



Civil Engineers

EXHIBIT 46  
Received 2/22/17

February 22, 2017

Mr. Joseph Laydon  
Town Planner  
Grafton Municipal Center  
30 Providence Road  
Grafton, MA 01519

**RE: Estates at Bull Meadow  
Response to Peer Review Comments  
Dated November 01, 2016**

Dear Joe:

McCarty Engineering Inc. (MEI) is in receipt of a review letter dated February 13, 2017 prepared by Graves Engineering, Inc. (GEI) relative to the Bull Meadow Estates proposed subdivision off Appaloosa Drive. This letter is in response to the revised definitive subdivision application materials submitted to the Town of Grafton and to GEI on January 23, 2017.

For ease of review, the Graves Comment is shown below with MEI's response provided below it in italic font. Additionally, comments previously addressed and acknowledged by the Town and GEI have been omitted.

The comments received are as follows:

**Subdivision Rules & Regulations**

**Subdivision Rules & Regulations (SR&R)**

- 5. The profile for Paddock Ridge Drive shows fill greater than 6 feet between stations 12+75 and 14+60. We understand a waiver request was submitted and will be reviewed by the Planning Board. (§4.1.2.1.b).*

**No further comment necessary.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

6. The minimum K requirement for vertical curves was not met at station 12+24 (proposed sag curve with K=27) and at station 13+81 (proposed crest curve with K=6). (§4.1.5.3)

November 1, 2016:

The minimum K requirement for a crest vertical curve is 28, however, a crest curve with K=7 is proposed at station 13+81. The Engineer responded that the curve meets the AASHTO requirement regarding sight distance for a design speed of 20 MPH. Nevertheless, the grades of the approach tangents are shallow and the height of the crest curve is low, such that a driver located in the low point of the road on one side of the vertical curve will be able to see an object in the road at the low point on the opposite side of the vertical curve. In short, based upon the information submitted with the revised plans and upon further evaluation of sight lines, we do not take issue with the sight distance provided at the crest curve and we find the K value of 7 to not be unreasonable in this particular situation.

As for the sag vertical curve at station 12+24, the plans were revised to propose a K of 28. The issue at hand is the ability to observe objects in the road if illuminated by a vehicle's headlights. In our opinion, the plans should be revised to provide a minimum K of 35 as required. Such a revision will require the length of the vertical curve to be extended from 164 feet to 208 feet and will result in the low point of the vertical curve being moved approximately sixteen feet and raised approximately 0.9 feet, thereby not impacting the efforts already made to address stormwater management.

**Our opinion of the proposed crest vertical curve at station 13+81 stands; the proposed vertical curve is not unreasonable in this particular situation. As for the sag vertical curve at station 12+24, GEI acknowledges that the plans were revised to provide a K of 35 as requested.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

7. Street lights were not shown on the plans. (§4.7.6)

**Acknowledged. Street lights have been added to the plans. We understand that the applicant will have to coordinate the final street light locations with the Grafton Board of Selectmen.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

8. The three hydrants proposed along Paddock Ridge Drive between Carriage House Lane and Bridle Ridge Drive are proposed at spacing greater than the required maximum of 500 running feet. If not already done, the Planning Board may wish to solicit comments from the Fire Department and Grafton Water District relative to hydrant locations. (§4.7.7.1)

**The Engineer responded that they will solicit a response from the Grafton Fire Department and Water District.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

11. Concrete sidewalk needs to be shown across driveways. (§4.9.1)

**The Engineer responded that a waiver has been requested not to install concrete sidewalks across proposed driveways. GEI has not received any**

**additional waivers as a part of this submittal; we understand waiver requests will be submitted directly to the Planning Board for review.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

14. Retaining walls are proposed within the Paddock Ridge Drive right-of-way between stations 12+50± and 14+45± and a waiver was requested. We understand that the Town of Grafton requires retaining walls to be outside the rights-of-way. (Schedule E, Standard Cross Section Minor Street B)

**No further comment. Please also see Comment #28.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

### **Stormwater Management & Hydrology Review**

22. Soil testing has not yet been performed at Infiltration Basin 2 to demonstrate compliance with MassDEP's required two-foot offset to seasonal high groundwater. Based upon the soil testing data that was submitted (for fifteen building lots and Infiltration Basin 1), the proposed elevation for Infiltration Basin 2 does not appear to be unreasonable. Nevertheless, soil testing will have to be performed at infiltration Basin 2.

**The Engineer responded that soil testing will be conducted after Conservation Commission approval. Soil testing will also need to be performed at Infiltration Basins 3 and 4. Considering the extent of soil testing done to date, GEI does not take exception to this approach.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

24. There is an unlabeled area shown on the Proposed Conditions Watershed Plan in front of Subcatchment Lot 13.

**Acknowledged. The Proposed Conditions Watershed Plan was revised; the area in question has been combined with Area 1A, which is reasonable.**

**Comment Satisfied: 1/23/2017**

*Response: Acknowledged*

### **General Engineering Comments**

28. Guardrails and pedestrian barriers (e.g. chain link fences) need to be provided at the tops of the retaining walls.

November 1, 2016:

A four-foot chain link fence has been added to the Precast Concrete Retaining Wall Detail, however, no guardrail is proposed between the roadway and the retaining wall. We believe a cross section of the right-of-way at the wetland crossing should be

provided to show the proposed roadway, retaining walls, chain link fences, guardrails, sidewalk, and utilities.

**A cross section of the right-of-way at the wetland crossing has been added to Sheet 23. GEI respectfully defers to the Planning Board regarding the location of the retaining walls at the wetland crossing. We offer the following for consideration: the cross section did not include a grass strip between the roadway's sloped granite edging and the sidewalk. This grass strip would serve the purpose of separating pedestrians from vehicular traffic and for snow storage (otherwise snow storage will occur on the sidewalk). Ideally, a grass strip should be provided. However, if the cross section is to be implemented then the sloped granite edging on the sidewalk-side of the street should be changed to vertical granite curb to better prevent drivers from being able to drive onto the sidewalk.**

*Response: The sloped granite edging has been revised to sloped granite curbing within the wetland crossing limits.*

### **General Comments**

29. We understand that the Planning Board or its staff will review any impact reports.  
**No further comment necessary.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

30. We understand that the Grafton Water District will review the proposed water utility infrastructure.  
**No further comment necessary.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

31. We are not aware if a meeting has occurred with Town staff/departments to address the configuration of the existing Appaloosa Drive cul-de-sac. At issue is whether the cul-de-sac should remain as is, be configured with an island or reconfigured as a through road. (MRSP 2014-8, Condition C3)  
**No further comment.**

*Response: As discussed at the Planning Board meeting on 2/13/2017, the cul-de-sac has been reconfigured to a through road.*

### **Additional Comments: January 19, 2017**

37. The plans were revised to eliminate individual proprietary stormwater treatment units at certain catch basins in favor of a single proprietary treatment unit on the main line of each drainage system. GEI has no issue with this change, which we understand was requested by Grafton DPW. Supporting documentation was not submitted for the new proprietary units. For the record, Stormceptor sizing calculations and calculations to convert water quality volume to flow rate for sizing proprietary stormwater treatment practices (in accordance with MassDEP requirements) must be submitted for the proposed treatment units at DMH12 and DMH 13. Information was

already submitted for the proposed treatment units at DMH 2, DMH 7A and DMH 9A (this unit was formerly proposed on the same drainage line at DMH 8).

**Acknowledged. Stormceptor sizing calculations and calculations to convert water quality volume to flow rate for sizing proprietary stormwater treatment practices were submitted for the proposed treatment units at DMH12 and DMH 13. The information is in order.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

38. On Sheet 14, the profile view references a STC 450 stormwater treatment unit at DMH 8; this reference must be deleted. The treatment unit is now proposed at DMH 9A.

**Acknowledged. The profile view of Sheet 14 was revised to reference a treatment unit only at DMH-9A.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

39. Upon further review, on Sheet 17, the 18" diameter drain pipes between DMH 14 and DMH 17 have pipe slopes that will result in excessive water velocities; velocities greater than 12 feet per second (fps). The pipe slopes need to be adjusted. Drops at the manholes may be necessary.

**The plans were not revised. The design engineer responded that the existing outlet pipe from the abutting North Grafton Estates project should not have been allowed to discharge across an adjacent private property without an established easement and that this condition is causing a hardship on the Bull Meadow project by adding significant cost. We'd like to address three points:**

- a. **With respect to the pipe discharge at the applicant's up-gradient property line, we believe that the design engineer is referring in general to a situation whereby existing stormwater runoff is distributed across a certain area and then under proposed conditions is to be concentrated and discharged at a specific point. If our understanding is correct, then we agree with the general reasoning that the creation of concentrated point sources should be avoided unless site-specific conditions necessitate otherwise.**
- b. **At the specific location of concentrated flow (the pipe outlet) and prior to construction of the abutting subdivision, there was a well-defined concentrated stormwater discharge point (i.e. a topographic valley or a swale) at the location of the pipe outlet. This situation is well-documented by way of the surveyed existing conditions topography and the pre-development hydrology modeling of the abutting project. The tributary area to this point at the property line consists of approximately 28.5 acres. In fact, the topographic valley can also be observed on the locus map on the Cover Sheet of the Bull Meadow Estates Definitive Plans. The topography on the Cover Sheet (ten-foot contour intervals) shows a channel originating to the west of the Bull Meadow Estates project,**

- entering onto Bull Meadow Estates and terminating at a wetland on or near Lot 1. The plans show that the channel passes across the back of Lots 3 and 4 in what appear to be areas of the lots not to be disturbed, then the channel passes across portions of Lots 1 and 2 that are proposed to be developed. In short, the existing pipe up-gradient of Bull Meadow Estates did not create a new point of concentrated flow; the concentrated flow existed regardless of the abutting project.
- c. Relative to the slope of the proposed 18" pipe, the design engineer was diligent in addressing water velocity at the discharge-end of the pipe; the lowest 250+/- feet of the pipe system is proposed with a slope that will provide satisfactory water velocities. Nevertheless, it is in the Town's long-term best interest to avoid excessive water velocities throughout the pipe system to avoid long-term scour of the pipes' interior caused by suspended debris in the stormwater. To address pipe slopes, the depths of three manholes in their present locations could be revised: DMH 14 (1.2+/- ft. deeper), DMH 15 (6.7+/- ft. deeper) and DMH 16 (1.7+/- ft. deeper). To reduce pipe slopes and generally maintain similar pipe depths, the manhole locations could be adjusted (e.g. move DMH 16 to station 1+60+/- and add a DMH at station 3+70+/-) concurrent with the pipe slope revisions. In short, although velocity at the discharge end is not an issue, ideally the entire pipe system should not be subject to excessive water velocity.

*Response: The cross country drainage has been revised to reflect the following: Additional drain manhole at STA 3+62 (DMH 16A), revised the location of DMH 16, and revised pipe slopes from DMH 14 to DMH 17. The modifications resulted in a maximum pipe slopes of 4% which reduced the velocities in the pipe run to below 12 feet per second. See attached revised Pipe Sizing Spreadsheet.*

40. On Sheet 24 at the "Granite Bound Detail", the leader-note of bound dimensions (32" long) and the depth dimension (4'-0") need to be revised to require a five-foot long bound. (SR&R §5.11.1) Also, please note that it has been the policy of the Grafton Planning Department that bounds in lawn areas and other areas subject to mowing or personal activities (e.g. play areas) be installed flush with the ground surface as proposed, but bounds in wooded areas and other areas not subject to mowing or regular human activity be installed approximately six inches above finished grade. The construction detail should be revised accordingly.

**Acknowledged. The "Granite Bound Detail" on Sheet 24 was revised.**

*Response: Acknowledged*

We trust that the responses provided above satisfactorily address the comments raised by Graves Engineering, Inc. We will prepare a revised set of Plans and forward them to the Town for review.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,



Brian Marchetti, PE  
Vice President

CC: Project File  
Applicant  
Jeff Walsh, PE - Graves Engineering, Inc.