



Bucky Sparkle, PE
378 Main St., #2, Easthampton, MA 01027
617.271.4004 or zengineerbucky@gmail.com

22 October 2019

Richard Harris, Director of Planning and Conservation
Planning Department
116 Main Street
Room 204
South Hadley, MA 01075
Phone: 413-538-5017, ext. 206
rharris@southhadleyma.gov

Project: **Skinner Woods Flexible Development**
Subject: **Response to 10/7/19 Fuss & O'Neill Letter**
Client: Skinner Woods, LLC
Thomas Spring
2 Cedar Ridge
South Hadley, MA 01075

Dear Richard,

Below, please find a point-by-point reply to the comments from Fuss & O'Neill. Even through today, I have been in communication with the reviewing agent seeking clarity on certain points and believe that this letter will address remaining issues. The number system has been maintained, per the last comment letter received.

Stormwater Management

7. The Operation, Maintenance & Inspection Agreement was submitted as Appendix 14.15 of the Flexible Development Application. A copy has been attached to this letter.
8. Confirmed.
10. Confirmed.

General

11. Confirmed.
15. Known wetlands are roughly 900 feet from disturbed areas. Additional protection is unwarranted. However, to appease the review agent, a filter sock will be added as a redundant measure downgradient of the northern silt fence.

19. Pages 70 and 74 of the stormwater report indicate that the peak water elevation in the detention basin is 251.47. The top of the basin berm is elevation 252.65, yielding 1.18 feet of freeboard.
20. a) The revised required recharge surface area was in error. Thank you for identifying the mistake. The correct value is 486 SF. The report has been updated.
b) The term "forebay" was used inadvertently. The recharge volume is provided in the Infiltration Basin. The report's text has been updated accordingly.
c) No recharge volume is provided by the detention basin. The sentence on page 21 of the report has been modified for clarity, "However, as the detention basin currently sits in disturbed soils *and in accordance with DEP standards*, it is assumed that infiltration in this area will be negligible and is ignored."
d) No changes to system geometry are proposed. The provided recharge volume remains in excess of the required volume.
21. The provided "Typical Built-Up Basin Berm" detail includes notes on compaction, earth materials and seeding. A revised version is included with this letter indicating erosion control blankets for slopes steeper than 3H:1V.

Additional Comments

28. The assumption that the TSS pre-treatment for the infiltration basin counted for the overall treatment train has been modified. Instead of the effective 87% TSS removal prior to the infiltration basin being counted in the overall treatment train, this is reduced by 44%, which is the amount assumed to be included in the the infiltration basin's required pre-treatment. The result is 89% TSS removal for the project.
29. The detention basin is for all practical purposes an extended dry detention basin. However, in lieu of arguing this point, the 50% TSS removal credit for this basin is removed from the treatment train. The resulting TSS removal rate is still above the 80% requirement.
30. The Fabco StormBasin refers to the insert between the inlet grate and the catch basin's sump. The TSS removal for the filters is independent of the functioning of the deep sump catch basin. Both of these treatment devices are active and included in the TSS removal treatment train. However, if the deep sump catch basin's TSS impact were removed from the treatment train, the resulting TSS removal rate would still be 96%.
31. The infiltration basin has 3 TSS removal methods/devices protecting it, offering 86% TSS removal. Sequentially, these are 1) street sweeping, 2) Fabco StormBasin, and 3) deep sump catch basin. The bulk of the protection stems from the StormBasin filter structure. Appendices 5.7 and 5.8 of the Stormwater Report

provides technical documentation demonstrating 82% TSS removal in third-party laboratory testing. Specifically, page 99 of the Stormwater Report (page 5 of Long Island Analytical Laboratories' report) shows 82.3% average TSS removal efficiency.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Brightly,


Bucky Sparkle, PE

CC: Thomas Spring (digital copy)
Aimee Bell, Fuss & O'Neill, 1550 Main Street, Suite 400, Springfield, MA 01103

Attachments (copies will be mailed to Fuss & O'Neill when they provide email addresses):
Municipal Stormwater Operation, Maintenance and Inspection Agreement (Draft)
Typical Built-Up Basin Berm detail
Revised Stormwater Report by The Zengineer, dated 10/22/19
Revised Plan Sheet 10 "Stormwater, Erosion & Sediment Control", dated 10/22/19