



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

January 28, 2026

Mr. Patrick Driscoll, Chair
Bridgewater Planning Board
Municipal Office Building
66 Central Square
Bridgewater, MA

RE: 2nd Technical Review-Site Plan Approval
Lot 4 Lakeshore Center
Encompass Health-Applicant

Dear Mr. Driscoll:

The Engineering Division completed its second technical review of the above-referenced project.

The following documents were reviewed:

A letter by Kimley Horn in response to comments made in the first technical review, dated November 19, 2025.

The drainage report "STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT LAKESHORE CENTER BRIDGEWATER, MA 02324" Dated November 2025.

The site plan "DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR ENCOMPASS HEALTH REHABILITATION CENTER OF BRIDGEWATER, MA 02324" Dated November 19, 2025.

Sight Distance plans containing six sheets dated 10-15-25.

A truck turning radius plan having no date.

Listed below are our comments made in our 1st review. Below the 1st review comments are our 2nd review comments in bold font beginning with the statement: "**Second Review Comment:**".

Sheet C-1.0 - Cover Sheet

1. The Applicant is requesting a "waiver" from the total parking count required by Bridgewater's Zoning Bylaw. The applicant is requesting a significant reduction of 97 parking spaces. The requested relief is



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

not from the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations but from the Zoning Bylaw, which in my opinion constitutes a variance. The Planning Board is also advised that the requested parking space "waiver" includes the Phase 2 build out, thus any relief granted will be for both Phase 1 and Phase 2. The Planning Board may grant a 20% parking space reduction under Section 9.4.12 of the Zoning Bylaw for mixed use projects have non-coincident peak occupancy times. Since this project is not a mixed-use project, this section is not applicable to this project, and thus, in my opinion, the applicant's requested relief from the required parking space count constitutes a variance from the ZBA.

Second Review Comment: It has been determined internally that the relief being requested can be granted by the Planning Board if they elect to do so.

2. The applicant stated he intends to use parking spaces from off-site parking lots located within the Lakeshore Development to make up for the 97 spaces he is not providing on his site. The applicant offered no written proof of entitlement to these off-site parking spaces, nor did he assess the impact this would have on the neighboring businesses. At a minimum, the adjacent parking lots must be analysed to see if the actual parking space count that exists exceeds the parking space count required by the bylaw is exceeded by 97.

Second Review Comment: The Applicant no longer seeks to utilize parking spaces in adjacent parking lots as he claims that 160 spaces is sufficient for the proposed use based upon historical data from other facilities similar to the proposed facility. The Applicant must provide this historical data to the Planning Board.

3. The applicant should analyze what the average distance a patient will have to walk to get to the health care facility if they are forced to park off site.
- Second Review Comment: Comment 3 is no longer relevant as the Applicant is no longer seeking to utilize parking spaces in adjacent parking lots.**

4. The site appears to have the land area necessary to construct additional 97 parking spaces need to meet the parking requirements.
- Second Review Comment: The applicant did not revise the parking lot plan as they are pursuing a waiver from the parking lot requirements.**

5. The Applicant must explain to the Planning Board why the project is broken out into Phases 1 & 2 and when phase 2 is expected to be built.
- Second Review Comment: The Planning Board must decide if they are going to approve both phases or just one phase under this permit bearing in mind Bridgewater's ability to accommodate water and sewer demands has fluctuated considerably over the past five years.**

6. The Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (AAB) requires 20% of the total number of parking spaces (160) to be accessible. Thus 20% of 160=32 required accessible spaces. The applicant states he



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

has provided 20 accessible spaces on the cover sheet, however only 19 accessible spaces are shown on Sheet C-5.0. (These numbers assume that relief is granted).

Second Review Comment: The Engineering Division of the DPW does not agree with how the Applicant has interpreted 521 CMR and the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board's regulations pertaining to accessible space counts. The regulations are clear, "20% of the total spaces should be accessible".

7. The Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (AAB) also requires 1 accessible space in 6 of the total number of accessible parking spaces (32) to be van accessible. Thus $32/6 = 5$ required van accessible spaces. The applicant has provided only 2 van accessible spaces. (These numbers assume that relief is granted).

Second Review Comment: We cannot find where the Applicant is deriving the total accessible parking space counts from 521 CMR. Please see the attached MAAB regulations I used to determine my required accessible space counts.

8. The Parking Count Requirements shown on the Cover Sheet references ADA Section 208.2; this section does not exist in 521 CMR. The ADA parking requirements for Massachusetts are regulated by 521 CMR 23 and the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (AAB). It appears the applicant used an ADA code from regulatory source outside of Massachusetts. The applicant must base the ADA parking counts and dimensional design on 521 CMR and the AAB.

Second Review Comment: The Applicant has revised the code references on the plans; however this does not change our interpretation of 521 CMR 23.1.

9. Section 6.1.9 of the Zoning Bylaw requires loading bays for Consumer Service and Office Building uses. Health care falls under umbrella of Consumer Service, and the facility has many offices located throughout the first floor. Loading bays are needed for laundry services, gym and other physical therapy equipment, and various office and treatment related supplies to be delivered to the facility.

Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Sheet C-2.0 – Survey Plan

The Engineering Division had no comments on this Sheet.

Sheet C-2.1 – Survey Plan

The Engineering Division had no comments on this Sheet.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

Sheet C-3.0 – General Notes

1. Note 42 must be revised to include language that all water used for dust control must be trucked in. No water from municipal sources will be allowed for dust control.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. Note 98 must be revised to change the “Call Before You Dig” reference to “Dig Safe”.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Sheet C-4.0 – Erosion and Sediment Control and Demolition Plan

1. The site is proposing to disturb more than 1 acre of land which triggers the EPA’s Construction General Permit (CGP) by preparing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The applicant has acknowledged this requirement in the drainage report.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed. Applicant acknowledges a SWPPP must be prepared.
2. The applicant is proposing silt fencing for sedimentation control around the perimeter of the site. The erosion control plan must be revised to use sedimentation barriers with a 12 diameter around the perimeter of the site. The proposed sit fencing is not strong enough to contain sedimentation volumes generated from 5.5 acres of site disturbance.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
3. Calculations demonstrating that the sediment trap has been adequately sized must be provided.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
4. The temporary swales intercepting and directing runoff into the sediment trap must be graded out to ensure proper construction is achieved.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
5. The tree lines shown outside the limit of disturbance (LOD) should be labeled as trees to remain un-cut.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
6. The Erosion Control Plan should show locations of re-fueling areas, staging areas, locations of construction trailer offices, parking spaces for crews, areas for stockpiling, etc.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

7. Most the notes under the “DEMOLITION/LAND DISTURBANCE NOTES” heading on this plan are not applicable to this site as they are demolition notes. The site is a vacant site; no demolition wastes will be generated from this site as there are no existing structures to be demolished. These notes must be revised to reflect actual site conditions and proposed construction activities.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
8. Likewise, most of the notes under the “CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE “heading on this plan are not applicable to this site as they reference the removal of existing buildings and the construction of building additions etc. These notes must be revised to reflect actual site conditions and proposed construction activities.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
9. A note stating that spare erosion control barriers are to be stored on site for emergency purposes must be put on the plan.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Sheet C-4.1 – Erosion and Sediment Control and Demolition Details

1. The plan must have notes pertaining to the maintenance of the sediment trap such as the frequency of removing sediment and periodic inspections.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. The plan must have notes pertaining to dewatering practices needed to maintain the sediment trap and for construction activities of the project.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
3. The plan must have a detail of a silt sock sedimentation barrier.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
4. The plan must have a detail of the method for stabilizing stockpiled materials, such as perimeter protection, and covering with vegetation or tarps.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
10. The applicant is proposing to disturb more than 1 acre of land and hence must prepare a SWPPP and obtain a Construction General permit (CGP) form the EPA. The applicant has acknowledged this requirement in the drainage report.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

5. Dewatering techniques should be detailed on the plans.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Sheet C-5.0 – Site Plan

1. The van accessible spaces depicted on the plan do not have an 8' wide access aisle per 521 CMR. The van accessible spaces must be revised to meet the Massachusetts ADA code, 521 CMR.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. See Comments 5,6, & 7 on Sheet C-1.0.
Second Review Comment: Comment Remains.
3. The plan references a Mechanical Electrical and Plumbing (MEP) Plan for the Airgas yard. It is unclear what the contractor's responsibilities are regarding site work associated with this area. It appears that there may be some perimeter fencing, curbing, and underground utilities associated with it. Please clarify.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
4. The applicant must verify the sidewalks located behind the EV Ready charging stations are in compliance with ADA clearance codes.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
5. The first entrance into the site does not show ADA ramps to be installed in the existing sidewalk.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
6. The applicant must provide sight distance information at both points of access. Sight distance information analysis must take into account the "VIVA" sign located near the first access point approaching the site from Pleasant Street. See Traffic Study Comments as well.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Sheet C-6.0 – Pavement Plan

1. The plan must show turning radius template curves for the largest fire apparatus operated by the Bridgewater Fire Department to verify adequate circulation of emergency vehicles can be achieved.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Sheet C-7.0 – Grading and Drainage Plan



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

1. Note 4 must specify the RCP as a Class V pipe as the cover over some of the pipes are only 2'.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Sheet C-7.1 – Grading Insets Plan

1. Note 4 must specify the RCP as a Class V pipe as the cover over some of the pipes are only 2'.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. The locations of CB A56 and CBA60 will capture very little runoff located on a steep and consistent slope. The applicant may consider relocating these CB's to another location with improved hydraulic efficiency.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
3. CB A43 has a Rim elevation of 71.50 in the Structure Table on Sheet C- 7.6, however the grate is shown in a low point having an elevation 68.80' on Sheet C-7.1. Please correct the conflicting rim elevations.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
4. The rim elevation of DMH A44 is too high, it should be less than elevation 69.24 to channel runoff into CB A43 effectively.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
5. Please show FG spot grades at all exterior corners of the facility including the Phase 2 portion of the building.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
6. What is the provision for runoff management in the central courtyard after Phase 2 is completed?
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
7. The perimeter of the southerly most parking stalls is located at the toe of a grassed slope. We have concerns this will cause icing conditions from snow melt in the winter. The applicant must provide a solution to control this condition.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
8. The proposed grading around the forebay and the infiltration basin must be revised to allow an 8' wide perimeter road around the basin for maintenance.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

Sheet C-7.2 – Grading Insets Continued

1. Note 4 must specify the RCP as a Class V pipe as the cover over some of the pipes are only 2'.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. Catchbasin A-1 is located off the parking lot in the green space. The structure must be relocated to the low point in the parking lot along the curb return (LP=68.80) and the rim elevation adjusted accordingly.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
3. DMH A5 has an invert out of 63.69' that is higher than the two inverts in (Inv's=63.54').
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

C-7.3 – Drainage Details Plan

1. The invert elevation into the forebay differs from the elevation listed in the Structure Table shown on Sheet C-7.5.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. The proposed 68 contour elevation terminates on either side of the broad crested weir and the emergency spillway. Contours do not terminate, they are continuous. The grading must be corrected and corrected in such a way to create an 8' wide access way around the basin for maintenance.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
3. The 24" RCP drainpipe into the forebay must have a flared end section or headwall equipped with a trash rack to prevent children or animals from entering the drain line system.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
4. The Engineering Division has following concerns with the forebay design:
 - a. Setting the invert elevation of the 24" RCP drainpipe at the bottom of the forebay will promote drain line clogging as sediments settle out in it. When 2' of sediment is retained in the forebay, the 24" RCP will be completely buried in sediment.
 - b. The spillway elevation is set at 66.0', hence the standing water within the forebay will flood the drainage system up to elevation 66.0'. The catchbasins at the beginning of each of the two drainage system runs both have invert elevations below 66.0, hence there will be some standing water throughout each run of the drainage system from common rainfall events.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

- c. The above conditions will result in sediment deposits and settlement within the drainage pipes causing maintenance issues and making the drainage system prone to surcharging.

Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

5. The infiltration basin must be designed with a piped draindown line with an invert at or near the Water Quality Volume elevation. Infiltration basins designed to infiltrate large volumes of water have been known to fail.

Second Review Comment: We recognize the Applicant's argument pertaining to code compliance with respect to the drawdown calculation being less than 72 hours. However, we are of the belief that a basin of this size will not infiltrate within 72 hours based upon the experiences of other projects constructed in Bridgewater of a similar size and stormwater design. We recommend the Applicant design the basin with a small diameter draw down pipe keep the depth of standing water to be recharged at 24" or less.

C-7.4 – Drainage Details Continued Plan

1. The detail for the stone pipe ends should call out a flared end section at the end of the pipe.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. The riprap apron at the outfall should be a plunge pool type for energy dissipation.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

C-7.5 – Drainage Structure Table Plan

1. Please update the table per any revisions made from this review letter.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

C-7.6 – Drainage Structure Table Plan

1. Please update the table per any revisions made from this review letter.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

C-8.0 – Utility Plan

1. Note 6 must specify the distance of encasement beyond the intersection point where the utilities cross.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

2. The sanitary sewer design has substituted sewer manholes for cleanouts in some areas. Where one sewer line connects onto another or when a 90 degree bend is encountered, a sewer manhole is required.

Second Review Comment: CO 2, CO 12, and CO 13 should be converted to SMH's as they change direction 90 degrees. An SMH should join the north and south sanitary lines and then discharge into the e-one grinder pump.

3. The invert elevation out at SSWR STRUCTURE 37 is 62.89'. The invert elevation of SSWR STRUCTURE 12 is 66.47' and is identified as the connection into the existing stub-out. By these invert elevations, a gravity connection into the existing sanitary line in Lakeshore Center cannot be made.

Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

4. The Engineering Division did not receive a set of the MEP plans and thus did not evaluate the drop in elevations through the Grease Interceptor Tanks. The applicant must provide this information for review.

Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

C-8.1 – Utility Details Plan

1. The plan must provide a standard bedding detail for a sanitary sewer pipe.

Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

C-9.0 – Construction Details Plan

1. The site is proposing several types of ADA ramps in addition to the one that is shown on the plan. A detail for the ADA ramps located at the curb returns at the parking lot entrances must be shown.

Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed, the detail was shown on Sheet C-6.1 nor C-9.1.

2. The WHEEL STOP LOCATION DETAIL should depict the ADA ramp that is proposed to be constructed behind them.

Second Review Comment: Please show a Wheel Stop on the "Accessible Parking-Striping" detail on Sheet -6.1.

C-9.1 – Construction Details Plan

1. The standard and heavy-duty paving details must show 12" of processed gravel compacted to 98% maximum density at optimum moisture content in no greater than 8" lifts.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

C-9.2 – Construction Details Plan

2. The plan must provide a standard bedding detail for a storm drainpipe.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

L-1.0 – Landscape Plan

1. The Site Plan did not show any areas to be utilized for on-site snow disposal. The Landscape Plan is an appropriate plan to show the disposal areas located in areas that will not cause damage to landscape vegetation from plowing operations. Additionally, Landscape companies often perform plowing services for their customers. A plowing contractor who is familiar with a Landscape Plan will serve to minimize damage to landscape vegetation.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

L-1.1 – Landscape Notes and Details Plan

1. The Engineering Division has no comments on this plan.

P-1.0 – Photometric Plan

1. Please add a certification note to the plan stating that photometric analysis is Dark Sky compliant and complies with Section 6.3.3(A) of the Town of Bridgewater Zoning Ordinance.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Upon reviewing the Stormwater Management Report, we make the following comments:

Section 1.2-Soils

1. Per the DEP Stormwater Handbook, a minimum of three (3) test pits must be performed in the area of the infiltration basin and be witnessed by the Town Engineer. Soil Evaluations shall be performed by a Certified Massachusetts Soil Evaluator including the determination of the seasonal high groundwater elevation as determined by mottling.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Section 3.2-Standard 2 Peak Rate Attenuation



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

1. Standard 2 has not been met as the peak discharges from the 25 and 100 year storms have not been mitigated. No analysis has been provided as to how the post development 100 year storm will impact the existing on-site stormwater basin located within the easement.

Second Review Comment: The Applicant has demonstrated by runoff analysis calculations that the 25 and 100 year storm events have not been mitigated; but has stated that this excess discharge rate or runoff will get routed through the existing detention basin to mimic current runoff conditions. If the applicant intends to utilize the existing on-site stormwater basin to meet the requirements of BMP Standard 2, the following calculations must be performed"

1. A pre and post analysis of the discharge out of the existing on-site stormwater basin.
2. Demonstration that the additional runoff getting discharge into the existing on-site stormwater basin will not adversely impact the existing subdivision infrastructure.

Section 3.3-Standard 3 Recharge

1. The infiltration basin has recharged the requisite Recharge Volume required by the BMP Standard 3. However, the volume of recharge is very excessive. Other stormwater infiltration basins, that were designed to recharge excessive volumes of stormwater, like this one, have failed. The warehouse at 900 Bedford Street is a prime example. The basin must be redesigned to infiltrate a volume closer to the required recharge volume to maintain the 72 hour drain down performance standard.

Second Review Comment: We acknowledge the calculations provided and they are not in dispute, however when the 2 and the 100 year storms both produce a 3.5' depth of standing water in the basin, it is our experience that infiltration issues will occur.

Section 3.4-Standard 4 Water Quality

1. The site is located in a Zone II and hence requires 44% TSS removal pre treatment.
Second Review Comment: Comment Remains, 44% pretreatment was not demonstrated by the TSS Spreadsheet submitted.
2. The Site appears to contain soils of rapid infiltration and hence requires 44% TSS removal pre-treatment.
Second Review Comment: See above comment.

Section 3.5-Standard 5 LUHPPL

1. The site is not considered to be a LUHPPL hence this Standard does not apply provided the applicant demonstrates the Average Daily Trip (ADT) generated from this project is less than 1000. See traffic study comments.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

Second Review Comment: Comment Remains until the Applicant's Traffic Engineer verifies that the facility will not generate more than 1000 ADT.

Section 3.6-Standard 6 Critical Areas

1. The Site is located in Zone II Aquifer Protection Area and hence Standard applies.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. The site is also located in an ACEC and disturbs more than a ½ acre and hence triggers MEPA, and thus requires the filing of an ENF per 301 CMR 11.03(12).
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Section 3.7-Standard 7 Redevelopments

1. BMP Standard 7 does not apply to this project.

Section 3.8-Standard 8 Construction Period Pollution Prevention and Erosion and Sedimentation Control

1. The applicant has acknowledged the project requires a SWPPP to be prepared prior to construction. We recommend the Board require the applicant furnish to them a copy of the EPA's Construction General Permit as a condition of approval.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Section 3.9-Standard 9 Operation and Maintenance Plan

1. The O&M Plan must include in its maintenance Logs provisions for the cleaning the catchbasin sumps.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. The applicant should clarify who will be maintaining the existing stormwater basin located in the easement that receives street runoff.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Section 3.10-Standard-10 No Illicit Discharges

1. The statement satisfies the requirements of BMP Standard 10. The statement will be required to be submitted after the project is complete.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Exhibit 1 Existing Condition Drainage Map



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

1. The drainage map should show the soils divide and identify the soil types and HSG designation.
2. Watershed "PRE 5.0 32" should be included in the Hydrocad model.
3. The Design Point should be shown on the map.

Second Review Comment: We did not see soil divides on the watershed maps. We could not verify that Watershed PRE 5.0 32 was included in the HydroCad Model. We did not see the design points labeled on the watershed maps.

Exhibit 2 Proposed Condition Drainage Map

1. The drainage map should show the soils divide and identify the soil types and HSG designation.
2. Watershed "POST 5.0 78" should be included in the Hydrocad model.
3. The Design Point should be shown on the map.
4. Portions of the post development watershed bypass the detention basin and must be modeled as such.

Second Review Comment: We did not see soil divides on the watershed maps. We could not verify that Watershed POST 5.0 78 was included in the HydroCad Model. We did not see the design points labeled on the watershed maps. We could not ascertain from the submittal materials if the bypass area was included in the model.

Exhibit 3 Inlet Drainage Area Map

1. The subcatchment areas tributary to some of the catchbasins exceed 0.25 acres in impervious area. In accordance with the Stormwater Handbook, Volume 2 Chapter 2, Page 4, the tributary area must not exceed 0.25 acres of impervious area in order for a catchbasin to receive credit for 25% TSS removal.
Second Review Comment: We require Subcatchment Areas D3, D43, and D53 be reduced in area as these subcatchments exceed the maximum area requirements by large amounts and have high RCN's.

APPENDIX A Soil Type and Geotech Report

1. The Geotech Report is suitable for evaluating soil suitability for the buildings and pavement, however soil evaluations must be performed and witnessed in the area of the infiltration basin. Seasonal High Groundwater determinations must also be performed as part of the soil evaluations. The applicant may be required to perform a mounding analysis based upon the results of the soil evaluations.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

APPENDIX B Hydrocad Analysis

1. The analysis only showed hydrographs for the detention basins. The existing watershed and the post development watershed must be included in the analysis.
Second Review Comment: Comment Remains.

APPENDIX C Checklist

1. Standard 6 must indicate that the discharge is near to a critical area by checking the appropriate box on the Checklist form. The site is in a Zone II and has soils with rapid infiltration.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. Standard 7, the wrong box is checked off for this standard the Checklist form. The project is not a redevelopment project.
Second Review Comment: Please remove the check mark shown in Standard 7 on the Checklist.

APPENDIX D O&M Plan

Overview Section

1. The Overview Section mentions Lakeshore Center Road, LLC current owner/operator of the existing on-site Stormwater Management System located in the drainage easement on the applicant's lot designed to manage runoff from the street. The Stormwater Report's narrative implies that the Applicant will inherit the maintenance responsibilities for this Stormwater Management System; making the Applicant responsible for both the existing Stormwater Management System as well as the one being proposed. Please verify that this is a condition of the sale and if so, please revise the O&M Maintenance logs to separate one Stormwater Management System from the other.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. See comments in BMP Standard 9.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

APPENDIX E Illicit Discharge Statement

1. See comments made in Section 3.10 of this comment letter for BMP Standard 10.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

APPENDIX F Pipe Sizing Calculation

1. The Conduit Table does not indicate the design storm used for sizing the pipes. Please identify the design storm used.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. The analysis didn't account for the tail water that will exist in the forebay.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

APPENDIX G Stormwater Calculations

1. Please see comments made in Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 of this report letter for the BMP Standards.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.

Upon review of the Traffic Impact Analysis Report (TIA), we offer the following comments:

1. The sight distance analysis was performed on an outdated Site Plan having one access/egress point centrally located along the site's frontage. The current Site has two access/egress points located near the north and south corners of the site along its frontage. A sight distance analysis must be performed at the intersections of each access/egress point being proposed.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
2. The sight distance analysis should include a profile along the lines of sight to ensure grades and other visual barriers such as existing signs, landscape vegetation, and cars parked in parking stalls do not alter the sight distances shown in the plan view.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
3. Stopping sight distances were based upon the posted speed limit of the Lakeshore Center and not on the 85th percentile of the traffic flow.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.
4. On Page 18 of the TIA the applicant states that they conducted AM and PM peak hour trip rates, but did not include an Average Daily Trip (ADT) count. The applicant states they estimated the ADT to be 720 based on a K-factor of 15%. Since an ADT of 1000 or more triggers MEPA we recommend the Board hire their own traffic consultant to review the TIA to ensure that it can be fully understood. The Engineering Division is not staffed with traffic analysis experts qualified to opine on the finer points of this TIA.
Second Review Comment: Satisfactorily Addressed.



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

Current Water Supply Condition for Bridgewater

The applicant has expressed his belief that he has the right to tie into Town water based upon the Conditions of Approval for the subdivision issued in 1988 for the entire site and that he has not exceeded that demand limit. Although the DPW needs further investigation into the accuracy of the applicant's claim; this is not the only water issue the DPW has with this project and other projects of similar water supply demand. The DPW is not in support of this project because Bridgewater currently is in a water supply crisis. Currently, Bridgewater simply cannot safely supply water to meet the current demands during contingency conditions without reducing water pressures in our distribution network to unsafe levels. Residual water pressures of 20 PSI within our water distribution network must be maintained at all times, under all plausible contingency conditions to adequately fight fires and meet the demands of the residents without compromising the water distribution network. Maintaining 20 PSI residual pressures within our water distribution network is also needed to prevent water mains from becoming damaged and possibly contaminated.

Our water towers are now experiencing critical low water levels during times of the year when they historically were able to be kept at safer levels. Currently our two water towers, Sprague's Hill and Great Hill have water level heights of 47.5' and 37.5' respectively, which represent a significant risk to the Town's water supply and distribution network. The brown water we commonly experience is *not* just a water quality issue, it is the symptom of a bigger problem, water quantity. When our wells pump continuously, they draw water from deeper levels in the aquifer where the water quality deteriorates, resulting in brown water. If that isn't bad enough, when safe water levels still can't be maintained in our towers, we are forced to activate Well 10B, which currently produces water that is not treated for manganese and iron (the source of brown water). When this well is activated, we see the most significant levels of brown water. The DPW is not in support of projects with high water supply demand because it is a public safety issue.

The DPW is currently engaging consultants to provide near-term and long-term water supply solutions. Let all parties be advised, until we have the infrastructure needed to maintain safe water levels in our towers, we cannot support this project, nor can we guarantee water connection permits will be issued at the time of construction. Has the applicant explored the possibility of installing an on-site private well?

Second Review Comment: The Applicant is not exploring the use of wells for this project.



PUBLIC WORKS

FIRST RESPONDER

BRIDGEWATER

Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer

Highway Building
151 High Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324
508-659-1306

The applicant must perform a Water Impact Study (WIS) that confirms the actual water demand that will result from the operation of this project. The WIS must also determine what the minimum water pressures will be in our water distribution system located at higher elevation in the Town during peak demand during a fire and a watermain break.

Second Review Comment: I have not received the WIS from our consultant at this time.

Should you have any comments or questions I would be happy to assist. Please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Gregory J. Tansey

DPW-Engineering Division
Gregory J. Tansey, P.E.
Town Engineer