor spaces and 4 customer spaces proposed. The visitor spaces are designated for visitors such as building maintenance or delivery of office supplies to the facility. The customer spaces are for those customers that will be coming to the site to retrieve their personal packages. These packages would likely consist of high value items that require a signature or packages that could not be delivered to the customer.

7. *Four driveways are currently being proposed for the site, whereas only 2 driveways are permitted for the current lot size per Section 40.26.G.7 of the Ordinance. Additionally, all site driveways must be spaced at least 200' apart from one another. The Engineer shall assess the need and spacing of the four site driveways. The applicant should consider removing the separate driveway for the associate parking area. It appears that employees could utilize the driveway to the northeast as most truck traffic will be overnight.*

Response: As discussed with your office during the TRC meeting on 2 September 2020, four site driveways are necessary to separate different traffic types on the site, providing increased employee safety, which is paramount to the tenant. Currently the associate car parking lot has a separate driveway and associate car traffic does not intermingle with truck / van traffic. If associates were to utilize the driveway to the northeast to access the associate parking lot, they will encounter truck traffic during the night time hours. Therefore, we respectfully request that the number of driveways remain as it is proposed, to help separate passenger car and truck traffic.

Additional testimony will be provided regarding the proposed site driveways.

8. The Engineer shall assess sight distances at the site driveways at a 30 MPH design speed (posted speed is 25 MPH). Sight triangle easements shall be shown on the site plans per Borough guidelines.

Response: Sight triangles have been provided at the site driveways at a 30 MPH design speed. Refer to Drawings CS102 and CS103.

9. Several sign designation callouts on the Signing and Striping Plans (specifically the S-21 callouts) do not point to a sign symbol. Similarly, several sign symbols exist which have no designation callout. The Engineer shall review and revise the Signing and Striping Plans to ensure all sign symbols are properly labeled.

Response: Callouts on the Signing and Striping Plans have been revised to point to a sign symbol, and all sign symbols have been labeled. Refer to Drawings SS101, SS102, and SS103.

10. The Engineer should consider revising the stop bars used at the site driveways to depict 2 foot wide white stripes rather than 1 foot wide white stripes.

Response: All the stop bars on site and the stop bar detail have been revised to be 2-FT wide white strips. Refer to Drawings SS101, SS102, SS103, and SS501.

11. The "DO NOT ENTER" pavement marking located at the site's southern driveway extends into the southbound travel lane along Jumping Brook Road. The Engineer shall shift all stop bars to a minimum of 6 feet from the curb line extension. The "DO NOT ENTER" pavement marking shall be removed. The "DO NOT ENTER" S-2 signs shall be relocated closer to Jumping Brook Road, but not placed back-to-back with the stop sign.

Response: The "DO NOT ENTER" pavement marking has been removed from the site's southern driveway, and stop bars at each driveway have been relocated to be a minimum of 6-FT behind the curb line extension. Additionally, the "DO NOT ENTER" S-2 signs have been relocated closer to Jumping Brook Road. Refer to Drawings CS102, CS103, SS102, and SS103.

12. The Engineer shall add travel lane widths and parking space dimensions to the Signing and Striping Plans.

Response: Travel lane widths and parking space dimensions have been added to the Signage and Striping Plans. Refer to Drawings SS101, SS102, and SS103.

13. The "LOADING DOCK STRIPING" detail does not appear to be plotting correctly on Sheet 13 of the Civil Plan Set. The Engineer shall review this detail and revise accordingly.

Response: The "loading dock striping" detail has been revised. Refer Drawing SS501.

14. It is unclear where van drivers will be parking their personal vehicles. If the personal vehicle parking is separated from the delivery van parking, there is a concern with employees walking long distances through the parking lots to get to their delivery van. The Engineer shall provide testimony regarding how the personal vehicle to delivery van parking condition will be handled.

- a. The Engineer should also consider providing additional sidewalk and crosswalks to link parking lots and aisles together, specifically for the isolated van parking spaces at the eastern end of the site.

Response: As discussed with your office during the TRC meeting on 2 September 2020, van drivers will enter the site in their personal vehicles, park their personal vehicles in an available van parking space, pick up a van, and proceed to the van queuing area. Van drivers will not be traveling long distances on foot within the van parking lots. Therefore, we respectfully request that the parking lot layout remain as it is proposed.

15. The Engineer should consider providing mid-block crossings along the access road which links Site Driveway #2 at Jumping Brook Road to the back (west) side of the proposed building by the loading dock spaces. These crossings would allow employees to safely walk between the van parking spaces and the Delivery Station building. All mid-block crossings shall be accompanied by proper pedestrian crossing and advanced warning signage.

Response: Refer to response to comment #14.a.

16. As part of any development application, the applicant is required to install a sidewalk along the property frontage or make an equivalent contribution to the Borough's sidewalk fund. If sidewalk is not proposed, the fee must be paid by the applicant prior to final plan approval. Based on the number of employees that will be working at the site and nearby commercial establishments, I recommend that sidewalk be provided along the property frontage.

Response: A sidewalk has been proposed along a portion of Jumping Brook Road. The sidewalk is proposed to extend from the western most driveway to the eastern most driveway, which is essentially the full extents of the proposed redevelopment. The sidewalk is not proposed to extend further to the west, and is not proposed to extend further to the east, as this would require additional wetland disturbance.

The applicant will agree to contribute to the Borough's Sidewalk Fund for the remainder of this property frontage where no sidewalk will be installed.

17. Section 40-26.Q.2.k of the Ordinance states that parking areas shall be paved with not less than four (4) inches of compacted base course of plant-mixed bituminous stabilized base course, or equivalent, and a minimum of two (2) inches thick compacted wearing surface of bituminous concrete (FABC), or equivalent. The applicant shall revise the paving details to adhere to the Borough requirement.

Response: A geotechnical report supporting the proposed pavement sections was provided to your office on 14 September 2020. We respectfully request that the paving design remain as proposed. This relief has been noted as a waiver request to Drawing GI 101.

18. Vehicle turning templates are provided for a delivery truck, delivery van, and fire truck.

a. Delivery truck

- i The delivery truck is shown encroaching on the opposing exit traffic lane when entering the site through Driveway #2. The Engineer shall provide testimony regarding how trucks are expected to enter the site when any number of vehicles are queued in the exit lane.

Response: The turning template has been revised to eliminate truck traffic conflicts. Refer to Drawing CS701.

- ii The traffic report indicates that no trucks will be making southbound rights from Jumping Brook Road. The truck turning template indicates that trucks will be making this southbound right turn movement. The Engineer shall clarify this discrepancy.

Response: We anticipate trucks will be arriving from and departing to tenant-managed facilities located to the north and west of the proposed delivery station. We are aware of such facilities in Robbinsville, Cranbury, Carteret, Edison, NJ, and Staten Island, NY. The likely routes trucks would use between the proposed delivery station and these area facilities would consist of the Garden State Parkway, NJ Route 66, NJ Route 34, and NJ Route 18 to the north of the NJ Route 34 intersection. Accordingly, we do not anticipate any trucks using the Asbury Avenue and Green Grove Road intersection.

However, we have included a truck turning template to demonstrate that a truck could make this turn, in the unlikely circumstance it is required.

- iii The Engineer shall provide a turn template for left turns into the site from Jumping Brook Road.

Response: Turn templates for left turns into the site from Jumping Brook Road have been provided. Refer to Drawing CS701.

- iv *The Engineer shall confirm that the NJ Title 39 design vehicle is not anticipated anywhere else on the site other than the travel path shown on the turning template diagrams.*

Response: The NJ Title 39 design vehicle is not anticipated anywhere else on site other than the travel path shown on the turning template diagrams.

- b. *Delivery van*
 - i *Travel path acceptable as shown*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged.

- c. *Fire truck*
 - i *We defer to the local Fire Marshall for review.*

Response: The plans were provided to the Fire Marshall on 4 September 2020 and comments were received on 14 September 2020. The comments consisted of adding an additional hydrant along the shared truck and van access drive (Driveway #3). This change has been incorporated on the enclosed plan set.

F. Traffic

1. *The Engineer shall review crash history along Jumping Brook Road within the vicinity of the proposed site, including the analyzed intersections, and provide an interpretation of the data to ensure there are no historical trends in this area that would be impacted by this development and need to be addressed accordingly.*

Response: We reviewed crash data at the study intersections from 2017 to August 2020 provided by the Tinton Falls and Neptune Township police departments. A figure summarizing the data and a crash data analysis are included in the revised traffic study.

2. *Trip projections were estimated and provided by the tenant. The Engineer developed the trip generation for the proposed site from these trip projections and approximate arrival/departure times. This method of calculating trip generation accounts for site specific operating conditions including anticipated work shifts.*

The proposed site is reported to peak in the AM at 276 trips from 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM and in the PM at 250 trips from 7:30 PM to 8:30 PM based on the information provided by the tenant.

Our office reviewed the ITE trip generation for a "Warehousing" (L.U. 150) facility. The peak hour trips of the facility based on the number of employees was calculated as follows:

"Warehousing" (L.U. 150):

177 associates + 195 van drivers + 54 flex drivers = 426 employees

@ 0.68 trips per employee during AM peak hour:

$426 * 0.68 = 290$ trips

@ 0.68 trips per employee during PM peak hour:

$426 * 0.68 = 290$ trips

It appears that the trip generation used in the applicant's analysis is slightly less than the comparison with the ITE "Warehousing" land use of an equal employee count. Despite this difference, the trip generation used in the analysis appears consistent with what would be expected from a site of this nature when considering the unique working shifts and employee count presented in the report.

There does however appear to be a disconnect between the reported number of employees/trips and the parking spaces being provided. The Engineer shall provide correlation between the proposed parking facilities and operational needs considering the presented employee count.

Response: The number of proposed parking spaces will accommodate the increase in associates and DSP personnel during peak season operations.

3. *Delivery facilities typically experience seasonal increases in demand and product output, particularly around Thanksgiving and Christmas time. The Engineer shall provide testimony comparing seasonal peaks to normal operation and how much additional traffic may be generated compared to what was presented in the traffic report. The worst case scenario shall be provided.*

Response: During peak season operations the following will occur:

- another 76 associates will be added to Shift 1 (2:00 AM to 12:30 PM),
- another shift of 165 employees will be added from approximately 5:30 PM to 1:00 AM,
- another 26 tractor-trailers will arrive and depart the site between 6:00 PM and 12:00 AM, and
- another 160 delivery van drivers will arrive and depart the site between 6:30 AM and 8:00 AM and will return to the site starting at approximately 5:00 PM, and
- another 156 delivery van drivers will arrive and depart the site during the normal DSP operation, which will be extended to approximately 12:00 PM.

4. The Engineer shall provide testimony regarding how the trip generation of the proposed site compares to that of an Amazon Fulfillment Facility. The statement should include how the trip generation and type of vehicles utilizing the facility differ.

Response: The engineer will provide testimony at the public hearing. The proposed delivery station will generate a fraction of the trip generation of a fulfillment center.

5. The Engineer identifies the intersections and roadways which will serve the proposed site in a trip distribution figure (Figure 9) located in the appendix of the traffic report. A large portion of the site generated trips are expected to utilize the Garden State Parkway and County road systems.

- a. The Engineer has established a proposed directional trip distribution based on journey-to-work census data for passenger cars and for delivery vans. The Engineer shall indicate why the same directional distributions were used for both passenger cars and delivery vans. The Engineer shall also identify the delivery range (radius) which the proposed site will service.

Response: We used the same distribution for passenger cars and delivery vans because the people that will work at this delivery station live in the areas that will be served by the delivery station. The proposed delivery station will primarily serve northern Ocean County and eastern Monmouth County. The service area includes Keansburg to the north, Colts Neck to the west, Jackson to the southwest, and Wall to the southeast.

- b. Based on Table 2 on Page 4 of the traffic report, 100% of the truck traffic will be arriving/departing west on Route 66. The Engineer shall explain why there are no trucks anticipated at the intersection of Jumping Brook Road & Asbury Avenue.

Response: We anticipate trucks will be arriving from and departing to tenant-managed facilities located to the north and west of the proposed delivery station. We are aware of such facilities in Robbinsville, Cranbury, Carteret, Edison, and Staten Island. The likely routes trucks would use between the proposed delivery station and these area facilities would consist of the Garden State Parkway, NJ Route 66, NJ Route 34, and NJ Route 18 to the north of the NJ Route 34 intersection. Accordingly, we do not anticipate any trucks using the Asbury Avenue and Green Grove Road intersection.

- c. Typically, a delivery facility of this nature receives pre-packaged deliveries from a larger warehouse located elsewhere in the region. The Engineer shall indicate where the trucks supplying the proposed Delivery Center are originating from.

Response: Please see response above.

6. The AM peak hour of the proposed site is anticipated to occur between 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM which does not coincide with the peak hour of adjacent street traffic at 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM. The traffic report provides an analysis of both the network AM peak hour and site AM peak hour.

Response: No response necessary.

7. The PM peak hour of the proposed site is anticipated to occur between 7:30 PM to 8:30 PM which does not coincide with the peak hour of adjacent street traffic at 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM. However, the traffic report does not provide an analysis of the site's PM peak hour. The Engineer shall provide information regarding traffic conditions during the 7:30 PM to 8:30 PM peak hour for the site.

- a. The Engineer shall supplement Table 1 in the traffic report to include the trip generation of the site during the 7:30 PM to 8:30 PM peak hour for the site.

Response: We updated Table 1 in the traffic report to include the evening peak hour of the delivery station.

8. The Engineer has accounted for trips due to future adjacent developments in the area. These include a 9,007 SF shopping center and a 2,250 SF restaurant with a drive-thru window located at the northwestern corner of the Jumping Brook Road & Essex Avenue intersection. The Engineer shall clarify how these adjacent development volumes shown in Figure 4 were established or indicate where they were obtained from.

Response: We obtained the adjacent development volumes from the traffic study for that other development. We included the traffic volume figure from that other traffic study in the appendix of our traffic study.

9. The Engineer shall modify/produce a level of service (LOS) analysis summary table to include the volume to capacity ratio (V/C ratio), vehicle delay, 95th percentile vehicle queue, and LOS for each movement at each analyzed intersection approach. We reserve the right to further review queuing conditions at the analyzed intersections once this table is provided.

Response: We added tables summarizing the volume to capacity ratio and vehicle queues to the traffic study.

10. Traffic impacts between the 2021-No-Build and 2021-Build conditions are relatively minimal except for the intersection between Jumping Brook Road & Essex Road. A LOS E or worse is generally considered unacceptable. During the PM peak hour, the LOS at the eastbound intersection approach between Jumping Brook & Essex Road degrades from LOS E to LOS F between 2021-No-Build and 2021-Build conditions. Proposed traffic improvements are not discussed in the traffic report. The Engineer shall discuss the need for traffic improvements within the adjacent areas, and more specifically at the intersection of Jumping Brook Road & Essex Road.

Response: As requested by the board's planner, we have accounted for the improvements proposed by others at the Jumping Brook Road and Essex Road intersection in our revised traffic study. We note that those intersection improvements will better align turning vehicles at the intersection; however, those improvements will not result in better traffic operations.

As shown in the revised traffic study, the traffic impacts of the delivery station are not significant at any of the offsite intersections studied.

11. *The LOS analysis output considers the northbound and southbound right turn lanes at the intersection of Jumping Brook Road & Asbury Avenue as free-flowing movements when yield control is provided. Similarly, the southbound right turn at the intersection of Jumping Brook Road and NJ Route 66 is analyzed as a free-flowing movement when yield control is provided. It should also be noted that no dedicated acceleration lane is provide for any of these yield conditions. The Engineer shall revise the analysis input to properly assess these yield traffic control conditions.*

Response: We revised the yield control at the northbound and southbound right-turn lanes at the intersection of Asbury Avenue and Green Grove Road and the southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of NJ Route 66 and Jumping Brook Road and updated the analyses accordingly.

12. *The LOS analysis output considers the lane utilization factor of both southbound thru lanes at the intersection of Jumping Brook Road and NJ Route 66 as 95% even though the right lane ends just past the intersection. Similarly, both eastbound thru lanes at the intersection of Jumping Brook Road and Asbury Avenue are analyzed as 95% % even though the right lane ends just past the intersection. Drivers that are familiar with the area tend to utilize the lane which does not need to merge, resulting in a more significant difference in lane utilization. The Engineer shall revise the analysis input to incorporate more accurate lane utilization factors.*

Response: We reviewed the peak-hour videos used to conduct the traffic counts to obtain the actual lane utilization factors and updated the analyses accordingly.

13. *The capacity analysis worksheets attached to the traffic report do not appear to account for any additional heavy vehicle percentages due to site truck traffic at the intersection of Jumping Brook Road and NJ Route 66 even though 100% of the site truck traffic is expected to utilize this intersection. The Engineer shall assess the need to increase heavy vehicle percentages at this intersection due to site truck traffic and revise the analysis accordingly.*

Response: We expect one truck or less will use the eastbound left-turn and southbound right-turn movements during peak hours. This added truck would increase the heavy truck volume by less than 0.5 percent and therefore the heavy vehicle percentages do not require adjustment at these approaches.

14. The proposed site provides 11 truck loading dock spaces however, only 2 trucks are anticipated to arrive/depart per any given hour based on the Trip Projection Table in the appendix of the report. The Engineer shall provide testimony regarding the accuracy of such an even arrival/departure distribution and discuss the likelihood of a larger platoon of trucks to arrive/depart in single hour.

Response: Up to two trucks are anticipated to arrive and depart in any given hour. The number of loading docks is required to meet the tenant's operational needs. Approximately 9 dock doors will be utilized to receive incoming packages. The remaining 2 docks will be used for reverse logistics, for those packages that need to be sent back to the fulfillment centers. Additional testimony will be provided regarding the proposed number of loading docks.

15. The Engineer shall trace/highlight the approximate limits of the proposed site on the Site Location Map (Figure 1) provided in the appendix section of the report.

Response: We updated Figure 1 to approximate the property limits of the proposed site.

G. Grading, Drainage & Utilities

1. Additional grading information shall be provided for the proposed curb ramps adjacent to the ADA parking stalls, as well as spot elevations along the sidewalk to confirm ADA slope and accessibility requirements are met.

Response: Additional grading information for the proposed ADA parking stalls is provided on Drawing CS505.

2. The applicant is currently proposing a 10.88 foot retaining wall in the north west corner of the site, whereas a maximum height of 6 feet is permitted. The applicant's engineer shall provide testimony on why a wall of this height is necessary. We recommend the grading be adjusted if possible to lower the wall height or that a tiered retaining wall system be designed to breakup the total height of the proposed single wall.

Response: As discussed with your office during the TRC meeting on 2 September 2020, the proposed retaining cannot be adjusted due to grading, site layout, drainage constraints, anticipated length of geogrid reinforcement, and proximity to the property line. Therefore, we respectfully request that the retaining wall height remain as it is proposed.

3. The applicant shall be aware that structural calculations, plans, and details prepared by a Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of New Jersey will be required prior to construction for all walls over 3 feet in height. We defer further review and approval to the Construction Official.

Response: The appropriate structural calculations will be provided to your office prior to construction. Note #1 of the Concrete Block Retaining Wall Detail states that "The contractor shall submit detailed site specific drawings, engineering calculations, stability calculations, and material specifications to the engineers of record and agencies having jurisdiction for review and approval prior to construction." Refer to Drawing CS501.

4. *The proposed project will disturb more than 1 acre of land; therefore, it is considered a "major development" as defined by N.J.A.C. 7:8, and subject to the NJDEP Stormwater Management requirements.*
- a. *The applicant is proposing five (5) extended detention basins to address the Stormwater Quantity requirements by reducing post-construction peak runoff rates for the 2, 10 and 100-year storm events to 50, 75, and 80 percent, respectively, of the pre-construction peak runoff rates.*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged.

- b. *This project increases the impervious surface area more than 0.25 acres; therefore, the water quality requirements are applicable per N.J.A.C. 7:8-5.5. The applicant indicates that the project meets the water quality requirements by using five (5) extended detention basins and six (6) Stormfilter water quality devices to reduce the post-construction load of total suspended solids (TSS) per N.J.A.C. 7:8-5.5.*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged.

- c. *The applicant is proposing to address the groundwater recharge requirement by maintaining 100% of the average annual pre-construction groundwater recharge volume for the site via the two (2) subsurface recharge systems.*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged.

5. *The applicant shall revise the proposed drainage area (36.73 acres) to match the existing drainage area (36.77 acres).*

Response: The proposed drainage area has been revised to match the existing drainage area. Refer to Appendix B in the Stormwater Management Report.

6. *The applicant shall provide the soil types and soil boundaries on the Existing and Proposed Drainage Area Maps.*

Response: Soil types and soil boundaries have been provided on the Existing and Proposed Drainage Area Maps. Refer to Drawings DA101 and DA102 in the Stormwater Management Report.

7. The applicant shall provide the Tc information for each Tc path on the Existing and Proposed Drainage Area Maps.

Response: Tc paths for each watersheds have been indicated on the Existing and Proposed Drainage Area Maps. Refer to Drawings DA101 and DA102 in the Stormwater Management Report.

8. The applicant shall provide the existing outlet control structure information to support the Pre-Development Quantity Calculations.

Response: Information for the existing outlet control structure has been provided on Drawing DA101 in the Stormwater Management Report.

9. The applicant shall confirm the 3.5-inches orifice invert in Basin 1. An invert of 96.01 has been proposed in Basin 1 in the Post-Development Quantity Calculations and the elevation 96.00 shown on the Site Detail Plans 4.

Response: The orifice for Basin 1 has been revised to be at elevation 96.00 on the Post-Development Quantity Calculations. Refer to Appendix B in the Stormwater Management Report.

10. The applicant shall confirm the slope of the culvert out of Basin 2. The pipe slope of 0.5% has been proposed in the Basin 2 Post-Development Quantity Calculations but a pipe slope of 0.3% is shown on the Partial Grading and Drainage Plans.

Response: The pipe slope of the culvert out of Basin 2 has been revised to be 0.3% in the Post-Development Quantity Calculations. Refer to Appendix B in the Stormwater Management Report.

11. The applicant shall revise the 24-inches culvert length of 75-ft and the slope of 0.25% in Basin 5 in the Post-Development Quantity Calculations to match with the length of 73-ft and the slope of 0.3% shown on the Partial Grading and Drainage Plans.

Response: The pipe length and slope of the culvert out of Basin 5 has been revised in the Post-Development Quantity Calculations. Refer to Appendix B in the Stormwater Management Report.

12. The basins grading shall be revised to ensure that all basins have one (1) foot of freeboard.

Response: The grading for the proposed basins and basin outlet control structures have been revised to ensure that all basins have 1 FT of freeboard. Refer to Appendix B in the Stormwater Management Report and Drawings CG101, CG102, and CG103.

13. *The applicant shall provide the Stormfilter. Water Treatment Device design for review.*

Response: The Stormfilter Water Treatment Device design has been provided. Refer to Appendix C in the Stormwater Management Report.

14. *The applicant shall provide the TSS removal calculations for BMPs in series for watersheds A2 and A4 for review.*

Response: TSS removal calculations for BMPs in series have been provided on Drawing DA104 in the Stormwater Management Report.

15. *The applicant shall provide justification for placing the Stormfilter Water Treatment Device units in series as this is typically not acceptable to the NJDEP.*

Response: An application was submitted to the NJDEP for impacts to the freshwater wetlands and the flood hazard area. The NJDEP is currently reviewing the application and has provided initial comments. The comments received do not take exception to the manufactured treatment devices in series. Therefore, we request that the MTD's remain pending NJDEP approval.

16. *The applicant shall provide the groundwater recharge systems routing calculations for review.*

Response: The groundwater recharge system routing calculations have been provided in Appendix B in the Stormwater Management Report.

17. *The applicant shall revise the Groundwater Recharge Spreadsheet to match the proposed impervious areas and ensure the volume balance is solved on the spreadsheet.*

Response: The proposed impervious area shown on the Groundwater Recharge Spreadsheet reflect the proposed impervious area on-site. The volume balance is solved using the two proposed underground recharge chambers. Refer to Appendix D in the Stormwater Management Report.

18. *The applicant shall provide a spreadsheet of "C" Runoff Coefficient calculations for review.*

Response: The "C" Runoff Coefficient calculation has been provided. Refer to Appendix F in the Stormwater Management Report.

19. *The applicant shall revise the peak flow of Basin 4 from 2.0 CFS to 2.4 CFS and of Basin 5 from 6.0 CFS to 6.4 CFS in the emergency spillway calculations.*

Response: The emergency spillway calculations have been revised to reflect the updated 10-year storm flow. Refer to Appendix E in the Stormwater Management Report.

20. The following pipe sections shall be revised for consistency between the plans and pipe calculations with respect to the proposed Grade / Rim Elevation;

- a. CB-108
- b. MH-303
- c. MH-304
- d. MH-305
- e. MH-306
- f. MH-307
- g. MH-309
- h. CB-310
- i. CB-311
- j. CB-315
- k. CB-312
- l. CB-316
- m. MH-318

Response: The grade / rim elevation for the above structures have been revised to be consistent with the plans. Refer to Appendix F in the Stormwater Management Report.

21. The following pipe sections shall be revised for consistency between the plans and pipe calculations with respect to the proposed pipe length.

- a. Line 1 in 100 Storm Run: MH-102 to FES-102
- b. Line 20 in 300 Storm Run: CB-301 to FES-301

Response: Pipe lengths for MH-102 to FES-102 and CB-301 to FES-301 have been revised to be consistent with the plans. Refer to Appendix F in the Stormwater Management Report.

22. The following pipe sections shall be revised for consistency between the plans and pipe calculations with respect to the proposed pipe slope;

- a. Line 1 in 100 Storm Run: MH-102 to FES-102
- b. Line 10 in 100 Storm Run: CB-110 to MH-113
- c. Line 9 in 300 Storm Run: MH-309 to MH-306
- d. Line 3 in 400 & 500 Storm Run: CB-501 to FES-501

Response: The conveyance calculations have been updated to be consistent with the design drawings. Refer to Appendix F in the Stormwater Management Report.

23. The following pipe sections shall be revised for consistency between the plans and pipe calculations with respect to the proposed pipe invert;

- a. Line 9 in 300 Storm Run: MH-309 to MH-305
- b. Line 2 in 400 & 500 Storm Run: OCS-401 to HW-401
- c. Line 3 in 400 & 500 Storm Run: CB-501 to FES-502

Response: The pipe inverts for MH-309 to WQ-3, OCS-401 to HW-401, and CB-501 to FES-502 have been revised to be consistent with the plans. Refer to Appendix F in the Stormwater Management Report.

24. The following pipe sections shall be revised for consistency between the plans and pipe calculations with respect to the proposed pipe size;

- a. Line 3 in 400 & 500 Storm Run: CB-501 to FES-502

Response: The pipe size for CB-501 to FES-502 has been revised to be consistent with the plans. Refer to Appendix F in the Stormwater Management Report.

25. The following pipe sections shall be revised for consistency between on plans and pipe calculations with respect to the runoff coefficient;

- a. Line 1 in 300 Storm Run: CB-302 to FES-302
- b. Line 10 in 300 Storm Run: CB-314 to MH-309

Response: Runoff coefficients for CB-302 to FES-302 and CB-314 to MH-309 have been revised to be consistent with the plans. Refer to Appendix F in the Stormwater Management Report.

26. The applicant shall rename the structure from FES-201 to HW-201 and revise the flow from 6.77 CFS to 10.72 CFS in the Scour Hole Calculations. Applicant shall update all plans upon revision of calculations.

Response: The scour hole calculations for HW-201 has been revised to reflect the most recent 25-year storm flow. Refer to Appendix G in the Stormwater Management Report.

27. The applicant shall provide the 100-year storm elevation at each basin on the Partial Grading and Drainage Plans.

Response: The 100-year storm elevation at each basin has been provided on Drawings CG101, CG102, and CG103.

28. The applicant shall provide the Test Pits data including existing ground elevations, seasonal high ground water elevations and the permeability rates on the Grading and Drainage Plans.

Response: Test pit locations have been provided on the Overall Grading and Drainage Plan. A table has also been included on the plan to include the seasonal high groundwater elevation and permeability rates. Refer to Drawing CG100.

29. Applicant shall confirm that all drainage structure and pipe callouts are shown on the Partial Drainage Plans and Storm Sewer Profile Plan.

Response: All drainage structure and pipe callouts have been provided on the Partial Drainage Plans and Storm Sewer Profile Plan. Refer to Drawings CG101, CG102, CG103, CG201, CG202, and CG203.

30. The applicant shall provide all basin cross section details with the water surface elevations for the 2, 10, and 100 year storm events, as well as the SHGW elevations to demonstrate that a minimum one (1) foot separation between the bottom of the detention basins and SHGW is provided.

Response: Basin cross section details including water surface elevations for the 2, 10, and 100 year storm events and approximate groundwater elevations have been provided on Drawing CS505. Where 1-FT of separation was not provided, a liner was proposed on the bottom of the basin as well as the side slopes. Refer to Drawings CG103 and CS505.

31. The applicant shall verify that a minimum two (2) foot separation between the bottom of the Groundwater Recharge Chambers and SHGW is provided. Also denote that a minimum two (2) foot separation between the bottom of the Groundwater Recharge Chamber and SHGW is provided on the Site Detail Plans.

Response: The bottom of the Groundwater Recharge Chambers are located at elevation 100 FT, and the approximate SHGW elevation is 96.1 FT. These elevations and a note stating that a minimum of 2 FT separation is maintained between the bottom of Groundwater Recharge Chambers and SHGW have been added to the detail on Drawing CS503.

32. The applicant shall provide a 3'x 3' concrete cutoff wall at the end of the flared end section and add 6" coarse aggregate in between the riprap and filter fabric.

Response: The Concrete Flared End Section detail has been revised to include a 3-FT concrete anchor at point of outfall. Refer to Drawing CS503. Additionally, the scour hole detail on Drawing CE501 has been updated to include 6" coarse aggregate between the riprap and filter fabric.

33. *The applicant shall provide all non-standard drainage structure details for review.*

Response: Notes are provided on the inlet and manhole details stating that "detail indicates minimum structure dimensions. Larger dimensions may be required for larger pipes. Contractor shall provide shop drawings for oversize structures, as noted on the plans". The shop drawings will be provided for review as requested.

34. *The applicant shall provide all trash rack details for review.*

Response: Trash rack details have been provided on Drawing CS504.

35. *The applicant shall provide 6" crushed stone subbase on all outlet control structure details.*

Response: All the Outlet Control Structure details have been revised to indicate 6" crushed stone subbase. Refer to Drawing CS504.

36. *The applicant shall revise the basin bottom elevation on the details for OCS-101, OCS-201, OCS-301 and OCS-501 to match with the Post-Development Quantity Calculations.*

Response: The bottom basin elevations on the details for OCS-101, OCS-201, OCS-301 and OCS-501 have been revised to match with the Post-Development Quantity Calculations. Refer to Drawing CS504.

37. *The applicant shall add another 2.5-inches orifice at elevation 73.00 on the OCS-501 detail to match with the Post-Development Quantity Calculations.*

Response: The orifice detail for OCS-501 has been revised to match with the Post-Development Quantity Calculations. Refer to Drawing CS504.

38. *All tables in Stormwater Drainage Management Report shall be revised upon the revision of calculations.*

Response: All the tables in the Stormwater Drainage Management Report have been revised.

39. *The applicant shall include the groundwater recharge chamber maintenance tasks in the Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Manual.*

Response: Underground recharge / detention system maintenance and inspection logs have been provided in Appendix A of the Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Manual.

40. All inlets on the Partial Grading and Drainage Plans shall be labeled as to type (i.e. Type A, Type B, etc.).

Response: All the callouts for the proposed inlets have been revised to indicate the inlet type. Refer to Drawings CG101, CG102, and CG103.

41. A storm sewer detail shall be added to the Trench Detail for RCP and HDPE pipe. The HDPE detail must indicate crushed stone a minimum of 6" below the pipe and up to the spring line.

Response: A Trench and Bedding detail for storm pipes has been provided on Drawing CS503.

42. The applicant appears to be proposing Double B Inlet(s) at this time, however a Double E Inlet detail has been provided. The applicant shall revise the Double E construction detail to a Double B detail.

Response: A Double B Inlet detail has been provided. Refer to Drawing DS503.

43. A note shall be added to the plans indicating that all reinforced concrete pipe shall have rubber o-ring gaskets.

Response: Note #17, stating that all reinforced concrete pipes shall have rubber o-ring gaskets, has been added to the Grading and Drainage Plans. Refer to Drawing CG100, CG101, CG102, and CG103.

44. Drainage easements are required around each drainage basin. Metes and bounds descriptions shall be provided on the plans. The deed of easement and descriptions shall be submitted to our office and the Borough Attorney for review and approval. In the alternative, a blanket drainage easement across the entire site may also be provided.

Response: The applicant is coordinating with the Township to address the drainage easement requirement.

45. The applicant shall fill out, to the extent possible, and provide a draft copy of the "Tier A MS4 NJPDES Permit – Attachment D – Major Development Stormwater Summary" form for review.

Response: Tier A MS4 NJPDES Permit – Attachment D – Major Development Stormwater Summary has been provided in Appendix J in the Stormwater Management Report. .

46. The sanitary sewer manhole cover detail shall be revised to indicate "SEWER" on the manhole cover.

Response: The sanitary sewer manhole cover detail has been revised to indicate "SEWER" on the cover. Refer to Drawing CS502.

47. The applicant shall revise the sanitary manhole detail to include 2 coats bitumastic 8 mil thick exterior coating and 2 coats white epoxy, 8 mil thick interior coat.

Response: A note specifying coating requirements for the interior and outer surface of the sanitary manhole has been added to the sanitary manhole detail. Refer to Drawing CS502.

48. The sanitary cleanout detail shall be revised to indicate a screw type plug with brass cap and depressed nut. A cast iron cleanout box shall also be indicated to be required in any asphalt or concrete areas.

Response: The sanitary cleanout detail has been revised to indicate a screw type plug with brass cap and depressed nut. Additionally, a note stating that a cast iron cleanout box shall be used in any asphalt or concrete areas has been added to the detail. Refer to Drawing CS502.

49. The proposed sanitary sewer lateral is proposed to tie into an existing sewer manhole at an elevation greater than 2 feet above the invert out. A drop connection shall therefore be indicated.

Response: A drop connection has been indicated at the existing sanitary manhole. Refer to Drawing CU103.

50. A construction detail and/or notes shall be provided to indicate that the new sewer lateral connection to the existing manhole shall be done by core drilling with a new flexible water-tight rubber boot.

Response: A callout, stating that "Proposed lateral connection to existing sanitary manhole shall be done by core drilling with a new flexible water-tight rubber boot", has been provided. Refer to Drawing CU103.

H. Landscaping and Lighting

1. Section 40-26.M.1 of the Ordinance states that all areas not occupied by impervious surfaces shall be suitably landscaped. Therefore, additional trees and/or shrubs shall be planted along the softscape strip towards the rear of the loading area, adjacent to proposed 3LSR trees as there is plenty of space to do so.

Response: Additional trees and shrubs have been planted in the landscaped island along the truck loading area. Refer to Drawing LP101.

2. Section 40-26.M.3.c. of the Ordinance states shade trees shall be located not closer than 25 feet to any proposed streetlight or street intersection. There are some areas of conflict between light poles and shade trees. The applicant shall revise plans or request waiver.

Response: Shade trees within 25' of proposed lights at the street intersection have been relocated in order to compile with Section 40-26.M.3.c. Refer to Drawings LP102 and LP103

3. *Section 40-26.M.3.f of the Ordinance states that routine maintenance of shade trees shall be the responsibility of the property owner and shall commence once the certificate of occupancy has been issued.*

Response: Note #3, stating that stating that routine maintenance of shade trees shall be the responsibility of the property owner and shall commence once the certificate of occupancy has been issued, has been added to Drawing LP502.

4. *Section 40-26.M.3.g of the ordinance states that the developer shall guarantee that each shade tree shall fully survive until such time as the release of the maintenance guarantee. The Borough Engineer shall inspect the shade trees at the time of the request for the release of the performance guarantee and shall require that the dead or dying trees be replaced. Upon request by the developer for the release of the maintenance guarantee the Borough Engineer shall inspect the shade trees and shall require that the dead or dying trees be replaced.*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged. A Maintenance Guarantee section has been added to the Landscaping Maintenance Notes. Refer to Drawing LP501.

5. *40-26.M.4. As per the ordinance, any landscaping within two years of planting, dies for any reason, shall be replaced by the developer or by the current owner at their sole expense. The applicant shall revise the Landscaping Maintenance Notes for the maintenance during construction. Note D should state that plants are to be guaranteed for a period of two years after inspection.*

Response: Note D has been revised to state that plants are to be guaranteed for a period of two years after inspection and provisional acceptance. Refer to Drawing LP501.

6. *Section 40-26.M.6.k. of the Ordinance states that entrances to nonresidential lots shall be given special landscaping treatment with an entrance feature. The applicant shall provide testimony on compliance with this requirement.*

Response: As discussed during the TRC meeting on 2 September 2020, special landscaping is provided along the monument signs. Refer to LP102 and LP103.

Testimony will be provided regarding landscaping around monument signs.

7. *Section 40-26.M.3.d. of the Ordinance states no shade tree shall be removed for the construction of any driveway or curb cut without replacement. The Applicant shall specify the restoration areas on site.*

Response: As discussed during the TRC meeting on 2 September 2020, the Township requires a 1:1 replacement for shade trees. Based on the two sample areas analyzed, 130 shade trees are proposed to be removed on site, and 243 shade trees are proposed to be planted.

8. *Section 40-26.M.3.e of the Ordinance states that an exclusive shade tree easement dedicated to the Borough shall be recorded on the final site plan. The easement shall be 5 feet wide and indicated on the plans. A copy of the easement and associated metes and bounds description shall be submitted to our office and the Borough Attorney for review and approval.*

Response: The applicant is coordinating with the Township to address the 5-FT wide shade tree easement requirement.

9. *We defer to the Borough Shade Tree Commission for additional review and comments.*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged.

10. *As stated previously, Section 40-26.N.1.e of the Ordinance states that the maximum height of any freestanding light shall not exceed 18 feet, whereas a number of 25 foot freestanding light fixtures are proposed at the rear of the site. The applicant's engineer shall provide testimony on why conforming light pole heights cannot be utilized.*

Response: In order to light the rear of the site and meet the tenant lighting requirements 25-FT poles were provided to limit conflict between light poles and trucks/vans during site operations. Additional testimony regarding the 25-FT light poles will be provided.

Relief from Section 10-26.N.1.e of the Ordinance has been requested on the Zoning Table. Refer to Drawing GI101.

11. *Section 40-26.N.1.c.1 of the Ordinance states that all outdoor lighting during non-operating hours of the business on site not necessary for safety or security purposes shall be reduced, active by motion-sensor devices, or turned off.*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged. The requirement from Section 40-26.N.1.c.1 has been added to the compliance chart on Drawing LL100.

12. *Section 40-26.N.1.j of the Ordinance states that the light intensity at ground level shall be as follows:*

a. Minimum	0.5 footcandles
b. Maximum	4.0 footcandles
c. Maximum Average	2.0 footcandles
d. Uniformity ration (Not greater than)	4.1 footcandles

The plans shall be revised to confirm the above mentioned illumination requirements are met.

Response: Due to the lowered mounting heights and types of fixtures used to meet lighting requirements, the proposed maximum on any location of 7.1 footcandles and maximum average entire area of 3.1 footcandles exceeds the required footcandles.

Relief from Section 10-26.N.1.J of the Ordinance has been requested on the Zoning Table. Refer to Drawing GI101.

I. Environmental

1. *There are wetlands on the property that were delineated, and a Freshwater Wetlands Letter of Interpretation was approved in April 2020 to verify the boundaries of the wetlands and resource value of the wetlands. The EIS includes a copy of the LOI approval with the information on the required wetland buffers.*

Response: This comment has been acknowledged.

2. *The EIS describes the required NJDEP Permit applications as a result of the wetland and wetland buffer disturbance. The NJDEP permits that are listed in the EIS include a Freshwater Wetlands General Permit Nos. 2, 7, and 11 and Flood Hazard Area Individual Permit and Verification. The EIS includes a list of the required permits but does not include status of the permit applications. The applicant shall include information on the status of the permit application review and a copy of the approval should be sent to the Borough upon receipt. In addition, the plans show the proposed activities in the wetlands and wetland buffers, however they do not include impact numbers. The plans should be revised to show the amount of impacts in the regulated areas.*

Response: An application was submitted to the NJDEP on 4 August 2020. A copy of the approval will be provided to your office upon receipt.

Drawing WP101, showing the proposed impacts to regulated areas has been enclosed as part of this resubmission.

3. *The EIS mentions that an unnamed tributary to Jumping Brook is situated just beyond the northern property line. Based on review of the existing conditions plan and the topography, it appears as though there are tributaries that are located on the northern portion of the property. If the tributaries are considered "Regulated Waters" by the NJDEP Flood Hazard Area Control Act Rules, the top of bank needs to be labeled and the Riparian Zone needs to be on the plan. The EIS should provide a paragraph on the streams and riparian zones on the property. If the applicant is waiting on the NJDEP Flood Hazard Area Verification to establish the regulated waters and riparian zones, the EIS should include information on the regulated features. If any work is proposed in the Riparian Zone, the Flood Hazard Area Permit would address the impacts.*

Response: An unnamed tributary to Jumping Brook is located along the project site's eastern border. As such, an application has been submitted to the NJDEP. The application includes a request for a Flood Hazard Area Verification to confirm the extent of the regulatory flood hazard area using Method 3 at N.J.A.C. 7:13-3.4(e) as well as the associated riparian zone of this regulated water.

An Individual Flood Hazard Area Permit is required for minor work in the flood hazard area, which is the construction of one stormwater outfall and the installation of a new sewer line connecting into the existing utility.

The anticipated floodplains, riparian zones, and impacts are shown on the NJDEP Permitting Plan, which has been enclosed as part of this submission. A copy of the approval will be provided to your office upon receipt.

4. *Section 6.0 describes the existing gasoline Above Ground Storage Tank and Maintenance Building are to be removed onsite. The applicant shall include documentation that the two appurtenances have been removed with LSRP oversight and in compliance with NJDEP Site Remediation Requirements.*

Response: The above ground storage tank are unregulated storage tanks that do not require the oversight of an LSRP. This tank will be removed by the site owner or applicant at a later date.

5. *Since the former use of the site was a golf course the applicant should indicate whether there are irrigation wells. They should advise of if there will be a continued use of the existing irrigation well(s) or if they will close the well(s). If they close the well (s), the applicant will need a well abandonment permit. They may need a water allocation permit for water withdrawal if they continue to use the well(s).*

Response: Irrigation wells are present on the property and will be decommissioned by a NJ licensed well driller. After the wells are decommissioned, a well abandonment permit will be obtained.

A note has been added to Drawing CD100 to indicate that the existing irrigation wells onsite shall be decommissioned by a NJ licensed well driller.

J. Miscellaneous

1. *The applicant has indicated one wall sign on the site plan, however upon further review of the architectural plans it appears two large "Tenant Sign" wall signs and three "Minor Sign" wall signs are proposed. We note that two wall signs of the size appearing in the architectural plans are not permitted. Additionally, we will need details and location callouts on the plans. The number, size, location, and graphics of all proposed signage shall be clarified so any variances can be identified.*

Response: Details and location callouts for the two large "Tenant Sign" wall signs have been provided, and a variance has been listed in the Zoning Table. Refer to Drawings GI101, CS102, and SS501. Additional information for the three "Minor Sign" wall signs will be provided in the detailed building permit package, but the signs generally consist of 12-IN tall, black and white, non-illuminated wall signs.

2. *As it is currently shown, the cover sheet is missing a total page number. The plans shall be revised accordingly.*

Response: The Cover Sheet has been revised to include the total page number. Refer to Drawing GI101.

3. *As it is currently shown on the site plan, the compactor and dumpster locations seem to be within loading spaces. The locations of these features should be clarified, and the plans revised accordingly. We note that the dumpster(s) shall be located within a modular block trash enclosure.*

Response: In lieu of a trash compactor within a loading space, a dumpster enclosure has been provided in the western portion of the site next to the truck loading spaces. Refer to Drawings CS101. In addition, a detail has been provided on Drawing C502.

4. *As it is currently shown, the Zoning Chart on the cover sheet includes variances which are no longer applicable and is missing variances which the applicant is requesting relief from. The Zoning Chart shall be revised to reflect the variances outlined in this letter as well as any indicated in the Borough's Planner's letter.*

Response: The Zoning Chart has been revised to reflect the variances and design waivers required based on the most recent design. Refer to Drawing GI101.

5. *The Cover Sheet shall be revised to include a notarized signature block for the Owner/Applicant.*

Response: The Cover Sheet has been revised to include a notarized signature block for the Owner / Applicant.

6. *We defer further review and approval of emergency vehicular access to the Fire Marshall.*

Response: The Fire Marshall confirmed via email on 14 September 2020 that he takes no exception to the emergency vehicle access throughout the site.

7. All approvals or waivers should be obtained from any outside agencies having jurisdiction. This includes, but is not limited to:
- a. Freehold Soil Conservation District.
 - b. Monmouth County Planning Board.
 - c. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.

Response: Applications have been submitted to the Freehold Soil Conservation District, Monmouth County Planning Board, and the NJDEP Division of Land Use Regulation and are currently pending.

Should you have any questions, or should you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (973) 560-4704.

Sincerely,
Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc.



Richard Burrow, P.E.
Managing Principal

Enclosures: Civil Design Drawings
Stormwater Management Report
Stormwater Maintenance Report
Traffic Report
WP100 – NJDEP Permitting Plan

cc: Kristen Harding, Requique Yemerou, Langan
John Bancroft, Daniel Vignola, Prologis
Kenneth L. Pape, Heilbrunn Pape, LLC
Jennifer Beahm, Leon Avakian, Inc.