

BEACON LITE ROAD STOCKPILE – FDR AMENDMENT 1:

COMMENT RESPONSES

October 19, 2026

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

PDF page	No.	Comment
9	1	As you are listing basins tributary to DP2a3, basins X3 and X1 should be included. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Basins X1 and X3 have been included.
12	2	Per the calcs this should be 25.1 and 117 cfs. Revise accordingly. [Design Point 4a2 flows] <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
13	3	Per the plan B5 is the pond itself. [Design Point 4a4 narrative] <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
13	4	Previous comment: How is this conveyed to 4a2 and how will erosion be prevented due to this now concentrated flow. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Concentrated flow discharged from the ponds have energy dissipation aprons and leave those points with non-erosive velocities. Runoff then follows the natural terrain as it does today in broad swales until it reaches the design point locations.
14	5	There is no trickle channel in this pond. Revise. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
14	6	6.5 per pond calc. [Design Point 4a5, Q100] <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
14	7	X44 [callout on Basin X4 reference, Design Point 4c narrative] <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
15	8	X55 [callout on Basin X5 references, Design Point 4d narrative] <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
15	9	Please verify as the total flows between 2a3 and 4a2 only had a 0.2 cfs decrease and it impacts these downstream flows. [Clouded 4c/4d Q100 values in comparison table] <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision verified.
15	10	[Highlight on “Previouslky” in Design Point 6a narrative – typo] <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Spelling error fixed.

PDF page	No.	Comment
16	11	[Blank callout – no text; points to “2.3cfs and 6.2cfs” net reduction statement] <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Reduction value typos corrected.
51	12	Unresolved comment from Review 5: What about Basins D, E, and B2 that were on the previously approved calcs? There is disturbances in those areas that arent trib to the pond that appear that they could be treated via SPAs. <i>(Glenn Reese – EPC Stormwater)</i> Response: The three basins have been added to the table.
52	13	Unresolved comment from Review 5: What about Basins B2 and B3? There is disturbances in those areas that arent trib to the pond that appear that they could be treated via SPAs. <i>(Glenn Reese – EPC Stormwater)</i> Response: Revision made, refer to new IRF calcs and runoff reduction maps.
53	14	Irrelevant at this point, just remove this sheet. <i>(Glenn Reese – EPC Stormwater)</i> Response: Page now removed.
82	15	What is the difference between this page and the one 2 pages above this? Their Basin ID labels are the same, the inputs all look the same, but the output tables are completely different. I’m guessing one is old, so just remove the old one so we know which one is the current one to review compared to the latest CDs. <i>(Glenn Reese – EPC Stormwater)</i> Response: The old calculations pages have been removed.
82	16	Here’s my previous Review 5 comment on this topic for reference: 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. <i>(Glenn Reese – EPC Stormwater)</i> Response: The old calculations pages have been removed for clarity.
86	17	These diameters do not match what is shown on CDs. [Pond B vertical orifice diameters, Zone 1 and Zone 2, marked X] <i>(Glenn Reese – EPC Stormwater)</i> Response: 0.40in dia. is correct, see CD’s for converted size.
115	18	Update the table accordingly for the design points on the plan sheet. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
116	19	Please show all missing items on the plan. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
117	20	Please show all the existing TSB items that are missing. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.

PDF page	No.	Comment
117	21	Fix the leader for the text. Also, update the spillway specs as they do not match the plans. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Leader and note has been revised.
117	22	Please show riprap. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
117	23	Show RCP. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
117	24	Show all missing items. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
117	25	Fix proposed contours. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: The contours depict the existing contours versus the proposed contour addendum revisions.
118	26	Provide leader for this basin. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: A leader has been provided.
118	27	Show missing design point 4a1 and 4a2 and missing RCP. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Revision made.
118	28	Per previous comment, how will erosion be prevented at this now concentrated flow. <i>(Daniel Torres)</i> Response: Concentrated flow discharged from the ponds have energy dissipation aprons and leave those points with non-erosive velocities. Runoff then follows the natural terrain as it does today in broad swales until it reaches the design point locations.
124	29	Unresolved comment from Review 5: Please update this map (and the table on this map) to match the latest calcs on PDF pg 54 and 55 above. <i>(Glenn Reese – EPC Stormwater)</i> Response: Revision made.
124	30	Unresolved comment from Review 5: Also, a good addition to this map would be to add a color for each EDB to show the areas trib to each pond so we can visually confirm that all disturbances are treated by either a pond, Runoff Reduction, or an exclusion (previously you didn't have any exclusions). <i>(Glenn Reese – EPC Stormwater)</i> Response: The colors used identify the tributary basins, see legend)