

November 12, 2020

Mr. Earl Kurtz, Chairman
Cheshire Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission
84 South Main Street
Cheshire, CT 06410

**RE: Responses to Site Plan and Stormwater Management Review
Ball & Socket Arts, Inc.
493 West Main Street
Cheshire, Connecticut
MMI #5233-01**

Dear Mr. Kurtz:

Milone & MacBroom, Inc. (MMI) is in receipt of a comment letter prepared by Ms. Denise P. Lord, PE of Anchor Engineering Services dated November 9, 2020, regarding the above-referenced project. We offer the following responses to your comments:

- C1. The plans and report submitted should be signed and sealed by a CT licensed professional engineer/land surveyor as appropriate.
- R1. Signed/sealed revised plans and stormwater management computations have been submitted to the Cheshire planning office.**
- C2. It does not appear that the NOAA rates were used for the intensities in the storm water calculations. The calculations could be updated to include these higher rainfall rates. Having said that, it appears that most of the pipes have excess capacity so it may not matter for the pipes, but it may have an impact to the proposed detention.
- R2. The stormwater calculations have been revised to incorporate the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) rainfall data.**
- C3. Type B soils were included in the analyses but not soil data for the sits was included. Test pit data should be included for the detention. Infiltration area, establishing the existing groundwater elevation. The system is proposed with a cut of 6.5 feet +/-.
- R3. Hydraulic soil group B is used, given the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) designation as udorthents. We do not have soil data but have revised the detail for the StormTech® units to include an impervious liner and removed infiltration.**
- C4. The detention basin water elevation for the 10-year storm should be included as the tailwater elevation in the analysis for the inlet pipe to the detention system.
- R4. The tailwater elevation has been included in the revised inlet pipe analysis.**
- C5. The three proposed storm discharges outlet to the adjacent property to the west. Right to drain and drainage easement where improvements cross into the adjacent lot, should be secured.

- R5. An easement has been filed for the disturbance associated with stormwater discharge that will occur off the property. The filed easement can be found in Book 2660, page 287. All other discharges will occur on the property.**
- C6. Appropriately sized outlet protection should be included at the proposed pipe outlets.
- R6. Outlet protection was not included; the discharges will be directed toward a relatively stagnant body of water. Currently, no evidence of erosion or scour is present around the existing discharges. We do not believe this is warranted at the proposed outlets.**
- C7. The northmost proposed drainage outlet crosses an existing gas easement. The existing gas line in this area should be shown and adequate separation for the new drainage pipe ensured. A flared end or headwall should be included as the end of the pipe. This pipe also outlets adjacent to CT DOT storm drainage/wingwalls within a CTDOT drainage easement. The applicant should contact CT DOT for their review on this and for the necessary Encroachment Permit.
- R7. Comment noted. Prior to construction, coordination with the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) and the gas company will be completed. Any changes that may result will be coordinated with town staff.**
- C8. The WQF and the total bypass flow for the proposed CDS structures should be included on the plans so the structures can be appropriately designed at the time of construction.
- R8. Water quality computations have been added to the revised stormwater management computations. Flows have been added to the utility plan.**
- C9. An existing drive connection from the adjacent western abutter is proposed to remain-cross access easements should be acquitted.
- R9. Comment noted, although this is an existing connection that is not proposed to be used at this time.**
- C10. Some of the pipes appear oversized and with shallow cover in some areas, applicant may want to consider smaller pipes with more cover if possible or consider using PVC pipe which has thinner walls in lieu of the RCP Class V.
- R10. Comment noted. Our preference is to remain with Class V reinforced concrete pipe (RCP).**

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (203) 271-1773.

Very truly yours,

MILONE & MACBROOM, INC.



Ryan McEvoy, PE
Lead Project Engineer, Civil

5233.01.n1220.ltr.docx