

BEACON LITE ROAD STOCKPILE – FDR AMENDMENT 1:

COMMENT RESPONSES

September 8, 2026

Reference numbers correspond with County PDF page label comments. Comment responses are in red.

PDF page	Comment
1	Due to the volume and nature of the comments provided, additional comments may be generated on the resubmittal. Noted.
7	There are two D2 sheets with differing drainage maps. Please relabel the maps and narrative accordingly for clarity. The maps have been re-labeled and re-organized.
8	Basin X3 is indicated on the drainage map. Revise accordingly. This typo has been corrected and now makes reference to basin X3.
8	X3 on the map This typo has been corrected and now makes reference to basin X3.
9	6bx? This typo has been corrected and now refers to basin 6bx.
9	There is already a description above of Design point 6ax. please revise accordingly as the below description does not make sense for Design point 6ax shown on the existing drainage conditions map. Design point 6bx has been revised. Portions of the narrative are applicable to this design point, not 6ax as originally shown.
9	no table provided. Are you intending to provide a table of the new existing conditions vs the historic conditions? Refer to Proposed Conditions narrative.
9	4a1 was the pond outfall which had flows from A, B1, & C (X1, X3, X2a) revise accordingly. This has been revised accordingly, as the pond outfall location.
9	flows do not match the drainage map for X2a (B1), revise. N/A – this sentence has been removed. See revised narrative from prior comment.
9	previous report has design point 4a2 as Q5=24.6, Q100=116 cfs. The flows at this design point have been revised to match the prior approved report.
9	not shown on the existing drainage map. Please show This is shown on the Proposed “Overall” sheet.

PDF page	Comment
9	In lieu trying to add the original proposed conditions as the new existing conditions, the drainage report should keep the historic existing conditions and the proposed conditions should be all proposed conditions (inclusive of previous proposed conditions and new proposed conditions) for clarity and to avoid confusion. This will also allow the proper comparison of flows from existing to the ultimate proposed conditions. Further review will be provided upon re-submittal. Please feel free to give me a call to discuss. You are asking for this Amendment No. 1 report to be revised entirely. We are way too far into the preparation of this report to go back and start over at this point. Please see the revisions made throughout the report based on all of the other comments provided.
11	please describe basin C1 and C2 as this is a new stockpile area. These are now described.
11	label on the drainage map. The swales are now delineated with a swale linetype to match the other shown on the maps.as the rest the proposed
11	it was already stated that the TSB overtops. Also per the spillway width is indicated as 24' wide. This narrative has been revised. Duplicate text has been eliminated. The spillway width is now correct.
11	C2 is new fill area that is proposed over the existing forested land. Please revise. The basin B1 narrative has been removed and incorporated into the Design Point 3 narrative.
11	proposed contours are not shown. Please provide. Please see the proposed conditions site (N) drawing.
11	2. The basin B1 narrative has been removed and is now a part of the Design Point 3 narrative. Basin B1 goes to the pond, Design Point 3 directly.
11	As indicated above, keep the existing conditions in their original state and here provide a short description of the proposed new changes that will be added to the original proposed changes. Refer to prior comment response for page 9.
12	24' per plan. This has been corrected and now labeled as 24'.
12	C1 and C2 are conveyed by pipe to the new TSB and then after overtopping will go to the pipe that leads to pond A (Design point 3), The highlighted sentences were confusing and have removed from the narrative.
12	B2 is not tributary to the pond. Revise That typo has been revised, removing the B2 text.

PDF page	Comment
12	The development shall stay away. Work with the army corp if the grading will encroach into the wetlands. The drainage map and construction documents show the pond and disturbance limits outside of the wetlands which is the intent as described in the report.
12	identify how much the pond is increasing from the original proposed condition. The proposed pond additional storage has been added to the narrative.
12	32' per plan. 20' is correct, see pond design worksheet.
13	Please verify your calculations with B2 having 111.6 cfs and 4a1 having an increase from the original pond design to 7.4, the flow would exceed the stated 113 cfs and the existing conditions. Please address. B2 has been re-evaluated and was in error prior. It has since been revised to account for B3, B4 and B5.
13	Please provide a description of B2 as this area has now changed due to the new proposed stock pile on the south side and will ultimately impact design point 4a2. All basins that contribute to this design point should be included. A description has been provided for basin B2 and the narrative has been revised as well.
13	Show on the main proposed condition plan and Indicate what basin contributes to this design point. Refer to drainage map and revised narrative, referencing basin B3.
13	how is this conveyed to 4a2 and how will erosion be prevented due to this now concentrated flow. The swale/ditch created by the toe of the access road will be lined with turf reinforcement mat (TRM) to prevent erosion.
13	B5 consists of the pond, B4 is the stockpile. runoff from B5 appears to go directly to the pond. Revise accordingly. The narrative has been revised accordingly.
13	B4. This edit has been made.
14	16' per plan. revise accordingly. This has been revised accordingly.
14	I assume the intent is for the TSB to overtop into the pond, if so please state that. This is now stated specifically in the narrative.
14	appears to be a copy from above. revise accordingly for this pond B. This is similar to the prior pond information but is specific to this pond. See narrative for differences.
14	show design points on the main proposed drainage plan. See map for Design Point label additions.

PDF page	Comment
14	identify that this basin is shown on the overall proposed basin map and should this be X3? Please revise accordingly as X4 is also listed below. See narrative for revised routing and description.
15	see previous comments above and ensure all basins including the new work on the southside is included. The flows for Design Point 4a2 has been revised in the table to reflect the revised narrative and calculations.
15	? This remnant narrative was included in error. It has been removed.
15	update these accordingly and indicate how these have changed. Basin D now has less acreage These have been updated and has been described as being smaller.
16	identify any changes to the dissipater as the concentrated release is now further upstream The narrative has been revised but the size of the dissipation feature has not, since it is already constructed. i.e. – it is oversized and therefore conservative.
16	further review of the comparison will be provided once comments above are addressed. Noted.
17	3 total now. This typo has been corrected.
54	What about Basins D, E, and B2 that were on the previously approved calcs? There is disturbances in those areas that are trib to the pond that appear that they could be treated via SPAs. The basins in the calculations are for those tributary to the ponds themselves, one page for the north and one for the south.
55	What about Basins B2 and B3? There is disturbances in those areas that are trib to the pond that appear that they could be treated via SPAs. The basins in the calculations are for those tributary to the ponds themselves, one page for the north and one for the south.
83	label as "amended" like you did with the revised plan sheets. Revised accordingly.
85	This is very confusing to have both the original Pond A calcs and the new Pond A calcs on here with no labels for clarification. Please clearly label everything accordingly. Or just completely remove the original/old calcs. Those are obsolete at this point and are memorialized in the original FDR. No need to include old stuff in here. The original calculations have been removed as requested.
119	Per the narrative, the existing conditions map is intended to reflect the original proposed conditions. Please update the drainage map to reflect the contours of the original proposed conditions. Drawing updated to reflect existing conditions grading which has occurred.
119	provide a leader pointing to the basin See map for leader addition.

We need SPA calcs for all areas of disturbance. The areas trib to the ponds have nothing to do with needing SPA calcs.

These were not actually removed.

Still neither of the Pond A calc sheets is labeled as "amended".

PDF page	Comment
119	provide a leader pointing to the basin See map for leader addition.
119	The existing conditions map should be kept as existing (historic) conditions without the addition of the previously proposed work. See comments on the drainage report. See prior comment response related to this issue.
120	This existing basin should be broken up to better compare with the proposed work to be done within this basin. This map, similar to the other prior approved maps, have been relocated in the Appendix so they are separate and create less confusion.
122	provide complete basin delineation of Basin B2, B3 and B5 A basin line between B3 and B2 was missing and has since been put on the plan. Basin B5 is the pond itself.
123	make note larger and/or different color so that it stands out. Recommend keeping all original sheets together in an appendix to avoid confusion. See revised plan for bold and red text label. The approved plans have been located in the appendices separately now.
124	show the energy dissipation Riprap energy dissipation is now shown.
124	please show all the missing items such as the TSB, ripr rap, TSB spillway etc. The aerial image has been removed from all maps to be able to see the linework and text labels better. See revised map.
124	show all proposed contours for basin A & E. The aerial image has been removed from all maps to be able to see the linework and text labels better. See revised map.
124	Show all proposed contours for basin B1 The aerial image has been removed from all maps to be able to see the linework and text labels better. See revised map.
124	call out all new storm facilities. All new storm facilities are now labeled.
124	additional comments may be provided once all needed information is shown on the plan. Noted.
124	Riprap should extend to the bottom of the embankment where flow velocities would decrease. It is difficult to see at the scale for a drainage map, but the spillway riprap does extend 6' to 9' beyond the toe of the slope.
126	? This label has been revised accordingly.

PDF page	Comment
127	provide design point. Also how will erosion be prevented at this now concentrated flow. Design point labels have been added. Per a prior comment, the ditch along the toe of the stockpile is now to be lined with TRM. See narrative. The outfall for the pond has energy dissipation which yields non-erosive velocities when it discharges into a wide swale, essentially like sheet flow.
127	provide spillway for proposed pond See spillway linework addition on this sheet.

You did not address my Review 5 comments on PDF page 128 on here or on the map itself in the Drainage Report.