



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

January 24, 2022

Methuen Community Development Board
City Hall, Searles Building
41 Pleasant Street
Methuen, MA. 01844

Re: Definitive Subdivision at 23 Hampstead St, Methuen, MA
Response to Engineering Department provided by Stephen Gagnon dated December 22, 2021, and
Response to TEC peer review dated December 1, 2021

Members of the Board,

The following provides our response to peer review comments referenced above. We have included the peer review comments and our response to facilitate the Commission's review.

| <i>Comment / Response</i> | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Engineering Department Review | |
| <i>Comment 1:</i> | <i>The intended final ownership of the subdivision should be identified, i.e., City or Homeowners Association.</i> |
| <i>Response:</i> | The intention is for the Road to become a public road. |
| <i>Comment:</i> | <i>Comment addressed.</i> |
| <i>Response:</i> | <i>No response required.</i> |
| <i>Comment 2:</i> | <i>The cover sheet of the plan set requests the following waivers from the Subdivision Rules and Regulations:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Section 4.2.2.8 - Dead end streets.b. Section 5.7.1 - Sidewalks.c. Section 5.6.1 - Looped water main.d. Section 5.6.1 - 8" diameter water main. <i>I suggest in exchange for waivers a. and b. the Developer provide an additional inch of pavement thickness to the roadway, to increase its longevity and ultimately reduce future costs to the residents.</i> <i>I do not recommend waiver c. be granted. This waiver is contrary to the MassDEP Water Distribution regulations the city must follow.</i> <i>Annually, MassDEP completes a detailed audit of the City's water distribution system. Each year our score is adversely impacted due to dead</i> |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | <p><i>end water mains. The proposed water main could be easily looped to Applewood Ln. or Stoneybrook Rd., preventing the creation of a new dead-end water main and eliminating an existing dead end main.</i></p> <p><i>Waived d. cannot be granted, as DEP requires every water main which service a fire hydrant to be a minimum of 8" diameter.</i></p> |
| Response: | <p>Waivers A and B: We agree to the additional inch of pavement based on the approval of the waivers for pavement width and bituminous curb.</p> <p>Waiver C: There is currently no means of looping the proposed water main as no easements are in place. Furthermore, the cost associated with potentially looping the water main is significantly more than the cost to install the water main to serve the project and is cost prohibitive to the project.</p> <p>Waiver D: This waiver has been removed and 8" water main is proposed.</p> <p>Additional waivers have been added to the list.</p> |
| Comment: | <p><i>The pavement detail should be revised to depict 2½" binder and 1½" finish course.</i></p> <p><i>Waivers A and B - Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p> <p><i>Waiver C - I do not recommend granting this waiver. A looped water distribution system is critical for the proper operation of a domestic water system. Private wells should not be considered as adequate fire protection will not be provided. The nearest hydrant will be more than 500' from the dwelling on Lot 3.</i></p> <p><i>I would like to take a moment to restate why a looped water system is important. As you may be aware the domestic water treatment process involves several steps, concluding with disinfection utilizing a form of chlorine. The finish water leaves the treatment plant with a specific amount of residual chlorine sufficient to prevent bacteria growth in the distribution system. Chlorine decomposes over time; the rate of decomposition depends on environmental conditions such as water temperature. Consequently, a residual chlorine level of 1.4 PPM at the treatment plant will become 0.3 or less at the farthest reaches of the distribution network.</i></p> <p><i>In a dead-end water main, if water consumption is inadequate, the water may sit long enough for the chlorine to be completely depleted and allow bacteria to thrive. If the bacteria bloom is minor the</i></p> |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <p><i>situation may be resolved by flushing to expel the contaminated water and introduce new water with higher residual chlorine levels.</i></p> <p><i>Flushing wastes large amounts of water and labor and therefore should be avoided.</i></p> <p><i>In a looped water system, water with appropriate chlorine levels circulates through the system, maintaining sanitary conditions, preventing bacteria growth. Further, a looped water system is fed by two or more sources reducing the possibility of a service interruption or more importantly a loss of fire protection. This specific water loop will not only prevent a new dead end main, but it will also eliminate an existing dead end serving Stoneybrook Rd and Applewood Ln. According to the Water Distribution Superintendent the residents of Stoneybrook Rd and Applewood Ln. have had several service interruptions recently that could have been minor events had this water loop been in place.</i></p> <p><i>In his response, the Project Engineer states in part that the water loop cannot be provided as there are no easements in place to access a water main. It is my expectation the Developer would negotiate an easement with an abutter. Typically, a utility easement would be located along a property line, within the Zoning setback, thereby having little impact on the value of the subject property. In years past the Community Development Board would not hesitate to require a developer to secure the easements necessary to provide a properly designed utility. In fact, a brief review of some prior developments in the Methuen reveals more than 30 examples where utility easements on abutting properties were required and ultimately secured by Developers. Clearly, an easement to provide a properly designed water system is not an unreasonable ask. One final thought, the decisions the Board makes regarding the technical aspects of a subdivision may seem trivial however they have the potential to adversely affect the DPW for years to come.</i></p> |
| Response: | The pavement detail has been revised. We understand the reason for wanting a looped water main, however the length of water main required to loop the systems is about 3 times longer than the proposed water main itself and is not economically feasible for a project of this size. We have reached out to the abutters along Stoneybrook Road regarding the granting of an easement and have not received any response at this point. The granting of this |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|------------|--|
| | waiver would not further impact the water systems in the surrounding neighborhoods. |
| Comment 3: | Section 4.2.2.4 of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations requires roadway centerline offsets to be a minimum of 125'. The proposed roadway is offset only 110' from the private way known as Old Hampstead Street. |
| Response: | A waiver has been requested for this section. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 4: | Section 4.2.4.3 of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations requires a minimum length of 75' to be substantially level approaching an intersection. Approximately 25' has been provided. |
| Response: | The grading of the roadway has been revised to provide an average grade of less than 2% for 75'. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 5: | An analysis of the sight distance, at the intersection of the proposed road and Hampstead Street, should be provided. |
| Response: | A Traffic Memo which includes a sight distance analysis has been provided. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. However, the vegetation maintenance recommendations outlined in the traffic memo should be incorporated into the plan set. |
| Response: | The area within the right-of-way to be cut back for sight distance purposes has been added to the Grading and Drainage Plan. |
| Comment 6: | The proposed roadway will bisect the existing sidewalk on Hampstead Street. ADA/ABB compliant wheelchair ramps must be paid at each side of the proposed roadway. |
| Response: | ADA compliant ramps have been added to each side of the proposed roadway. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 7: | Subdrains should be provided along the roadway where the cut profile exceeds one foot. |
| Response: | A note has been added requiring the installation of a subdrain as required in the field. |
| Comment: | The note regarding subdrains, on sheet 6 of the plan set, states in part "where the site contractor deems necessary." The comment should be revised to state "subdrains shall be provided where cut exceeds one foot." |
| Response: | At our meeting on November 22, we had discussed this item and we discussed that groundwater was at least 45" below grade based on test pits and had agreed that we would depict subdrains where it was necessary and would leave it up to the contractor at the time of construction to install subdrains as needed. |
| Comment 8: | <i>It is not clear if the existing water mains in Hampstead Street are labeled correctly on the plan set. Regardless of the representation, the</i> |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|------------------|--|
| | <i>water connection for the subdivision must be made to the 12" diameter water main.</i> |
| Response: | The approximate location of the existing 12" main has been added to the plans. The connection of the proposed water main has been revised to connect to the existing 12" main. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 9: | <i>The plan should be revised to depict three gates at each connection to a water main.</i> |
| Response: | Three gate valves have been shown at the connection of the proposed water main. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 10: | <i>The proposed sewer service connections are depicted as 4" diameter on sheet 6 of the plan set. The plan should be revised to depict 6" diameter sewer service connections.</i> |
| Response: | The sewer service connections have been revised to 6" services. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 11: | <i>The plan set depicts approximately 125' of the roadway draining uncontrolled onto Hampstead Street. Catch basins should be provided to collect the stormwater before it reaches Hampstead Street.</i> |
| Response: | Catch basins have been added at the entrance of the proposed roadway. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 12: | <i>The proposed route maintenance vehicles are to access the infiltration basin should be identified on the plan set.</i> |
| Response: | The maintenance route has been added to the plan set. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 13: | <i>An underdrain should be provided in the infiltration basin so it can be dewatered for maintenance.</i> |
| Response: | An underdrain has been provided in the infiltration basin. |
| Comment: | Comment partly addressed - An underdrain is now depicted on the plan, but no information has been provided regarding pipe diameter, elevation, material etc. A complete construction detail should be provided. |
| Response: | A subdrain detail has been added to sheet 9. |
| Comment 14: | <i>The plan depicts the infiltration chamber outlet pipe discharging directly to Hampstead St. This is not acceptable as it will cause icing of the roadway and sidewalk in cold weather.</i> |
| Response: | The outlet from the subsurface infiltration area has been removed from the design. |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 15: | <i>In the profile view, the pipes entering DMH-1 from CB-1 & CB-2 are lower than the pipe exiting DMH-1. The plan should be revised accordingly.</i> |
| Response: | The profile has been revised to accurately depict the inverts of the drainage system. |
| Comment: | Comment not addressed. Some drainage structures do not have invert elevations. |
| Response: | The profile has been revised to show all drainage inverts. |
| Comment 16: | <i>The elevation of the flared end section on the infiltration pond outlet pipe does not agree in the plan set and the Stormwater Management Report.</i> |
| Response: | The elevation of the flared end has been revised. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 17: | <i>The Stormwater Management Report indicates Subcatchment P1B will flow overland before discharging directly into the infiltration chambers. The plan should be revised to provide pretreatment for the overland flow.</i> |
| Response: | The drainage design has been revised and no overland flow enters into the subsurface infiltration area. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 18: | <i>The plan depicts an existing 12" CMP entering the subject property from a catch basin on Hampstead Street. This pipe should be investigated, and its source determined.</i> |
| Response: | Additional detail was provided regarding the drainage system in Hampstead Street. No information was found regarding the pipe exiting the site. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 19: | <i>The soil logs provided in the Stormwater Management Report should be revised to provide an elevation for ESHGW and refusal.</i> |
| Response: | The soil logs have been added to the plan set and the elevation of the ESHGW have been added. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 20: | <i>The Operation and Maintenance Plan provided exceeds the ability of the Methuen DPW, should the Applicant wish the subdivision to be accepted by the city.</i> |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment: | <i>This issue will be further discussed during the Conservation Commission review.</i> |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 21: | <i>Under the heading of Infiltration Chambers, the Operation and</i> |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| | <i>Maintenance Plan states the Condo Association is the responsible party. Is this correct or a typographical error?</i> |
| Response: | The O&M has been revised to require the homeowner to be responsible for the maintenance of the subsurface infiltration area. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 22: | <i>The Applicant should consider installing a landscaped island in the cul-de-sac to reduce pavement costs and reduce impervious area and stormwater runoff.</i> |
| Response: | A landscape island has been added to the cul-de-sac. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 23: | <i>The plan depicts proposed grading adjacent to the east property line of Lot 4. A detail of this grading should be provided.</i> |
| Response: | A detail of the grading has been provided. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |

New Comments:

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Comment 1: | <i>Note 13 on page 4 of the plan set should be replaced with "6" thick concrete encasement extending 10' either side of the crossing."</i> |
| Response: | The note has been revised as requested. |
| Comment 2: | <i>Note 14 on page 4 of the plan set should be removed.</i> |
| Response: | The note has been removed. |
| Comment 3: | <i>Sheet 5 has a note that states "Prop reconstructed sidewalk along project frontage (see detail). I was unable to locate a corresponding detail. It should be noted the Construction Standard for curbing and sidewalk on a primary roadway is vertical granite curbing and cement concrete sidewalk."</i> |
| Response: | A detail has been added to sheet 4 showing the construction detail. As discussed in our November 22 meeting, we are proposing to replace the existing curb and sidewalk with similar construction as is in place today which is bituminous curb and sidewalk. |
| Comment 4: | <i>The hydrant detail should be revised to specify Mueller Centurion open left.</i> |
| Response: | The hydrant detail has been revised to specify a Muller Centurion open left. |

TEC Review Comments

| | |
|---|--|
| Site Plan & Application – Definitive Subdivision Regulations | |
| Comment 1: | <i>A discrepancy in the total lot area was noted in the Definitive Subdivision Application and Plans. The Application details a total lot area of 5.17 acres (as noted on the City of Methuen GIS), while the Definitive Subdivision Plans details a total site area of 4.87</i> |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|------------------|--|
| | acres. |
| Response: | The correct area of the project is 4.87 acres. |
| Comment: | Comment Addressed |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 2: | <i>As stated in Section 3.2.2.5 of the City of Methuen Subdivision Rules and Regulations (abbreviated further as MSRR), the proposed street name should be added to the plans.</i> |
| Response: | A road name of “Geramat Way” has been added to the plan set. |
| Comment: | Comment Addressed |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 3: | <i>TEC acknowledges the waivers requests in the Application and on Sheet 1 of the Definitive Subdivision Plans. TEC concurs with the terms of agreement for the two waivers (Sections 4.2.2.8 & 5.7.1) stated in the letter by Stephen J. Gagnon dated October 19, 2021. TEC also concurs with the statements regarding denial of the remaining two waivers based around the proposed water main.</i> |
| Response: | <p>Waivers A and B: We agree to the additional inch of pavement based on the approval of the waivers for pavement width and bituminous curb.</p> <p>Waiver C: There is currently no means of looping the proposed water main as no easements are in place. Furthermore, the cost associated with potentially looping the water main is significantly more than the cost to install the water main to serve the project and is cost prohibitive to the project.</p> <p>Waiver D: This waiver has been removed and 8" water main is proposed.</p> <p>Additional waivers have been added to the list.</p> |
| Comment: | <i>Regarding waiver D: comments addressed. Regarding waivers A-C & all additional waivers, TEC continues to defer to Stephon Gagnon and the City of Methuen on whether these waivers are acceptable.</i> |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 4: | <i>The proposed outlet invert is drawn higher than the inlet pipes within DMH 1. The inverts for this structure should be adjusted to be in accordance with Section 4.3.3.7 of the MSSR.</i> |
| Response: | The profile has been revised to correctly show the inverts of the drainage system. |
| Comment: | <i>TEC acknowledges the revisions on the profile, however inverts for the DMH 1, CB1, & CB 2 are no longer provided on the Definitive plan set. The applicant should revise the plans to detail all inverts for these structures.</i> |
| Response: | The Profile has been revised to show all inverts for DMH 1, CB1, and CB 2 |
| Comment 5: | <i>Per Sections 4.3.3.6 & 4.4.2.3 of the MSSR, drainage and sewer pipe designs respectfully have specific design velocity requirements. The applicant should provide pipe flow calculations for both systems to prove this design meets these requirements.</i> |
| Response: | Pipe flow calculations have been included in the Stormwater Report. |
| Comment: | <i>Regarding the drainage system & section 4.3.3.6 of the MSSR, comment address. Per section 4.4.2.3. of the MSSR, the applicant should provide sewer pipe design velocities for review.</i> |
| Response: | Sewer pipe sizing calculations have been included with this submittal. |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Comment 6: | <i>TEC recommends that the sewer service connections be drawn in the profile view on the plan & profile. It appears that the sewer service from Lot 4 may be too low to tie into the sewer main at the proposed location.</i> |
| Response: | The sewer services have been added to the profile view. Lot 4? |
| Comment: | Comment addressed |
| Response: | No response required |
| Comment 7: | <i>The sewer service detail calls for a 6" service diameter, but the Plan & Profile call for a 4" service diameter.</i> |
| Response: | The plans have been revised to depict 6" sewer services. |
| Comment: | <i>Regarding the Plan & Profile sheet and sewer service detail, comment addressed. However, the roadway cross-section detail shows a 6" PVC sewer under the roadway while the plan & profile detail an 8" PVC sewer. The applicant should revise this detail accordingly.</i> |
| Response: | The Roadway cross-section detail has been revised to show an 8" PVC sewer |
| Comment 8: | <i>Both CB 1 & 2 do not include the proposed use of gutter curb inlets. Per Section 5.3.8 of the MSSR, these catch basins should be revised to include gutter curb inlets.</i> |
| Response: | A waiver from this requirement has been requested. |
| Comment: | <i>See TEC response to Comment 3.</i> |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 9: | <i>Per Section 5.4.2.2 of the MSSR, all drainage pipes must be constructed of reinforced concrete. On Sheet 6 of the Definitive Subdivision Plan, the connection between CB 1, CB 2, and DMH 1 are detailed as 12" PVC. This should be revised to follow this Section.</i> |
| Response: | The drainage pipes have been revised to specify RCP. |
| Comment: | <i>TEC notes the change to the RCP for the pipes between these structures. However, there is no information stating the pipe type, size, lengths, or inverts on the definitive site plans. The applicant should revise the plans accordingly.</i> |
| Response: | All drainage pipes are labeled with size, material, length, and slope. |
| Comment 10: | <i>The proposed rim to invert elevation for CB 1 is just under 3'. This invert should be revised to have at least 3' of separation per Section 5.4.3.4 of the MSSR.</i> |
| Response: | The rim to invert separation has been revised to provide at least a 3' separation. |
| Comment: | Comment Addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Site Plan - General | |
| Comment 11: | <i>The typical section calls for sloped granite curbing on both sides of the roadway. The Applicant should confirm that curbing is proposed around the full extents of the roadway, and TEC recommends adding a leader to call out the proposed curbing on the Plan.</i> |
| Response: | A waiver has been requested to allow for bituminous curbs to be installed. Curbing is proposed along the full extents of the roadway. A label has been added to the Plan and Profile sheet calling out the curbing. |
| Comment: | <i>TEC recommends using sloped granite as originally shown on the typical section. Bituminous curbing will become a long-term maintenance issue for the city.</i> |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Response: | The bituminous curb has been discussed with the Engineering Department and in lieu of sloped granite curbing, we are in agreement to proposed bituminous curb and increase the depth of pavement for the roadway. |
| <i>Comment 12:</i> | <i>The maximum building coverage and open area requirements should be added to the zoning table on Sheet 3 of the Definitive Subdivision Plans.</i> |
| Response: | The maximum building coverage and open space requirements have been added to the table. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| <i>Comment 13:</i> | <i>TEC recommends that a building square footage should be added on each proposed building.</i> |
| Response: | The square footage of each footprint has been added to the plan set. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| <i>Comment 14:</i> | <i>There appears to be some existing vegetation at the rear corner of abutting lot 75-3. The plans should identify if this vegetation will be removed or a portion will remain. Location of individual trees may be required in this area in order to preserve the natural buffer.</i> |
| Response: | The existing vegetation will mostly be removed as the drainage line is proposed through the area of trees. |
| Comment: | TEC recommends that the plan be revised to clearly identify that these trees will be removed. |
| Response: | A note has been added to the plans stating “Exist. Trees within drain easement to be removed as needed” |
| <i>Comment 15:</i> | <i>It appears that the proposed tree line does not appropriately tie into the existing tree line at the south west property line of Lot 4.</i> |
| Response: | The tree line has been revised. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| <i>Comment 16:</i> | <i>TEC suggests the addition of proposed gas and electric connections to the proposed and existing dwelling(s) on Sheet 6 of the Definitive Subdivision Plans.</i> |
| Response: | Gas and underground electric have been added to the plan and profile sheet. |
| Comment: | Regarding the proposed gas connections, comment addressed. The proposed underground electric only shows connections from the cul-de-sac center to the proposed buildings. The plans should be revised to indicate is the underground electric will be extended to the street. |
| Response: | The underground electric has been extended to Hampstead Street. Note 3 has been added to the Plan and Profile Sheet. |
| <i>Comment 17:</i> | <i>On Sheet 6 of the Definitive Subdivision Plans a few issues were noted regarding the proposed utility profile:</i> <i>a. Pipe lengths of sewer pipes are labeled in inches, not feet.</i> <i>b. The inverts into DMH 1 should be specified for each CB they connect to.</i> <i>c. The invert out of CB 1 is labeled as an invert in.</i> |
| Response: | The sewer pipe labels have been revised. The Inverts into DMH 1 have been specified. The label for CB 1 has been revised to show the invert out. |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Comment: | <i>Regarding the sewer pipe labels, comment addressed. Regarding the labels for DMH 1 & CB 1, inverts and pipe sizes/materials should be added to the plans.</i> |
| Response: | The labels for DMH 1 & CB 1 have been revised to include inverts and pipe size/material. |
| Comment 18: | <i>On Sheet 7 of the Definitive Subdivision Plans a few issues were noted as listed below:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. <i>Erosion Control barriers are proposed in front of the existing driveways for the existing dwelling. A gap should be provided if this dwelling will be occupied during construction.</i>b. <i>Multiple areas of proposed grading cross the proposed silt sock line across the pxx lots. The silt sock positioning should be adjusted to provide a gap (3' recommended) between the work zone and the protected areas.</i>c. <i>The proposed silt sock crosses directly over the proposed rip rap for the outlet of Outlet Structure 1.</i> |
| Response: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. The existing dwelling is vacant and will ultimately access via the proposed roadway.b. We did not find any areas where the proposed grading crosses the erosion control barrier. The erosion control barrier has been revised to provide a 3' gap between the limit of work and the protected area.c. The erosion control barrier has been revised to avoid crossing the rip-rap. |
| Comment: | <i>Comment addressed.</i> |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 19: | <i>A detail should be provided for the inlet structure placed on top of the proposed subsurface infiltration system.</i> |
| Response: | This structure is no longer part of the stormwater design. |
| Comment: | <i>Comment addressed.</i> |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 20: | <i>On Sheet 9 of the Definitive Subdivision Plans, multiple details reference HDPE pipes, but none are referenced on the other sheets.</i> |
| Response: | All references to HDPE pipe have been revised to specify RCP pipe. |
| Comment: | <i>Comment addressed.</i> |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Stormwater Report | |
| Comment 21: | <i>Upon adjustment of the proposed catch basin locations (as suggested in the letter by Stephen J. Gagnon dated October 19, 2021), the water quality calculations should be adjusted to include the additional impervious area leading to these catch basins.</i> |
| Response: | The water quality calculations that were provided accounted for all of the roadway areas. |
| Comment: | <i>Comment addressed.</i> |
| Response: | No response required |
| Comment 22: | <i>TEC suggests the Water quality calculations and TSS removal calculations include information for the proposed subsurface infiltration system.</i> |
| Response | The design has been revised and the proposed subsurface infiltration area only takes flow directly from the roof of the dwelling on Lot 4. No TSS or water quality calculations are |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

| | |
|--|--|
| | required. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 23: | <i>The contribution to TSS Removal from deep sump hooded catch basins should be added to the TSS removal calculations.</i> |
| Response: | The TSS removal calculations have been revised to include the catch basins and sediment forebay as pretreatment prior to the infiltration basin. |
| Comment: | Comment addressed. |
| Response: | No response required. |
| Comment 24: | <i>The estimated seasonal high water table near the proposed infiltration basin within proposed Lot 2 is less than 2' below the bottom of the proposed basin based on the provided Test Pit 21-9. A revision in design of the basin is required to meet the 2' minimum separation between the estimated seasonal high water table and the bottom of basin per Volume 2 Chapter 2 of the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook. The ESHWT value on the Infiltration Basin Cross-Section on Sheet 9 of the Definitive Subdivision Plans should also be revised accordingly.</i> |
| Response: | The infiltration basin has been revised to provide a 2' separation to ESHGW. |
| Comment: | <i>Based on the revised design on sheets 7 & , the proposed infiltration basin still does not provide the 2' minimum separation between the estimated seasonal high-water table and the bottom of the basin. The ESHWT value reported for TP 21-8 is 176.6 based on the information on sheet 10. However, the ESHWT shown on the infiltration basin cross-section is labeled at 175.5 which is not detailed on any test pits. The applicant should revise accordingly.</i> |
| Response: | We believe there is at least a 2' separation to groundwater from the bottom of the basin. TP21-7 has ESHGW of 178.5 and the bottom of basin is 181.6. TP21-8 has an ESHGW at 176.6 and the bottom of basin is at 178.6. TP21-9 has an ESHGW at 178.4 and the bottom of basin is at 181.2. The lowest elevation of the basin is 177.5 and the existing grade is 179.5. With ESHGW in TP21-8 of 49", the lowest point of the basin will have just over 2' separation to groundwater. |
| Additional Comment - Stormwater | |
| Comment: | <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. <i>Sheet 5 labels the chambers as a roof drywell. Sheet 10 shows a detail labeled subsurface infiltration area. These labels should be revised to be consistent for clarity.</i>b. <i>The subsurface area elevations are not consistent with the dimensions of the detail. (Bottom chambers = 183.00 + 30" chamber height = 185.5, not 186.50)</i>c. <i>The "Subsurface Infiltration Area Detail" shows what appears to be an outlet pipe and manifold system labeled with a dimension "0.5". This is not shown on the site plan sheet 5.</i> |
| Response: | <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. The Detail on sheet 10 has been revised to read "Roof Drywell Detail"b. The subsurface elevations have been corrected.c. There is no outlet pipe coming from the roof drywell. The 0.5' dimension is the labeling the width of stone between chambers. |



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

We trust this response letter provides the necessary information for the Board's consideration of the request for completeness. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact our office at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Millennium Engineering, Inc.



James Melvin, P.E.
Project Manager

w/ Attachments

Massachusetts: 62 Elm Street - Salisbury - MA - 01952
New Hampshire: 13 Hampton Road - Exeter - NH - 03833
www.Mei-MA.com

Phone: 978 - 463 - 8980 Fax: 978 - 499 - 0029
603 - 778 - 0528 603 - 772 - 0689
www.Mei-NH.com