

PERMIT WRITING FORM - P2021-0207

Assigned EPS: ADL Reviewed by: Click or tap here to enter text. Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

APPLICANT

Project Sponsor(s): Tarpon Towers II, LLC, T-Mobile Northeast, LLC, New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T, Herkimer County, Hamilton County, and the Town of Inlet

Landowner(s): Hidden Peak, LLC, Harold Sauer, and Cynthia Sauer

Authorized Representative: Jacqueline Phillips Murray, Esq (The Murray Law Firm)

PROJECT SITE

Town/Village: Inlet County: Hamilton
Road and/or Water Body: Limekiln Road
Tax Map #(s): 59.000-3-4.112 (Hidden Peak, LLC) and 59.020-3-1.111, 59.020-3-15.100, and
59.020-3-13.1 (Harold and Cynthia Sauer)
Deed Ref: Instrument Number 2021-370 (TM# 59.000-3-4.112), Book 228 / Page 55 (TM# 59.020-3-
1.111 and 59.020-3-15.100), and Instrument Number 2015-885 (TM# 59.020-3-13.1)
Land Use Area(s): ☐H ☐MIU ☐LIU ☒RU ☐RM ☐IU
Project Site Size: 227.3± acres
□Same as Tax Map #(s) identified above
$oxtimes$ Only the \Box H \Box MIU \Box LIU $oxtimes$ RU \Box RM \Box IU portion of the Tax Map #(s) identified above
□Other (describe):
Lawfully Created? ⊠Y □N □Pre-existing subdivision:
River Area: $\square Y \boxtimes N$ If Yes: \square Wild - \square Scenic - \square Recreational Name of River:
CEAs (include all): \(\text{\text{Wetland}} \) \(\text{\text{Wetland}} \) \(\text{\text{\text{Bottage}}} \) \(\text{\text{Wetland}} \) \(\text{\text{\text{State}}} \) \(\text{\text{Hwy}} \) \(\text{\text{State}} \) \(\text{\text{Land}} \) \(\text{\text{\text{Bottage}}} \) \(\text{\text{Vetland}} \)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project as conditionally approved herein involves a subdivision by lease to create a 3,985±square-foot (0.09±-acre) lease area and construction of two new telecommunications towers. Tower 1 will be 95 feet in height and will be located 3,400± feet northwest of Limekiln Road. The top of the tower will be concealed as a simulated pine tree, for a total height of 100 feet. Antennas for T-Mobile Northeast, LLC, Herkimer County, Hamilton County, and the Town of Inlet will be installed on the tower at base heights of 60 feet to 95 feet above ground level (AGL). A 20-foot-tall antenna mounted at a base heigh of 95 feet AGL, at the top of the tower, will extend 15 feet beyond the crown branching, to a height of 115 feet AGL. Tower 2 will be 90 feet in height and will be located 60± feet northwest of Tower 1. The top of the tower will be concealed as a simulated pine tree, for a total height of 95 feet. Antennas for New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T, the Town of Inlet, and other permittees, will be installed on the tower at heights of 54 feet (antenna base) to 85 feet (antenna centerline). No antennas will extend beyond the height of the tower. The towers will be located within a fenced-in equipment compound that will contain three separate equipment shelters/pads and emergency back-up generators at the base of the towers. Access to the facility will involve construction of a 1,130±-foot-long gravel access drive from Limekiln Road, that will connect with an existing 3,010±-foot-long access drive, and then connect with an additional 830± feet of

existing access drive (to be widened from 8 feet to 12 feet), for a total of 4,970± feet/0.94± miles to reach the tower site. Underground utilities will be located along the access road and within a 25- to 30-foot-wide access and utility easement.

JURISDICTION (including legal citation)

810(1)(c)(17) major public utility use

810(1)(c)(5) structure over 40 feet in height

810(2)(c)(2)(b) lease parcel is substandard in size (< 7.35 acres)

PRIOR PERMITS / SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS BEING SUPERSEDED

None

FINDINGS OF FACT - ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	
Lakes, Ponds, Navigable Rivers and Streams	Check if none ⊠
Water Body Name:	
Length of Existing Shoreline (feet):	MHWM determ: □Y □N
Minimum Lot Width:	Meets standard:□Y □N
Structure Setback (APA Act):	Meets standard: □Y □N
Structure Setback (River Regs):	Meets standard: □Y □N
□Y □N Cutting proposed within 6 ft of MHWM?	If Yes, < 30% vegetation? □Y □N
□Y □N Cutting proposed within 35 ft of MHWM?	If Yes, < 30% trees 6" dbh? \Box Y \Box N
\Box Y \Box N Cutting proposed within 100 ft of river area?	(If Yes, include under jurisdiction)
Non-Navigable Streams in proximity to development	Check if none □
☑Permanent Stream ☐Intermittent Stream	Classified? ⊠Y □N
DEC Environmental Resource Mapper stream classification	n: There is an existing crossing of Bottle
Brook, classified C(T), which will be used as part of the ac	cess drive.
Wetlands	
There are shrub swamp, deciduous swamp and emergent	
Bottle Brook. According to Agency Permit 2007-0006, the	y have a value of "2" pursuant to 9 NYCRR
Part 578.	
$\boxtimes Y$ $\square N$ Jurisdictional wetland on property, or	
\square Y \boxtimes N Wetlands are a basis of development jurisdic	ction 🗌 If Yes, RASS biologist consulted
→ If Y, covertype:	
→ If Y, value rating:	
\Box Y \boxtimes N Draining, dredging, excavation of wetland	
Area of wetland loss: Permanent? □Y □N	
☐Y ⊠N Fill/structure in wetlands	
Fill/structure area:	
☐Y ⊠N Shading of wetland	
Area of shading:	
☐Y ☒N Clearcutting >3 acres of wetland *RASS fores	ter consulted
Clearcut area:	
□Y ⊠N Untreated stormwater discharge into wetlan	d
□Y ⊠N Pollution discharge into wetland	

	Y ⊠N	ion type: Pesticide/Herbicide application in wetland ion type:	
Ecolo	ogical / ⊠N ⊠N ⊠N	Wildlife Natural Heritage Sites/listed species or habitat present Forest management plan existing or proposed Biological Survey required by RASS Biologist 2 or Supplied to the state of t	If Yes, RASS forestry analyst consulted
Spec □Y	ial Dist ⊠N	ricts Agricultural District	
Slope Existi		\square RASS engineer consulted if structure proposed on >15%, e range: 0 to > 40% Building area(s) if authorizing dev	-
	□N Yes, soi	Deep-hole test pit completed? (Necessary for every be il data information determined or approved by RASS so ed Soil Series or Other Comments:	9 ,
□Y ⊠Y	Setba	Greater than 1 acre disturbance, or Proposed ground disturbance < 100 feet from wetland es, stormwater management reviewed and approved by RASS en ck to wetlands: Existing access drive that crosses Bottl Il not be widened.	gineer
Neart Adjoid Is nea → If Y	ning Lai arby de	ude all): ⊠Residential ⊠Commercial □Industrial □And Uses / State Land: NYS Wild Forest, Residential, Covelopment visible from road? ⊠Y □N re road and describe visible development: Commercial a	ommercial, Private Forestland
Addit	tional E	Existing Development (ex: dam on site, etc.): See Indi	vidual Lot Development Forms
***	Attach	Individual Lot Development Worksheet (if a subdiv	vision, attach one for each lot)
		OF FACT - COORDINATED REVIEW	
□Y	⊠N ⊠N	Archeologically Sensitive Area, according to OPRHP	☐ If Yes, APA APPO consulted
□Y □Y	⊠N ⊠N	Structures > 50 years old on or visible from site Within Lake George Park □ If Yes,	☐ If Yes, APA AHPO consulted LGPC consulted / application submitted
□Y	⊠N	_	If Yes, DEC / DOH application submitted
□Y	⊠N	Greater than 1,000 gpd wastewater	☐ If Yes, DEC application submitted
□Y	$\boxtimes N$	Disturbing bed or bank of water body	☐ If Yes, DEC application submitted
$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$	Creating 5 or more lots less than 5 acres each	☐ If Yes, DOH application submitted

□Y □Y	⊠N ⊠N	Army Corps involvement Agency-approved Local Land Use Prog	gram	\Box If Yes, ACOE consulted \Box If Yes, Town/Village consulted
prope		, received Section 106 Notification of SF area of potential effects) and visual effects).		
		, 2021 meeting, the Town of Inlet declar 21.35 made November 9, 2021 reaffirme		
PERM	/IIT CO	NDITIONS AND IMPACT ANALYSIS		
Merg Justifi		f merger required: NA		
Non-k If Yes prior	and lo	lant Iot being created? ⊠ Y □N It is not being merged by condition, no P Agency authorization for any new land u I beyond what was proposed and is autl	ise or development o	on the 3,985±-square-foot
If Y, c veget proxir	ment pr consult valive ea mity to t	roposed or required? ⊠Y □N with Legal for conditions. Justification: 1 asement from the towers, required for vis the proposed simulated tree. The Project and utility easement from Limekiln Road	sual screening and toot of the second such that the second second is the second	to maintain natural trees in a 25-foot-wide and a 30-foot
Is nev → If \	v devel ⁄:	n Location and Size (may be different opment (other than oswts) being authori Structure height limit and justification: 1 nt limited to limit visual impact and comp	zed without further <i>F</i> 100-foot-tall and 95-f	Agency review? ⊠Y □N foot-tall simulated tree
		Structure footprint limit and justification	: size of equipment s	shelters/pads as proposed
→ If N	→ Acc	ceptable development sites identified for view of future development required?	all subdivision lots v	with PB allocation? □Y □N
	sed an If N, g	ges (if authorizing a dwelling) NA d reviewed? □Y □N uest cottages potentially allowed? □Y stification for any conditions:	□N	
	sed an	f (if project site contains shoreline) North oathouses potentially allowed? □Y □Y → If N, justification:	A □N	

→ If Y, review required (beyond definition limits)? → If Y, justification:	□Y	$\square N$
Docks (if project site contains shoreline) NA Proposed and reviewed? If N, docks potentially allowed?	□Y □Y	□ N □ N
 → If N, justification: → If Y, review required (beyond definition limits)? → If Y, justification: 	□Y	$\square N$
Outdoor Lighting (if authorizing development) Plan proposed and reviewed? □Y □N		
Building Color (if authorizing development) If color condition required, justification: towers to be	e conceal	ed as simulated white pine trees
Tree Cutting / Vegetation Removal Town with Northern Long-Eared Bat occurrences? Indiana Bat habitat indicated on Lookup? □Y ☒N		⊠N
Vegetative cutting restrictions required? ⊠Y ☐N If Y, restrictions required (choose all that apply): ☐within feet of limits of clearing ☐within feet of road ☐within feet of river/lake/etc ☐within feet of wetlands ☒Other: on project site and within 300 feet of tow OR ☐on entire site outside limits of clearing		own on Project Plans
Extent of cutting restriction necessary within the arc Cutting of all vegetation prohibited Cutting of trees of greater than 8 inches dbh pro Other: Justification: retain trees on project site and within screening, except those trees proposed to be remo	ohibited	of towers to provide natural visual
Plantings Plan proposed and reviewed? □Y ⊠N If N, plantings required? □Y ⊠N → If Y, species, number, location, and time of year Justification:	ar:	
Density (may be different for each subdivision I Located in Town with ALLUP? □Y ☒N Authorizing PB on substandard-sized lot created properties and the matically available # of new PBs (in addition)	re-2000 w	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Extinguishing PBs? □Y ⊠N	If Y, number:	-		
Wastewater (if authorizing consult with RASS for additional	roved? oproved by RAS ed by engineer a tion for conventi tion for conventi confirmed for e	S? nd approved by RAS onal standard trench onal shallow trench s	S? system? ystem?	□Y□N □Y□N □Y□N □Y□N □Y□N □Y□N
Stormwater Management (if automostic Consult with RASS for conditions wetlands or greater than 1 acre de Justification:	. Condition requ	uired if authorizing de		
Erosion and Sediment Control Consult with RASS for conditions wetlands or greater than 1 acre d Justification: protection of soils ar	. Condition requisturbance; condition	uired if authorizing de dition possibly require	-	
Infrastructure Construction (if a Construction necessary before lo Justification:	_	- ,		
For permits that will not include Plantings Explain why no condition is needed		lated to Building Co	lor, Vegetation Re	moval, or
Additional Site / Project-Specific If constructed as shown on the Protree), the towers and antennas con New Telecommunications Towers the dimensions or appearance of towers. The applicant does not in	roject Plans (i.e. omply with the A s and Other Tall the towers coul	, location, dimensions gency's "Policy on Ag Structures in the Adi d defeat the concealn	pency Review of Pro rondack Park." Any nent elements of the	pposals for change to
The tower does not require regist	ration with the F	ederal Aviation Admi	nistration.	
By letter dated April 29, 2021, the no adverse effect to any current of Areas (MOA) and therefore the U	or proposed Milit	ary Training Routes (
✓Y □N Public comments□Y □N Applicant submitte		Yes, #: 3 – all in sup		30 am]

In addition, one comment letter was received in August 2020 for P2019-0147, a previous permit application for a single tower on the same property. The letter was in support of improved telecommunications in the Inlet area.



INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW – P#2021-0207

If a subdivision: Lot #TM # 59.000-3-4.112 owned by Hidden Peak, LLC (Rural Use portion of 172.40± acres)

Assigned EPS:ADL Reviewed by: Click or tap here to enter text.Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

Existing Development				
PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS	}			
Structure -	Pre-	existing (Y/N)?	-	Lawfully constructed (Y/N)?
None				
ACCESSORY STRUCT	JRFS			
Structure -		existing (Y/N)?	_	Lawfully constructed (Y/N)?
Shed-machine		N (2005)		Υ
Utl Shed, Res		N (2019)		Υ
Proposed Developmen	t		Check	$oxed{a}$ if portions or all below are NJ $oxed{\Box}$
PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS	_			if proposed as a non-building lot: □
Structure		Footprint	Height	# Bedrooms Slopes
No principal buildings pro	posed	•	.,	<u> </u>
Have necessary density? # remaining potential prin			ulated from □a	unyov, er. □eetimete
# remaining potential pri	icipai bi	ulidings – not calct		divey of Destinate
ACCESSORY STRUCT	JRES			
Structure		Footprint	Height	Slopes
No accessory structures	propose	ed		
		engineer for driveway osed Length: ~3	•	nsult RASS ecologist for driveway > ½ mile 2 ft
Sight distance evaluated	? □Y	⊠N Slopes: no	change to exis	ting access drive slopes
Need Clearing/Grading?	$\boxtimes Y$	□N Comments	s: Access drive	will be within 30-foot-wide access and
utility easement, no char	ige to ~:	2710 ft length of ac	cess drive, fina	~830 ft of access drive (to tower
site) will be widened fron	18 ft to	12 ft, gravel surfac	e (Note if HOA or	shared maintenance involved)
Need hwy access permit	? □Y	$\boxtimes N$		
Need easement?	$\boxtimes Y$	$\square N$		
Need signs?	$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$		

VISUAL / AESTHETIC									
$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$	Proposed development visible from public areas (list) Only development = access drive							
⊠Y	□N		•		tation will screen, if r				
□Y	$\boxtimes N$	Plantin	ng plan	proposed		☐ If Yes, RASS forestry analyst consulted			
WAST	EWAT	ER TR	EATM	ENT (WWTS)	NA *Consult RASS end	gineer for engineered plans			
		on-site		☐ Municipal	☐ Communit	,			
$\Box Y$	$\square N$	Slope	suitabl	e for WWTS (i.e., ≤8% shallow, ≤1	5% conventional)?			
$\Box Y$	$\square N$	Soil su	iitable	for WWTS (i.e	e., depth to SHGW ar	nd bedrock)?			
$\Box Y$	$\square N$	All wat	er bod	lies or stream	s > 100 feet WWTS?	(If No, needs variance – from Town if ALLUP)			
$\Box Y$	$\square N$	If fast	perc (1	-3 min/in), wa	iter > 200 feet WWT	6? (If No, amended soils required)			
$\Box Y$	$\square N$	All juris	sdictio	nal wetlands >	> 100 feet WWTS? (If No, counts as permit jurisdiction)			
$\Box Y$	$\square N$	Suitab	le 100°	% replacemer	nt area identified?				
□ Exi	sting a	nd prop	osed t	o remain (nee	eds suitable 100% replac	ement area)			
WATE	R SUF	PLY N	Α						
□ Ind	ividual	on-site		☐ Municipal					
$\Box Y$	$\square N$	All wat	er sup	plies, on-site	and off-site, > 100 fe	et WWTS? (If No, need DOH waiver)			
STOR	ΜWΔΤ	FR/F	ROSIC	N & SEDIME	INT CONTROL *Cons	sult PASS engineer			
⊠Y	STORMWATER / EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL *Consult RASS engineer ⊠Y □N Does proposed development maintain existing drainage patterns?								
⊠Y	□N		•	•	_	ontrol Plan if water/slope/soil resources at risk)			
□Y	⊠N				` •	which includes E&S Control Plan)			
Propo	sed lim	its of d	isturba	nce = 0.917±	acres (for entire proj	ect site)			
UTILI	TIES								
Availa	ble on	site?	$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$	☐ Overhead	☐ Underground			
Availa	ble at r	oad?	$\boxtimes Y$	\square N	⊠ Overhead	☐ Underground			
Propo	Proposed for site? ⊠Y □N □ Overhead ⊠ Underground								



INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW - P#2021-0207

If a subdivision: Lot #Lease Area (3,985± sq ft / 0.09± acres)

Assigned EPS:ADL Reviewed by: Click or tap here to enter text.Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

Existing Development				
PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS				
Structure -	Pre-existing (Y/N)?	-	Lawfully o	constructed (Y/N)?
None			•	
ACCESSORY STRUCTUR	ES			
Structure -	Pre-existing (Y/N)?	-	Lawfully o	constructed (Y/N)?
None			-	
Proposed Development		Check	if portions or al	l below are NJ □
PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS		Check if	proposed as a n	on-building lot: □
Structure	Footprint	Height	# Bedroor	•
No principal buildings propo		<u></u>	= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	
Have necessary density?	⊠Y □N			
# remaining potential princip		ulated from □sur	vey or □estima	ate
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	TOWERS			
Structure	Footprint	Height	Slopes	
Telecommunications tower	#1 NA	100 ft to top of	of branching	~8%
Telecommunications tower	#2 NA	95 ft to top of	of branching	~8%
Multiple antennas (see Proje	ect Plans)		_	

ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

Structure	Footprint	Height Slope	es
Equipment pad (T-Mobile)	240 sq ft	< 15 ft	~8%
Equipment platform (AT&T)	300 sq ft	< 15 ft	~8%
Equipment shelter (County/To	own) 240 sq ft	< 15 ft	~8%
Chain link fence po	erimeter of lease area	7 ft (6 ft fence + barbed w	re) ~8%

Sight distance Need Clearing parcels; park Need hwy ac Need easem	□existing /□ te evaluated? tg/Grading? ting and turn-a ticess permit? ent?	Iproposed Y N Y N Around are on Y N N Y N	Length: Width: Slopes: Comments: access of	e / *consult RASS ecologist for driveway > ½ mile Irive is on Hidden Peak LLC and Sauer OA or shared maintenance involved)			
Need signs? VISUAL / AE		□Y □N					
⊠Y □N		velopment vis	sible from public areas	s (list) *			
⊠Y □N ⊠Y □N *simulated br	Planting plan	proposed		etained □ If Yes, RASS forestry analyst consulted phopines (i.e., simulated trees)			
 ☐ Individual ☐ Y ☐ N 	on-site Slope suitable Soil suitable All water bod If fast perc (1 All jurisdiction Suitable 100	☐ Municipal e for WWTS (i.e for WWTS (i.e ies or stream -3 min/in), wa nal wetlands > % replacemen	☐ Community (i.e., ≤8% shallow, ≤15 e., depth to SHGW an s > 100 feet WWTS? ater > 200 feet WWTS	5% conventional)? d bedrock)? (If No, needs variance – from Town if ALLUP) ? (If No, amended soils required) No, counts as permit jurisdiction)			
WATER SUF □ Individual □Y □N	on-site	☐ Municipal plies, on-site	and off-site, > 100 fee	et WWTS? (If No, need DOH waiver)			
STORMWATER / EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL *Consult RASS engineer ⊠Y □N Does proposed development maintain existing drainage patterns? ⊠Y □N < 1 acre disturbance proposed (May need E&S Control Plan if water/slope/soil resources at risk) □Y □N > 1 acre disturbance proposed (SWPPP required, which includes E&S Control Plan)							
Proposed lim	its of disturba	nce = 0.917±	acres (for entire proje	ect site)			
UTILITIES Available on site? □Y □N □ Overhead □ Underground Available at road? □Y □N □ Overhead □ Underground Proposed for site? □ □ □ Overhead □ Underground							



INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW – P#2021-0207

If a subdivision: Lot #TM# 59.020-3-1.111, 59.020-3-15.100, and 59.020-3-13.1 owned by Harold and Cynthia Sauer (Rural Use portion of 57.9**± acres**)

Assigned EPS:ADL Reviewed by: Click or tap here to enter text.Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

Existing Dovolonment					
Existing Development PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS					
Structure -	Pre-	existing (Y	/N)?	_	Lawfully constructed (Y/N)
5432 SF structure built 19		CXISTING (1	/1 N /):		Lawrany constructed (1714)
ACCESSORY STRUCTU	RES				
Structure -	Pre-	existing (Y	′/N)?	-	Lawfully constructed (Y/N)
Boat shelter 4,080 SF buil			•		`
Boat shelter 2,640 SF buil	t 1983				
Canopy-roof 482 SF built	1983				
Proposed Development				Chacl	k if portions or all below are NJ □
PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS					if proposed as a non-building lot: □
Structure		Footprin	+	Height	# Bedrooms Slopes
No principal building propo	need	Ιουιριπι	L	Height	# Deditions Slopes
Have necessary density? # remaining potential princ		□N uildings =	not calcu	lated from □s	unvey or Destimate
	•	ullulligs –	not calcu		urvey or —estimate
ACCESSORY STRUCTU	RES				
Structure		<u>Footprin</u>	<u>t </u>	Height	Slopes
No accessory structures p	ropos	ed			
ACCESS *Consul	t RASS	engineer fo	r driveway	> 12% slope / *co	nsult RASS ecologist for driveway > ½ mil
Driveway is ⊠existing /∑	⊴propo	osed L	ength: 11	30 ft (proposed	I) + ~300 ft (existing) Width: 12 ft
Sight distance evaluated?	$\Box Y$	⊠N S	lopes: ma	aximum 15%	
Need Clearing/Grading?	$\boxtimes Y$	□N C	omments	s: Access drive	to be constructed within 25- to 30-
foot-wide access and utilit	y ease	ement (Note	e if HOA or	shared maintenar	nce involved)
Need hwy access permit?	$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$			
Need easement?	$\boxtimes Y$	$\square N$			
Need signs?	$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$			

VISUAL / AESTHETIC							
$\boxtimes Y$ $\square N$ Proposed development visible from public areas (list) Only development = access drive;							
entrance will be visible from Limekiln Road, among existing development							
$\boxtimes Y$	\square N	Existing topography / vegetation will scree				retained	
□Y	$\boxtimes N$	Plantir	ng plan	proposed		☐ If Yes, RASS forestry analyst consulted	
\/\^ \C	Γ Ε \Λ/ Λ Τ	ED TD		ENT /\A/\A/7	FC) NA *Conoult BASS o	naineer for engineered alone	
WASTEWATER TREATMENT (WWTS) NA *Consult RASS engineer for engineered plans ☐ Individual on-site ☐ Municipal ☐ Community							
□ Individual on-site □ Municipal □ Community □ No Slope suitable for WWTS (i.e., ≤8% shallow, ≤15% conventional)?							
□Y	□N	Soil suitable for WWTS (i.e., \$6% Shallow, \$15% Conventionar)?					
□Y							
		All water bodies or streams > 100 feet WWTS? (If No, needs variance – from Town if ALLUP)					
□Y		If fast perc (1-3 min/in), water > 200 feet WWTS? (If No, amended soils required)					
□Y	□N	All jurisdictional wetlands > 100 feet WWTS? (If No, counts as permit jurisdiction)					
□Y	'						
☐ Existing and proposed to remain (needs suitable 100% replacement area)							
WATER SUPPLY NA							
☐ Individual on-site ☐ Municipal							
$\Box Y$	$\square N$	All wa	ter sup	plies, on-si	te and off-site, > 100 f	eet WWTS? (If No, need DOH waiver)	
STORMWATER / EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL *Consult RASS engineer							
⊠Y	□N	Does proposed development maintain existing drainage patterns?					
⊠Y	\square N	< 1 acre disturbance proposed (May need E&S Control Plan if water/slope/soil resources at risk)					
□Y	$\boxtimes N$	> 1 ac	re dist	urbance pro	oposed (SWPPP required	d, which includes E&S Control Plan)	
Proposed limits of disturbance = 0.917± acres (for entire project site)							
UTILITIES							
						□ Underground	
Available at road? ⊠Y □N ⊠ Overhead □ Underground						•	
Proposed for site? $\boxtimes Y \square N$					☐ Overhead	□ Underground	