

From: Jonathan R. Earle
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2018 1:44 PM
To: 'Dustin Roma (dustin@dmroma.com)'; Amanda L. Lessard; phollisland@gmail.com
Subject: 18-13 Ruby Meadows Final Plan Application

To all:

Below are my comments for the Ruby Meadows Final Plan Application dated July 23, 2018.

1. Provide locations for granite monumentation on the approved subdivision plan per Section 911.A.3.
2. I would suggest incorporating the location PPLC pipelines onto the subdivision plan and plan/profile sheets. Since the road profile for Viola Lane stops short of the existing pipelines, showing the depth of the pipelines on the profile is not necessary.
3. Include language in the draft declaration for the maintenance responsibility for the additional vegetation proposed to be cleared. Provide updated stormwater treatment calculations that account for the additional disturbed area created by this clearing.
4. Was the cost for road restoration on Albion Road included in the cost estimate?
5. Has ground survey been completed within the footprints of the constructed stormwater BMPs?

Jon Earle, PE
Town Engineer
Town of Windham

Office: (207) 894-5900, ext. 6124
Cell: (207) 212-1802
www.windhammaine.us

From: Jonathan R. Earle
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2018 4:11 PM
To: 'Dustin Roma (dustin@dmroma.com)'; Amanda L. Lessard; phollisland@gmail.com
Subject: RE: 18-13 Ruby Meadows Preliminary Plan Application

Below are my responses to the letter from DM Roma dated July 6, 2018. For clarity, my original comment remains in blue and the updated response in red.

Comment 1: Show sight distance at the intersection of the proposed subdivision road and Albion Road consistent with the narrative included in the subdivision application.

Response 1: Sight distance at the intersection of the subdivision road and Albion Road has been added to sheet PP-1, exceeding the distance required for the posted speed limit. No further information required..

Comment 2: Provide a moratorium restoration detail for the water main and water service connections that conforms with Chapter 210 – Streets and Sidewalks. Verify that the

cost associated with the moratorium restoration was included in the estimated construction cost line item for water main and hydrants.

Response 2: Albion Road restoration detail has been added to sheet D-2. It is still not clear whether the additional cost for the moratorium restoration on Albion Road was included in the project's cost estimate based on the breakdown provided.

Comment 3: High intensity soils and hydrogeologic analyses – Will you be providing the information for these or waiver requests?

Response 3: A waiver request has been provided and the justification for the waiver is reasonable based on the BMPs being used and the soil types onsite.

Comment 4: Additional test pit information for septic suitability for each lot as noted in Amanda's email.

Response 4: The test pit location information has been added to the plan as noted. Were the test pit logs submitted previously? I'm not seeing them in the preliminary submission in the electronic file. Also, it should be verified that there is a passing test pit within the cleared area for each lot so that the proposed treeline assumptions for stormwater modelling are not disturbed by construction of a disposal field.

Comment 5: Waiver from Dead End street standard is reasonable. Chief Libby should comment on this as well.

Response 5: Waiver has been provided. Has Chief Libby reviewed and commented?

6. Stormwater Management:

Comment 6a: As Amanda mentioned, show forested buffers on the plan along with the permanent marking note as required.

Response 6a: The permanent marking note has been added to the subdivision plan. However, it does not appear that the forested buffers being used for stormwater management are differentiated from the treeline clearing limits on the plan sheets submitted with the response letter.

Comment 6b: Flooding Standard – There appears to be a typo in Table 1 (Peak runoff at each study point). Specifically, the predevelopment 25-yr flow at SP-1 is listed as 0.10 CFS and the HydroCAD calculations indicated the peak flow is 7.18 CFS.

Response 6b: Table has been revised. No further comment.

Comment 6c: Provide ground topography for the underdrained soil filter and the 4 bioretention cells.

Response 6c: Ground survey for the stormwater BMPs not completed at this time per response #21.

Comment 6d: Show proposed grading for bioretention cells 3 and 4. The typical detail does not provide enough information to cross check the stage-storage assumption being made in the stormwater modeling.

Response 6d: Grading for bioretention cells has been provided on sheet LD-1.

Comment 6e: The stormwater treatment goals are being met for the project with the proposed BMPs treating 95% of the impervious and 80% of the developed areas. Provide a lot by lot summary of impervious and developed areas on the subdivision plan in addition to the summary table included in the stormwater report. This will help our Code Enforcement

department as they are issuing building permits for each lot with the overall treated areas being only slightly above what is required.

Response 6e: Added to the subdivision plan. No further comment.

Jon Earle, PE
Town Engineer
Town of Windham

Office: (207) 894-5900, ext. 6124
Cell: (207) 212-1802
www.windhammaine.us

From: Jonathan R. Earle
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2018 12:46 PM
To: 'Dustin Roma (dustin@dmroma.com)'; Amanda L. Lessard
Subject: 18-13 Ruby Meadows Preliminary Plan Application

Dustin & Amanda,

Below are my review comments for 18-13 Ruby Meadows Preliminary Plan Application:

1. Show sight distance at the intersection of the proposed subdivision road and Albion Road consistent with the narrative included in the subdivision application.
2. Provide a moratorium restoration detail for the water main and water service connections that conforms with Chapter 210 – Streets and Sidewalks. Verify that the cost associated with the moratorium restoration was included in the estimated construction cost line item for water main and hydrants.
3. High intensity soils and hydrogeologic analyses – Will you be providing the information for these or waiver requests?
4. Additional test pit information for septic suitability for each lot as noted in Amanda's email.
5. Waiver from Dead End street standard is reasonable. Chief Libby should comment on this as well.
6. Stormwater Management:
 - a. As Amanda mentioned, show forested buffers on the plan along with the permanent marking note as required.
 - b. Flooding Standard – There appears to be a typo in Table 1 (Peak runoff at each study point). Specifically, the predevelopment 25-yr flow at SP-1 is listed as 0.10 CFS and the HydroCAD calculations indicated the peak flow is 7.18 CFS.
 - c. Provide ground topography for the underdrained soil filter and the 4 bioretention cells.
 - d. Show proposed grading for bioretention cells 3 and 4. The typical detail does not provide enough information to cross check the stage-storage assumption being made in the stormwater modeling.
 - e. The stormwater treatment goals are being met for the project with the proposed BMPs treating 95% of the impervious and 80% of the developed areas. Provide a lot by lot summary of impervious and developed areas on the subdivision plan in addition to the

summary table included in the stormwater report. This will help our Code Enforcement department as they are issuing building permits for each lot with the overall treated areas being only slightly above what is required.

Jon Earle, PE
Town Engineer
Town of Windham

Office: (207) 894-5900, ext. 6124

Cell: (207) 212-1802

www.windhammaine.us