



**Peer Review Comment Form**

NO.	SHEET NO.	SECTION	GREEN'S COMMENT	Applicant's RESPONSE	CONFIRMED BY	DATE
		<b>Site Plans</b>				
1	C1.1		Estimated seasonal high groundwater for deep Test Pit D1 observed to be 213.5', but it is listed at 214.33' in the Subsurface Infiltration System Detail. Please clarify.			
2	C2.0		Rims, inverts, pipe sizes, and pipe materials are missing. Grading & Drainage Note 2 indicates this information could be on Sheet 8. There is no sheet 8 in the plan set. Please revise to include this information.			
3	C2.0		The FEMA flood maps show a 100 year floodplain line around the site but this is not included on the plans. Please show the 100-year floodplain line on plans.			
4	C2.0	Town of Littleton Wetland Protection Regulations 4.2	There are proposed grade changes within the 50' No-Disturbance Area. No activities or work is permitted other than foot or non-motorized vehicle passage and removal of invasive vegetation. Please revise to keep work outside the 50' No-Disturbance area or provide reasoning for why this cannot be done.			
5	C2.0		The 217 contour doesn't match into existing contour on eastern side of project. Please revise and confirm proposed grading limits.			
6	C2.0	Town of Littleton Wetland Protection Regulations 2.3	The 50' wetland buffer should be revised to be named 50' No-Disturb. Please revise.			
7	C2.0		Please verify proposed spot shots on northeastern side of proposed building. Should they be 223.5 instead of 233.5?			
8	C2.0		Subsurface Infiltration System Detail shows the top of the system at 221. Based on the proposed contours, the cover would be less than 1'. The detail indicates it having 1' to 2' of cover. Please verify the cover and that this meets H-20 loading.			
9	C2.0		There are no callouts for proposed curb along the edges of the proposed pavement. Please provide callouts and indicate the limits of curb.			
10	C2.0		The existing detention pond was not visible in the field due to construction debris and overgrown vegetation. How will the existing detention pond be remediated? It is clear that it is not currently being maintained and will not function properly unless it is maintained. There are no test pits performed at the detention pond to determine soil type or groundwater elevation. Although it does appear to have adequate separation to groundwater and good soils if other test pits are used on site. Please consider providing an emergency spillway for the detention pond.			
11	C2.0		Consider adding a sign to not plow snow into wetland to reinforce the boulders.			
12	C2.0		Please provide the drilling and installation procedure for the private well.			
13	C2.0	Wells 226-6.B.	The symbol for the well is drawn on the 100 foot wetland buffer line. Please move the symbol completely outside the buffer zone and confirm that construction of the well will not disturb area within the 100' wetland buffer.			
14	C2.0	Wells 226-6.B.	The neighboring property is identified as an inactive landfill on MassMapper. The plans shall be updated to show the proposed well meets the minimum setback of 400 feet to an active or closed landfill.			



**Peer Review Comment Form**

NO.	SHEET NO.	SECTION	GREEN'S COMMENT	Applicant's RESPONSE	CONFIRMED BY	DATE
15	C2.0	Wells 226-6.D.	The well should be upgradient from runoff from the surrounding land unless adequately protected. It appears based on the grading it is located on a slope which allows runoff to run over it. Please clarify. Was moving the well to a ridgeline in the grading to minimize runoff considered?			
16	C2.0	Town of Littleton Wetland Protection Regulations 4.9	Snow Storage locations shall be shown on the plans. The snow storage shall be stored outside the No Disturbance Area and Buffer Zone. Please revise.			
17	C2.1		Proposed RFA Restoration Area is within the 50' No Disturbance Area. Please provide information on what will be done for restoration in this area.			
18	C2.1		Please show existing and proposed tree line so, it is clear where there will be tree clearing. Limit of tree clearing should be clear since there are rare and endangered species in the area. Please revise.			
19	C3.0	Town of Littleton Wetland Protection Regulations 4.7	Erosion control should be installed at the 50' no disturb line to limit disturbance within the 50' no disturb. If work has to be done within the 50' no disturb area, then additional perimeter controls should be installed between the work and the wetland. Consider phasing this work to limit disturbance time within the 50' no disturbance buffer. Please revise.			
20	C3.0	Town of Littleton Wetland Protection Regulations 4.7	Erosion control shall be placed around the entire site. The Erosion control plan is cut off so it is not clear the limits of erosion control. Please revise.			
21	C3.0	38-16.C.7.	Erosion control shall be provided at gravel removal from plows and boulder protection installation area. The limits of erosion control blanket should be shown and a detail should be provided. Please revise.			
22	C3.0	Town of Littleton Wetland Protection Regulations 4.9	The fill remaining onsite and proposed stockpile area shall be surrounded by erosion control.			
23	C3.0	Town of Littleton Wetland Protection Regulations 4.10	The site currently has construction debris within the buffer zone based on our site visit. There shall be no disposal or burial of construction debris within the buffer zone. Please add to the plans that all construction debris will be legally disposed and will not be located within the buffer zone.			
24	C3.0	38-16.C.5	Provide a delineation and number of square feet of the land area to be disturbed. The disturbance line should include the slope restoration work the along wetlands south of the site.			
25	C3.0		Does the stormceptor unit have a grate? If it does, provide inlet protection during construction.			
<b>Stormwater Report</b>						
26	13, 43, 72, & 95		In various locations of the application (SW Checklist, recharge calculations, HydroCAD, etc) there is conflicting information noting whether impervious areas are being entirely or partially treated. Please clarify.			
27	Recharge/WQ Calcs		The recharge and water quality calcs do not indicate if they are for the subsurface infiltration system or for the detention basin. Please clarify.			
28	HydroCAD	MA Stormwater Handbook V2Ch2	The detention basin is being modeled in HydroCAD as an infiltration basin. The setbacks include being 50 feet from any slope greater than 15%, 50 feet from surface water of the commonwealth, and 100 foot from a private well. The side slopes down to the wetland appear to be over 15%, please confirm. Bennett's Brook is less than 50 feet from the basin. The top of the basin is within the 100 ft buffer of the private well. The basin appears to not meet the setback requirements of an infiltration basin. Please revise.			



**Peer Review Comment Form**

NO.	SHEET NO.	SECTION	GREEN'S COMMENT	Applicant's RESPONSE	CONFIRMED BY	DATE
29	HydroCAD/Recharge Calcs	Rawls Rate Table	Based on Deep Test Pit D1, the area where the subsurface infiltration system is proposed the soil is LS (loamy-sand). Per the Rawls Rate table loamy sand has an infiltration rate of 2.41 in/hr but 8.270 in/hr is being used in HydroCAD and recharge calculations. Please revise.			
30	HydroCAD/Watershed Plans		The areas in square feet from the existing and proposed HydroCAD don't match the areas in square feet noted on the existing and proposed watershed plans. Please revise so they are consistent.			
31	Watershed Plan/TSS Calcs	MA Stormwater Handbook V2Ch2	Per the watershed plan the detention pond receives impervious area. But, there is no pretreatment for the detention pond. The detention pond shall have pretreatment to function properly. The detention pond should also be included in the TSS calculations. Please revise.			
32	Watershed Plans		Please explain why Pre A.2 will discharge to DP-A instead of DP-B. It appears most of this area would discharge south of wetland flag AA29 which would be part of DP-B. This also applies to the similar portion of Post A.3.			
33	Watershed Plans		Post B.2 should be renamed to Post A.4 because it would discharge to DP-A if the detention basin overflowed. Please revise.			
34	Watershed Plans		There is limited grading for the roadway shown on the plans. Based on our site visit it appeared the roadway sloped down to the north. Therefore a portion of the roadway would enter the swale that leads to the detention basin. This area should be included in the detention basin HydroCAD model. Also, additional grading should be provided to confirm the area in B.2 will actually get to the detention basin and not continue down the road to DP-A. Please revise.			
35	Watershed Plans		A-2 does not appear to be fully curbed and therefore some of the area would not enter the CB and stormceptor. The parking lot should be curbed to confirm the runoff will enter the structures. Please revise.			
<b>O&amp;M Plan</b>						
36			In the subsurface infiltration system maintenance, it mentions that there is a proposed trench drain. There is no trench drain in the plans. Please clarify.			
37			In the subsurface infiltration system maintenance, it mentions that there is an isolator row. Is this true? The plans do not indicate an isolator row being proposed.			
38		MA Stormwater Handbook V2Ch2	Once the detention basin is remediated, inspect it after every major storm for the first few months to ensure it is stabilized and functioning properly and if necessary take corrective action. Please include in O&M.			
39			Please include manufacturers O&M for subsurface infiltration system and stormceptor.			
40		38-18.B.3.	Please sign the Operation & Maintenance Manual.			