

January 23, 2020

Newburyport Planning Board  
c/o Ms. Bonnie Sontag, Chair  
60 Pleasant Street  
Newburyport, MA 01950

**RE: Response to Philip G. Christiansen, PE Review Comments  
Smart Growth Redevelopment – 3 Boston Way**

Dear Members of Board:

On behalf of Three Boston Way, LLC (Applicant), The Morin-Cameron Group, Inc. (MCG) has provided the following responses to comments issued by Philip G. Christiansen, PE (PGC) on November 4, 2019.

Included with this submission is the following:

- Civil/Site Plans and Constructions Details entitled "3 Boston Way Newburyport, MA Sheets C-1 - C-9" prepared by MCG on October 23, 2019 and revised through January 23, 2020.
- "Drainage Report" prepared by MCG on October 23, 2019 and revised through January 23, 2020.

While Mr. Christiansen's comments were written in paragraph form, they are represented below in numbered format for clarity. The **PGC** comments are italicized below, followed by the **MCG** response:

**Drainage Report Narrative**

**1.PGC:** *The following sentence appears in the second paragraph of Existing Site Description:*

*"Stormwater from most of the parking area and the large existing building is captured in an existing catch basin between the two buildings, which leads to a drainage swale along the western edge of the property....."*

*The flow path shown in Figure 5 Existing Site Development Watershed for subcatchment E1 does not conform to the description above. The flow from the large building and the parking lot is shown to flow to the east to a swale that flows to the north then turns westerly to flow to Design Point 1.*

*The text should be corrected to reflect Figure 5 or Figure 5 should be modified to reflect the text.*

**1.MCG:** The description of the flow path on page 3 of the narrative was updated to reflect Figure 5.

**2.PGC:** *In the third paragraph it is stated "The entire site is shown to be outside of Zone X on the FEMA" map yet on Sheet C-1 the "Limit of the FEMA Flood Hazard Zone AE (El=10)" is shown in the area of the constructed stormwater wetland on 1 Boston Way and the 10 elevation extends into 3 Boston Way. There is a Flood Note on the plan.*

*My review of the FEMA map 25009C0117G is that the entire site is in Zone X which is an area of minimal flooding therefore not included in the AE zone which is shown as being on the opposite side of Boston Way. However, the area of the constructed stormwater wetland is below elevation 10 (the FEMA flood elevation) and the culvert connects that area to the AE zone across the street.*

CIVIL ENGINEERS • LAND SURVEYORS • ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS • LAND USE PLANNERS

66 Elm Street, Danvers, MA 01923 978.777.8586 FAX 978.774.3488

Providing Professional Services Since 1978

www.morincameron.com

*The engineer should explain the differences and how the FEMA flood designation effects the proposed design.*

- 2.MCG:** Although it is not accurately represented on the FEMA maps, the subject property is connected to the "AE" Flood Zone (El=10) across Boston Way by the existing 30" culvert. The FEMA Map is only an approximation of the flood limits, which were then refined and updated by MCG based on the topographic survey data. In this case, the elevation 10 contour is considered to be the 100-year flood elevation. Based on this information, the culvert will operate under a tailwater condition during the 100-year flood event. However, this is the case in both the existing and proposed condition, and the proposed project will not negatively impact the drainage characteristics. During more typical storm events, the culvert will be free-flowing without any impacts from tailwater.
- 3.PGC:** *In the Stormwater Management section of the report within the Existing Watershed Characteristics a reference is made to an "existing constructed stormwater wetland". A site inspection and aerial views of the property show the area to be overgrown and it is difficult to determine that it is a "constructed stormwater wetland". If it is a stormwater facility it hasn't been maintained. The engineer should confirm the area is as described. If it is a Constructed Stormwater Wetland its role as a detention pond should be accounted for in the calculations. The detention capabilities of the proposed constructed storm water wetland should also be accounted for in the calculations.*
- 3.MCG:** While the area is currently overgrown and not functioning correctly, the existing constructed stormwater wetland was previously redesigned and approved during the permitting for the 1 Boston Way property. In order to fully account for the flow dynamics of the culvert and the upstream ponding area, the HydroCAD model has been updated to represent both existing and proposed conditions. Additionally, a tailwater elevation of 10.0 was applied to the 100-year storm to account for the FEMA flood elevation of 10.0.
- 4.PGC:** *The description of water flow in Subcatchment E1 as contained in Description of Existing Subcatchments matches what is diagramed in Figure 5 but is contradictory to the language in the existing site description as noted above. E1 should be expanded westerly to include to the center line of Boston Way and expanded northerly to include all of the area on 1 Boston Way that will contain improvements for the proposed project as shown on sheet C-3.*
- 4.MCG:** These additional areas are now included in Figure 5, the existing HydroCAD analysis and the description of existing subcatchments.
- 5.PGC:** *The description of Subcatchment E2 should be expanded to include the slope to the north of the MBTA parking lot and the land to the east up to the railroad tracks. Figure 5 should be modified accordingly.*
- 5.MCG:** This area was included in Figure 5, the existing HydroCAD analysis and the description of Subcatchment E2.
- 6.PGC:** *As described in Summary of Proposed Subcatchments stormwater from Subcatchment P1A flows to a proposed catch basin. The Flow path for P1A as shown on Figure 6 should be corrected to terminate at the catch basin as described in the text. The area of P1A should be expanded in the description as well as in Figure 6 to include the improvements to be made on 1 Boston Way for the proposed project.*
- 6.MCG:** The area was adjusted to include 1 Boston Way, and the time of concentration path was updated.
- 7.PGC:** *Area P1B should be expanded in the description as well as in Figure 6 to include Boston Way to*

*the centerline and the area to the North of P1B on 1 Boston Way that is to be modified for the proposed project.*

- 7.MCG:** These areas are included in Figure 6, the proposed HydroCAD analysis and the description of the proposed subcatchments.
- 8.PGC:** *Subcatchment P2A should be expanded to the east up to the railroad tracks and to the south up to the MBTA parking lot. Figure 6 should be changed accordingly.*
- 8.MCG:** This area is included in Figure 6, the proposed HydroCAD analysis and the description of Subcatchment P2A.
- 9.PGC:** *The discharge from Subcatchment P2B does not discharge to DP1 as stated in the text but rather discharges to the constructed stormwater wetlands and thence to DP1. The text should be corrected.*
- 9.MCG:** The text was modified to reflect the stormwater discharge to the constructed stormwater wetland prior to DP1.

### **Review of Stormwater Management Standards**

- 1.PGC:** *It is stated in the text that Standard 1 is met and each of the three boxes showing compliance with standard 1 on the Checklist are checked. There aren't any new untreated discharges*

*However, calculations have only been provided for the discharge velocity from the discharge pipes as contained in the HydroCAD analysis but calculations of potential erosion from the outfall have not been provided as required by Volume 3 of the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook.*

*The locations of the discharges are not on the applicant's property. If as shown in the calculations the proposed discharge velocity is less than or equal to the existing velocity, there won't be any change in the effect on the wetlands.*

*In my opinion if the discharge velocity remains the same under proposed conditions as under existing conditions the project meets the standard. However, since the outlet from the culverts have not been designed for this project the second box assuring the design will not cause scour or erosion cannot be checked. Additionally, supporting calculations for rip rap or erosion control measures at the outlet were not supplied therefore the third box cannot be checked.*

- 1.MCG:** The Stormwater Checklist was revised such that the two boxes described above are no longer checked. The HydroCAD calculations show a reduction in velocity in the post-developed condition. MCG is in agreement with Mr. Christiansen's assessment of the runoff velocity in both existing and proposed conditions. A comparison of the existing and proposed discharge velocities from the 30" pipe under Boston Way are summarized in the table below.

#### **Schedule of DP1 Discharge Velocities**

<b>Storm Event</b>	<b>Existing Velocity</b>	<b>Proposed Velocity</b>
2-year	3.32 ft/sec	3.23 ft/sec
10-year	5.63 ft/sec	5.57 ft/sec
100-year	5.10 ft/sec	5.24 ft/sec

\*The 100-year storm event is operating under flood control. Therefore, tailwater impacts the velocity such that it decreases from the 10-year event

- 2.PGC:** *The calculations show that Standard 2 is met. However, the calculations need to be rerun according to the comments above and including the pre and post from 1 Boston Way.*
- 2.MCG:** The HydroCAD analyses for existing and proposed conditions were updated to include the extra areas and are summarized in the narrative.
- 3.PGC:** *Standard 3 is met as stated by the engineer in that the site consist of C/D soils and minor infiltration will occur through the stormwater wetlands as well as through landscaped areas*
- 3.MCG:** No response is required.
- 4.PGC:** *Standard 4 is met by the use of Constructed Stormwater Wetlands, Pocket Wetlands, Vortsentry units, and a filter strip.*
- 4.MCG:** No response is required
- 5.PGC:** *The TSS removal efficiency table for P1A and P2B should be revised to include the Constructed Stormwater wetland. The TSS removal efficiency for P2C should be revised to add the vegetative filter strip with 10% removal.*
- 5.MCG:** The TSS removal efficiency tables were revised to include a Constructed Stormwater Wetland for watershed P1A and P2B and a Vegetative Filter Strip (10%) for P2C. Volume 2, Chapter 2, Page 25 states that "For sheet flow, there are a number of pretreatment option. These options include:... A grass and gravel combination. This should consist of at least 8" of gravel followed by 3 to 5 feet of sod." While this pretreatment practice is listed under the bio-retention section in the Handbook, it is our understanding that it can be applied as a pretreatment method for any BMP. Therefore, the proposed filter strip with stone diaphragm provides adequate pre-treatment as required by the handbook.
- 6.PGC:** *As required calculations should be provided for the equivalent flow rate associated with the Water Quality Volume for the removal systems proposed.  
(See attached discussion concerning TSS standards and removal)*
- 6.MCG:** These calculations were added to the Drainage Report under the TSS Removal Calculations section.
- 7.PGC:** *The plan complies with Standards 5 and 6*
- 7.MCG:** No response is required.
- 8.PGC:** *The requirements of Standard 7 are met but not explained with use of the checklist in Volume 2 Chapter 3 of the Stormwater Handbook as suggested by the last box checked in the Standard 7 checklist.*
- 8.MCG:** The requested checklist is provided at the end of the MASSDEP Stormwater Management Report Checklist.
- 9.PGC:** *The plan does not comply with the requirements of Standard 8 because it lacks the required erosion and sedimentation control plan The Construction Phase Best Management Practice Plan contained in Appendix D is thorough but not site specific. Sequence of operations for both the demolition phase as well as the new construction phase should be added to the Plan*
- 9.MCG:** An Erosion and Sedimentation Plan was prepared and included in the Site Plan set as sheet C-9.
- 10.PGC:** *The plan complies in part with Standard 9 as shown by the Long-Term Best Management Practices O&M Plan contained in Appendix E but lacks the required estimated operating and maintenance budget.*

**10.MCG:** The estimated Operation and Maintenance budgets are provided in the Long-Term Best Management Practices O&M Plan.

**11.PGC:** *An Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement is included in the applications in Appendix F and confirms compliance with Standard 10*

**11.MCG:** No response is required.

## **Review of Stormwater Management Standards**

**1.PGC:** *As stated above the Existing Site Development Watershed drawing, Figure 5 in the report, shows the limit of the study area at the property line. Area E2 should be expanded to include the slope on the south side of the property between the wetland and the MBTA parking lot and the area to the east between the easterly property line and the MBTA property. It should also be expanded to the north to include the area that is to be developed on the property at 1 Boston Way. That area includes the constructed stormwater wetland, trash enclosure and the garden amenity space as well as all proposed paving areas not on 3 Boston Way. In looking at the design plans it appears scuppers are proposed under the sidewalk adjacent to Boston Way to allow for water to flow from the street into the swale on the property. If that is the case the westerly limit of the drainage area should extend into the middle of Boston Way. Figure 5 should be adjusted accordingly. Figure 6 should also be adjusted to include all additional areas discussed for Figure 5. The Flow path for area P1A should end at the catch basin not in the corner of a parking space.*

**1.MCG:** The Watershed Figures and HydroCAD analyses were revised to reflect the above comment.

**2.PGC:** *The outlet structures for both the Design Point 1 and 2 are modeled as concrete pipes with a friction factor of 0.010. The pipes are old and appear to not be maintained and the friction factor should be 0.015 not 0.010. In neither case are entrance losses nor ponding in front of the pipe shown in the calculations. Both need to be considered. By ignoring entrance losses and only considering pipe flow according to the Manning equation the depth of headwater is incorrectly presented, and the area of ponding misrepresented, and the outflow rate improperly represented.*

**2.MCG:** The friction factor for the outlet pipes were modified to use 0.015 to reflect the condition of the pipes. The entrance losses and ponding in front of the pipes is now accounted for by entering the specific parameters in the pond nodes being used to represent the outlets in the existing and proposed HydroCAD analyses.

**3.PGC:** *Routing Diagram for 3856-pre should be revised to show ponding areas prior to discharge.*

**3.MCG:** The HydroCAD model was updated accordingly.

**4.PGC:** *The calculated times of concentration for post development subcatchments areas P1A, P1B, P2A and P2B are 2.5 min, 2.9 min, 4.0 min and 3.3 min respectively. However, for all areas the times were increased to 6 minutes. While changing the time of concentration does not affect the volume of flow (cubic feet) it does affect the rate of flow (cubic feet per second). The shorter the time the greater the peak flow rate, the longer the time of concentration the lesser the peak rate. Thus, increasing the time of concentration to 6 minutes for all areas reduces the predicted peak rate. The calculated times of concentration should be used not the assumed 6 minutes.*

*The HydroCAD computer model allows for calculations with short times of concentration as explained in the following excerpt from the manual for the model:*

*“HydroCAD does not impose any restrictions on the Tc value. The value may be as long or short as required. For example, a Tc value of zero can be used to model the instantaneous “runoff” from the surface of a pond.*

*The behavior of short Tc values is highly dependent on the quality of the selected rainfall distribution. For accurate results with short Tc values, the rainfall distribution must include enough ‘detail’ to accurately indicate the rainfall intensity for the specified duration. HydroCAD uses a polynomial representation for the most common rainfall distributions (Type I, IA, II, III) to ensure that very short durations are well represented, and avoid the loss of accuracy that can occur with linear rainfall tables.”*

- 4.MCG:** The actual time of concentration values calculated for each individual watershed are now used in the HydroCAD analyses, rather than using a minimum value of 6 minutes.
- 5.PGC:** *The Routing Diagram for 3856-post should be revised to show a pond prior to DP1 and another before DP2.*
- 5.MCG:** Both the constructed stormwater wetland and constructed pocket wetland are modeled as ponds in the proposed HydroCAD analysis.
- 6.PGC:** *On drawing C-1 the 10 ft contour north of the property, on 1 Boston Way in the area labeled as a constructed stormwater wetland is the upper limit of the 100-year flood. Will the flooding affect the use of the area as a stormwater wetland and detention area?*
- 6.MCG:** No, the flooding will not affect the functionality of this existing stormwater wetland except in large storms equal or greater than the 100-year event. In the smaller, everyday storms there are no tailwater impacts on the existing culvert. As stated previously, a tailwater elevation of 10.0 was applied to the 100-year storm in HydroCAD to account for this flooding condition.
- 7.PGC:** *There is a drain pipe shown discharging into the constructed stormwater area on C-1 just east of the 30-inch outlet. It doesn’t appear on any other drawings. Will that pipe be eliminated by the work on 1 Boston Way?*
- 7.MCG:** Yes, this drain pipe will be removed as a result of the work on 1 Boston Way. For clarity, a note calling for the pipe to be removed was added to sheet C-1.
- 8.PGC:** *The flows to design point 1 are presented as flowing into 1 Boston Way without any corresponding flows from the project on 1 Boston Way. The analysis should be redone to include the pre and post flows from 1 Boston Way.*
- 8.MCG:** The analyses were redone to include the 1 Boston Way areas flowing to the Design Point in both existing and proposed conditions.
- 9.PGC:** *Additionally, the rainfall rates that should be used for the analysis as most recently approved by Jon-Eric White, City Engineer are*
- |                    |                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>2-year</i>      | <i>10-year</i>     | <i>100 year</i>    |
| <i>2.63 inches</i> | <i>4.83 inches</i> | <i>8.94 inches</i> |
- The analysis was done with slightly higher rainfall rates which is acceptable.*
- 9.MCG:** The rainfall rates were modified to match the rates approved by Jon-Eric White, City Engineer.
- 10.PGC:** *The hydrologic analysis must be redone to incorporate the above comments.*
- 10.MCG:** The hydrologic analysis was redone to address the above comments.

**11.PGC:** *The Chamber Wizard printout should be added to the HydroCAD printout.*

**11.MCG:** The chamber wizard summary is now included in the HydroCAD printout.

## **Plan Review**

### **• Sheet C-1**

**1.PGC:** *A FEMA Flood Hazard Zone AE is shown on this sheet. Explain why it is depicted as such when the FEMA Flood Maps show the entire site in Flood Zone X.*

**1.MCG:** As previously described, there is a culvert that hydraulically connects the area of the flood zone to the area depicted in the flood zone on site. Since the FEMA map did not account for this connection, none of the subject property is shown in the AE zone. It is our position, following extensive surveys and site observations, that the 100-year flood will extend onto the parcel as depicted on the plan.

**2.PGC:** *A fire hydrant located in the northwest corner of the site is not shown.*

**2.MCG:** The fire hydrant is shown on the Existing Conditions Plan on sheet C-1. It is called out "to remain" on the Utility Plan on sheet C-4.

**3.PGC:** *A drain line from 1 Boston Way is shown discharging into the area of the constructed stormwater wetland (CSW) but does not appear on any other drawings. Please explain.*

**3.MCG:** The drain line is proposed to be removed under the redevelopment of the 1 Boston Way property. This pipe is called out to be removed on Sheet C-1.

**4.PGC:** *The Invert of the 15-inch drain line that discharges into the easterly end of the CSW is not shown*

**4.MCG:** The invert is now shown on Sheet C-1.

### **• Sheet C-3**

**1.PGC:** *Inv of 15" at east beginning of CSW is missing*

**1.MCG:** The invert is shown on Sheet C-3.

**2.PGC:** *Vortsentry rim to invert min is 3 ft. The most southerly unit has only 2.9 ft.*

**2.MCG:** The invert elevation was lowered to 17.8 to increase the rim to invert depth to 3.1'.

**3.PGC:** *The flow from P1A and P2B all flow into an existing 15" line which combine in a proposed drain manhole on 1 Boston Way. An additional line of unspecified size is shown entering the manhole from the north. Does the 15-inch pipe have adequate capacity to handle all of the flows.*

**3.MCG:** A rational method calculation showing that the existing 15" drain pipe can adequately convey flows during the 10-year storm event is as follows:

Rainfall Intensity,  $i = 3.73$  in/hr

Area,  $A = 2.26$  acres

Runoff Coefficient,  $C = 0.73$  (weighted average)

Flow,  $Q = C i A$

**$Q = 0.73 \times 3.73 \times 2.26 = 6.15$  cfs**

**Capacity of 15" RCP @ 1.36% slope and 95% full = 7.07 cfs**

**The estimated 10-year flow rate of 6.15 cfs is less than the pipe capacity of 7.07 > OK <**

**4.PGC:** *Need rim elevation on proposed DMH*

**4.MCG:** The rim elevation is shown on Sheet C-3.

**5.PGC:** *Need to specify dimensions of proposed retain-it units as well as elevation of bottom of stone and elev. of bottom of units. Location of access manholes and elevation should be on sheet C-3.*

**5.MCG:** The dimensions, inverts and elevations were added to the detail on Sheet C-3 and access manhole locations are shown on sheet C-3.

**6.PGC:** *Has any testing been performed on site to determine water table elevation and if it will affect the construction or operation of proposed systems?*

**6.MCG:** The bottom of the detention system is being placed above existing grade so groundwater will not affect the operation of the system.

**7.PGC:** *A limit of paving work in Boston Way should be shown.*

**7.MCG:** The limit of paving was shown on sheet C-2.

**8.PGC:** *A limit of paving work into 1 Boston Way should be shown.*

**8.MCG:** The limit of paving was shown on Sheet C-2.

**9.PGC:** *Proposed SMH in parking lot at 1 Boston way with a rim at 15.9 and inlet at 12.75 has only 3.15 ft from rim to invert and less than 2.15 ft from top of pipe to the rim. Cannot be built with the detail contained in the plans.*

**9.MCG:** The typical sewer manhole detail on Sheet C-5 was replaced to show a manhole which will allow for a pipe invert to be constructed 2.15 feet below the rim elevation.

- **Sheet C-3**

**1.PGC:** *Are valves proposed on the service side of the service tees or also on the main line? Need to show thrust blocks*

**1.MCG:** The valves are shown on Sheet C-4. Thrust blocks were added at bends and tees on sheet C-4 and a detail was added to Sheet C-1.

- **Sheets C-5, C-6, C-7**

**1.PGC:** *Pavers detail should be added*

**1.MCG:** A paver detail was added to sheet C-5.

**2.PGC:** *Overflow weir detail prior to DP2 should be added*

**2.MCG:** An overflow weir detail was added to sheet C-8.

**3.PGC:** *Pocket wetland detail should be added*

**3.MCG:** A pocket wetland detail for Pond 2P was added to Sheet C-8.

**4.PGC:** *Constructed stormwater detail should be added*

**4.MCG:** A constructed stormwater wetland for Pond 1P detail was added to Sheet C-8.

**5.PGC:** *Details to protect and enhance drainage swale should be added to the plan.*

**5.MCG:** This information was submitted with the Notice of Intent filing on December 20, 2019. A report prepared by Radner Design Associates outlines the planting plan for the drainage swale.

**6.PGC:** *A Detail of 7 ft high wall at east end of stormwater wetland should be added*



- 6.MCG:** A typical wall detail was added to Sheet C-8. Since the wall is 7 feet tall it must be designed by a structural engineer prior to construction.
- 7.PGC:** *Remove steps from DMH and SMH as per DPS*
- 7.MCG:** The steps were removed from the applicable details.
- 8.PGC:** *Is the flow from the floor drains proposed to be directed to an MDC trap and then pumped to the sewer? If so location and elevation of MDC trap should be on the plan and a detail of MDC trap added to the plan.*
- 8.MCG:** The flow from the interior floor drains will be sent to an interior sand, oil and gas separator prior to being pumped into the proposed sewer service. The location of the separator, pump and connection will be coordinated with the M.E.P. engineer prior to completion of construction drawings. A detail for the sand, oil & gas separator is provided on sheet C-8.
- 9.PGC:** *Need to add thrust block detail to plan*
- 9.MCG:** A thrust block detail was added to Sheet C-5.
- 10.PGC:** *Add City water details*
- 10.MCG:** Specific construction notes provided by the Newburyport DPS Water Division are now shown on the Utility Plan (sheet C-4).
- 11.PGC:** *Is 8" sewer adequate for the combined flows from both 1 and 3 Boston Way?*
- 11.MCG:** Yes, an 8" sewer is adequate for the combined flows. The flow per bedroom is calculated at 110 gallons per day per bedroom (Title 5 – 15.203 (2)). The proposed building at 1 Boston Way contains 125 bedrooms and 3 Boston way contains 132 bedrooms, which is a total of 257 bedrooms. This equates to a total design flow of 28,270 gallons per day (0.05 cfs). If a peaking factor of 6 is applied to this flow, then the design flow is 0.3 cfs. The capacity of an 8" pipe sloped at 0.6% (at 1 Boston Way) is 1.0 cfs, which is sufficient for the anticipated peak flow rate.
- 12.PGC:** *Manhole detail should show a boot for pipe connections. Note referencing drain pipe should be removed from sewer manhole detail*
- 12.MCG:** A boot connection is shown on all manhole details. The note referencing drain pipes was removed from the sewer manhole details.
- 13.PGC:** *Add the dimensions of the on-street parking spaces.*
- 13.MCG:** A detail showing the dimensions on parking on Boston Way was added to Sheet C-6.

### **Additional Information Required**

- 1.PGC:** *As mentioned above an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan is required for compliance with Standard 8 of the Stormwater Standards. That plan should be added to the plan set.*
- 1.MCG:** A plan was added to the set as sheet C-9.
- 2.PGC:** *There is site demolition as well as buffer zone restoration and new construction. Sedimentation and erosion control locations may be different for each of those phases of development and perhaps more than one Sedimentation and Erosion Control Plan needs to be added to the plan set.*
- 2.MCG:** The sedimentation and erosion control measures are shown on sheet C-9.

- 3.PGC:** *The plan(s) should include the location of the Stabilized Construction Entrance, location of propose sedimentation control measures, soil and material stockpiles.*
- 3.MCG:** The locations of these are shown on the Erosion Control & Site Preparation Plan on sheet C-9.
- 4.PGC:** *The plan should also include a written description of activities involved with the site demolition and restoration of the wetlands and construction including which materials will be removed from the site and which will remain.*
- 4.MCG:** This information was submitted with the Notice of Intent filing on December 20, 2019. A report prepared by LEC Environmental Consultants, Inc. outlines the material removal and wetland restoration. Further information regarding the locations of material removal can be seen on the Erosion Control & Site Preparation Plan on sheet C-9.
- 5.PGC:** *It appears that at least eight feet of fill is being imported to the site. This information should be added to the project description.*
- 5.MCG:** This fill information is detailed in the proposed site description on page 2 of the Drainage Report Narrative.
- 6.PGC:** *A substantial amount of work is proposed on 1 Boston Way which is owned by 1 Boston Way LLC a different entity than 3 Boston Way LLC. Easements should be delineated on the plans for the appropriate required easements for construction and maintenance and easement documents should be generated as required.*
- 6.MCG:** An easement sketch and documents will be provided at a later date.

We trust these responses satisfy the peer review comments, which were also discussed with the Jon-Eric White, PE, City Engineer. If you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office at (978) 887-8586.

Very Truly Yours,  
**THE MORIN-CAMERON GROUP, INC.**

  
Scott P. Cameron, PE  
Principal

cc: Three Boston Way, LLC

Attachments

LEC Report

