



TO: Beals + Thomas
144 Turnpike Road
Southborough, MA 01772

Professional Services Corporation, PC
Ten Lincoln Road, Suite 201
Foxboro, MA 02035

DATE: 9/13/2022

FROM: Howard Stein Hudson

HSH PROJECT NO.: 19227.01

SUBJECT: 20 Hancock Street – Wrentham, MA 02093

Beals and Thomas

General Comments

1. Chapter 390 – Article 7.2.F of the By-law requires a locus plan incorporating several elements at a scale of 1"=200'. We acknowledge the locus provided by the Applicant at a scale of 1"=160'. B+T takes no specific exception to the scale used; however, notes the inconsistency relative to the d By-law for the benefit of the Board.

HSH: Concur

2. Chapter 390 – Article 7.3 of the By-law requires the site plan submission be depicted at a scale of 1"=40'. The Applicant has used a scale of 1"=20' in the current submission. B+T takes no specific exception to the scale used; however, notes the inconsistency relative to the d By-law for the benefit of the Board.

HSH: Concur

3. Chapter 390 - Article 7.4 of the By-Law requires multiple elements be incorporated into the Site plan set. The Project documentation provided does not appear to be fully compliant with the requirements of the referenced By-Law. We note the following:

- a. Article 7.4A(3) of the By-Law require a suitable space to record the action the Planning Board and signatures of members on each sheet. We note that the existing conditions plans do not incorporate this requirement.

HSH: A suitable space to record the action and signatures of the Planning Board Members has been added to the Existing Conditions Plans.



- b. Article 7.4.A(5)(b) of the By-Law requires significant soil types be delineated.
HSH: Soil delineation lines have not been shown on the watershed maps as there is only one type of soil being used.

- c. Article 7.4.A(5)(c) of the By-Law requires that the 100-yr flood elevation be depicted.
HSH: The property is not within a flood zone of any kind, no 100-year flood elevation is depicted.

- d. Article 7.4.A(6) of the By-Law requires a locus map that includes principal buildings, zoning district limits, etc.
HSH: The Locus Map, provided on Sheet C1.3, has been revised to include all principal buildings and Zoning District limits.

- e. Article 7.4.A(8) of the By-Law requires plans prepared by a Registered Architect including building elevations, etc. We acknowledge the architectural plans provided by the Applicant; however, note they do not include the required endorsement.
HSH: Revised Architectural Plans have been endorsed by a Registered Architect.

- f. Article 7.4.A(9) of the By-Law requires plans prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect be provided relative to the landscaping design. We acknowledge the planting plans provided by the Applicant; however, note they do not include the required endorsement.
HSH: Revised Landscape Plans have been endorsed by a Registered Landscape Architect.

- g. Article 7.4.A(10) requires a table showing various site areas (building coverage, impervious area, etc.)
HSH: The Zoning Requirements Table shown on the Cover Sheet of the plan set, as well as the Dimensional Requirements Table shown on page 3 of the Supplemental Data Report have been revised to include all required information per Article 7.4.A(10) of the Town of Wrentham Zoning Bylaws.

We request that the Applicant address the noted requirements of the By-Law.



- Chapter 390 – Article 13.5(D)(6) of the By-Law requires that permanent conservation restriction be placed on the open space associated with a SLC. We note this for the benefit of the Board when considering potential conditions of approval.

HSH: Concur, the applicant is comfortable placing the area outside of the limit of work in a conservation restriction.

- Chapter 390 – Article 13.5(D)(9) of the By-Law requires a 5-ft sidewalk be installed along one side of the roadway. As proposed, the Applicant has provided a meandering 6-ft wide walking path that will loop the perimeter of the developed portion of the property. We further note that the sidewalk is provided on the opposite side of the roadway from where the residential units are proposed. B+T does not necessarily take exception to the site conditions proposed; however, defers to the Board to determine if the intent of the referenced By-Law is being met.

HSH: During the planning board process, the board requested that the sidewalk be constructed on the opposite side of the roadway and access driveways to remain continuous without driveway or vehicular interruptions. The walkway has also been designed, as requested by the Board, to meander from the edge of the pavement creating a more enjoyable walking experience for the residents of the development.

- Chapter 390 – Article 13.5(D)(10) and 18 of the By-Law defines signage requirements. Project signage is not proposed at this time; however, the Applicant indicates that signage will likely be proposed at a later date. We note this for the benefit of the Board and defer review of the comprehensive signage package to the building permit review process.

HSH: Concur

- Chapter 390 – Article 13.5(D)(11) of the By-Law requires that an SLC have an amenity structure to allow for a variety of passive and active recreational activities to support the residents of the community. As proposed, an amenity structure has not been proposed. However, Article 13.5(I)(3) allows the Board to waive the requirement with a super majority vote. Accordingly, we defer to the Board on the need for the Project to provide an amenity structure.

HSH: A community shared pavilion structure has been provided within the common green area on the interior of the proposed units. The shared pavilion will be a roofed open-air structure with a level floor surface. This space will provide area for seating, tables, and could also be rearranged and be used for active activities as well. The common green area can also be utilized for a number of different



activities and include an interconnected walking loop to each unit, as well as an open green space to be utilized as desired by the residents. The project is also serviced by a 6' wide meandering sidewalk with benches placed intermittently at the outside of the project allowing a longer, uninterrupted loop at the edge of the wetland and forested areas for the use of the residents.

8. Chapter 390 – Article 13.5(E)(8) allows for multiple methods for the Project to provide for affordable housing. In the documentation provided it is unclear which method the Applicant will pursue. We note this for the benefit of the Board when considering potential conditions of approval.

HSH: Response to be submitted by attorney under separate cover.

9. Chapter 390 – Article 14 includes requirements relative to the earth removal special permit being requested by the Applicant. The documentation provided by the Applicant is unclear. It states that 124 CY of material will be excavated within the site; however, 32,965 CY of material will be transported from the site (cumulative for the Sheldon Meadow and Sheldon West Projects). Additionally, Article 14 also requires:

HSH: Howard Stein Hudson has revised the application to more clearly depict the calculations. Each application has been provided with its own cut/fill numbers and are not cumulative for both projects. The initial analysis for Sheldon Meadow showed a cut of 21 CY and a fill of 35,640 CY of fill required to be brought onto the site. These number have been updated as the design has been revised. The updated cut/fill for Sheld Meadow is approximately a 20 CY cut and 38,060 CY of fill, with a net of 38,040 CY being brought onto the site.

- a. Article 14.5(6) requires a minimum of two vertical benchmarks be included on the plans. Benchmarks do not appear to have been provided.

HSH: Benchmarks will be set prior to the start of construction. Multiple benchmarks will be set throughout the project due to tree clearing and the lack of existing permanent structures on site. As development occurs, permanent benchmarks will be set.

- b. Article 14.7(K) stipulates excavation cannot be conducted within 10-ft of the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation. Several of the on-site test pits demonstrated shallow groundwater elevations.



HSH: The proposed site, in general, is to be raised from the existing elevation. However, stormwater basins are allowed to be within 2' of groundwater and the septic system, 5-6' within groundwater. Excavation will be required within 10' of groundwater in order to install the septic system and stormwater basins.

- c. Article 14.9 includes submission of an Environmental Impact Statement. Reference in this document is made to the Site needing to be filled to mitigate shallow groundwater as opposed to the export reported in the applicant documents.

HSH: The application was misread, and values were placed on incorrect lines. Updated values per the revised design will be reported to the Board.

- 10. The Project proposes to utilize existing municipal water infrastructure in Hancock Street to serve the domestic and fire protection water demands. Notations on the existing conditions plan indicate the water main in Hancock Street is 4"; however, the proposed Project water main is 8". The increase in size would be an atypical engineering design. We defer the Wrentham DPW personnel to review and approve the water connection.

HSH: Concur

- 11. We acknowledge the photometric plan provided by the Applicant; however, it depicts light trespass onto the abutting residential properties on Hancock Street. Also, a pole height does not appear to have been specified. We request that the Applicant clarify the design intent of the lighting design to not impact abutting parcels.

HSH: The photometric plan has been revised to eliminate any light trespass onto abutting residential properties. A mounting height of 18 feet for all pole lights and 3.5 feet for bollards has been added to the Lighting Plans (Sheets C9.1 and C9.2).

- 12. The Applicant has not provided a swept path vehicular turning movement analysis for larger emergency vehicles. Though access appears to be adequate, we defer to Wrentham Fire Department personnel relative to the adequacy of the emergency access provided.

HSH: A swept path vehicular movement plans, showing large emergency vehicle access has been included as Appendix M of the Supplemental Data Report.

- 13. The Project proposes the use of an on-site sanitary waste disposal soil absorption system. We note the following:



- a. The existing on-site septic system (location not provided within the submission) will need to be decommissioned and abandoned.

HSH: The location of the current septic system has been added to the Existing Condition Plans and notes have been added to the plan set regarding decommissioning and abandoning the system.

- a. Details of the proposed system have not been provided within this submission.

HSH: The proposed system will be submitted to the Town of Wrentham Board of Health for permitting at a later date.

- b. The Project is within the Aquifer Protection district.

HSH: The proposed system will be submitted to the Town of Wrentham Board of Health for permitting. The system has been designed in accordance with the requirements and limits within the Aquifer Protection District.

We note these items for the benefit of the Board and defer review and approval of the proposed system to the Wrentham Board of Health review process.

14. We request that the Applicant analyze if stop control (stop sign and stop bar) are required at the intersection of the Project access drive and Hancock Street.

HSH: A stop bar and sign have been added to the revised Site Plan set.

15. The Applicant does not appear to have provided a comprehensive inventory of site details. Details for the crosswalks, fences, retaining wall, benches, etc. do not appear to have been provided. Additionally, proposed retaining walls are at a height that would require fall protection be incorporated. We request that the Applicant clarify the design intent and provide all details necessary to execute the proposed site work.

HSH: Details for the aforementioned items have been added to the Detail Sheets (Sheets C10.1 – C10.11) of the plan set.

Stormwater Management Comments

16. Section 4.51.g and 5.212 of the Subdivision Regulations require that projects not cause an increase or decrease in either the total volume or runoff discharged offsite, or total rate of



runoff offsite for the 2-inch, 2-yr, 10-yr, 50-yr and 100-yr frequency events. As proposed, we note the following relative to the noted regulation:

- a. AP1 has a net increase in discharge rate for the 2-inch event.

HSH: The stormwater analysis has been revised with updated storm data and revised subcatchment areas based on changes to the grading. The outlet structure has also been removed from the infiltration basin which was the source of the increase in the previous design. There is no longer an increase to AP1 in any storm

- b. AP3 has a net increase in volume for the 50-yr and 100-yr event.

HSH: The subcatchment areas and routing for the area of AP3 has been revised in the pre and the post. The area of the depression in the abutters property is routed to AP3, which is now indicated as Hancock Street. The abutters depression, if it were to overflow would flow into Hancock St and continue to the headwall on the south side of the road. The increase in AP3 in the revised design is due to the lack of drainage structures or curbing on Hancock Street, in order to connect the new access way to Hancock areas that are currently grass will need to be paved, and with lack of pitch in the road some of the pavement will flow down the side of Hancock and into the headwall which leads to the wetlands on the project site, also analyzed as AP1. The slight increase of CFS and volume will not cause any taxation on a town storm drain system and will enter back onto the project site causing no flooding due to its negligible amount. The depression on the abutter will take less runoff than in its existing condition. We understand that through the information provided from the abutter that they have not had any standing water on their property. In our analysis there would only be visible standing water on their property if a 50 or 100 year storm occurred and it would still be less than one foot of water, and given the soil it would draw down fairly quickly. Please see table below with elevation and storage amounts in the various storms for pre and post. The modeled bottom of the depression is 249.70 and a top of 250.60. The table below shows an improvement to the conditions of their property

	<i>2-inch storm</i>	<i>2-year</i>	<i>10-year</i>	<i>50-year</i>	<i>100-year</i>
<i>Pre-Development</i>	<i>Vol=0 cf</i>	<i>7 cf</i>	<i>130 cf</i>	<i>606 cf</i>	<i>1,009 cf</i>



	<i>EL=249.70</i>	<i>249.78</i>	<i>250.07</i>	<i>250.41</i>	<i>250.58</i>
<i>Post Development</i>	<i>0 cf</i> <i>249.70</i>	<i>0 cf</i> <i>249.71</i>	<i>18 cf</i> <i>249.84</i>	<i>183 cf</i> <i>250.13</i>	<i>350 cf</i> <i>250.27</i>

c. AP1 and AP2 demonstrate significant volume decrease for all events.
HSH: Concur. The design is retaining and infiltrating more water than in the existing conditions.

d. AP2 demonstrates significant rate decreases for the 50-yr and 100-yr event.
HSH: Concur. The design is retaining and infiltrating more water than in the existing conditions.

We request that the Applicant clarify the stormwater management design and document compliance with the referenced regulation.

17. Section 5.213 of the Subdivision Regulations require that rainfall event estimate be derived from Technical Paper No. 40 (TP-40). Though the rainfall events appear appropriate, we request that Applicant confirm the assumptions made. We request that the Applicant document compliance with the referenced regulation.

HSH: All rainfall data has been updated in HydroCAD analysis to use data from NRCC, as agreed upon with the peer review engineers. The NRCC rainfall data is more recent and conservative (larger rainfall amounts) than TP-40 data.

18. Section 5.225 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that stormwater basins greater than 500 cubic feet be screened from roadways by a greenbelt of trees. As designed, the Project does not provide the required subdivision screening requirements. Acknowledging the Project is not specifically a subdivision, we note this for the benefit of the Board when considering potential conditions of approval.

HSH: The landscaping plan has been revised to provide proper screening.

19. Section 5.232 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that all drainage pipe have a minimum diameter of 12-in. As designed, the stormwater management system does not comply with this regulation. We request that the Applicant clarify the design intent and document compliance with the noted regulation.

HSH: All pipes leading from inlet structures in the roadway are a minimum of 12". Header and outlet pipes from the subsurface infiltration chambers are not, but are



not intended to be, as this is an emergency outfall, if large pipes were used it would reduce the overall storage capacity of the system. The trench drain and pipe from area drain-1 leading to SIS1 is also not a 12” as it would be oversized for the small amount of water entering it. The other pipes that are less than 12” are roof drains enters SIS2, and they are sized appropriately for the amount of water entering them.

20. Section 5.241 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that catch basins or equivalent structure, have a maximum spacing of 300-ft. As designed, the inlet spacing does not appear to comply with this requirement. We request that the Applicant clarify the design intent and document compliance with the referenced regulation.

HSH: This project is not considered a Subdivision. However, the design has been revised and all stormwater inlets have been spaced appropriately to not exceed the maximum distance of 300-feet between high points to first structures and between in line structures down gradient.

21. The modeling of the Pond IB1: Infiltration Basin #1 is unclear. The outlet control structure orifice, outlet invert, and basin bottom are all at the same elevation. This would appear to provide no initial storage of the “first flush” required by the Wrentham Stormwater Regulations. We request that the Applicant clarify the design intent of for this infrastructure and revise the documentation as applicable.

HSH: The outlet control structure has been removed from Infiltration Basin #1.

22. We request that the Applicant provide a fully executed MassDEP Checklist for Stormwater Report endorsed by a Professional Engineer (PE) registered in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

HSH: A fully executed MassDEP Checklist was previously submitted to the Town of Wrentham Conservation Commission. The checklist has been included as Appendix D of the Supplemental Data Report.

23. Standard 3 of the MassDEP Regulations requires documentation of the on-site soil types. The Applicant indicates that the on-site soils are within the Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) B; however, utilizes the most ideal HSG A infiltration rates for all the modeling analysis and drawdown calculations. We request that the Applicant clarify the noted inconsistency and revise the documentation as applicable.



HSH: As part of the design process, a Hydrogeologist conducted testing that produced results characteristic of A soils. Although the USDA soil map previously used showed possible results of different soils, the testing was used since it was seen to be more accurate. Site soils have been revised to be consistent with the infiltration rates used within the infiltration practices, all associated with HSG A. A memo from the Hydrogeologist can be found in Appendix N of the Supplemental Data Report.

24. Standard 3 of the MassDEP Regulations requires that the Estimated Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation (ESHGWE) be established for the Site. B+T acknowledges the test pit data provided and the 2-ft vertical separation provided between these elevations and the bottom of infiltrative stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs). However, considering the bottom elevation of the BMPs is within 4-ft of the ESHGWE we request that the Applicant provide a mounding analysis for each BMP.

HSH: 2 feet of separation from groundwater is met. Mounding calculations have been provided in Appendix I of the Supplemental Data Report.

25. Standard 3 of the MassDEP Regulations requires drawdown calculations for all infiltrative BMPs. The storage volumes used do not appear to be consistent with the modeling. We request that the Applicant clarify the volumes used and revise the calculations accordingly.

HSH: Drawdown calculations have been provided within the Supplemental Data Report. The volumes used for the calculations consist of the entirety of the volume associated with the BMP associated with that storm.

26. Standard 4 of the MassDEP Regulations requires water quality treatment standards are met. We acknowledge the treatment train input provided. However, the TSS removal percentages utilized were derived from vendor correspondence. We request that the Applicant provide formal documentation that certifies the level of treatment provided by the proposed proprietary treatment units.

HSH: Formal documentation has been provided as Appendix C of the Supplemental Data Report that certifies that level of treatment provided by the proprietary treatment units.

27. Standard 8 of the MassDEP Regulations requires that Construction Period Pollution Prevention and Erosion and Sedimentation Controls be documented. The Project will be covered by the NPDES Construction General Permit. Accordingly, a Stormwater Pollution



Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required. A SWPPP has not been provided with the documentation provided by the Applicant. We request that the Applicant document compliance with the noted regulation.

HSH: A draft of the SWPPP has been submitted to the Town of Wrentham for review. A final SWPPP will be completed prior to construction as part of the NPDES permitting.

28. Standard 10 of the MassDEP Regulations requires that the Applicant provided an executed Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement. The Applicant indicates that this documentation will be provided under separate cover. We note this for the benefit of the Board when considering potential conditions of approval. We recommend that the Applicant provide the referenced documentation prior to construction.

HSH: A signed Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement has been provided within this submission.

29. The modeling of the Pond EX: Existing Abutter Depression, in both the pre- and post-development analysis, is unclear. It assumes elevations and grades that are not depicted on the existing conditions plans. We request that the Applicant clarify how this area was modeled.

HSH: The existing abutter depression was modeled using the existing surface provided by the surveyor. Several spot elevations were used to determine the exact nature of the depression. These spot elevations were removed for readability purposes. A blowup detail of the abutter depression has been included within the watershed maps with the spot shots and tenth-contours turned on.

30. There appears to be an inconsistency with the design of Pond SIS2. The modeling indicated 45 chamber units will be included; however, the plans depict an additional row and 50 chamber units. We request that the Applicant clarify the noted inconsistency and revise the documentation accordingly.

HSH: The system has been revised based on the new rainfall data and grading changes. The plans have been revised to match the modeling of SIS2 within the HydroCAD model.

31. For several of the pond structures (drain manholes, catch basins, area drains) the pipe material and associated Manning's "n" values are inconsistent. Many are identified as HDPE



on the plans; however, are modeled as RCP. We request that the Applicant clarify the design intent and revise the documentation accordingly.

HSH: The hydrocad has been updated to have manning's values associated with HDPE.

Professional Services Corporation, PC

Comments on Acceptable Stormwater Management Plan Requirements

The RSMR (item 1, page 2) requires the Applicant to “Capture and treat the "FIRST FLUSH" of storm, usually defined herein ... as the runoff from the first 2-inches of precipitation...”

The Applicant’s stormwater report presents stormwater BMP calculations to address this for capture of 1-inch, but this analysis needs to be upgraded to 2-inches to meet this requirement. Also, we defer on final comment until other flaws in the submittal are corrected. See Comment 11 below.

HSH: The water quality calculations have been revised to use a value of 2 inches instead of the previously used 1 inch.

The RSMR (item 2, page 2) requires that the plan “Not cause an increase or decrease in either the total volume of runoff discharged offsite, or total rate of runoff discharged offsite, as compared with the respective discharge offsite prior to the development. Such condition shall be required for storms of 2-inch, 2- year, 10-year, 50-year, and 100-year frequency events.” The proposed stormwater management design seeks to maintain peak flow and volume of stormwater runoff to levels that currently run off the land. The Applicant proposes to do this by directing Site runoff to surface and subsurface infiltration basins. However, in one case (discharge point AP3) the volume is not controlled for the 50-year and 100-year storms; and it is not yet clear if peak flows and volumes in general will be controlled because the saturated hydraulic conductivity rate used to model the three infiltration systems is too high. The rate needs to be revised to a slower rate (2.41 inches per hour) which is a Rawls rate more appropriate for the soils class and soil test data provided:

1. The Applicant needs to revise the HydroCAD model and the design of the three infiltration areas based on using a saturated hydraulic conductivity rate of 2.41 inches per hour, which



is appropriate given the “Loamy Sand” determination from test pit soil evaluations within the basin area.

HSH: As part of the design process, a Hydrogeologist conducted testing that produced results characteristic of A soils. Although the USDA soil map previously used showed possible results of different soils, the testing was used since it was seen to be more accurate. Site soils have been revised to be consistent with the infiltration rates used within the infiltration practices, all associated with HSG A. A memo from the Hydrogeologist can be found in Appendix H of the Supplemental Data Report.

2. Increase the CN value to 98 for the surface infiltration pond to account for 100% of direct pond rainwater being collected.

HSH: The CN value of the surface infiltration pond has been revised to a value of 98.

3. The reported increase in stormwater volume that will be released to the abutting resident’s land on the east side of the entrance road is not acceptable and needs to be rectified. The Applicant’s summary of post-development stormflows notes that for the 50-year storm and 100-year storm, the volume of flow released to a low area on the adjacent resident’s lot increases by 77 cubic feet and 276 cubic feet respectively.

HSH: Please see response to #16b of the B+T responses above.

The RSMR (item 3, page 2) requires that the plan “Include source controls and design of BMPs including, but not limited to, Infiltration and Detention Structures, LID Techniques, Bioretention Areas, and Constructed Storm Water Wetlands in accordance with procedures acceptable to the Board of Health...”: The Applicant’s Site plans and stormwater report demonstrate adequate plans to address this requirement. However, we defer on final comment until the other flaws in the submittal are corrected.

HSH: Concur.

The RSMR (item 7, page 4) requires: “Include hydrologic and hydraulic calculations and data to support the proposed design for the runoff drainage system. Both volume and flow rate of runoff, before and after development, must be clearly stated and shall be in accordance with the specifications previously designated herein. Calculations shall be performed using the most recent procedures of the U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service such as are described in National Engineering handbook - Section 4- Hydrology (SCS 1985., TR-20 "Computer Program for Project Formulation-Hydrology (SCS 1983), and Technical Release



No. 55 "Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds" (SCS 1986). Structure design shall comply with the standards of USDA SCS Publication TR-60 for containments for detention and retention areas or other designated references. Rainfall event amounts shall be as derived from the latest Atlases of Precipitation as published by the Northeast Regional Climate Center, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y." The Applicant's submittals generally demonstrate compliance with these requirements. However, as noted earlier, the "hydrologic and hydraulic calculations and data to support the proposed design" are flawed and need to be corrected before we can offer final comment on compliance.

HSH: Please see response #22 above. A memo from the Hydrogeologist can be found in Appendix N of the Supplemental Data Report.

Review per the RSMR Checklist of Design Regulations

The Applicant's submittal does not include an evaluation of compliance with the Wrentham RSMR checklist of design regulations for stormwater and drainage designs. In our review, we have found the following items of non-compliance, and related items to be addressed.

HSH: A Wrentham RSMR Checklist was included as part of the submission to the Town of Wrentham Board of Health. A Checklist has been included as Appendix E of the Supplemental Data Report.

4. The Applicant also needs to submit a copy of the *MassDEP Checklist for Stormwater Report* that is stamped and dated by the Registered Professional Engineer for the Project.

HSH: A MassDEP Checklist was included as part of the submission to the Town of Wrentham Board of Health. A checklist has been included as Appendix D of the Supplemental Data Report.

5. **Separate overlays shall be included of pre- and post- development watershed catchment areas, including the soil types, hydrologic categories, CN values of the NRSCS, and the Time of Concentration flow paths and design points delineated.**
The Applicant needs to clarify the pre- and post-development watershed plans with details (perhaps spot grades) to clearly define drainage patterns at the existing depression (elevation 250) on the abutting lot at 32 Hancock Street, east of the entrance road. This low area which will collect stormwater, is described in both the pre- and post-development models, but it is not clear how the stage-storage elevation data stated in the HydroCAD model is derived. Also, an overflow is included in HydroCAD pre-and post-development routing diagrams



(modeled as a broad crested weir: 20' long, 15' breadth) but it is not clear how this has been derived. Does it in fact exist? Please explain and/or resolve these issues.

HSH: All soils have been modeled as A, as previously discussed, so there are no soil delineation lines shown, the CN values can be referenced in the HydroCAD, and delineated on the plans by edge of pavement, roofs with hatching, and tree lines. The existing depression on the abutting lot has been enlarged on the pre-watershed map and spot shots and tenth-contours have been shown for the area modeled as the depression. The weir has been removed and the depression has been modeled for any overflow to routed to AP3 directly (Hancock Street). The TCs on the pre and post watershed maps has been delineated with hatched circles to indicate where each flow path or change of surface and slope occurs as modeled in hydrocad report. The time of concentration has also been added directly to the plans, and can also be seen in the node reports of the subcatchment in Appendix H. Please see response to #16b of the B+T responses above for more detail on the existing depression.

6. Related to Comment **Error! Reference source not found.**, the infiltration rate assumed for HydroCAD modeling of the existing depression at Lot 32 Hancock Street is 2.410 inches per hour. Given that this is an existing condition, and not a constructed area, and that topsoil (loam) will be present as the most restrictive layer, the Rawls rate should be reduced to 0.52 inches per hour, that for Loam, HSG B soils.

HSH: Please see response to #16b of the B+T responses above for more detail on the existing depression. We are assuming A soils, so we used an infiltration rate of 1.02 inches per hour for the existing depression, instead of 8.27 in/hr to be conservative. However overall we are reducing the amount of water and square footage running onto the abutting property, so if a different infiltration rate is used in the pre and post, the results of the post would still show lower discharge to the area and thus improving the existing condition.

7. There is a large flat area with undefined elevations at the intersection of the entrance road with the loop road bounded by a proposed 257 contour line, and this area needs spot grades to define the drainage patterns and to show that water will not stagnate in the area.

HSH: Several spot grades have been added to this area. Flow path arrows have also been added to help depict the drainage pattern and direction of flow.

8. There is a large flat area at the south end of the loop road bounded by a proposed 251 contour line, and this area needs an additional proposed contour line and/or spot grades to



define the drainage patterns to show that water will not stagnate in the area and will flow to the nearest curb-side inlet.

HSH: Several spot grades have been added in the area to help depict the flow path to the Rain Guardian Foxhole(s) inlet.

9. At proposed CB-3, the overflow for the 45 Stormtech chamber system, the rim elevation is 253.5 and the upgradient contour is 254. The area downgradient of this overflow structure is not well defined and needs to be clarified with re-shaped contour lines and/or spot grades to ensure that overflow will be safely channeled by a swale toward the south end of the loop road, and away from abutting Units 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 & 12. Presently, it appears very likely that overflow will drain toward the rear of Units 7, 8 and 9 where water could flood near the foundations.

HSH: Several spot grades and flow path arrows have been added to better depict the drainage pattern and direction of flow. Runoff will be directed towards one of the stormwater inlet devices and enter the infiltration basin in the rear of the site.

10. Provide spot grades and additional detail for grading of the area that will capture water from the side slope on the east side of the entrance road, that will drain into an un-named Area Drain with Rim elevation 250.75. More controlled grading is necessary to ensure that drainage to that area will not overflow or run on to the land of the abutter at 32 Hancock Street on the east side of the entrance road.

HSH: More detailed grading has been done and spot shots, and flow arrows have been added to show the flow path. Some pavement will flow into Hancock Street, but the grading shows that it will flow towards the headwall on the south side of the street and flow back into the wetland series on the project site. This area was accounted for in our weighted TSS and adjusted recharge calculation and the design meets the stormwater standards.

11. **Best Management Practices shall be provided for removal of contaminants from the peak runoff from the 2-inch storm. Specific calculations shall be prepared.** The Applicant needs to submit revised Water Quality Volume calculations for proposed pre-treatment BMPs that are based on the 2-inch storm (instead of the 1-inch quantity that was used).

HSH: Water Quality Volume calculations have been revised within the Supplemental Data Report to use a value of 2-inches compared to the previous 1-inch.



High groundwater determinations shall be made in the areas of any detention or infiltration basins based upon soil morphology or by use of an adjustment provided by or otherwise approved by the Board of Health based upon the methodology of Frimpter. The location of all test holes and monitor wells shall be shown, including elevation of top of monitor well, elevation of ground, date of water level readings (should usually be taken between the 22nd and 29th of the month), and groundwater adjustment used with supporting data, where applicable. The Applicant has provided adequate soil data and estimated seasonal high groundwater (ESHGW) data per on-site soil evaluations.

12. **Hydrographs shall be printed out and show data and a 2D graphical representation for pre- and post- development conditions.** The applicant needs to submit printed hydrographs, but in the interest of saving paper volume, we recommend that it would most useful if the hydrographs printed by the Applicant only be for the final design point discharges for pre- and post-development conditions for required design storm events. *HSH: Hydrographs have been added to Appendix H within the Supplemental Data Report.*

13. **20-scale Cross-Section view of basin showing detail of design features and underlying profiles of high groundwater, existing grade, proposed grade, soil strata, and impervious/bedrock layers. All test holes and borings also shown in appropriate perspective.** The Applicant has submitted cross sections of the proposed surface and subsurface infiltration areas, however more details are required for the cross-section views of the two proposed subsurface systems; and the cross-sections for all infiltration areas should be supplemented by the following:
 - a. Show in the cross-sections of the surface basin and subsurface chambers logs of the test pit results (soil strata, in grey scale background), including elevations, for the relevant test pits, and including ESHGW designations for each. Also note the elevation of ESHGW from which the proposed 2-foot vertical setbacks are noted for each infiltration area.
 - b. For the surface basin overflow, add bedding material for the 12-inch rock riprap, and show the materials specifications and depths on the spillway details.
 - c. For the surface basin inflows and outflows, submit calculations to show that the proposed armoring is sufficient to prevent erosion and to withstand the entrance and



exit velocities at the basin. [For example, the 100-year outflow currently projected is 8.69 cubic feet per second.] Such calculations should be prepared after the basin has been re-designed to account for a lower hydraulic conductivity rate, and any mounding analysis adjustments.

- d. For the subsurface basins, submit calculations to show that the proposed catch basin grate outlet designs will be sufficient to prevent erosion and to withstand 100-year exit velocities during overflows from the subsurface systems. Such calculations should be prepared after the subsurface basins have been re-designed to account for a lower hydraulic conductivity rate, and any mounding analysis adjustments.
- e. Each subsurface chamber system cross section should include the following:
 - i. Elevation of seasonal high groundwater below the system base stone
 - ii. Bottom of stone elevation
 - iii. Bottom and top of chamber elevations
 - iv. Top of stone elevation
 - v. Elevations, sizes, materials of inlet and outlet pipes (including header if any)
 - vi. Elevations, and details of any water level control weirs at the inlet and outlet
 - vii. Elevations of finished grades above the system.

HSH: A cross-section view of the basin and underground chambers has been added to Detail Sheets 9 & 10 (Sheet C10.9 & C10.10) and all requested information is shown on either the cross-section or plan view on the same sheet.

Geometric Design follows both Board of Health requirements and DEP Stormwater Handbook. Note that 4:1 side slopes are required on basin interiors and a 10' safety bench are required. The width of the top of the containment berm must be at least 10' wide. The Applicant's plans meet these requirements.

HSH: Concur

Minimum of 12 inches of freeboard provided. The Applicant's plans currently comply with this rule. However, this standard should be re-visited after the subsurface basin has been re-designed to account for a lower hydraulic conductivity rate, and any mounding analysis adjustments.

HSH: A memo from the Hydrogeologist can be found in Appendix N of the Supplemental Data Report.



Maintenance access has been provided (for basins). The Applicant's plans comply with this rule.

HSH: Concur

Soil hydraulic conductivity shall be based upon field borehole permeability tests. The Applicant has provided soil evaluations, which are an acceptable alternative to this rule.

HSH: Concur

Complete Boring Logs and Details of Calculations shall be submitted. This requirement is not applicable to the proposed design methodology.

HSH: Concur

Elevation of high ground water, elevation of underlying impervious layer (ledge or clay), and saturated thickness of underlying aquifer has been determined. The Applicant's test pits have adequately documented soils layers, and restrictive soil layers were not found. Not applicable.

HSH: Concur

- 14. Mounding of Groundwater shall be considered in the design.** Because the vertical separation from the bottom of the proposed surface and subsurface infiltration basins is less than 4-feet from ESHGW and basins are used to control peak flows, per the Massachusetts SWH, the Applicant needs to submit mounding analyses for the proposed surface and subsurface infiltration basins.

HSH: Mounding calculations have been completed and can be found in Appendix I of the Supplemental Data Report.

- 15. An infiltration structure for a 2-inch storm will have a minimum of 2 feet of vertical clearance (preferably 4 feet) to the high ground water with consideration of the groundwater mound.** The Applicant needs to demonstrate that this requirement is met for all infiltration systems after completing the work noted in Comment **Error!**

Reference source not found..

HSH: Mounding calculations have been completed that demonstrates compliance with the above requirement. These calculations can be found in Appendix I of the Supplemental Data Report.



16. **Ten-year storm will empty (infiltrate) in 24 hours maximum.** The Applicant should submit calculations to demonstrate that this condition is met for all infiltration systems after revising the surface and subsurface basin designs based on a lower saturated hydraulic conductivity rate (see Comment 1).

HSH: Calculations have been included within the Supplemental Data Report that show each infiltration system emptying within 24 hours regarding the 10-year storm event.

17. **100-year storm will empty (infiltrate) in 72 hours maximum.** The Applicant should submit calculations to demonstrate that this condition is met by the proposed basin after revising the basin design based on a lower saturated hydraulic conductivity rate (see Comment 1).

HSH: Calculations have been included within the Supplemental Data Report that show each infiltration system emptying within 24 hours regarding the 100-year storm event.

18. **Underground Infiltration Facilities shall be preceded by an Innovative/Alternative stormwater quality enhancement system that has had its performance verified by the Massachusetts Strategic Envirotechnology Partnership (STEP). Such I/A systems shall be required for all underground infiltration facilities. Units shall be designed to accept the flow rate from a 2-inch NRCS Type 3 Rainfall without by-pass.** The Applicant should submit evidence that the Rain Guardian systems (“Bunkers” and “Foxhole” proposed as pre-treatment practices for storm flow have had their performance verified by the STEP program, and that they can accept the flow rate from a 2-inch NRCS Type 3 Rainfall without by-pass.

HSH: Massachusetts STEP program was defunded in 2014. We have provided documents verifying the proprietary treatment units from third party testing, provided by the manufacturers of the BMPs. Please refer to Appendix C of the Supplemental Data Report.

19. **The stormwater management system shall have an operation and maintenance plan satisfactory to the Board of Health in accordance with Mass DEP guidelines and good engineering practice to ensure that systems function as designed. For stormwater facilities that are not publicly owned or maintained, the Board of Health shall require that an agreement shall be executed, subject to the approval of the Board of Health, for perpetual maintenance and operation of the**



stormwater system in order to guarantee the regular maintenance, repair, and replacement of any or all components as necessary. Subject to some recommended additions, the Applicant has submitted a satisfactory Operation & Maintenance Plan for the proposed stormwater BMPs; however as noted, an agreement between the Board of Health and the Owner (and ultimately the Homeowner Association) will need to be executed. See Comments 41 and 44.

HSH: Concur

Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards

The Applicant's Stormwater Management Report includes an evaluation of compliance with the Stormwater Management Standards as presented in the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook (SWH). The Project's compliance with Stormwater Management Standards are addressed for each standard below:

Standard 1: No New Untreated Discharges or Erosion to Wetlands. Compliance with this standard has been partially demonstrated. However, our concerns regarding use of alternative curbside pretreatment, and use of an inappropriate saturated hydraulic conductivity rate for the infiltration basin and the design revisions that may follow such revisions, need to be addressed prior confirmation of compliance with this standard. Also see additional comments under Standard 8 below.

HSH: The proprietary treatment device information has been provided within Appendix C of the Supplemental Data Report. A memo from the Hydrogeologist discussing the results of the testing can be found within Appendix N of the Supplemental Data Report.

Standard 2: Peak Rate Attenuation. Compliance with this standard has been partially demonstrated because the current design complies with Standard 2 and the current post-development peak flows do not exceed the pre-development runoff rates. However, we've raised concern on use of an inappropriate saturated hydraulic conductivity rate and the design revisions that may follow use of a revised rate, and mounding analyses results, must be addressed prior to confirmation of compliance with this standard.

HSH: See Appendix N of the Supplemental Data Report.

Standard 3: Stormwater Recharge. The intent of Standard 3 is to ensure that the infiltration volume of precipitation into the ground under post-development conditions is at least as much as the infiltration volume under pre-development conditions. Compliance with this standard has been



generally demonstrated, but based on flawed infiltration input. The Applicant needs to address the issues discussed in Comments 1 and **Error! Reference source not found.** to demonstrate that the surface infiltration BMP is properly designed in compliance with MA SWH requirements.

20. The Applicant needs to submit calculations proving adequate drawdown times for the surface infiltration detention basin, factoring in the requested revised saturated hydraulic conductivity rate. See Comment 1 above.

HSH: Calculations proving adequate drawdown times for surface infiltration detention basins has been provided within the Supplemental Data Report.

Standard 4: Water Quality. The Stormwater Report and design plans demonstrate that stormwater runoff from all paved areas will be collected and directed through pre-treatment and contained infiltration with the exceptions noted in Comments 11 and 18 which the Applicant must first address before this Standard can be stated as met. Also, address the following:

21. The Applicant must address the erosion control provisions noted under Standard 8 below before this Water Quality Standard can be stated as met.

HSH: All comments associated with erosion and control provisions have been addressed within the attached revised materials.

22. The Applicant must submit evidence that pretreatment performance for the Rain Guardian systems that are employed prior to discharge to the surface infiltration basin will comply with the Town's required pretreatment of the first 2-inches of rainfall, (also see Comments 18).

HSH: Calculations showing compliance with the Town's required 2-inches of runoff has been provided within the Supplemental Data Report.

23. SWH Standard 4 requires submittal of a *Long Term Pollution Prevention Plan (LTPPP)* to fully comply with Standard 9. The Applicant has submitted a plan to meet the other Standard 9 requirement, which is a "Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Plan" (in Appendix A of the project "Supplemental Data Report"), but this is not a LTPPP. The Applicant should submit a LTPPP that include includes procedures for the following:

- a. good housekeeping;
- b. storing materials and waste products inside or under cover;
- c. vehicle washing;
- d. routine inspections and maintenance of stormwater BMPs;



- e. spill prevention and response;
- f. maintenance of lawns, gardens, and other landscaped areas;
- g. storage and use of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides;
- h. pet waste management;
- i. operation and management of septic systems; and
- j. proper management of deicing chemicals and snow

HSH: A draft of the Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan including the aforementioned items has been included as Appendix A of the Supplemental Data Report.

Standard 5: Land Uses with Higher Potential Pollutant Loads (LUHPPLs). This standard is not applicable for the Project Site.

HSH: Concur

Standard 6: Critical Areas. The Project Site does not fall within a Critical Area and compliance with this standard is not required.

HSH: Concur

Standard 7: Redevelopment Project. This standard is not applicable for the Project Site.

HSH: Concur

Standard 8: Construction Period Pollution Prevention and Erosion and Sedimentation

Controls: The Applicant has provided plans and instructions for controlling erosion and sedimentation and is partially in compliance with this standard. However, the Applicant should review these and confirm (or revise to confirm) that the following comments are being addressed:

24. Because site contractors often seek to utilize proposed stormwater basin areas as temporary stormwater detention basins during construction, we recommend that the Applicant add a note to the Erosion Control Plan to specify procedures and temporary stormwater management controls to be followed during construction to ensure that the proposed surface and subsurface recharge basins will not be utilized for control of stormwater during construction. All runoff should be held entirely on the work site and the final basins shall not be used except for the completed project. If the Applicant finds that the aforementioned controls are not possible, then the need for utilizing the proposed surface and subsurface basins during construction must be discussed. As a minimum any check dam pools (say in the proposed swales) or at the surface detention basin used for temporary drainage during



construction must not overflow to the wetland buffer zone, and final excavation of the stormwater basins to finished bottom grades should not be completed until all other site construction and land disturbance work is completed; and only then shall the basin bottom areas be exposed and graded, and any accumulated siltation within the basin areas must be removed along with the required excavation to the final bottom grades.

HSH: Temporary sediment basins have been added to the Demolition and Erosion Control Plans (Sheets C3.1 and C3.2) of the plan set. Additional Erosion and Sedimentation Controls and narratives will be provided in preparation of the SWPPP and NPDES filing prior to construction.

25. Although a basic “General Construction Sequence” is provided on Detail Sheet 1 of 7 (Sheet C10.1) and in Appendix B of the Supplemental Data Report, provide supplemental plan(s) and narrative to explain the proposed sequence of work to manage stormwater during the Site construction. Provide details and narrative to explain how stormwater will be directed and maintained within the Site disturbance limits during construction, for example through sequenced placement of temporary diversion swales, temporary sediment traps/basins, etc. Keeping stormwater as close as possible to the source of generation is the preferred approach, and allowing Site stormwater to accumulate at one collection point is not preferred.

HSH: The management of stormwater during Site Construction will be developed with the selected site Contractor when completing the SWPPP and NPDES permit filing prior to construction. Howard Stein Hudson requests that this be made a condition prior to construction as items may differ dependent on the Contractor selected and the timing of the build out. The general sequence on Detail Sheet 1 has been updated to be more detailed.

26. Add a note to the Erosion Control Plan (Sheets C3.1, C3.2), and include discussion in the Appendix B narrative “Erosion Control and Sedimentation Control” to require that the Site Contractor: “Monitor and maintain the Stabilized Construction Entrance to ensure that it is cleaned and functioning correctly to prevent tracking of sediment by construction vehicles that exit the Site”.

HSH: A note has been added to Sheet C1.2 stating the above.

27. See note 10 on the Erosion Control Plan Notes (Sheet C1.2): We recommend replacing the word “mulch” and include the following: “a tarp or mulch can be used to cover stockpiles, and temporary seeding can also be applied”.



HSH: The aforementioned note has been revised to include the requested language.

28. Add some form of “Weekly Inspection and Maintenance Report Form” within “Appendix B, Erosion and Sediment Control Notes and General Construction Sequence”, and include inspection requirements for the following, at a minimum:
- a. Erosion Control Blanket Areas (e.g., for swale and basin side slope areas, and for any perimeter slope areas),
 - b. Temporary Sediment Control Basin(s) and Swales;
 - c. Temporary Stockpile areas,
 - d. Stabilized Construction Entrance,
 - e. Installations of “Compost Filter Socks”, and
 - f. Sediment traps to protect all proposed curbside inlet areas
 - g. Protection of the proposed 10-foot wide pervious parking shoulder areas.

HSH: The operation and maintenance forms can be used for weekly inspections, there are no dates specified in the empty table. We have added some of the above items to the regular operation and maintenance appendix. The other items and scheduling of inspections will be included in the SWPPP and NPDES permit filing prior to construction. Howard Stein Hudson requests that this be made a condition prior to construction as items may differ dependent on the Contractor selected and the timing of the build out.

There are several other recommended revisions for the Erosion Control Plan Notes (Sheet C1.2) and the Erosion Control Plan (Sheets C3.1 & C3.2) to specify controls and procedures as follows:

29. Add notes for stabilizing any new exposed slope areas - such as the slopes and channel bottoms along the proposed drainage swales, slopes along the project perimeter, and slopes at the surface basin, with erosion control matting as soon as the grading is completed. It is preferable for the erosion control matting to include mulch, grass seed and fertilizer, and be organic so as to degrade over time without removal.

HSH: Erosion Control Plan Note 18 on Sheet C1.2 has been revised to state “New, exposed slope areas, such as the slopes and channel bottoms along the proposed drainage swales, slopes along the project perimeter, and slopes at the surface basin must be stabilized with erosion control matting as soon as the grading is completed.”



30. Provide a detail to explain the proposed method to protect the various Rain Guardian curbside inlets (Rain Guardian Bunkers, and Rain Guardian Foxhole) from erosion sediment during the construction period, since it does not appear feasible to install silt sacks such as those detailed on the plans. Also address requirements to protect the proposed 10-foot wide pervious parking shoulder areas from the impacts of stormwater sediment.

HSH: All curbside inlets and pervious parking shoulders will be protected with the use of compost sock. These areas will be presented in more detail and shown on the final plan that will accompany the SWPPP which will be provided prior to the start of construction.

31. Remove any detail that calls for use of Haybales, and add a note that Haybale Silt Barriers are not allowed for catch basin protection.

HSH: Haybales have been removed from the plan set and a note has been added to Sheet C1.2 stating that the use of haybales for catch basin protection is not allowed.

32. Add notes to discuss procedures to protect the surface detention basin and the two subsurface chamber areas and prevent impacts during construction. Describe procedures to be followed during excavation and construction of these surface and subsurface basins, to remove unsuitable soils that may be encountered. Call for heavy equipment to avoid unnecessary compaction of soils. Describe a work sequence that employs erosion control BMPs and prevents discharge of excavated materials and prevents erosion into excavation for these BMP areas.

HSH: The surface infiltration basin and subsurface chamber areas will be protected with the use of construction fencing and compost socks during construction. The protection of these areas will be presented in more detail in the final SWPPP that will be submitted to the Town of Wrentham prior to the start of construction.

33. Prior to any excavation which may require removal of soil off site, the Applicant must apply for and obtain an Earth Removal Permit from the Planning Board in accordance with the Wrentham General Bylaw - Article 7.11.

HSH: An Earth Removal Permit is currently before the Planning Board for review.

34. Because the project will disturb over one acre, an eNOI must be filed with the USEPA and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared by the Applicant. We recommend that a Draft SWPPP be submitted to the Town now for review and comment. As part of the SWPPP preparation, we recommend that the erosion control information already



submitted be included in the SWPPP, and that erosion control notes and narrative should be upgraded, at a minimum, to describe how temporary measures, including construction phasing, are to occur, and be consistent with the *Massachusetts Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban and Suburban Areas* (1997, revised 2003) (hereinafter, MA E&S Guidelines), and be consistent with the methods noted in the E&S Guidelines starting at page 42. The erosion control narrative should also address restoration of temporary impacts that will occur due to construction (grading, retaining wall, etc.) within the 100-foot Buffer Zone.

HSH: A draft of the SWPPP is included as Appendix B of the Supplemental Data Report.

35. For the proposed stockpile area noted on the plan, describe what is to be stockpiled and reference a detail (to be placed on one of the detail sheets) of how the stockpile(s) will be protected (see item 38 below).

HSH: A note has been added to the Erosion Control Plan Notes specifying the types of materials that may be stockpiles with reference to a detail on a typical stockpile.

36. The Site entrance from Hancock Street has a proposed construction vehicle *Stabilized Construction Entrance*. This entrance area should be divided into two parts clearly marked as either “entry or exit only.” There is no need to clean vehicles that are entering as vehicles entering an exit zone will degrade the exit zone by compaction. (Also see Comment 39 below.)

HSH: The Demolition and Erosion Control Plan (Sheet C3.1) has been revised to show a separated construction entrance and exit. The detail on Detail Sheet 1 (Sheet C10.1) has also been revised.

37. Upgrade the notes on the erosion control plans to be consistent with methods noted in the MA E&S Guidelines starting at page 42, and address phasing of the work such that clearing, grubbing, and stabilization should be done in discreet areas at different times. It appears that tree clearing will be required for grading along the east property line and in the south half of the Site, including areas near to the proposed surface stormwater basin, and in areas within the 100-foot buffer zone on the west side and south end of the Site. Therefore, the erosion control narrative should explain in more detail how tree removal will occur, how felled logs will be removed from the site (landing areas, etc.), how grubbing will occur, and how erosion from the grubbed site and any sloped areas will be prevented until such areas are stabilized. (Also see Comment 33 above.)



HSH: The management of stormwater during Site Construction will be developed with the selected site Contractor when completing the SWPPP and NPDES permit filing prior to construction. Howard Stein Hudson requests that this be made a condition prior to construction as items may differ dependent on the Contractor selected and the timing of the build out. The general sequence on Detail Sheet 1 has been updated to be more detailed.

38. Add a detail for material stockpiles. Show how soil and other material stockpiles will be protected from wind and stormwater. This may be done with mulch, tarps, or annual seed mixes that are watered until growing, and ringed with a silt fence.

HSH: A temporary stockpile detail has been added to Detail Sheet 2 (Sheet C10.2) of the plan set.

39. Revise the Stabilized Construction Entrance detail (Sheet C10.1) to provide a stone pad zone that is slightly depressed and pitched in the center so as to drain off to one side into a limited drainage water catchment area. In addition to the detail revision, show this catchment area location on the Layout and Materials Plan (Sheet C4.1). The objective should be to clean the vehicles and have any drainage from the tracking pad captured off to one side so that silt and sediment are settled out and not re-tracked. In addition, add a note to call for personnel at the exit to supervise traffic direction and clean off vehicles with problems and ensure any material covers are in-place. One feature of the Town's IDDE Bylaw and eventual regulations will be a requirement to retain all drainage on-site. Failure to do so will result in fines and delays.

HSH: A detail on Detail Sheet 1 (Sheet C10.1) has been revised to include an entrance and exit as well as a depression to drain off to the side.

40. The SWPPP (to be prepared) and the erosion control plans should include the following additional procedural notes to help ensure that the Project contractor is informed of procedures that are important to the Town and so that construction activity minimizes erosion and associated impacts:

- a. The inspection of erosion control devices adjacent to the buffer zone and along downgradient areas will be done by the Applicant's Engineer, and once installation is determined to be accurate, the Engineer will send a letter to the Board of Health attesting to accuracy and describing any potential changes.



- b. The plan needs to state how often the Project Construction Supervisor will inspect the Site and the erosion controls. Also, the owner shall submit any changes to sequence or timing of construction or inspections to the Board of Health and Commission prior to implementation.
- c. To keep unauthorized grading machine traffic to a minimum, install a four-foot high, high-visibility limit-of-work (LOW) fence to enclose the work site and any non-active work areas.
- d. Catch basins and Rain Guardian devices on Site and any downgradient catch basin(s) in Hancock Street shall be covered until all surfaces in the watershed of the catch basin are stable and the stormwater management areas are fully constructed. If catch basins are required to be operational, these shall be protected by an approved method as detailed on the plans, and these shall be checked weekly and following any storm event, and cleaned sediment is captured.
- e. Stormwater must be managed in the work area and it must not be allowed to impact erosion control devices, nor be discharged outside of the Site work area.
- f. All grades or bare soil within the buffer zone, and any slopes or areas potentially draining near to a proposed infiltration practice or off site must be stabilized within 48 hours, and no discharge of sediment is to leave the Site.
- g. A stump grinder shall be used to make a mulch material that can be stockpiled and used throughout the Site for stabilization. Also, save leaves and other surface debris for similar use in stabilization of disturbed areas.
- h. The use of Haybales is not allowed on the Site. (The Applicant's submittals need to be revised to remove all references to Haybales). Only compost filter socks of minimum 8-inch height are to be employed, and these shall be backed by a silt fence and a high-visibility Limit-of-Work (LOW) fence. The Board of Health requires that the details for the filter mitt and wattle comply with the specifications of the Conservation Commission (see the Commission's web site).
- i. A LOW fence is required for abutting properties.



- j. No topsoil is to be imported to the Site unless required because of a shortage of topsoil gathered or stockpiled on the Site, and only if pre-approved by the Wrentham Conservation Agent.

HSH: All aforementioned information will be provided in the final SWPPP that will be submitted to the Town of Wrentham prior to construction.

Standard 9: Long Term Operation and Maintenance Plan and Long Term Pollution Prevention Plan. An Operation and Maintenance Plan has been submitted as part of the stormwater report, however this plan does not fully comply with Standard 9. This O&M plan should be amended as follows:

41. The O&M plan could include all relevant elements as required by Standard 9 for a Long Term Pollution Prevention Plan (LTPPP), or it may be preferable for the Applicant to submit a separate LTPPP document. The project Homeowners Association can utilize a LTPPP as a guide for property management. The LTPPP requirements are listed in Comment 23 above.

HSH: A Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan has been included as Appendix A in the Supplemental Data Report. This will be a “living” document that will be updated and revised as the SWPPP is prepared.

42. To fully comply with Standard 9, the Applicant should revise and confirm that their Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Plan at a minimum includes all of the following:
 - a. Stormwater management system owners;
 - b. The party or parties responsible for operation and maintenance, including how future property owners will be notified of the presence of the stormwater management system and the requirement for proper operation and maintenance;
 - c. A narrative description of the routine and non-routine stormwater system maintenance tasks to be undertaken by the Homeowner Association after construction is complete and a schedule for implementing those tasks;
 - d. A plan that is drawn to scale and shows the location of all stormwater BMPs in each treatment train along with the discharge point;
 - e. A description and delineation of public safety features; and



- f. An estimated Total Annual Operations and Maintenance Budget for all stormwater BMP systems combined.

HSH: The Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan has been included with the aforementioned items as Appendix A within the Supplemental Data Report.

- 43. The O&M Plan for stormwater facilities should include recommendations, which should also be included on the maintenance and inspection forms, regarding the frequency of inspection of the Rain Guardian systems' equipment and filters, with emphasis on requiring increased frequency of inspections during seasons when leaves, debris and sand will stress these filter systems, especially since these do not have deep sumps or oil/water hoods.

HSH: Proprietary maintenance and BMP information can be found in Appendix A and C of the Supplemental Data Report.

- 44. The O&M Plan should include recommendations for maintenance, and inspection forms for the infiltration basin overflow and inflow receiving areas.

HSH: The O&M Plan within the Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan includes recommendations for the infiltration basin overflow and inflow areas.

- 45. The O&M Plan should include recommendations for maintenance, and inspection forms for the 10-foot wide pervious parking shoulder areas.

HSH: The O&M Plan within the Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan includes recommendations for the pervious parking shoulders throughout the site.

- 46. Although snow storage areas have been shown on the "Layout and Materials Plan" (sheets C4.1 and C4.2) of the project plans, the O&M Plan should include this snow storage plan to show operators where snow storage should occur during winter storms. In addition, the Applicant should submit calculations that document the amount of snow accumulation that will be gathered during a typical snowstorm event from paved areas, and demonstrate that the calculated amount of required storage will be provided by the recommended snow storage zones. The following are suggested guidelines for such calculations:

- a. Calculate snow accumulation to occur after paving the Site (say per inch of snow)
- b. Calculate the maximum storage capacity of the various areas noted on the project plans (plus any new areas). Assume a maximum storage height based on 1:1 side slope snow storage that will fit within the designated snow storage footprints.



- c. From a. and b. above, and allowing for compaction, determine how many inches of snow can be effectively stored on the project Site, and by default, the excess volume that will require haul-away to an appropriate disposal site.
- d. Also, provide a response (in the project narrative) to discuss how the Site will comply with MADEP Snow Storage Guidelines which can be found at:
<https://www.mass.gov/guides/snow-disposal-guidance#-snow-disposal-guidance->

HSH: Snow storage calculations have been provided as Appendix K of the Supplemental Data Report and meets all standards set forth by the State.

DEP guidance, in part states: “Avoid disposing of snow on top of storm drain catch basins or in stormwater drainage systems including detention basins, swales or ditches. Snow combined with sand and debris may block a stormwater drainage system, causing localized flooding. A high volume of sand, sediment, and litter released from melting snow also may be quickly transported through the system into surface water.”

Standard 10: Prohibition of Illicit Discharges. An Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement has not been submitted and therefore this standard has not been met.

47. The Applicant should submit a signed Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement as discussed in the Massachusetts SWH.

HSH: A signed Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement has been provided.

Other Comments on the Project Submittals

48. Three (3) retaining walls are proposed: one along the southwest side (near to and/or touching the 200-foot outer riparian zone), one along the west side (near the 50-foot no disturb zone), and one on north side of the Site (near two abutters with frontage on Hancock Street). The wall heights on the southwest will vary from 1-foot to 4-feet, heights on the west wall will vary from 1-foot to 6-feet, and heights on the north wall will vary from 0.5-feet to 5-feet. These retaining walls need to be designed by a Massachusetts registered Structural Engineer. Calculations for factor of safety against Massachusetts registered Structural Engineer. Calculations for factor of safety against overturning, sliding and bearing capacity are required for any section over 4-feet in height, and the proximity of wetlands and possible high groundwater should be factored into the design. If the structural plans are provided by a wall manufacturer then the Board should require that the plans be based on site specific geotechnical information and the Board should not accept plans that are qualified by



requiring further determination of geotechnical conditions after issuance of the signed and sealed structural drawings.

HSH: All design and calculations associated with the retaining wall on site will be completed by a Massachusetts registered Structural Engineer and will be provided prior to construction. Howard Stein Hudson requests that the conditions of approval specify that the wall construction and impacts are not any closer to the resource areas than depicted in the plans currently under review.

49. Explain how construction of the three (3) retaining walls – one in close proximity to the 200-foot outer riparian zone on the southwest, one near the 50-foot no touch zone on the west, and one near to abutting properties on the north - will be possible without temporary disruption of these buffer zones or neighbors' land, and please designate an appropriate "temporary disturbance limit of work" line on the Grading and Drainage Plans (Sheet C5.2), and provide reasonable estimates of the area (in square feet) of temporary disturbance that will be required for access to, and construction of these retaining walls, and provide a restoration plan for the disturbances.

HSH: The walls and grading have been revised. Please see plans for distances to the critical design limits. The proposed Versa-lok wall system construction guidance requires a 2' wide trench for the installation of the base of the wall. The wall will then be battered away from the limit of work. No temporary disturbance will be necessary for installation of the wall. Howard Stein Hudson requests that the conditions of approval specify that the wall construction and impacts are not any closer to the resource areas than depicted in the plans currently under review.

50. Show the proposed downspout locations for all homesite roof drainage systems and check to be sure that the sub-catchment areas limits are not affected by roof leader locations.

HSH: Proposed downspout locations for the homesite roof drainage system has been provided as Appendix L of the Supplemental Data Report.

51. Provide details for the proposed post & rail guard rails to be used on site.

HSH: A detail of the proposed post and rail fence around the site has been added to Detail Sheet 2 (Sheet C10.2) of the plan set.

52. The entrance road catch basin CB-1 will be critical to preventing stormflow from draining into Hancock Street, and even if catch basin CB-1 is effective, the lack of grading detail at



the entrance road intersection with Hancock Street could still lead to water shedding into Hancock Street. Therefore, we have the following two recommendations:

- a. Provide calculations to show that the single grate catch basin CB-1 will be adequate to capture storm flow from the 4 storm events that have been analyzed without overflow/bypass into Hancock Street; and
- b. Provide a modest berm or rise in grade at the Site entrance, detailed with spot grades, to ensure that all sheet and gutter flow draining from the entrance road to Hancock Street will be directed to, and captured by CB-1. And conversely, such a berm or rise in grade must help prevent Hancock Street drainage from entering CB-1, (which should not enter CB-1 since the connected subsurface infiltration chamber system is not designed to accept such extra flow).

HSH: Flow from Hancock Street will not enter CB-1, the storm flows can be seen in the hydrocad analysis entering CB-1. More detail grading and flow paths have been added to the plan. If the grade in Hancock Street were to change, the overflow from the chambers or the overflow in Hancock Street would both lead to the wetland area to the north of the entrance road and enter into the larger wetland system on the subject property. During large storms in the existing conditions, the water flows into the headwall on the southern side of Hancock Street, as it is the only drainage structure on Hancock Street.

53. Provide calculations to show that the following curbside catch basins will adequately capture storm flow from the 4 storm events that have been analyzed without resulting in overflow/bypass: CB-2, CB-5 and CB-6.

HSH: Catch basin 2 is mainly an emergency overflow, fine grading has been done to ensure that it is not the main flow path for stormwater through open area, but if the catch basin were to discharge water, it would flow southerly through the green area inside the interior walkway and discharge into the foxholes at the low point in the road. The inlet catch basins have been designed per Massachusetts stormwater recommendations of less than a quarter acre of impervious area. Within the hydrocad, there is no surging in the outlet pipes, providing calculated analysis that the catch basins can capture the four storm events analyzed.

54. The drain manhole upgradient of DMH-6 should probably be labeled DMH-5. Please confirm and relabel it as appropriate.



HSH: The manholes have been re-labeled appropriately.

55. During the 100-year event, the HydroCAD model indicates that there will be some flooding over the headwall (top elevation 254) area near DMH-5 which could potentially impact Unit 5. Please redesign the headwall area and/or connecting pipe at the headwall to eliminate this condition.

HSH: The road is super imposed with the low side being the outside. The peak elevation in a 100-year storm is 253.93. If this were to overflow over the headwall, the water would continue down the curb line to the next catch basin. There is no potential damage to unit 5 as it is upgradient to the road.

56. Two (2) Area Drains are proposed: One at the toe of slope area east of the entrance road, and one in the yard area between Units 14 & 15. First, identify these Area Drains with numbers, and second, we recommend that standard 4-foot deep sump hooded catch basins be provided at these two locations instead of the small 6-inch diameter Nyloplast-ADS structures noted on details Sheet C10.5. These structures are transferring on-site flow to off-site locations, and these could potentially be classified as not complying with Standard 1 of the MA SWH. Please justify. [Also, if the use of these small Nyloplast-ADS structures is critically important for some reason, please explain and submit calculations to justify the capacity of these lesser alternatives for capturing and managing flows from the anticipated 4 storm events that are evaluated.]

HSH: Yard drains between units have been removed. The only remaining area drain along the entrance road is taking a small area, consisting of only grass, and is directed to enter SIS1, thus complying with standard 1. The area drain is modeled in hydrocad, and accepts all four storm events, an equivalent structure may also be used with sign off from the engineer prior to construction.

57. Update the HydroCAD model to include the following:
- a. Drainage flow through the proposed strip drain (located below the east side of the loop road next to the retaining wall) should be modeled appropriately, say as a trench pond with no exfiltration, relieved by a perforated collection/outlet pipe, and then routed through a solid pipe reach to the west side of the Site based on the pipe sizes and types as identified on Sheet C5.1

HSH: Infiltration strip drain has been removed and replaced with an ADS slot drain, that will collect water and transport through a 6" PVC pipe to SIS1. This is modeled in hydrocad with flows and max elevations in the 4



storm events and is of adequate size for the small amount of area flowing into it.

- b. Drainage flow from the area between Units 14 & 15 should be routed through a catch basin pond (see Comment 56 above) that flows through a reach to the outlet based on the pipe sizes and types as identified on Sheet C5.1

HSH: Elevations of the units have been revised as well as the grading to eliminate the need for a yard drain and allow water to flow into the street and through treatment BMPs and infiltration structures.