

# **TOWN OF EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 •FAX 772-4709 <u>www.exeternh.gov</u>

# LEGAL NOTICE EXETER PLANNING BOARD AGENDA

The Exeter Planning Board will meet on Thursday, May 23, 2024 at 7:00 P.M. in the Nowak Room of the Town Office Building located at 10 Front Street, Exeter, New Hampshire, to consider the following:

# APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 28, 2024

# **NEW BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARINGS**

The application of Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC for site plan review and Wetlands and Shoreland Conditional Use Permits for the proposed construction of a commercial vehicle storage area, a 22,500 S.F. accessory storage building and associated site improvements on the property located at 127 Portsmouth Avenue. The property is located in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district and is identified as Tax Map Parcel #52-112-2

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

- Election of Officers
- Master Plan Discussion
- Land Use Regulations Review
- Field Modifications
- Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Releases

# EXETER PLANNING BOARD

Langdon J. Plumer, Chairman

Posted 05/10/24: Exeter Town Office and Town of Exeter website

1 2 3	TOWN OF EXETER PLANNING BOARD NOWAK MEETING ROOM 10 FRONT STREET
4 5	
5 6	DRAFT MINIITES
7	7.00 PM
, 8	I. PRELIMINARIES:
9	
10	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT BY ROLL CALL: Vice-Chair Aaron Brown, Gwen English, John Grueter,
11 12	and Nancy Belanger Select Board Representative
13 14	STAFF PRESENT: Town Planner Dave Sharples
15 16 17	<b>II. CALL TO ORDER:</b> Acting Chair Brown called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and introduced the members.
18	III. OLD BUSINESS
19	
20 21	APPROVAL OF MINUTES
22 23	February 22, 2024
24 25 26	Ms. Belanger motioned to approve the February 22, 2024 meeting minutes. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 4-0-0.
27 28 29	Acting Chair Plumer indicated with the applicant's approval to switch the agenda around so the lot line adjustments could go ahead of Front Street's application which would take longer.
30	IV. <u>NEW BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARINGS</u>
31 32 33 34 35 36 37	<ol> <li>The application of W. Robert Kelly and Karen K. Kelly for a lot line adjustment of the common boundary line between the properties at 59 Columbus Avenue and 55 Columbus Avenue (Maxwell property) R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district Tax Map Parcels #63-60 and #63-61 Planning Board Case #24-3</li> </ol>
38	Acting Chair Brown read out loud the public hearing notice.
39	Town Planner Dave Sharples indicated the case was ready for review purposes.
40	The Board voted unanimously to open Planning Board Case #24-3.

- 41 Town Planner Dave Sharples indicated that the proposed lot line adjustment will allow for the
- 42 conveyance of 2,291 square feet (0.05 acres) of lot area from the Maxwell property at 55 Columbus
- 43 Avenue to the abutting property owned by the Kellys at 59 Columbus Avenue to provide additional side
- 44 yard buffer. He indicated there was no TRC review however the materials were reviewed by staff and
- 45 there were no issues.
- 46 Bob Kelly presented the application noting that he was the co-owner of 59 Columbus Avenue and has
- 47 been neighbors with the Maxwells for over 40 years. He noted they would like to square up the
- 48 property line which is close to the existing line of the garage.
- Acting Chair Brown opened the hearing to comments from the public at 7:10 PM and being none closedpublic comment for deliberations.
- 51 Town Planner Sharples indicated two proposed standard conditions of approval:
- 52 1. A dwg file of the plan shall be provided to the Town Planner showing all property lines and
- 53 monumentation prior to signing the final plans. This plan must be in NAD 1983 State Plane New
- 54 Hampshire FIPS 2800 Feet coordinates; and
- 2. All monumentation shall be set in accordance with Section 9.25 of the Site Plan Review and
- 56 Subdivision Regulations prior to signing the final plan.
- 57 Ms. Belanger motioned that the request of Robert Kelly & Karen Kelly, Planning Board Case #24-3, for
- 58 a lot line adjustment be approved subject to the conditions stated by the Town Planner Dave Sharples.
- 59 Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 4-0-0.
- 60
- The application of Chris Turner for a lot line adjustment of the common boundary line between the
   properties at 3 Rocky Hill Avenue and 4 Rocky Hill Avenue (Rocco property)
- 63 R-2, Single Family zoning district
- 64 Tax Map Parcels #71-60 and #70-12
- 65 Planning Board Case #24-5
- 66
- 67 Acting Chair Brown read out loud the public hearing notice.
- Town Planner Dave Sharples indicated the case was ready for review purposes.
- 69 The Board voted unanimously to open Planning Board Case #24-5.
- 70 Mr. Turner presented the application noting the lot line would be moved over approximately 30.' He
- 71 noted that the property comes close to his property as it is situated now.
- 72 Mr. Grueter asked if there would be any change to the driveway and Mr. Turner indicated no, there
- 73 would be an angle with the frontage.
- Acting Chair Brown opened the hearing to the public for comments and questions at 7:14 PM and beingnone closed public comment to enter deliberations.
- 76 Mr. Sharples indicated three waivers were applied for that were not applicable or necessary.

- 77 Town Planner Sharples indicated two proposed standard conditions of approval:
- 1. A dwg file of the plan shall be provided to the Town Planner showing all property lines and
- 79 monumentation prior to signing the final plans. This plan must be in NAD 1983 State Plane New80 Hampshire FIPS 2800 Feet coordinates; and
- 2. All monumentation shall be set in accordance with Section 9.25 of the Site Plan Review and
  Subdivision Regulations prior to signing the final plan.
- Ms. Belanger motioned that the request of Chris Turner, Planning Board Case #24-5, for a lot line
   adjustment be approved subject to the conditions stated by the Town Planner Dave Sharples. Ms.
   English seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 4-0-0.
- The continued public hearing on the application of 81 Front Street LLC for a multi-family site plan
   review for the proposed conversion of the existing single-family residence at 81 Front Street into six
- 88 (6) residential condominium unites along with associated parking and site improvements.
- 89 R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district
- 90 Tax Map Parcel #72-195
- 91 Planning Board Case #24-1
- 92

93 Acting Chair Brown read the Public Hearing Notice out loud.

94

95 Shane Forsley of New Hampshire Development presented the application on behalf of the owners. He

96 provided full size plans to the Board for review. He noted that when he last appeared before the Board

97 there was discussion about special changes to proposed parking for the 14 spaces provided for the

98 residents. He indicated access, with adequate turning radius, would be by driveway off Front Street

99 rather than off Seminary Lane. Two spaces would be nose in by the Carriage House, six spaces would be

100 nose in by the neighbors, with plantings and there would be six spaces configured as three in the garage

and three shown out front. There would be minor changes to pavement to accomplish the swing

102 distance. He indicated working with Henry Boyd at Millenium Engineering.

103

Ms. English asked him to elaborate on the original design using Seminary Lane. Mr. Forsley indicated
 they were unable to get an agreement for use from the school. Mr. Brown noted there was no legal
 easement and access could be terminated at any time. Mr. Sharples noted he also reached out to the

- school and had no response, they were noticed and have not participated.
- 108

109 Mr. Grueter asked about the fence shown as "new fence" on the plan and Mr. Forsley indicated the

110 intent was to re-use the existing 4-5' cedar fence with a line of plantings but move the fence over (closer

111 to the neighbor' house). Mr. Grueter asked if the fence was in good condition and he indicated that it

- 112 was and was built sometime in the 80s.
- 113

114 Ms. English indicated the parking area was tight and expressed concerns about snow removal and

- plowing. Mr. Forsley indicated snow removal would be done by snow thrower and that there was a fair
- amount of room around the old doctor's office and left side of driveway, Carriage House and to the left

117 of parking and right of parking garage/former pool. He noted there is good drainage on site due to all 118 the landscaping and vegetation. 119 120 Mr. Sharples noted this is not a new structure really and there are no issues impacting Front Street or 121 the right of way. Mr. Brown noted the biggest difference is the additional parking. 122 123 Mr. Grueter asked if the enclosed walkway was staying and Mr. Forsley indicated no it would serve as a 124 connector to new entry points. 125 126 Ms. English asked about the old doctor's office and Mr. Forsley indicated there were no plans for that at 127 this point. 128 129 Ms. Belanger asked about plantings and Mr. Forsley indicated arborvitae or cypress in front of each 130 parking spot along the fence. Ms. Belanger noted that would provide an additional buffer for sound and 131 light. 132 133 Acting Chair Brown opened the hearing to the public for comments and questions at 7:33 PM. 134 135 Sally Brown Rush of 79 Front Street noted the plan change was significant and her biggest objection is 136 the fence being bumped out a few feet. She noted that where the new fence will be located will be 24' 137 from her house and will prevent going from the back to the front where she had 6' before. She passed 138 out photos. She referenced the regulation she noted at the last meeting about parking not being 139 adverse to other property owners. 140 141 Mr. Brown asked if the fence was on her property and whether she was going on the neighbor's 142 property to do that and she indicated it has been that way for 34 years. She noted safety concerns and 143 the problem it would create for her to do maintenance and painting her house. She indicated she 144 wanted to keep the fence where it is. 145 146 Mr. Brown asked if the applicant has spoken to the abutter about it and they indicated there had been 147 no discussions between them. Mr. Brown encouraged that discussion should happen. Mr. Brown noted 148 that is a matter of neighbors being neighborly and there was not a lot of legal standing for the request 149 as he was not aware of any easements. 150 151 Attorney Cassaza noted he reached out to Mr. Boyd but never connected. He noted the Board could 152 waive the requirement for that sixth space with the condition that the existing fence has to be 153 maintained. He noted the setbacks here predate zoning. Mr. Sharples noted there was no issue with 154 the six spaces and a waiver would not be necessary. 155 156 Ms. English agreed that she would like to see a dialogue happen between the two owners. 157 158 Mr. Grueter asked if the fence was not moved and the plantings eliminated would that work and Mr. 159 Forsley indicated he liked to cooperate with neighbors but would defer to the engineers and owner on 160 the decision.

161

162 Carter Segal of 36 Pine Street asked if the driveway could be located on the west side of the property 163 where there is no abutter. Mr. Sharples explained that the Planning Board does not design plans for 164 people it reacts to the plan presented and whether it meets regulations. He noted that design may not 165 be easily accessible to all of the units. Mr. Forsley pointed out the access to each of the units and three-166 car garage and the heavy hardscape and landscaping built over time and the loss of character and issues 167 with the Historic District Commission. Ms. Segal asked why the front doors couldn't be moved. Mr.

- 168 Forsley noted there were no changes proposed to the fascade or historic integrity which is his goal to
- 169 preserve. Ms. Segal noted the addition was put on in the 80s. Mr. Forsley pointed out the modern
- addition and pool (being removed) and garage built in 1990.
- 171

172 Josh Segal of 36 Pine Street stated that it sounded like access via Seminary Lane was still up in the air.

173 Mr. Sharples indicated their answer was no. Mr. Brown explained it is not a legally enforceable access.

174 Ms. Belanger noted it was a private road and access could be taken away at any time. Mr. Segal asked if

- the space could be used until that time. Mr. Brown noted the Board had to uphold regulations and the
- applicant is required to show on the plan where parking will meet code.
- 177
- Mr. Brown noted further concerns about this being a condominium and whether the association mightsee the use by Ms. Rush as an encroachment on their property.
- 180
- 181 Mr. Grueter asked Ms. Wilson where she parks and she indicated she would like to park on Seminary182 Lane until someone says she can't.
- 183

Mr. Segal proposed removing spaces 14 and 11 to drive to the back and have spaces back there. Mr.
 Forsley indicated there are condensers and gas meters back there and it would require significant
 mechanical work and the area is heavily landscaped with existing drainage structures. It would require
 more pavement. Mr. Segal responded that HVACs and meters could be moved and noted that he

- 188 believed it was a cost issue.
- 189

Mr. Brown noted the property line and abutting fence with plantings is the biggest area of concern with the abutter at this time. Mr. Forsley indicated that he understood whether the fence were moved or not the parking spaces would still work. Mr. Brown indicated it sounded like the abutter did not want the additional screening provided by the plantings and there had been a misunderstanding when she spoke at the last meeting about her view from her bedroom and car lights coming in.

195 196 Mr. Sharples noted that the applicant would need a fence permit to move it and does not come to the 197 Planning Board for that. The property owner has the right to put the fence on their property wherever 198 they want. He proposed a condition that the plantings along the easterly side of parking stalls 3-8 shall 199 be removed from the final plan and the fence remain to provide screening to the property to the east. 200 He noted there is no authority in the site plan regulations to dictate where the owner puts a fence on 201 their property. Screening can be done in different ways. The Board can't dictate where or appear to be 202 taking the applicant's property from them. Mr. Brown agreed that was a civil matter between the 203 parties.

204

205 206	Mr. Sh	arples no	oted that cars not backing onto Front Street would be an ongoing condition of approval.		
207 208	Ms. English asked about lighting and Mr. Forsley indicated there was no new lighting proposed.				
209 210 211 212	Mr. Sharples noted there would be an ongoing condition of approval that all outdoor lighting, including security lights, shall be down lit and shielded so no direct light is visible from adjacent properties and/or roadways.				
212 213 214	Mr. Sh	arples re	ad the remaining conditions:		
215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230	• • Ms. Be family Mr. Gi	The pla and the be inclu It will b shall be roadwa A dwg f monun Hamps All app impact building	antings along the easterly side of parking stalls 3-8 shall be removed from the final plan e fence shall remain to provide screening to the property to the east. This condition shall uded in any condominium documents. be an ongoing condition of approval that all outdoor lighting, including security lights, e down lit and shielded so no direct light is visible from adjacent properties and/or ays. file of the plan shall be provided to the Town Planner showing all property lines and nentation prior to signing the final plans. This plan must be in NAD 1983 State Plane New hire FIPS 2800 Feet coordinates; and ropriate fees to be paid including but not limited to: sewer/water connection fees, fees, and inspection fees (including third party inspection fees) prior to the issuance of a g permit or a certificate of occupancy whichever is applicable as determined by the Town. <b>notioned that the request of 81 Front Street, LLC, Planning Board Case #24-1 for multi-</b> <b>n approval be approve with the conditions stated by the Town Planner Dave Sharples.</b> <b>conded the motion.</b> A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 4-0-0.		
231	V. OT	HER BU	SINESS		
232 233 234		•	Master Plan Discussion		
235 236 237 238		Mr. Sha was lef meetin	arples noted the Committee met and discussed the Stantec report and analysis and what it to be done. A graphic designer will work on the plan and come back to the May g.		
239 240		•	Field Modifications		
241 242		•	Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Release		
243 244 245 246		• indicate previou Access	Ms. English asked about the new bank in the Hannaford Parking lot and Mr. Sharples ed they didn't have to come before the Board for site plan review. The bank had usly been located within the store and not increasing drainage, pavement or traffic. already exists. Mr. Sharples emailed the Chair and Vice-Chair to let them know		

247				
248	• Mr. Grueter asked about the urbanization exemption application. Mr. Sharples noted			
249	that after receiving unanimous recommendation from the Planning Board he went before the			
250	Conservation Commission where it was recommended by all but one member. It was not			
251	recommended by ESRLAC and the next step would be to go to the Select Board. He noted the			
252	application still had to go to the State and they would determine if the exemption applied.			
253				
254	<ul> <li>Mr. Brown noted that more alternates needed to be recruited so if anyone was</li> </ul>			
255	interested in serving to contact Mr. Sharples or the Board members.			
256				
257	<ul> <li>Mr. Brown reminded that election of officers would be at their first meeting in May.</li> </ul>			
258				
259	VII. TOWN PLANNER'S ITEMS			
260	VIII. CHAIRPERSON'S ITEMS			
261	IX. PB REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT ON "OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITY"			
262	X. ADJOURN			
263	Ms. Belanger motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 PM. Mr. Grueter seconded the			
264	motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.			
265	Respectfully submitted.			
266	Daniel Hoijer,			
267	Recording Secretary			

268 Via Exeter TV



TOWN OF EXETER

Planning and Building Department 10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 • FAX 772-4709 www.exeternh.gov

Date: May 15, 2024

To: Planning Board

From: Dave Sharples, Town Planner

Re: Meniscus Financial Holdings LLC – 127 Portsmouth Avenue PB Case #24-1

The Applicant is seeking a site plan review and Wetlands/Shoreland permits for the proposed construction of a commercial vehicle storage area, a 22,500 S.F. accessory storage building and associated site improvements on the property located at 127 Portsmouth Avenue. The property is located in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district and is identified as Tax Map Parcel #52-112-2.

The Applicant met with the Planning Board and Conservation Commission, in June and July 2023, respectively, for a preliminary review of the project prior to moving forward with a full engineered design. Copies of the minutes from those meetings are enclosed, along with the formal application submission.

Attached please find applications, plans and supporting documents, dated 2/13/24, for your review.

A Technical Review Committee meeting was held on March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024; copies of the TRC comment letter, dated 3/12/24 and UEI comment letter, dated 3/8/24 are enclosed. A second TRC meeting was held on April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2024; TRC and UEI comment letters, dated 3/16/24 and 3/15/24 respectively, are also enclosed for review.

A site walk was conducted by the Conservation Commission prior to their May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2024 meeting at which the Applicant presented their applications for Wetlands and Shoreland Conditional Use Permits. At the meeting, it was noted that Underwood Engineers, Inc. (UEI) had not yet been provided with the revised plans for review and no review comments were available. The Commission requested that the Applicant return at a future meeting once the plans had been reviewed by UEI.

Revised plans and supporting documents were submitted to our office on May 15th, 2024, and staff is still in the process of reviewing those materials. I will update the Board with my review of the revised plans at the meeting.

The Applicant is requesting a waiver from Section 7.4.7 of the Board's Site Plan Review & Subdivision regulations for relief from the requirement to identify significant trees of 20" or greater in caliper. A copy of the waiver request, dated 2/13/24, is included in the application materials.

The Applicant had acknowledged that both the Planning Board and Conservation Commission would like to schedule a site walk to review the current site and discuss the proposed improvements. I would suggest that the Board schedule a site walk prior to the next meeting and request that the Applicant mark out the important features of the site.

# Planning Board Motions:

**Table Motion:** I move that the application of Meniscus Financial Holdings LLC (PB Case #2-4) be TABLED to the (date/time) Planning Board meeting.

Thank You.

Enclosures

# **BEALS · ASSOCIATES** *PLLC*

70 Portsmouth Avenue 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Suite 2 Stratham, N.H. 03885 603 – 583 - 4860 Fax: 583 - 4863

February 13, 2024

Chairman Town of Exeter Planning Board 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

RE: Letter of Explanation Foss Motors Proposed Vehicle Storage Area & Accessory Storage Use Tax Map 0052 Lot #: 112.2

Members of the Board:

The applicant is proposing a commercial vehicle storage area at the front of the lot to increase inventory at 127 Portsmouth Avenue, along with a connecting driveway to the existing Foss Motors vehicle display lot. Additionally, an accessory storage use building is proposed towards the rear of the lot to be served by municipal water & sewer. The parcel consists of 6.24-acres which is encumbered by 150-foot and 300-foot municipal Shoreland Protection District (SPD) buffers adjacent to the Exeter Reservoir. Areas of wetland disturbance are proposed (all of which are man-made wetlands). The total wetland disturbance is 6,555 sf, the 150-foot SPD impact area proposed is 18,350+/- sf, the 300-foot SPD impact area is 65,403+/- sf, and a 22,500 sf building if proposed within the SPD. Disturbance and impacts associated with the proposed development requires applications for Conditional Use Permits for both the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District and Shoreland Protection District.

We met with the Planning Board for a preliminary consultation in June 2023 and with the Conservation Commission in July 2023 to review the project and obtain feedback prior to embarking on full engineering design.

We look forward to presenting this project to you in the near future.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours, BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O Smith

Christian O. Smith P.E. Principal



# TOWN OF EXETER, NH APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

#### **OFFICE USE ONLY**

# THIS IS AN APPLICATION FOR:

COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN REVIEW
 INDUSTRIAL SITE PLAN REVIEW
 MULTI-FAMILY SITE PLAN REVIEW

- () MINOR SITE PLAN REVIEW
- () INSTITUTIONAL/NON-PROFIT SPR

APPLICATION # DATE RECEIVED APPLICATION FEE PLAN REVIEW FEE ABUTTERS FEE LEGAL NOTICE FEE TOTAL FEES

INSPECTION FEE
INSPECTION COST
REFUND (IF ANY)

1.	NAME OF LEGAL OWNER OF RECORD:	Meniscus Financial Holdings. LLC

**TELEPHONE:** (603) <u>475-4339</u>

ADDRESS: 133 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH 03833

2. NAME OF APPLICANT: Same as owner

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **TELEPHONE:** ( )\_\_\_\_\_

# 3. RELATIONSHIP OF APPLICANT TO PROPERTY IF OTHER THAN OWNER: <u>N/A</u>

(Written permission from Owner is required, please attach.)

4. **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:** Vacant with drive to 129 & 131 Ports Ave. (access easement)

ADDRESS: 127 Portsmouth Avenue (131 listed on deed)

 TAX MAP: 52
 PARCEL #: 112-2
 ZONING DISTRICT: C-2

AREA OF ENTIRE TRACT: <u>6.24 acres</u> PORTION BEING DEVELOPED: <u>2.24 acres</u>

#### f:\docs\plan'g & build'g dept\application revisions\application revisions 2019\site plan review app 2019.docx

#### 5. ESTIMATED TOTAL SITE DEVELOPMENT COST \$\_\_\_\_\_

#### 6. EXPLANATION OF PROPOSAL: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed paved vehicle storage/display area with an accessory use storage building.

## 7. ARE MUNICIPAL SERVICES AVAILABLE? (YES/NO) Yes

If yes, Water and Sewer Superintendent must grant written approval for connection. If no, septic system must comply with W.S.P.C.C. requirements.

# 8. LIST ALL MAPS, PLANS AND OTHER ACCOMPANYING MATERIAL SUBMITTED WITH THIS APPLICATION:

ITEM:	NUMBER OF COPIES
A. Full Size Plan Set	7
B. Letter of Explanation	1
C. Applications (Site, Utility Connections)	1
D. Applications (CUP Shoreland & Wetlands)	1
E. Drainage Analysis	2
F. Check for Application Fees, Waiver Reques	t Letter 1
Abutters List / Labels	1/3

9. ANY DEED RESTRICTIONS AND COVENANTS THAT APPLY OR ARE CONTEMPLATED (YES/NO) <u>No</u> IF YES, ATTACH COPY.

#### 10. NAME AND PROFESSION OF PERSON DESIGNING PLAN:

NAME:	Christian O Smith, P.E Beals Associates, PLLC				
ADDRESS: 70 Portsmouth Ave., Stratham, NH		nam, NH 03885			
PROFESSION:	Civil Engineer	TELEPHONE:	( <u>603</u> ) <u>583-4860</u>		

### 11. LIST ALL IMPROVEMENTS AND UTILITIES TO BE INSTALLED:

Proposed paved vehicle storage/display area with an accessory use storage building with associated lighting and stormwater collection and treatment, and a driveway connection to the existing Foss Motors business. Utilities to include water, sewer, gas, electric, and communications.



Vaa

\$800,000



# 12. HAVE ANY SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS OR VARIANCES BEEN GRANTED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT TO THIS PROPERTY PREVIOUSLY?

IF YES, DESCRIBE BELOW. (Please check with the Planning Department Office to verify)

No

# 13. WILL THE PROPOSED PROJECT INVOLVE DEMOLITION OF ANY EXISTING BUILDINGS OR APPURTENANCES? IF YES, DESCRIBE BELOW.

(Please note that any proposed demolition may require review by the Exeter Heritage Commission in accordance with Article 5, Section 5.3.5 of the Exeter Zoning Ordinance).

No

# 14. WILL THE PROPOSED PROJECT REQUIRE A "NOTICE OF INTENT TO EXCAVATE" (State of NH Form PA-38)? IF YES, DESCRIBE BELOW.

No

**NOTICE:** I CERTIFY THAT THIS APPLICATION AND THE ACCOMPANYING PLANS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION HAVE BEEN PREPARED IN CONFORMANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE REGULATIONS; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE "SITE PLAN REVIEW AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS" AND THE ZONING ORDINANCE. FURTHERMORE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 15.2 OF THE "SITE PLAN REVIEW AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS", I AGREE TO PAY ALL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REVIEW OF THIS APPLICATION.

DATE 2-13-2024

OWNER'S SIGNATURE

ACCORDING TO RSA 676.4.I (c), THE PLANNING BOARD MUST DETERMINE WHETHER THE APPLICATION IS COMPLETE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF SUBMISSION. THE PLANNING BOARD MUST ACT TO APPROVE, CONDITIONALLY APPROVE, OR DENY AN APPLICATION WITHIN SIXTY FIVE (65) DAYS OF ITS ACCEPTANCE BY THE BOARD AS A COMPLETE APPLICATION. A SEPARATE FORM ALLOWING AN EXTENSION OR WAIVER TO THIS REQUIREMENT MAY BE SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT.

#### ABUTTERS LIST FOR NH- 1471 EXETER, NH - FOSS MOTORS DATE February 12, 2024

#### SUBJECT PARCEL **OWNER OF RECORD** TAX MAP/LOT 52-112-2 MENISCUS FINANCIAL HOLDINGS LLC 133 PORTSMOUTH AVE. EXETER, NH 03833 **ABUTTERS** TAX MAP/LOT **OWNER OF RECORD** 52-112-1 **OSRAM SYLVANIA** 275 W. MAIN ST. HILLSBORO, NH 03244 52-112 NH EXETER PROPERTIES LLC 120 NORTHWEST BLVD. **NASHUA, NH 03063** LAURENCE & DEBRA FOSS 52-111 30 BUNKER HILL AVE. STRATHAM, NH 03885 52-53 EXETER LUMBER 120 PORTSMOUTH AVE. EXETER, NH 03833 108 HEIGHTS LLC. 52-52 c/o TWO GUYS SELF STORAGE 65 POST RD. HOOKSETT, NH 03106 52-51 SAF REALTY LLC. c/o STEVES DINNER INC. 100 PORTSMOUTH AVE. **EXETER, NH 03833** 52-50 AA FIELD REALTY LLC. 98 PORTSMOUTH AVE. EXETER, NH 03833 65-123 TOWN OF EXETER 10 FRONT ST. EXETER, NH 03833

EXETER SPORTSMANS CLUB PO BOX 1936 EXETER, NH 03833

#### ABUTTERS LIST FOR NH- 1471 EXETER, NH - FOSS MOTORS DATE February 12, 2024

#### PROFESSIONALS

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC. 70 PORTSMOUTH AVE. 3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR STRATHAM, NH 03885

WETLANDS & SOILS

GOVE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES 8 CONTINENTAL DRIVE, UNIT H EXETER, NH 03833

SURVEYOR

DOUCET SURVEY, INC. 102 KENT PLACE NEWMARKET, NH 03857



# SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION CHECKLIST

## A COMPLETED APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW MUST CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING

1.	. Application for Hearing				
2.	Abutter's List Keyed to Tax Map (including the name and business address of every engineer, architect, land surveyor, or soils scientist whose professional seal appears on any plan submitted to the Board)	(√)			
3.	Completed- "Checklist for Site Plan Review"	( )			
4.	Letter of Explanation	( 🗸 )			
5.	Written Request for Waiver (s) from "Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations" (if applicable)	( )			
6.	Completed "Preliminary Application to Connect and /or Discharge to Town of Exeter- Sewer, Water or Storm Water Drainage System(s)"( if applicable)	(~)			
7.	Planning Board Fees	( )			
8.	Seven (7) full-sized copies of Site Plan	(			
9.	Fifteen (15) 11"x17" copies of the final plan to be submitted <u><b>TEN DAYS</b></u> <u><b>PRIOR</b></u> to the public hearing date.	(  )			
10.	Three (3) pre-printed 1"x 2 5/8" labels for each abutter, the applicant and all consultants.	( )			
<u>NOT</u>	ES: All required submittals must be presented to the Planning Department office for distribution to other Town departments. Any material submitted directly				

to other departments will not be considered.



# SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

# 7.4 Existing Site Conditions Plan

Submission of this plan will not be applicable in all cases. The applicability of such a plan will be considered by the TRC during its review process as outlined in <u>Section 6.5 Technical</u> <u>Review Committee (TRC)</u> of these regulations. The purpose of this plan is to provide general information on the site, its existing conditions, and to provide the base data from which the site plan or subdivision will be designed. The plan shall show the following:

APPLICANT	TRC	REQUIRED EXHIBITS	
X		7.4.1 Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the owner, applicant, and person(s) or firm(s) preparing the plan.	
X		7.4.2 Location of the site under consideration, together with the current names and addresses of owners of record, of abutting properties and their existing land use.	
X		7.4.3 Title, date, north arrow, scale, and Planning Board Case Number.	
X		7.4.4 Tax map reference for the site under consideration, together with those of abutting properties.	
X		7.4.5 Zoning (including overlay) district references.	
X		7.4.6 A vicinity sketch or aerial photo showing the location of the land/site in relation to the surrounding public street system and other pertinent location features within a distance of 2,000-feet, or larger area if deemed necessary by the Town Planner.	
W		7.4.7 Natural features including watercourses and water bodies, tree lines, significant trees (20-inches or greater in diameter at breast height) and other significant vegetative cover, topographic features, and any other environmental features that are important to the site design process.	
X		7.4.8 Man-made features such as, but not limited to, existing roads, structures, and stonewalls. The plan shall also indicate which features are to be retained and which are to be removed or altered.	
X		7.4.9 Existing contours at intervals not to exceed 2-feet with spot elevations provided when the grade is less than 5%. All datum provided shall reference the latest applicable US Coast and Geodetic Survey datum and should be noted on the plan.	
X		7.4.10 A High Intensity Soil Survey (HISS) of the entire site, or appropriate portion thereof. Such soil surveys shall be prepared by a certified soil scientist in accordance with the standards established by the Rockingham County Conservation District. Any cover letters or explanatory data provided by the certified soil scientist shall also be submitted.	



X	7.4.11 State and Federally designated wetlands, setback information, total wetlands proposed to be filled, other pertinent information and the following wetlands note: "The landowner is responsible for complying with all applicable local, state, and federal wetlands regulations, including any permitting and setback requirements required under these regulations."
X	7.4.12 Surveyed property lines including angles and bearings, distances, monument locations, and size of the entire parcel. A professional land surveyor licensed in New Hampshire must attest to said plan.
X	7.4.13 The lines of existing abutting streets and driveway locations within 200-feet of the site.
X	7.4.14 The location, elevation, and layout of existing catch basins and other surface drainage features.
X	7.4.15 The shape, size, height, location, and use of all existing structures on the site and approximate location of structures within 200-feet of the site.
X	7.4.16 The size and location of all existing public and private utilities, including off-site utilities to which connection is planned.
X	7.4.17 The location of all existing easements, rights-of-way, and other encumbrances.
X	7.4.18 All floodplain information, including the contours of the 100-year flood elevation, based upon the Flood Insurance Rate Map for Exeter, as prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, dated May 17, 1982.
X	7.4.19 All other features which would fully explain the existing conditions of the site.
X	7.4.20 Name of the site plan or subdivision.



# 7.5 Proposed Site Conditions Plan (Pertains to Site Plans Only)

The purpose of this plan is to illustrate and fully explain the proposed changes taking place within the site. The proposed site conditions plan shall depict the following:

APPLICANT TRC REQUIRED EXHIBI		REQUIRED EXHIBITS
X		7.5.1 Proposed grades and topographic contours at intervals not to exceed 2-feet with spot elevations where grade is less than 5%. All datum provided shall reference the latest applicable US Coast and Geodetic Survey datum and should be noted on the plan.
X		7.5.2 The location and layout of proposed drainage systems and structures including elevations for catch basins.
X		7.5.3 The shape, size, height, and location of all proposed structures, including expansion of existing structures on the site and first floor elevation(s). Building elevation(s) and a rendering of the proposed structure(s).
X		7.5.4 High Intensity Soil Survey (HISS) information for the site, including the total area of wetlands proposed to be filled.
X		7.5.5 State and Federally designated wetlands, setback information, total wetlands proposed to be filled, other pertinent information and the following wetlands note: "The landowner is responsible for complying with all applicable local, state, and federal wetlands regulations, including any permitting and setback requirements required under these regulations."
NA		7.5.6 Location and timing patterns of proposed traffic control devices.
X		7.5.7 The location, width, curbing and paving of all existing and proposed streets, street rights-of-way, easements, alleys, driveways, sidewalks and other public ways. The plan shall indicate the direction of travel for one-way streets. See Section 9.14 – Roadways, Access Points, and Fire Lanes for further guidance.
NA		7.5.8 The location, size and layout of off-street parking, including loading zones. The plan shall indicate the calculations used to determine the number of parking spaces required and provided. See Section 9.13 – Parking Areas for further guidance.
X		7.5.9 The size and location of all proposed public and private utilities, including but not limited to: water lines, sewage disposal facilities, gas lines, power lines, telephone lines, cable lines, fire alarm connection, and other utilities.
X		7.5.10 The location, type, and size of all proposed landscaping, screening, green space, and open space areas.
X		7.5.11 The location and type of all site lighting, including the cone(s) of illumination to a measurement of 0.5-foot-candle.
X		7.5.12 The location, size, and exterior design of all proposed signs to be located on the site.
NA		7.5.13 The type and location of all solid waste disposal facilities and accompanying screening.



X	7.5.14 Location of proposed on-site snow storage.
X	7.5.15 Location and description of all existing and proposed easement(s) and/or right-of-way.
X	7.5.16 A note indicating that: "All water, sewer, road (including parking lot), and drainage work shall be constructed in accordance with Section 9.5 Grading, Drainage, and Erosion & Sediment Control and the Standard Specifications for Construction of Public Utilities in Exeter, New Hampshire". See Section 9.14 Roadways, Access Points, and Fire Lanes and Section 9.13 Parking Areas for exceptions.
X	7.5.17 Signature block for Board approval

# **OTHER PLAN REQUIREMENTS (See Section indicated)**

- X 7.7 Construction plan
- X 7.8 Utilities plan
- X 7.9 Grading, drainage and erosion & sediment control plan
- X 7.10 Landscape plan
- **X** 7.11 Drainage Improvements and Storm Water Management Plan
- 12 Natural Resources Plan
- na 7.13 Yield Plan

# **Town of Exeter**



# Preliminary Application to Connect and/or Discharge

Town of Exeter Sewer, Water, or Storm Water Drainage System(s)

# July 2014

#### **TOWN OF EXETER- DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

#### PRELIMINARY APPLICATION TO CONNECT AND/OR DISCHARGE TO TOWN OF EXETER SEWER, WATER, OR STORM WATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM(S)

Project Name Foss M	otors - Vehicle sto	rage/display with ar	accessory use stora	ge building.
Project Location	127 Portsmouth	Avenue, Exeter, NH		
Applicant/Owner Name _	Meniscus Financ	ial Holdings, LLC		
Mailing Address	133 Portsmouth	Avenue, Exeter, NH	1 03833	
		Phone: ( )	(603) 475-4339	
Project Engineer Ch	ristian O Smith, PE	E - Beals Associates	s, PLLC	
Mailing Address 70	Portsmouth Avenu	ue, Stratham, NH 03	3885	
		Phone: ( )	(603) 583-4860	
Type of Discharge/Connecti	on: Sewer <u>X</u>	WaterX	Storm Water_ <mark>n</mark> /	a
Estimated sewage	discharge quantity base	d on WS:1008.02 (B) [Closest Use = Factory/Ware	100 G.P.D. ehouse @ 10 gpd/ee x 10 ee's =	= 100 gpd]
New Connections (Complete	e Section A. and C. if ap	plicable)		
(check one) Change of Build	ling Use Only: Yes	(If yes, com	plete Sections B and C) or	No <u>X</u>
Reviewed and verif	fied by Planning & Build	ing Department		
			Town Planner	
******	******	******	*****	****

#### Sewage Disposal

Discharge quantities for various uses should be based upon the "State of New Hampshire Subdivision and Industrial Sewage Disposal System Design Rules, Part WS: 1008.2 (B)" or other methodology which may be deemed acceptable by the Town of Exeter. Please note that the discharge amount for single family homes is 120 gallons per day/bedroom. The minimum fee for single family is two (2) bedrooms, unless the sewer impact fee of \$4.85 per gallon of discharge is paid for all new discharge as well as any individual discharge resulting from an expansion or change of current use.

If the proposed discharge is non-residential or is residential but exceeds 5,000 GPD, Section C must be completed. Certain water and sewer discharges must be approved by the State of New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services by way of permit and plan submittals. It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure submittals are made to the state through the town as necessary. Final town approval cannot be made without the state's approval if required.

APPROVAL VALID FOR PERIOD OF ONE (1) YEAR FROM DATE OF APPROVAL

### SECTION A: PROPOSED NEW CONNECTIONS OR REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING LINES

# <u>SEWER</u>

SPECIFICATIONS:				
	Proposed 6-inch SDR-35 PVC from proposed building to existing			
	sewer manhole (#1228 on plans).			
TITLE OF PLAN: Util	ity Plan			
TOTAL GPD (*) :100	) GPD			
(*) FOR ANY NON-RESIDEN	ITIAL DISCHARGE OR RESIDENTIAL DISCHARGE	EXEEDING 5,000 GPD, OR FOR A CHANGE OF		
USE, COMPLETE SECTION	C			
Approved:	Date			
Approved	/S Superintendent			
•••	, o superintendent			
	WATER			
SPECIFICATIONS:				
DESCRIPTION OF WORK:	Proposed new water line service from	n existing main in		
	Portsmouth Avenue to proposed build	ding.		
		······		
TITLE OF PLAN:	Utility Plan			
TOTAL ESTIMATED GPD (*)	: 100 GPD			
Approved:		_ Date:		
	W/S Superintendent			
	STORM WATER			
·				
SPECIFICATIONS:				
DESCRIPTION OF WORK	N/A - Stormwater will not tie into mu	nicipal system.		
FLOW RATE - CFS:				
(25 YEAR STORM)				
TITLE OF PLAN:				
Approved:		Date:		
	Highway Superintendent			

3

# SECTION B: CHANGE OF USE N/A

In order to determine whether or not a sewer impact fee will be required for a change or expansion in building use, the following information must be provided.

CURRENT/PRIOR USE (S):		
BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE_	GALLONS PER DAY	
(*) SHOW CALCULATIONS BAS	D ON STATE OF N.H. DESIGN RULES, PART OF WS:1008	.02 (B)
******	**********	*****
PROPOSED USE:		
BUILDING SQUARE	GALLONS PER DAY	
(*) SHOW CALCULATIONS BASI (TOWN OF EXETER ASS	D ON STATE OF N.H. DESIGN RULES, PART WS:1008.02 ESSES GALLONS/DISCHARGE UNIT PER DAY X 80% ADJU	(B) JSTMENT FACTOR)
NET INCREASE/DECRE/	ASE GALLONS PER DAY (GPD)	*****
If there is a decrease, no a sewer impact fee will I Increase in GPD	sewer impact fee will be charged. If there be charged using the following formula: x \$4.85 = (SEWER IMPACT FEE)	is an increase,
Increase in GPD	x \$2.00 =(WATER IMPACT FEE)	
Approved by Town of Exeter: _		
	(Town Planner)	(Date)
	(W/S Superintendent)	(Date)

# APPROVAL VALID FOR PERIOD OF <u>ONE (1) YEAR</u> FROM DATE OF APPROVAL

4

**SECTION C: Baseline Monitoring and Classification** (NON-RESIDENTIAL OR RESIDENTIAL DISCHARGE OVER 5,000 GPD)

N/A

In accordance with Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 403 Section 403.14, information provided herein shall be available to the public without restriction except as specified in 40 CFG Part 2. A discharge permit will be issued on the basis of the information provided in this section.

In accordance with all terms and conditions of the Code of the Town of Exeter, New Hampshire Chapter 1500, all persons discharging wastewater into the town's facilities shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local Industrial Pre-treatment rules.

PART I - USER INFORM	ATION			
COMPANY	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
ADDRESS				
		P	HONE ()	
OWN	RENT	(If renting, name of owne	er)	
******	*****	*******	*****	*****
PART II - PRODUCT OR	SERVICE INFO	RMATION PRODUCT	(S) MANUFACTURED	······
	······			
SERVICES(S) PROVIDED			······································	
SIC CODE(S)		BUILDING SIZE	SQ. FT.	
NO. OF EMPLOYEES		DAYS/WEEK	SHIFTS	
PART III - CATEGORY C	OF SEWER DISC	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	*****	*****
TYPE OF DISCHARGE:	SEPTIC	PROF	POSED	
	EXISTING	CHANGE C	DF USE	
WATER USAGE IN GALLO	NS PER DAY:	(From Section A, <sup>-</sup>	Fotal Gallons per day)	
CHECK WHICH APPLIES:				
DOMESTIC WASTE ONLY	(TOILETS & SINH	(S)		
DOMESTIC WASTE PLUS	SOME PROCESS	WASTEWATER		
FEDERAL PRE-TREATMEN	IT STANDARDS (	40 CFR APPLIES)		

#### APPROVAL VALID FOR PERIOD OF ONE(1) YEAR FROM DATE OF APPROVAL

(TO BE COMPLETED BY TOWN) PART IV - CLASSIFICATION DETERMINATION \* CLASS 1 - SIGNIFICANT OR CATEGORICAL INDUSTRIAL USER CLASS 2 - MINOR INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL USER CLASS 3 - INSIGNIFICANT INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL USER CLASS 4 - NON-SYSTEM USER. OR DISCONTINUED SERVICE DETERMINED BY \_\_\_\_\_\_ TITLE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE **\*SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR BASIS OF DETERMINATION** APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_ W/S SUPERINTENDENT

#### **PART V - CERTIFICATION**

I HAVE PERSONALLY EXAMINED AND AM FAMILIAR WITH THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED IN THIS SECTION FOR THE ABOVE NAME USE. THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IS TRUE, ACCURATE AND COMPLETE. I AM AWARE THAT THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT PENALTIES FROM FEDERAL, STATE AND/OR TOWN REGULATORY AGENCIES FOR SUBMITTING FALSE INFORMATION, INCLUDING THE POSSIBILITY OF FINE AND/OR IMPRISONMENT.

I ACKNOWLEDGE AND AGREE TO PAY ALL CHARGES INCURRED FOR MONITORING, TESTING AND SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS PERFORMED ON THE TOWN OF EXETER'S SEWER, WATER AND/OR STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM(S), IN THE COURSE OF DETERMINING THE TOWN'S ABILITY TO SERVE THE PROJECT. FURTHER, I ACKNOLEDGE AND AGREE THAT FAILURE TO ACCURATELY DECLARE SAID FLOW REQUIREMENTS SHALL BE SUFFICIENT CAUSE TO DENY ACCESS TO THE TOWN OF EXETER'S SEWER, WATER AND/OR STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM(S).

SIGNAT	URE	OF	APP	LICA	NT
21014/11	OIL L	$\sim$	/ XI I		

\_\_\_\_\_ DATE <u>2-13-24</u>

NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER Menuscus Financial Holding, LLC

APPROVAL VALID FOR PERIOD OF ONE (1) YEAR FROM DATE OF APPROVAL

6

# **BEALS · ASSOCIATES** *PLLC*

70 Portsmouth Avenue Stratham, New Hampshire 03885 603 – 583 - 4860 Fax: 583 - 4863

February 13, 2024

Chairman Town of Exeter Planning Board 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

RE: Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC - Proposed Vehicle Storage Site Plan Waiver Request - Tax Map 52; Lot # 112-2

Dear Members of the Board:

This is written to formalize a request for waiver with regard to the referenced Site Plan Review application.

Your petitioner seeks the following relief:

We respectfully request a waiver to Sections 7.4.7 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations that requires all significant trees be survey located and depicted on the plans. We feel the waiver is justified as field locating every 20" caliper tree on the property is a vast undertaking on this parcel. A large portion of the site has been cleared for a historic excavation operation and remains as lawn, and the majority of the area with larger trees remaining is protected by wetlands or Shoreland protection buffers and is not proposed to be disturbed. Finally, as we fully anticipate a site walk with both the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board, no additional information of value would be provided from which to evaluate the proposed development by mandating the requirement as stated in the regulations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours, BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O. Smith

Christian O. Smith, P.E. Principal

201 Maria George Carrasquillo of 77 Jady Hill Avenue expressed concerns with runoff and children 202 playing out front, speeding and beverage consumption. She noted patrons change into their 203 golf clothes out on the street on the public road. 204 205 Jacques Wagemaker of 14 Webster Avenue expressed concerns with drainage and hopes it will 206 be addressed. 207 208 Alex Pearson of 1 Webster Avenue expressed concerns with existing drainage and doubling the 209 parking lot and adding to the problem. He stated he was not sure the island would work. He 210 also noted the 11 new lights would be 20' up and was unsure how they could be downcast and 211 212 dark sky compliant. 213 Mr. McCarthy stated he was also concerned with failure of the system with more frequent, 214 larger storm systems being experienced. 215 216 Mr. Sharples read out loud a letter received from Doreen Chester and Sherm Chester of 3 217 Webster Avenue expressing traffic concerns and requesting a stop sign, as well as concerns with 218 runoff and sewer capacity in the past. Mr. Scammon indicated that the more narrow entrance 219 may help with traffic concerns. 220 221 Mr. Sharples questioned whether it was known where the water was coming from and whether 222 the town engineer or UEI could attend the site walk or next planning board meeting to weigh in 223 on that. There may be separate issues. 224 225 Mr. Grueter asked about scheduling a site visit. Mr. Grueter proposed June 21st at 8 AM. Ms. 226 English asked that the parking area, storage area and dry well be marked. 227 228 Ms. Cameron motioned to table Planning Board Case #23-2 to 7:00 PM on June 22, 2023. Ms. 229 Belanger seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 6-0-0. 230 231 3. The application of Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC for a preliminary conceptual review for 232 the proposed construction of a vehicle storage/display area and associated site improvements 233 on the property located at 127 Portsmouth Avenue 234 C-2, Central Area Commercial zoning district 235 Tax Map Parcel #52-112-2 236 Planning Board Case #23-7 237 238 Chair Plumer read out loud the Public Hearing Notice. 239 240

- 241 Mr. Sharples indicated the applicant is requesting a preliminary conceptual consultation (non-
- 242 binding with no abutter notice) with the Board to discuss the proposed phased development of
- the property located at 127 Portsmouth Avenue. Letter of explanation, application, conceptual
- site plan and supporting documents dated May 18, 2023 were provided to the Board.
- 245

246 Christian Smith of Beals Associates presented the conceptual plan on behalf of the applicant.

- 247 He noted the applicant needed additional inventory storage and display area. The 300'
- shoreland setback and 150' buffer would be impacted. There were two wetland areas to be
- filled. They would meet with the Conservation Commission at their July 11<sup>th</sup> meeting. There
- would be two acres of shoreland impact and 21,000' of impact to the buffer. The swale was
- determined to be man made according to wetland scientist Jim Gove.
- 252
- 253 Ms. Martel recommended the landscape buffer be improved with plantings that would not
- block the visibility of the vehicles. She noted Hannaford had done something with their
- 255 frontage.
- 256
- Lighting and tree cutting were discussed briefly. There could be a site walk scheduled with Conservation in attendance.
- 259

264

### 260 VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- Master Plan Discussion
- 262 Field Modifications
- e Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Release

Mr. Sharples reported that Ray Farm was all done.

#### 265 VII. TOWN PLANNER'S ITEMS

266 Mr. Sharples reviewed the June 1<sup>st</sup> memo discussed with Kristen Murphy concerning the conflicting

- criteria in the zoning ordinance for the CUP. The site plan and subdivision regulations were to be
   revised then COVID hit. Currently stricter regulations would apply. He noted there would be a public
- revised then COVID hit. Currently stricter regulations would apply. He noted thehearing scheduled in the near future to correct the ordinance.
- 270 VIII. CHAIRPERSON'S ITEMS

## 271 IX. PB REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT ON "OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITY"

272

178 179	Mr. Mattera seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 5-0-0.
180 181	4. Minimum Impact Expedited Wetland application for Epping Road Expansion
182 183 184 185	Greg Backus presented the proposal for extending the center lines on Epping Road and widening on both sides for 1500.' He described the impact as 886 SF permanent and 700+/- SF temporary impact, mostly roadside ditches. There will be sidewalks and drainage improvements. The town project will improve safety and traffic flow. He described an Iris of concern which was found not to be the species
186 187 188 188	of concern and will close the loop with DES on that. He described the sidewalks to Gateway and the Mobil station and one break due to a ROW. He described stormwater management and catch basins. Detention basins will be expanded and have deep sumps in the catch basins.
190 191	MOTION: Mr. Koff motioned to sign the expedited application. Mr. Mattera seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 5-0-0.
192 193 194	5. Conceptual discussion on the construction of commercial vehicle storage area for Foss Motors at Tax Map 52 Lot 112.2 (Christian Smith)
195	
196	Brendan Quigley of Gove Environmental presented the application on behalf of Foss Motors and
197	indicated that Tim Foss was present. He indicated the location of the parcel south of the prior Sylvania
198	property. He indicated the reservoir location and location of the brook. He proposed a parking area out
199	front for storage and display of inventory and a potential building to the rear for offices. He described
200	three potential wetland impacts and the location of the 300' and 150' shoreland protection buffers. The
201	impact would be substantial, 80,000 SF. He did not have a lot of detail concerning stormwater
202	management but described it would be robust in this location.
203	
204 205	Ms. Murphy reminded this was a non-binding, conceptual, review and the Commission would be entitled to differing opinions when reviewing the final plans.
206	the second second second for the use of the design due to the consitive
207 208	Mr. Koff indicated he was not in favor of this proposal for the use of the design, due to the sensitive area of the Exeter drinking water source and amount of wetland and shoreland impacts. Mr. Madison
209 210 211	favor of the proposal either.
212 212 213	Mr. Madison asked the dimensions of the office space – 22,000 SF.
214 215	Mr. Mattera described the buffer impacts right next to the reservoir.
216 217	Mr. Foss described how long his family had owned the growing business and a desire not to leave Exeter in order to expand but they are maximized and have to grow.
218	
219	Mr. Mattera described the purpose of the buffer to protect the water quality and indicated he would
220 221	need to be shown that the water coming out is cleaner than when it started in terms of stormwater management. Mr. Madison agreed. Ms. Fanger was skeptical that anything could be done to protect

5

Con Comminutes 7/11/23

Con Com minutes 7/11/23

222 223	the water. Mr. Mattera questioned whether they were putting off the invevitable. Mr. Koff asked if they had considered off-site properties and Mr. Foss described the importance of the display location,
224	and off-site security and maintenance concerns.
227	and on site security and maintenance concerns.
225	C. Committee Benerts
220	a. committee reports
227	
228	7. Approval of Minutes
229	
230	i. June 13, 2023 Meeting
231	
232	MOTION: Mr. Koff motioned to approve the June 13, 2023 meeting minutes. Mr. Mattera
233	seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 5-0-0.
234	
235	8. Correspondence
236	
237	9. Other Business
238	
239	10. Next Meeting: Date Scheduled (8/8/23), Submission Deadline (7/28/23)
240	
241	11. Adjournment
242	
242	MOTION: Mr. Koff moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:41 PM seconded by Mr. Madison. A vote was
245	token all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously
244	taken, all were in lavor, the motion passed dianimously.
245	
246	Respectfully submitted,
247	
248	Daniel Hoijer. Recording Secretary
249	Via Exeter TV
250	Zoom ID 815 4715 1492
200	

# TOWN OF EXETER

Planning and Building Department 10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 • FAX 772-4709

www.exeternh.gov

Date:March 12, 2024To:Christian Smith, P.E., Beals Associates PLLC<br/>Tim Foss, Meniscus Financial Holdings LLCFrom:Dave Sharples, Town PlannerRe:Site Plan Review TRC Comments<br/>PB Case # 24-4<br/>Tax Map Parcel #52-112-2

The following comments are provided as a follow-up for technical review of the site plans and supporting documents submitted on February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2024 for the above-captioned project. The TRC meeting was held on March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024 and materials were reviewed by Town departments.

### TOWN PLANNER COMMENTS

- 1. Are there any known environmental hazards onsite? Have any environmental studies been completed and, if so, please provide copies;
- 2. The access from the adjacent lot is close to Portsmouth Ave and it appears that there is a location to the east that minimizes wetland impacts, consider relocating this access;
- 3. Is pedestrian travel on and to the site anticipated? If so, provide appropriate access.
- 4. Is the public going to drive in to the site and view the cars?
- Provide architectural elevations for the structure to determine compliance with Section
   9.2 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations;
- 6. Send plan set and supporting materials to UEI for review;
- 7. Will there be a dumpster on-site? If so, show the location and details. If not, describe how waste removal will be handled;
- 8. Provide low screening along Portsmouth Ave between pavement and sidewalk to satisfy Section 9.7.5.2;
- 9. Confirm that all curbing will be either granite or concrete;
- 10. Provide information on why a 30' access aisle is proposed around the sides of the building;
- 11. Show how cars will be stored on the storage areas. How many, configuration? This will help determine if the plan meets the requirements of Section 9.7.5;
- 12. There is no landscaping along the southerly side of the parking area. Suggest a mix of shrubs and deciduous trees along this edge;
- 13. EV charging readiness should be shown on the plans;

- 14. Snow storage areas appear inadequate and not where snow would normally be stored. If this is where it will all be stored then provide signage in other areas that prohibit snow storage;
- 15. Provide information that satisfies the requirements of Section 9.20.4. For example, provide specifications on timer if lights will remain on after 10pm;
- 16. What is the largest vehicle anticipated to visit the site? Provide turning template around the building to insure adequate access.

## Waivers:

I believe you are misinterpreting the significant tree provisions as it only requires identification in the area proposed to be disturbed.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS

No comments received – see UEI review letter dated 3/8/24.

## FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Comments provided to Applicant's representative by Deputy Fire Chief Jason Fritz at the TRC meeting.

# **CONSERVATION & SUSTINABILITY PLANNER COMMENTS**

- I agree it would be prudent to schedule a site walk before the CC meeting either 5:30p or 6:00p.
- Add State shoreland permit under listing of permits required (cover sheet). Have there been discussions with NHDES regarding this project? What is the timeline for wetland and shoreland applications.
- Sig Tree Waiver: Significant tree documentation requirement only includes areas that will be impacted, not to the whole property and half of the impacted area is already cleared of trees (SS 7.4.7). Support for a waiver is unlikely. Should you continue to seek a waiver, evidence to ZO 13.7 waiver criteria would be needed.
- Please review requirements for a waiver to use fertilizer within the shoreland district and associated restrictions, modify fertilizer specs as necessary (ZO 9.3.4.F.12.C.II).
- Please label buffers on the site plan proposed conditions.

# Shoreland CUP

- The application did not include any written findings of fact by the wetland scientist so I am unable to evaluate the responses (ZO 9.3.4.G.2).
- An impervious cover calculation within the shoreland district of 48.1% is dramatically higher than any application I could find. I suspect the CC and PB would have strong concerns about the precedent this could set.

- All snow storage is located within the shoreland protection district. Dumping of snow containing road salt or other de-icing chemicals is prohibited in the ESPD (ZO 9.3.4.F.6). Recommend signage prohibiting snow storage on south side.
- Stormwater management
  - Regulations require 80% TSS, and 60% N & P. The UNH stormwater center's biannual report includes an evaluation of stormtech chambers and confirms 80% TSS removal but indicates 0 DIN, and less than 60% of P with winter removal efficiencies of less than 30%. It is unclear how this meets our stormwater regulations or the CUP criteria.
  - Have you conducted any test pit data to determine estimated seasonal high-water table under parking area? UNH Stormwater Center's report recommends 3-5' separation to avoid groundwater contamination. This area is also within the area modeled to experience sea level rise-induced groundwater rise under a 2' SLR scenario which is within the range the coastal risk and hazards commission indicate could occur by 2050.
- Given the efficiencies reported by the stormwater center and the percent impervious cover proposed for the shoreland district, I do not see how a conclusion this project meets the criteria 2a (will not detrimentally impact surface water quality) can be reached.

# Wetland CUP

- The 2017 Wetland CUP application used has since been revised and the criteria modified. Please include a response to the current criteria available on website <u>HERE</u>.
- The application did not include an impact assessment from the wetland scientist so there is no response to current condition #3.
- What will the approach be to restore temporary disturbance (criteria 5 in old list)? If only seeding please consider a New England native mix. CC likely to request additional plantings.
- No evidence is provided to support determination of man-made wetlands (photos, wetland scientist report, etc.)
- Wetlands indicate they were delineated in Oct 2023. Was the site evaluated for the presence of vernal pools? What time of year was this additional review conducted?

## Other:

- EV Readiness is 2% of new parking (SS 9.13.8). Please clarify why the number of spaces within the vehicle storage site were not included in the calculation.
- I did not see any parking islands or interior plantings (SS 9.7.5). This plays an important role in reducing heat island effect and runoff temperature which is a water quality component.
- Chanticleer pear is a variety of Bradford pear which is on the watch list for invasive plants due to its invasive qualities. Please consider an alternative.
- Given proximity to reservoir, please use natural materials for erosion control such as woven jute or mulch berms where appropriate.

Please submit revised plans along with a letter responding to these comments (and other review comments, if applicable) **no later than March 28, 2024.** These materials will be reviewed at a second Technical Review meeting scheduled for **Thursday, April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2024**. A public hearing date for the project to be presented to the Planning Board will be scheduled accordingly.
### civil & environmental engineering



3033.00

March 8, 2024

Mr. David Sharples, Town Planner Town Planning Office, Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

Re: Foss Motors Expansion Design Review Engineering Services Exeter, New Hampshire

#### Site Information:

Tax Map/Lot#: 52 / 112.2			
127 Portsmouth Avenue			
6.24 Acres			
Commercial			
Town			
Town			
Zoning District: C-2 (Highway Commercial)			
Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC			
Beals Associates			

#### **Application Materials Received:**

- Site plan set entitled "Commercial Site Plan", undated, prepared by Beals Associates
- Site plan application materials prepared by Beals Associates
- Drainage report prepared by Beals Associates

#### Dear Mr. Sharples:

Based on our review of the above information, in addition to comments provided by the Town, we offer the following comments in accordance with the Town of Exeter Regulations and standard engineering practice.

<u>General</u>

- 1. Section C of Exeter's application to connect to water and sewer is applicable, please complete.
- 2. The use of the proposed building is not yet clearly defined. Please clarify the use and adjust water and sewer flows if necessary.
- **3.** If floor drains are installed in the building, they will need to be registered through NHDES. Information regarding discharge location and/or holding tank specifics should be added to the plans.

Review No. 1

Page 2 of 2 Mr. David Sharples March 8, 2024

**4.** The NHDOT slope easement and the sign easement notes are included on many sheets, many without accompanying leaders. Please correct or remove for clarity if not pertinent to the proposed project.

#### Cover Sheet

- **5.** The plan set should be dated.
- 6. A NHDES Shoreland Permit should be added to the list of required permits.

#### Existing Conditions Plan

- 7. Existing hand holes are shown on the plan. If the location of existing underground electrical is known or approximated, it should be added to the plan.
- **8.** The approximate location of the existing water main in Route 108 should be shown including the material and size information.

#### <u>Site Plan</u>

- **9.** The Water Works easement indicated on the existing conditions plan contains a 10" CI water main. The water main should be protected during construction. A note should be added to the plans to mark the location of the water main in the field prior to construction, and to maintain the markings throughout the duration of construction.
- 10. The proposed usage of vehicle storage near sensitive wetlands areas and in the Shoreland Zone is concerning. Please confirm the entirety of the paved area will be curbed for containment of leaks / spills. Please note vertical granite curb is required. Will there be any other resources kept onsite or procedures in place for immediate spill response?
- **11.** It has been indicated that vehicles may be stored inside the building. No architectural plans have been received. It is unclear how and where the vehicles will be driven into the building.
- **12.** The radii at all driveway entrances should be labeled.
- **13.** The need for 30' wide drive aisles is unclear. It appears there is opportunity to reduce the amount of pavement shown.
- 14. Indicate the location of the potential EV charging spot.
- **15.** Please clarify the need for 3 access points from the southern side of GTE Road.
- **16.** The description of the project says the lot will be for display and storage of vehicles. Will the lot be open to customers to view the vehicles? If customers and staff will be walking between the existing Foss Motors lot, across GTE Road, is a crosswalk warranted? If this is the case, the proximity of the crossing to the intersection of Route 108 and GTE Road is concerning for pedestrian safety, and consideration should be given to moving the entrance further away from Route 108.
- 17. If trucks or other vehicles are stacked to make a left-hand turn onto Route 108, visibility of vehicles turning onto GTE Road may be limited for drivers crossing from the existing Foss Motors lot to the new lot.

Page 3 of 2 Mr. David Sharples March 8, 2024

- **18.** Related to the comment above, please clarify the purpose of the access drive around the building. If the purpose of the access is for emergency vehicles:
  - We recommend looking into alternative surfacing to decrease the amount of pavement.
  - Provide a fire truck turning movement plan.
- 19. Please show the location of an enclosed dumpster pad, HVAC pads, and/or generator pad, if applicable.
- 20. Please note there are restrictions on snow storage in the Shoreland Protection overlay district.

#### Grading and Drainage Plan

- 21. Has the existing 36" drainage pipe crossing the lot been inspected to assess condition?
- 22. The location of CB #1 is in conflict with the existing sewer line.
- **23.** The grade of the short drive between the existing Foss motors lot and GTE Road is 13% and sheets water directly into GTE Road. Crowning of this drive is recommended. Additionally, the rapid grade change may cause some vehicles to bottom out.
- 24. DMH #8:
  - The elevation of the outlet from DMH #8 appears to be in direct conflict with the existing sewer line.
  - Two invert ins are listed, for a 4" pipe and a 24" pipe, with one 18" invert out. One 18" invert in is shown. Coordination is needed.

#### Utility Plan

- **25.** Existing water valves are shown in Route 108, one appears to be a hydrant valve. Is the other a stub for this parcel?
- **26.** Indicate the distance, in both directions, of the nearest inline valves on the Route 108 water main relative to the proposed connection.
- **27.** Please add a note to require the water line be installed under all utility lines with 18" of vertical clearance between utilities at crossings.
- **28.** It is unclear if Note 7 is applicable to this project.
- **29.** Is the entire length of the water service to be 4" DI? Please clarify on the drawings.
- **30.** Coordinate method of water service tie-in with the Exeter DPW.

#### Landscaping Plan

- **31.** Please show the location of the utility poles, hydrant, water and gas lines on the plan. We defer further comment regarding conflicts with the location of the proposed trees until a revised plan has been received.
- **32.** There are specific fertilizer regulations in the Exeter Shoreland Protection zone. Notes referencing the regulation or conveying the intent should be included on the plans.

Page 4 of 2 Mr. David Sharples March 8, 2024

**33.** Landscaped islands within the lot are required.

#### Stormwater Design and Modeling

- **34.** Provide a narrative and calculations for pollutant loading and removal volumes. We note the Stormtech (detention) systems do not meet required removals for nitrogen or phosphorous.
- **35.** The volume of water and the rate leaving the site during the 2-year storm is greater in the post-development condition. This is prohibited in the Town of Exeter per the site and subdivision regulations, section 9.3.1.5.
- **36.** The proposed discharge of the site's stormwater directly in front of the inlet to the existing cross-site 36" culvert is akin to discharging downstream of the site for most storm events. Any additional stormwater treatment that the upstream wetland may offer will be largely limited to very large storm events, when treatment is least critical.
- **37. PTAP Database: This project requires registration with the PTAP Database.** The Applicant is requested to enter project related stormwater tracking information contained in the site plan application documents using the Great Bay Pollution Tracking and Accounting Program (PTAP) database (<u>www.unh.edu/unhsc/ptapp</u>) and submit the information with the resubmitted response to comments.

A written response is required to facilitate future reviews. Please contact us if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

UNDERWOOD ENGINEERS, INC.

Allison M. Rees, P.E. Project Manager

MSL-

Robert J. Saunders, P.E. Senior Project Engineer

AMR:scc



Land Planning • Civil Engineering Landscape Architecture • Septic Design & Evaluation Stratham, NH

Exeter Planning Board, David Sharples, Town Planner Town Planning Office, Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

March 28, 2024

Re: Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Avenue – Commercial Site Plan

Dear Mr. Chairman & Members of the Board:

We are in receipt of a review letter from the Town Planner summarizing the Technical Review Committee's comments, dated March 12, 2024 and we offer the following responses to the noted comments. Each comment is followed by our response in **bold**.

#### TOWN PLANNER COMMENTS

1. Are there any known environmental hazards onsite? Have any environmental studies been completed and, if so, please provide copies;

Response: There are no know environmental hazards onsite and no environmental studies have been completed at this time.

2. The access from the adjacent lot is close to Portsmouth Ave and it appears that there is a location to the east that minimizes wetland impacts, consider relocating this access;

**Response:** The location of the access driveway was reviewed during the design. As shown, there is a 13% slope access drive. Shifting the driveway further to the east increases that slope to over 17% due to the existing grades.

- 3. Is pedestrian travel on and to the site anticipated? If so, provide appropriate access. Response: Pedestrian travel to the site is not anticipated. Customers will be able to drive to the site or be taken by a salesperson's vehicle.
- 4. Is the public going to drive in to the site and view the cars?Response: While the majority of customers will continue to visit the main dealership site, customers would also be welcome at the new site.
- 5. Provide architectural elevations for the structure to determine compliance with Section 9.2 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations;

**Response:** Architectural elevations for the proposed building are being prepared and will be submitted under separate cover.

- Send plan set and supporting materials to UEI for review;
   Response: The plan set and supporting materials have been provided to UEI and they have provided written comments.
- 7. Will there be a dumpster on-site? If so, show the location and details. If not, describe how waste removal will be handled;
   Response: A dumpster will not be located on-site. The limited amount of waste from the building will be placed out for municipal pickup.
- Provide low screening along Portsmouth Ave between pavement and sidewalk to satisfy Section 9.7.5.2;
   Response: Additional landscaping along Portsmouth Avenue has been provided.
- 9. Confirm that all curbing will be either granite or concrete; Response: All curbing will be vertical granite.
- 10. Provide information on why a 30' access aisle is proposed around the sides of the building; **Response: The 30' wide access aisles have been reduced to 24' wide.**
- 11. Show how cars will be stored on the storage areas. How many, configuration? This will help determine if the plan meets the requirements of Section 9.7.5;
  Response: The vehicle storage areas have been better defined and continue to be meant to be flexible parking depending on the size, type, and style of vehicles.
- 12. There is no landscaping along the southerly side of the parking area. Suggest a mix of shrubs and deciduous trees along this edge;Response: Shrubs and trees have been added to the southern side of the parking area.
- 13. EV charging readiness should be shown on the plans;Response: Conduits for EV charging readiness are shown on the Utility Plan at the western corner of the building.
- 14. Snow storage areas appear inadequate and not where snow would normally be stored. If this is where it will all be stored then provide signage in other areas that prohibit snow storage;

**Response:** Revised snow storage locations have been provided. Additionally, see Town Note #3 on the Site Plan for removal of snow for larger snow events.

15. Provide information that satisfies the requirements of Section 9.20.4. For example, provide specifications on timer if lights will remain on after 10pm;

**Response:** See Lighting Note #2 specifying that lighting shall be reduced to security levels by 10pm.

16. What is the largest vehicle anticipated to visit the site? Provide turning template around the building to insure adequate access.

**Response:** The Exeter Fire Truck is anticipated to be the largest vehicle to access the site and a turning template has been included on Sheet 11.

Waivers:

I believe you are misinterpreting the significant tree provisions as it only requires identification in the area proposed to be disturbed.

**Response:** The waiver to identify all trees 20 inches and larger has been removed and Doucet Survey will be locating those trees and revising the Existing Conditions Plan.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS

No comments received – see UEI review letter dated 3/8/24. **Response: Comment noted.** 

#### FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Comments provided to Applicant's representative by Deputy Fire Chief Jason Fritz at the TRC meeting.

Response: Comments have been addressed.

#### **CONSERVATION & SUSTINABILITY PLANNER COMMENTS**

- I agree it would be prudent to schedule a site walk before the CC meeting either 5:30p or 6:00p. Response: Comment noted and we will be available for a site walk prior to the Conservation Commission meeting.
- Add State shoreland permit under listing of permits required (cover sheet). Have there been discussions with NHDES regarding this project? What is the timeline for wetland and shoreland applications.

**Response:** A NHDES Shoreland Permit requirement has been added to the Cover Sheet. Discussions and submittals to NHDES have been tabled until we get further into the design process with the town, and will likely happen by the beginning of May 2024.

• Sig Tree Waiver: Significant tree documentation requirement only includes areas that will be impacted, not to the whole property and half of the impacted area is already cleared of trees (SS 7.4.7). Support for a waiver is unlikely. Should you continue to seek a waiver, evidence to ZO 13.7 waiver criteria would be needed.

**Response:** The waiver to identify all trees 20 inches and larger has been removed.

- Please review requirements for a waiver to use fertilizer within the shoreland district and associated restrictions, modify fertilizer specs as necessary (ZO 9.3.4.F.12.C.II).
   Response: Fertilizer requirements meeting Town regulations have been added to the plans.
- Please label buffers on the site plan proposed conditions. **Response: Buffer labels have been added to the Site Plan.**

#### **Shoreland CUP**

• The application did not include any written findings of fact by the wetland scientist so I am unable to evaluate the responses (ZO 9.3.4.G.2).

**Response:** A wetland impact assessment by Gove Environmental Services is being prepared and will be provided under separate cover.

• An impervious cover calculation within the shoreland district of 48.1% is dramatically higher than any application I could find. I suspect the CC and PB would have strong concerns about the precedent this could set.

Response: The impervious cover calculation within the Town's shoreland district has been revised to 44.3% and will likely be reduced further pending discussion with fire department and owner on circulation around the building.

• All snow storage is located within the shoreland protection district. Dumping of snow containing road salt or other de-icing chemicals is prohibited in the ESPD (ZO 9.3.4.F.6). Recommend signage prohibiting snow storage on south side.

**Response:** Revised snow storage locations have been provided. Additionally, see Town Note #3 on the Site Plan for removal of snow for larger snow events.

- Stormwater management
  - Regulations require 80% TSS, and 60% N & P. The UNH stormwater center's biannual report includes an evaluation of stormtech chambers and confirms 80% TSS removal but indicates 0 DIN, and less than 60% of P with winter removal efficiencies of less than 30%. It is unclear how this meets our stormwater regulations or the CUP criteria.
  - Have you conducted any test pit data to determine estimated seasonal high-water table under parking area? UNH Stormwater Center's report recommends 3-5' separation to avoid groundwater contamination. This area is also within the area modeled to experience sea level rise-induced groundwater rise under a 2' SLR scenario which is within the range the coastal risk and hazards commission indicate could occur by 2050.

**Response: ADS BayFilters** have been added to the outlet control structure along with test results showing at least a 60% removal for total nitrogen and total phosphorous to meet Town regulations. Test pits were performed during the soil mapping. Since we do not have the required separation to groundwater, the stormwater system is lined to prevent infiltration.

• Given the efficiencies reported by the stormwater center and the percent impervious cover proposed for the shoreland district, I do not see how a conclusion this project meets the criteria 2a (will not detrimentally impact surface water quality) can be reached.

**Response:** The stormwater design has been improved and the percent impervious cover reduced.

#### Wetland CUP

- The 2017 Wetland CUP application used has since been revised and the criteria modified. Please include a response to the current criteria available on website HERE.
   Response: The July 2023 version of the Wetland CUP application has been provided as part of this response submittal.
- The application did not include an impact assessment from the wetland scientist so there is no response to current condition #3.
   Response: A wetland impact assessment by Gove Environmental Services is being prepared and will be provided under separate cover.
- What will the approach be to restore temporary disturbance (criteria 5 in old list)? If only seeding please consider a New England native mix. CC likely to request additional plantings.
   Response: Restoration of temporary disturbances has been revised to use a New England native mix and additional plantings have been provided.
- No evidence is provided to support determination of man-made wetlands (photos, wetland scientist report, etc.)

**Response:** A wetland impact assessment by Gove Environmental Services is being prepared and will be provided under separate cover.

Wetlands indicate they were delineated in Oct 2023. Was the site evaluated for the presence of vernal pools? What time of year was this additional review conducted?
 Response: Gove Environmental Services is preparing a wetland impact assessment and schedule of review and will be provided under separate cover.

#### Other:

- EV Readiness is 2% of new parking (SS 9.13.8). Please clarify why the number of spaces within the vehicle storage site were not included in the calculation.
   Response: Cars in storage were not considered for the EV readiness calculation. Future EV charging stations would be for vehicles coming and going on a daily basis, not in storage.
- I did not see any parking islands or interior plantings (SS 9.7.5). This plays an important role in reducing heat island effect and runoff temperature which is a water quality component. **Response: Parking islands with interior plantings have been added to the plans.**
- Chanticleer pear is a variety of Bradford pear which is on the watch list for invasive plants due to its invasive qualities. Please consider an alternative.
   Response: Chanitcleer pear trees have been revised.

• Given proximity to reservoir, please use natural materials for erosion control such as woven jute or mulch berms where appropriate.

**Response:** An erosion control mulch berm and coconut erosion control blanket are shown on the plan.

Thank you for your timely and professional review of the submitted plans. We hope the information provided address your concerns. Please feel free to contact our office if you have any additional question and/or comments.

Very Truly Yours,

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O. Smith

Christian O. Smith, PE Principal



Land Planning • Civil Engineering Landscape Architecture • Septic Design & Evaluation Stratham, NH

Exeter Planning Board, David Sharples, Town Planner Town Planning Office, Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

March 28, 2024

Re: Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Avenue – Commercial Site Plan

Dear Mr. Chairman & Members of the Board:

We are in receipt of a review letter from Underwood Engineers, dated March 8, 2024 and we offer the following responses to the noted comments. Each comment is followed by our response in **bold**.

#### <u>General</u>

- 1. Section C of Exeter's application to connect to water and sewer is applicable, please complete. Response: Section C of the Preliminary Application to Connection and/or Discharge has been completed and resubmitted as part of this response.
- The use of the proposed building is not yet clearly defined. Please clarify the use and adjust water and sewer flows if necessary.
   Response: The building use is accessory storage to the main dealership lot to the north.
- **3.** If floor drains are installed in the building, they will need to be registered through NHDES. Information regarding discharge location and/or holding tank specifics should be added to the plans. **Response: The building will not have floor drains.**
- 4. The NHDOT slope easement and the sign easement notes are included on many sheets, many without accompanying leaders. Please correct or remove for clarity if not pertinent to the proposed project.

Response: These notes have been updated for clarity.

#### Cover Sheet

- The plan set should be dated.
   Response: A date along with a revision date have been added to the cover sheet.
- A NHDES Shoreland Permit should be added to the list of required permits.
   Response: A NHDES Shoreland Permit has been added to the list of required permits.

#### Existing Conditions Plan

7. Existing hand holes are shown on the plan. If the location of existing underground electrical is known or approximated, it should be added to the plan.

**Response: Handhole locations were located by the surveyor, but the locations of the underground electrical is not known.** 

**8.** The approximate location of the existing water main in Route 108 should be shown including the material and size information.

**Response:** The approximate location of the water main in Route 108 is shown on the Utility Plan. We will continue to coordinate with Exeter DPW to define the water connection requirements.

#### <u>Site Plan</u>

**9.** The Water Works easement indicated on the existing conditions plan contains a 10" CI water main. The water main should be protected during construction. A note should be added to the plans to mark the location of the water main in the field prior to construction, and to maintain the markings throughout the duration of construction.

Response: The above notes have been added to the Site Plan.

**10.** The proposed usage of vehicle storage near sensitive wetlands areas and in the Shoreland Zone is concerning. Please confirm the entirety of the paved area will be curbed for containment of leaks / spills. Please note vertical granite curb is required. Will there be any other resources kept onsite or procedures in place for immediate spill response?

**Response:** The entire vehicle storage area will be paved and surrounded with vertical granite curbing. No other resources will be stored on-site.

- It has been indicated that vehicles may be stored inside the building. No architectural plans have been received. It is unclear how and where the vehicles will be driven into the building.
   Response: Architectural elevations for the proposed building are being prepared and will be submitted under separate cover.
- The radii at all driveway entrances should be labeled.
   Response: Driveway radii have been added to the Site Plan.
- 13. The need for 30' wide drive aisles is unclear. It appears there is opportunity to reduce the amount of pavement shown.Response: The 30' wide access aisles have been reduced to 24' wide.
- 14. Indicate the location of the potential EV charging spot.Response: Conduits for EV charging readiness are shown on the Utility Plan at the western corner of the building.
- 15. Please clarify the need for 3 access points from the southern side of GTE Road.Response: We are continuing to review the requirement for the access road around the building with both the fire department and the owner. This access road will be limited as much as possible.
- 16. The description of the project says the lot will be for display and storage of vehicles. Will the lot be open to customers to view the vehicles? If customers and staff will be walking between the existing Foss Motors lot, across GTE Road, is a crosswalk warranted? If this is the case, the proximity of the crossing to the intersection of Route 108 and GTE Road is concerning for pedestrian safety, and consideration should be given to moving the entrance further away from Route 108.
  Response: While the majority of customers will continue to visit the main dealership site, customers would also be welcome at the new site. Pedestrian travel to the site is not

anticipated. Customers will be able to drive to the site or be taken by a salesperson's vehicle. The location of the access driveway was reviewed during the design. As shown, there is a 13% slope access drive. Shifting the driveway further to the east increases that slope to over 17% due to the existing grades.

**17.** If trucks or other vehicles are stacked to make a left-hand turn onto Route 108, visibility of vehicles turning onto GTE Road may be limited for drivers crossing from the existing Foss Motors lot to the new lot.

### **Response:** We are expecting very low volume of traffic to this access driveway and do not anticipate an unusual conflict at this location.

- **18.** Related to the comment above, please clarify the purpose of the access drive around the building. If the purpose of the access is for emergency vehicles:
  - We recommend looking into alternative surfacing to decrease the amount of pavement.
  - Provide a fire truck turning movement plan.

Response: The need for the access drive around the building continues to be verified with the fire department and the owner, and will become alternate surfacing is possible. A fire truck maneuvering plan has been added to the plan set.

**19.** Please show the location of an enclosed dumpster pad, HVAC pads, and/or generator pad, if applicable.

Response: There will not be a dumpster pad at the site and HVAC and generator equipment will be stored on the roof.

20. Please note there are restrictions on snow storage in the Shoreland Protection overlay district. Response: Revised snow storage locations have been provided. Additionally, see Town Note #3 on the Site Plan for removal of snow for larger snow events.

#### Grading and Drainage Plan

- 21. Has the existing 36" drainage pipe crossing the lot been inspected to assess condition?Response: A note has been added to the plans indicated the existing 36" drainage pipe shall be inspected.
- **22.** The location of CB #1 is in conflict with the existing sewer line. **Response: CB#1 has been shifted further from the sewer line.**
- **23.** The grade of the short drive between the existing Foss motors lot and GTE Road is 13% and sheets water directly into GTE Road. Crowning of this drive is recommended. Additionally, the rapid grade change may cause some vehicles to bottom out.

#### Response: The access drive has been crowned.

- **24.** DMH #8:
  - The elevation of the outlet from DMH #8 appears to be in direct conflict with the existing sewer line.
  - Two invert ins are listed, for a 4" pipe and a 24" pipe, with one 18" invert out. One 18" invert in is shown. Coordination is needed.

Response: The outlet from DMH#8 has been revised and the 4" invert has been removed.

#### <u>Utility Plan</u>

**25.** Existing water valves are shown in Route 108, one appears to be a hydrant valve. Is the other a stub for this parcel?

Response: We have confirmed with Exeter DPW that one valve is a hydrant valve, the other is an inline valve, and no stub exists to the parcel.

**26.** Indicate the distance, in both directions, of the nearest inline valves on the Route 108 water main relative to the proposed connection.

**Response:** We will continue to coordinate with Exeter DPW to define the water connection location and requirements.

**27.** Please add a note to require the water line be installed under all utility lines with 18" of vertical clearance between utilities at crossings.

Response: This note has been added to the Utility Plan as note #7.

- **28.** It is unclear if Note 7 is applicable to this project. **Response: This note has been removed.**
- 29. Is the entire length of the water service to be 4" DI? Please clarify on the drawings.Response: We are currently showing a 6" DI from the water main to the building and will confirm with the building requirements and Exeter DPW.
- 30. Coordinate method of water service tie-in with the Exeter DPW.
   Response: The plans have been updated to call out a live tap on the 12" ductile iron water main with a tapping sleeve per Exeter DPW direction.

#### Landscaping Plan

**31.** Please show the location of the utility poles, hydrant, water and gas lines on the plan. We defer further comment regarding conflicts with the location of the proposed trees until a revised plan has been received.

Response: The additional site features have been added to the Utility Plan.

**32.** There are specific fertilizer regulations in the Exeter Shoreland Protection zone. Notes referencing the regulation or conveying the intent should be included on the plans.

Response: Note regarding fertilizers within the Exeter Shoreland Protection zone have been added the Lighting & Landscape Plan.

**33.** Landscaped islands within the lot are required. **Response: Parking islands with interior plantings have been added to the plans.** 

#### Stormwater Design and Modeling

34. Provide a narrative and calculations for pollutant loading and removal volumes. We note the Stormtech (detention) systems do not meet required removals for nitrogen or phosphorous.
Response: ADS BayFilters have been added to the outlet control structure along with test results showing at least a 60% removal for total nitrogen and total phosphorous to meet Town regulations.

**35.** The volume of water and the rate leaving the site during the 2-year storm is greater in the postdevelopment condition. This is prohibited in the Town of Exeter per the site and subdivision regulations, section 9.3.1.5.

Response: The post-development conditions have been revised to reflect the plan changes.

**36.** The proposed discharge of the site's stormwater directly in front of the inlet to the existing crosssite 36' culvert is akin to discharging downstream of the site for most storm events. Any additional stormwater treatment that the upstream wetland may offer will be largely limited to very large storm events, when treatment is least critical.

Response: The outlet has been relocated further from the existing 36" pipe.

**37.** PTAP Database: This project requires registration with the PTAP Database. The Applicant is requested to enter project related stormwater tracking information contained in the site plan application documents using the Great Bay Pollution Tracking and Accounting Program (PTAP) database (www.unh.edu/unhsc/ptapp) and submit the information with the resubmitted response to comments.

#### Response: Registering with PTAP will occur as the project moves forward.

Thank you for your timely and professional review of the submitted plans. We hope the information provided address your concerns. Please feel free to contact our office if you have any additional question and/or comments.

Very Truly Yours,

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O. Smith

Christian O. Smith, PE Principal

### TOWN OF EXETER

Planning and Building Department

10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 • FAX 772-4709

<u>www.exeternh.gov</u>

Date:	April 16, 2024		
То:	Christian Smith, P.E., Beals Associates PLLC Tim Foss, Meniscus Financial Holdings LLC		
From:	Dave Sharples, Town Planner		
Re:	Site Plan Review TRC Comments PB Case # 24-4 Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC, 127 Portsmouth Avenue Tax Map Parcel #52-112-2		

The following comments are provided as a follow-up for the second technical review of the site plans and supporting documents submitted on April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2024 for the above-captioned project. The TRC meeting was held on April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2024 and materials were reviewed by Town departments.

#### TOWN PLANNER COMMENTS

No additional comments

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS

No comments received – see UEI review letter, dated 4/15/24

#### FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Comments provided to Applicant's representative by Deputy Fire Chief Jason Fritz at the March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024 TRC meeting. Requested information regarding the storage of electric vehicles and charging stations.

#### **CONSERVATION & SUSTINABILITY PLANNER COMMENTS**

- The project as presented does not meet stormwater requirements. Presented a solution that provides an average of 60% removal efficiency, however our regulations require a min of 60%.
- Please ensure the wetland scientist stamp on the plans and wetland who prepared the report match.

- I can find no record of a project that proposed impervious cover of this amount in our shoreland district after regulations were adopted.
- I would encourage the wetland scientist report be revised removing vague language as it introduces confusion. Example: Unclear if wetlands B4-6 are manmade. If there is not definitive evidence, our buffer requirements must be adhered to. Additionally, it is not clear if all wetlands were surveyed for vernal pool indicator species. The statement "potentially adequate pool" is a value judgement and not a regulatory term. Either VP indicator species were present or not. They should all be checked.
- Not previously shared at the meeting: There is no key to understand the different symbols for the significant trees on the plans submitted today.

In order to be heard at the May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2024 Planning Board meeting, please submit any revised plans along with a letter responding to these comments (and other review comments, if applicable) **no later than May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024**, but sooner if possible, to allow staff adequate time to review the revisions and responses prior to the planning board hearing.

### civil & environmental engineering



3033.00

April 15, 2024

Mr. David Sharples, Town Planner Town Planning Office, Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

#### Re: Foss Motors Expansion Design Review Engineering Services Exeter, New Hampshire

#### Site Information:

Tax Map/Lot#:	52 / 112.2
Address:	127 Portsmouth Avenue
Lot Area:	6.24 Acres
Proposed Use:	Commercial
Water:	Town
Sewer:	Town
Zoning District:	C-2 (Highway Commercial)
Applicant:	Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC
Design Engineer:	Beals Associates

#### **Application Materials Received:**

- Site plan set entitled "Commercial Site Plan", revision date 3/28/24, prepared by Beals Associates
- Response letters prepared by Beals Associates, dated March 28, 2024

#### Dear Mr. Sharples:

Based on our review of the above information, in addition to comments provided by the Town, we offer the following comments in accordance with the Town of Exeter Regulations and standard engineering practice. Please note comments no longer listed have been addressed satisfactorily.

<u>Site Plan</u>

**10.** The proposed usage of vehicle storage near sensitive wetlands areas and in the Shoreland Zone is concerning. Please confirm the entirety of the paved area will be curbed for containment of leaks / spills. Please note vertical granite curb is required. Will there be any other resources kept onsite or procedures in place for immediate spill response?

*Beals Response: The entire vehicle storage area will be paved and surrounded with vertical granite curbing. No other resources will be stored onsite.* 

Review No. 2

## While UE recognizes that there are no standard requirements for spill response equipment, we recommend that spill response kits be maintained on site. We defer further comment to the Conservation Commission.

**11.** It has been indicated that vehicles may be stored inside the building. No architectural plans have been received. It is unclear how and where the vehicles will be driven into the building.

Beals Response: Architectural elevations for the proposed building are being prepared and will be submitted under separate cover.

#### The original comment still stands.

12. The radii at all driveway entrances should be labeled.

Beals Response: Driveway radii have been added to the plan.

We recommend increasing the radii at the westernmost site entrance to improve access for large vehicles, including fire apparatus.

**15.** Please clarify the need for 3 access points from the southern side of GTE Road.

Beals Response: We are continuing to review the requirement for the access road around the building with both the fire department and the owner. This access road will be limited as much as possible.

#### The original comment still stands.

**16.** The description of the project says the lot will be for display and storage of vehicles. Will the lot be open to customers to view the vehicles? If customers and staff will be walking between the existing Foss Motors lot, across GTE Road, is a crosswalk warranted? If this is the case, the proximity of the crossing to the intersection of Route 108 and GTE Road is concerning for pedestrian safety, and consideration should be given to moving the entrance further away from Route 108.

Beals Response: While the majority of customers will continue to visit the main dealership site, customers would also be welcome at the new site. Pedestrian travel to the site is not anticipated. Customers will be able to drive to the site or ne taken by a salesperson's vehicle. The location of the access driveway was reviewed during the design. Shifting the driveway further to the east increases that slope to over 17% due to the existing grades.

#### Our original comment still stands.

17. If trucks or other vehicles are stacked to make a left-hand turn onto Route 108, visibility of vehicles turning onto GTE Road may be limited for drivers crossing from the existing Foss Motors lot to the new lot.

Beals Response: We are expecting very low volume of traffic to this access driveway and do not anticipate an unusual conflict at this location.

The original comment still stands. We defer further comment to the Planning Board.

Page 3 of 5 Mr. David Sharples April 15, 2024

#### Grading and Drainage Plan

**21.** Has the existing 36" drainage pipe crossing the lot been inspected to assess condition?

*Beals Response: A note has been added to the plans indicated the existing 36" drainage pipe shall be inspected.* 

### The new note should also indicate that any issues found during inspection should be relayed to the design engineer for resolution.

**23.** The grade of the short drive between the existing Foss motors lot and GTE Road is 13% and sheets water directly into GTE Road. Crowning of this drive is recommended. Additionally, the rapid grade change may cause some vehicles to bottom out.

Beals Response: The access drive has been crowned.

### Follow-up comment: Consider improving the transition grades on both ends for a smoother profile.

#### <u>Utility Plan</u>

**26.** Indicate the distance, in both directions, of the nearest inline valves on the Route 108 water main relative to the proposed connection.

*Beals Response: We will continue to coordinate with Exeter DPW to define the water location and requirements.* 

Acknowledged. We note the proposed connection shown should be pulled back to the existing water main shown.

#### Stormwater Design and Modeling

**34.** Provide a narrative and calculations for pollutant loading and removal volumes. We note the Stormtech (detention) systems do not meet required removals for nitrogen or phosphorous.

Beals Response: ADS BayFilters have been added to the outlet control structure along with test results showing at least a 60% removal for total nitrogen and total phosphorous to meet Town regulations.

Acknowledged. Please see comments regarding the BayFilters below.

**35.** The volume of water and the rate leaving the site during the 2-year storm is greater in the post-development condition. This is prohibited in the Town of Exeter per the site and subdivision regulations, section 9.3.1.5.

Beals Response: The post-development conditions have been revised to reflect the plan changes.

### Acknowledged. Please see the new comment below regarding increased volumes leaving the site.

#### New Comments

- **38.** Crossing #1, as noted on the Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control sheet, indicates 4 inches of vertical clearance, with the existing PVC sewer over the proposed HDPE drain line. This clearance conflict will require additional detail and construction measures to attain proper compaction. Notes requiring that the joints of the respective pipes be appropriately staggered and consideration for sleeving the sewer should be given.
- **39.** Revise the label for the DMH labeled as "DMH #XXX" downstream of the outlet control structure on the Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control Plan.
- 40. The angle of the sewer service should be revised to direct the flow downstream.
- **41.** The revised location of the Stormtech system, directly over the existing 36" culvert, renders the existing pipe inaccessible for replacement or repair. More importantly, there is no way to know how the existing pipe was installed, or what compaction level the material received during installation or during the years since installation. The cross culvert, like all culverts, is a conduit risk for rapid conveyance of water through the ground. Positioning a detention basin above the culvert presents an increased risk of slope failure should the detained water find a path to the culvert to follow if the membrane layer tears or fails. Please discuss.
- **42.** The Stormtech detail sheets notes several items to be designed/determined by engineer, including manifold and underdrain sizing, depth of stone under the system, the outlet structure with weir and DMH's with elevated bypass manifold. The submission, including the plans as appropriate, should include the required information for those elements.
- **43.** The project will result in a significant increase in stormwater run-off volume leaving the site and onto the adjacent town-owned parcel. Volume increases 45% (or approximately 169,000 gallons) during a 10-year storm. UE notes that the 100-year flood elevation of Wheelwright Creek is elevation 8 and that the downstream culvert inverts are around elevation 7. Modeling the cross-parcel culvert, taking the flood elevation into account and including any tailwater effects from flood water will have on its capacity, is prudent. Please discuss the effect of the increase in volume of stormwater exiting the site on the town-owned parcel.
- **44.** It is unclear what storm the BayFilters are designed for. Please clarify in the stormwater report.
- **45.** We note any pollutant removal capability of the BayFilters is heavily contingent on system maintenance. As the filters clog over time, pollutant removal decreases. The BayFilters are not addressed in the I&M plan. It is noted maintenance requires use of a vacuum truck and filter replacement. What assurances can be provided to the Town that the units will receive proper and timely maintenance?

Page 5 of 5 Mr. David Sharples April 15, 2024

**46.** The following details should be added to the plans:

- a. BayFilter details
- b. Outlet control structure, plan view and elevation, with dimensions
- c. Concrete washout pit

A written response is required to facilitate future reviews. Please contact us if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

UNDERWOOD ENGINEERS, INC.

Allison M. Rees, P.E. Project Manager

Alsa

Robert J. Saunders, P.E. Senior Project Engineer

AMR:scc



MATERIALS SUBMITTED 5/15/24 FROM BEALS ASSOC., LLC

## **BEALS** · **ASSOCIATES**

70 Portsmouth Avenue 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Suite 2 Stratham, N.H. 03885 603 – 583 - 4860 Fax: 583 - 4863

May 15, 2024

Chairman Town of Exeter Planning Board 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

RE: Letter of Explanation Foss Motors - Proposed Vehicle Storage Area & Accessory Storage Use Tax Map 0052 Lot #: 112.2

PLLC

Members of the Board:

The applicant is proposing a commercial vehicle storage area at the front of the lot to increase inventory at 127 Portsmouth Avenue, along with a connecting driveway to the existing Foss Motors vehicle display lot. Additionally, a 22,500 square foot accessory storage use building is proposed towards the rear of the lot to be served by municipal water & sewer. The parcel consists of 6.24-acres which is encumbered by 150-foot and 300-foot municipal Shoreland Protection District (SPD) buffers adjacent to the Exeter Reservoir as well as wetland pockets and associated buffers. Disturbance and impacts associated with the proposed development requires applications for Conditional Use Permits for both the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District and Shoreland Protection District. Wetland and shoreland impacts are shown on the provided plans and applications.

We met with the Planning Board for a preliminary consultation in June 2023 and with the Conservation Commission in July 2023 to review the project and obtain feedback prior to embarking on full engineering design. Since then, we have completed the site design, attended two rounds of Technical Review Committee (TRC) meetings, and responded to two rounds of comments by both the TRC and Underwood Engineering. Changes associated with these consultations have included the reduction of impervious surfaces, including the removal of a drive aisle around the building and revising the parking area to porous pavement. Additionally, roof runoff is now directed to a stone infiltration trench along the south side of the building.

In terms of stormwater, the entire water quality volume from the proposed parking area and building will be infiltrated into the ground following treatment. In addition to the removal rates associated with an infiltration trench which are 90% of Total Suspended Solids (TSS), 55% of Total Nitrogen (TN), and 60% of Total Phosphorus (60%), a bioretention filter media is provided within the trench to remove an additional 90% of TSS, 65% of TN, and 65% of TP. The porous pavement removal rates are 90% of TSS, 60% of TN, and 65% of TP. These removal efficiencies rates are per the NHDES Stormwater Handbook and meet the Town of Exeter requirements. All treated stormwater from the parking lot will be discharged downstream of the Exeter Reservoir.

Foss Motors, Exeter, NH NH-1471 May 15, 2024 Page 2

We look forward to presenting this project to you in the near future.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours, BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O Smith

Christian O. Smith P.E. Principal

## **Town of Exeter**



# Planning Board Application for <u>Conditional Use Permit</u>:

# Wetlands Conservation Overlay District

February 2017

Revised 02/2017-CUP



#### Conditional Use Permit: Wetland Conservation Overlay District In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Article: 9.1

#### SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS:

- 1. Fifteen (15) copies of the Application
- 2. Fifteen (15) 11"x17" and three (3) full sized copies of the plan which must include: Existing Conditions
  - a. Property Boundaries
  - b. Edge of Wetland and associated Buffer (Wetlands Conservation Overlay District WCOD)
    - --Prime wetland: 100'

- --Very Poorly Drained: 50'
- --Vernal Pool (>200 SF): 75'
- --Poorly Drained: 40'
- --Exemplary Wetland: 50' --Inland Stream: 25'
- c. Structures, roads/access ways, parking, drainage systems, utilities, wells and wastewater disposal systems and other site improvements

Proposed Conditions

- a. Edge of Wetlands and Wetland Buffers and distances to the following:
  - i. Edge of Disturbance
  - ii. Structures, roads/access ways, parking, drainage systems, utilities, wells and wastewater disposal systems and other site improvements
- b. Name and phone number of all individuals whose professional seal appears on the plan
- 3. If applicant and/or agent is not the owner, a letter of authorization must accompany this application
- 4. Supporting documents i.e. Letters from the Department of Environmental Services, Standard Dredge and Fill Application and Photos of the property
- 5. A Town of Exeter Assessors list of names and mailing addresses of all abutters

Required Fees:		
Planning Board Fee: <b>\$50.</b> 00	Abutter Fee: <b>\$10.</b> 00	Recording Fee (if applicable): <b>\$25.</b> 00

The Planning Office must receive the completed application, plans and fees on the day indicated on the Planning Board Schedule of Deadlines and Public Hearings.

APPLICANT	Name: Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC		
	Address:	133 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH 03833	
	Email Address	: TimFoss@FossCars.com	
	Phone:	(603) 475-4339	
PROPOSAL	Address:	127 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH 03833	
	Tax Map #	<u>52</u> Lot# <u>112-2</u> Zoning District: <u>C-2</u>	
	Owner of Reco	ord: Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC	
Person/Business	Name:	Same as Applicant	
performing work	Address:		
outlined in proposal	Phone:		
Professional that	Name:	Brendan Quigley - Gove Environmental Services, Inc.	
delineated wetlands	Address:	8 Continental Drive, Building 2 Unit H, Exeter, NH 03833	
	Phone:	(603) 778-0644	

#### **Town of Exeter Planning Board Application Conditional Use Permit: Wetland Conservation Overlay District**

Detailed Proposal includ	ing intent, project descript	tion, and use	e of property: (Use additio	nal sheet as needed)
Foss Motors proposes to	o construct a commercial sit	e plan consi	sting of vehicle storage/disp	lay and a 22,500 sf
accessory use storage b vacant lot bordering Wa	building, along with associate terworks Pond.	ed landscapi	ing, drainage, utilities, and I	ighting on a currently
Wetland Conservation	Overlay District Impact	(in square	footage):	
Temporary Impact	Wetland:	(SQ FT.)	Buffer:	(SQ FT.)
	Prime Wetlands		Prime Wetlands	
	Exemplary Wetlands		Exemplary Wetlands	
	□ Vernal Pools (>200SF)		□ Vernal Pools (>200SF)	
	U VPD		U VPD	
	D PD		X PD	304
	Inland Stream		Inland Stream	
Permanent Impact	Wetland:		Buffer:	
	Prime Wetlands		Prime Wetlands	
	Example w Wetlands		Evomplawy Watlanda	

i el manent impact	Wettallu.		Duilei.	
	Prime Wetlands		Prime Wetlands	
	Exemplary Wetlands		Exemplary Wetlands	
	□ Vernal Pools (>200SF)		Vernal Pools (>200SF)	
	UPD VPD		U VPD	
	X PD	6,336	× PD	45,420
	Inland Stream		Inland Stream	

List any variances/special exceptions granted by Zoning Board of Adjustment including dates: N/A

Describe how the proposal meets conditions in Article 9.1.6.B of the Zoning Ordinance (attached for reference):

See attached.

ABUTTERS: PLEASE LIST ALL PERSONS WHOSE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN NEW HAMPSHIRE AND ADJOINS OR IS DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET OR STREAM FROM THE LAND UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD. THIS LIST SHALL BE COMPILED FROM THE EXETER TAX ASSESSOR'S RECORDS.

ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ		ТАХМАР
NAME		
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ		ТАХ МАР
NAME		
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
TAX MAP		TAXMAP
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
	PREVIOU	ISLY PROVIDED
TAX MAP		TAX MAP
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ		ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ
NAME		
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ		ТАХ МАР
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
		ΤΔΥ ΜΔΡ
		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
 TAX MAP		
NAME		
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
 TAX MAP		TAX MAP
NAME		
ADDRESS		ADDRESS

#### 9.1.6 B. Conditions:

- 1. That the proposed use is permitted in the underlying zoning district;
- 2. That the use for which the permit is sought cannot feasibly be carried out on a portion or portions of the lot which are outside the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District;
- 3. The proposed impact has been evaluated in the context of the relative "value" of the wetland, including its ecological sensitivity, as well as its function within the greater hydrologic system. To the extent feasible, the proposed impact is not detrimental to the value and function of the wetland(s).
- 4. That the design, construction and maintenance of the proposed use will, to the extent feasible, minimize detrimental impact on the wetland or wetland buffer and that no alternative design which does not impact a wetland or wetland buffer or which has less detrimental impact on the wetland or wetland buffer is feasible;
- 5. In cases where the proposed use is temporary or where construction activity disturbs areas adjacent to the immediate use, that the landowner agrees to restore the site as nearly as possible to its original grade and condition following construction;
- 6. That the proposed use will not create a hazard to individual or public health, safety and welfare due to the loss of wetland, the contamination of groundwater, or other reasons;
- That all required permits shall be obtained from the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services Water Supply and Pollution Control Division under NH RSA §485-A: 17, the New Hampshire Wetlands Board under NH RSA §483-A, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

### **BEALS · ASSOCIATES** *PLLC*

70 Portsmouth Avenue 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Suite 2 Stratham, N.H. 03885 603 – 583 - 4860 Fax: 583 - 4863

May 3, 2024

Chairman Town of Exeter Planning Board 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

RE: Wetlands Conservation Overlay District Conditional Use Section 9.1.6.B Foss Motors - Proposed Vehicle Storage Area & Accessory Use Storage Building Tax Map 0052 Lot #: 112.2

Members of the Board:

As part of the Application for Conditional Use Permit for disturbances within the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District, the following addresses the conditions of Article 9.1.6.B of the Exeter Zoning Ordinance:

#### 9.1.6.B Conditions:

- 1. The proposed vehicle storage and accessory use storage building are accessory uses to the permitted Auto Dealership in the C-2 Zone.
- 2. The use cannot be feasibly carried out on portions of the lot completely outside the Wetland Conservation Overlay District (WCOD). Due to wetlands on either side of the long narrow lot, the majority of the lot is within the WCOD and cannot be avoided.
- 3. The proposed layout has been designed to minimize wetland and WCOD impact to the maximum extent possible, but cannot be configured to be completely outside the WCOD due to the existing wetland boundaries. None of the wetlands being impacted are considered high value. Refer to Gove Environmental Services wetland report for additional information.
- 4. The design, including construction and maintenance, has been configured to minimize any detrimental impact on the wetlands and buffers where possible. There is not a feasible design layout for this property that would avoid impacting the wetlands or buffers as they extend throughout the parcel.
- 5. The proposal will not create a hazard to individual, or public health, safety, or welfare due to the loss of the man-made, minimal function & value wetlands, and their associated buffers.

- 6. There is not an opportunity to increase wetland buffers elsewhere on site as those areas are already developed.
- 7. Where disturbance is temporary or adjacent to the immediate use, those areas will be restored as nearly as possible to the original grade and condition following construction.
- 8. NHDES Wetlands Dredge and Fill permit will be filed and will be strictly adhered to throughout construction.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours, BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O Smith

Christian O. Smith P.E. Principal

## **Town of Exeter**



# Planning Board Application for <u>Conditional Use Permit</u>:

## **Shoreland Protection District**

February 2017

Revised 02/2017-CUP/SPD



#### Conditional Use Permit: Shoreland Protection District In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Article: 9.3

#### SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS:

#### (see Conservation Commission and Planning Board meeting dates and submission deadlines)

- 1. One (1) electronic copy of full application, including plans (color copy if available)
- 2. Fifteen (15) copies of the Application
- 3. Fifteen (15) 11"x17" and three (3) full sized copies of the plan which must include: Existing Conditions
  - a. Property Boundaries
  - b. Edge of Shoreland and associated Buffer (Shoreland Protection District SPD)
  - c. Structures, roads/access ways, parking, drainage systems, utilities, wells and wastewater disposal systems and other site improvements

Proposed Conditions

- a. Edge of Shoreland and Shoreland Buffers and distances to the following:
  - i. Edge of Disturbance
  - ii. Structures, roads/access ways, parking, drainage systems, utilities, wells and wastewater disposal systems and other site improvements
- b. Name and phone number of all individuals whose professional seal appears on the plan
- 4. If applicant and/or agent is not the owner, a letter of authorization must accompany this application
- 5. Supporting documents i.e. Letters from the Department of Environmental Services, Standard Dredge and Fill Application and Photos of the property
- 6. A Town of Exeter Assessors list of names and mailing addresses of all abutters

Required Fees:		
Planning Board Fee: <b>\$50.</b> 00	Abutter Fee: <b>\$10.</b> 00	Recording Fee (if applicable): <b>\$25.</b> 00

The Planning Office must receive the completed application, plans and fees on the day indicated on the Planning Board Schedule of Deadlines and Public Hearings.

APPLICANT	Name: Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC		
	Address:	133 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH 03833	
	Email Address	TimFoss@FossCars.com	
	Phone:	(603) 475-4339	
PROPOSAL	Address:	127 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH 03833	
	Tax Map #	<u>52</u> Lot# <u>112-2</u> Zoning District: <u>C-2</u>	
	Owner of Reco	rd: Meniscus Financial Holdings, LLC	
Person/Business	Name:	Same as Applicant	
performing work	Address:		
outlined in proposal	Phone:		
Professional that	Name:	Brendan Quigley - Gove Environmental Services, Inc.	
delineated wetlands	Address:	3 Continental Drive, Building 2 Unit H, Exeter, NH 03833	
	Phone:	603) 778-0644	

#### Town of Exeter Planning Board Application Conditional Use Permit: Shoreland Protection District

Detailed Proposal including intent, project description, and use of property: (Use additional sheet as needed) Foss Motors proposes to construct a commercial site plan consisting of vehicle storage/display and a 22,500 sf accessory use storage building, along with associated landscaping, drainage, utilities, and lighting on a currently vacant lot bordering the Waterworks Pond.

Shoreland Protection District Impact (in square footage):			
Water Body	Waterworks Pond		
Temporary Impact	<ul> <li>300 Foot SPD</li> <li>150 foot SPD</li> <li>SPD Building Setback</li> <li>75 Vegetative Buffer</li> </ul>		
Permanent Impact	<ul> <li>X 300 Foot SPD</li> <li>X 150 foot SPD</li> <li>X SPD Building Setback</li> <li>75 Vegetative Buffer</li> </ul>	67,947 12,268 22,500	
Impervious Lot Coverage	SF of Lot within District SF of Impervious within District % of Impervious within District	<u>178,758</u> <u>25,205</u> 14.1%	Excluding Building 2,705 1.5%

List any variances/special exceptions granted by Zoning Board of Adjustment including dates: N/A

Describe how your proposal meets the conditions of Article 9.3.4.G.2 of the Zoning Ordinance (attached for reference): See attached.

#### ABUTTERS: PLEASE LIST ALL PERSONS WHOSE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN NEW HAMPSHIRE AND ADJOINS OR IS DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET OR STREAM FROM THE LAND UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD. THIS LIST SHALL BE COMPILED FROM THE EXETER TAX ASSESSOR'S RECORDS.

TAX MAP		ТАХМАР
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
TAX MAP		ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ		ТАХМАР
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ТАХ МАР	PREVIOU	SLY PARQVIDED
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ		ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ		ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
TAX MAP		ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ТАХ МАР		ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
ΤΔΧ ΜΔΡ		ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ
NAME		NAME
ADDRESS		ADDRESS
#### Conditional Use Permit Criteria Shoreland Protection District

9.3.4 G Conditional Uses:

2. The Planning Board may grant a Conditional Use Permit for those uses listed above only after written findings of fact are made which have been reviewed by technical experts from the Rockingham Conservation District, if required by the Planning Board, at the cost of the developer, provided that all of the following are true:

a. The proposed use will not detrimentally affect the surface water quality of the adjacent river or tributary, or otherwise result in unhealthful conditions.

b. The proposed use will discharge no waste water on site other than that normally discharged by domestic waste water disposal systems and will not involve on-site storage or disposal of hazardous or toxic wastes as herein defined.

c. The proposed use will not result in undue damage to spawning grounds and other wildlife habitat.

d. The proposed use complies with the use regulations identified in Article 9.3.4 Exeter Shoreland Protection District Ordinance – Use Regulations and all other applicable sections of this article.

e. The design and construction of the proposed use will be consistent with the intent of the purposes set forth in Article 9.3.1 Exeter Shoreland Protection District Ordinance – Authority and Purpose.

## **BEALS · ASSOCIATES** *PLLC*

70 Portsmouth Avenue 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Suite 2 Stratham, N.H. 03885 603 – 583 - 4860 Fax: 583 - 4863

May 3, 2024

Chairman Town of Exeter Planning Board 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

RE: Shoreland Protection District Conditional Use Section 9.3.4.G.2 Foss Motors - Proposed Vehicle Storage Area & Accessory Storage Use Tax Map 0052 Lot #: 112.2

Members of the Board:

As part of the Application for Conditional Use Permit for disturbances within the Shoreland Protection District, the following addresses the conditions of Article 9.3.4.G.2 of the Exeter Zoning Ordinance:

#### 9.3.4.G.2. Conditional Uses:

- a. The proposed development will not detrimentally affect surface water quality to Water Works Pond or Wheelwright Creek, or result in unhealthful conditions due to the proposed stormwater management system that meets the Town of Exeter's requirements. In addition, no snow will be plowed towards or stored within the Shoreland Protection District (SPD) that does not enter the stormwater system.
- b. The project will solely discharge domestic wastewater through the municipal sewer system. There will be no on-site storage or disposal of hazardous or toxic wastes at the project site.
- c. The proposed development will not result in any damage to spawning grounds or other habitat. Refer to Gove Environmental Services wetland report for additional information.
- d. The layout has been designed to minimize disturbance within the SPD and complies with use regulations identified in Article 9.3.4 with the exception of the following which are part of this Conditional Use Permit request:
  - a. <u>Maximum Lot Coverage</u>: The maximum impervious lot coverage is limited to 10% where we are requesting an impervious lot coverage of 15.3%. This is a reduction from the previous design's 44.3% lot coverage with the removal of the access road around the building and the introduction of porous pavement in the main parking area.

- b. <u>300-foot Buildings Setback:</u> The proposed building is within the 300-foot building setback from the shoreland of Water Works Pond.
- e. Given the fact that the access road to the reservoir and gun club exists between the proposed development and the river, we feel recreational and aesthetic values associated with the shoreline and river environment are preserved and the intent and purposes cited in Article 9.3.1 are met.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours, BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O Smith

Christian O. Smith P.E. Principal



# CIVIL ENGINEERS:

**BEALS**•ASSOCIATES PLLC 70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860, FAX. 603-583-4863



# LAND SURVEYORS:



# WETLAND/SOIL CONSULTANT:

GOVE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC. 8 CONTINENTAL DRIVE, BLDG 2 UNIT H EXETER, NH 03833 1-603-778-0644

## LOCATION MAP



SCALE: 1"=600'

SHEET #	TITLE
	COVE
1	EXIST
2	SITE P
3	GRAD
4	EROS
5	PORO

6

7

## PLAN SET LEGEND

5/8" REBAR	•		
DRILL HOLE	۲		
CONC. BOUND		VGC	VERTICAL GRANITE CURB
UTILITY POLE	C)		
DRAIN MANHOLE	D	OVERHEAD ELEC. LINE	
SEWER MANHOLE	S	FENCING	×
EXISTING LIGHT POLE	¢	DRAINAGE LINE	D
EXISTING CATCH BASIN		SEWER LINE	S
PROPOSED CATCH BASIN	<b>H</b>	GAS LINE	
WATER GATE	wv M	WATER LINE	W
WATER SHUT OFF	<i>w</i> eo	STONE WALL	
HYDRANT	ЪС.	TREE LINE	······································
PINES, ETC.	*	ABUT. PROPERTY LINES	
MAPLES FTC	e and	EXIST. PROPERTY LINES	
EVIST SDOT ODADE		BUILDING SETBACK LINES	
EXIST. SPUT GRADE	96269		100
PROP. SPOI GRADE	(96×69)	EXIST. CONTOUR	100
DOUBLE POST SIGN		PROP. CONTOUR	
SINGLE POST SIGN	<del></del>	SOIL LINES	

## **DRAWING INDEX**

ER SHEET TING CONDITIONS PLAN (DOUCET SURVEY) PLAN DING, DRAINAGE, & EROSION CONTROL SION & SEDIMENT CONTROL DETAILS **DUS PAVEMENT & INFILTRATION TRENCH DETAILS** WETLAND IMPACT PLAN EXETER SHORELAND IMPACT PLAN

## RECORD OWNER/APPLICANT

MENISCUS FINANCIAL HOLDINGS, LLC 133 PORTSMOUTH AVE. (NH ROUTE 108) EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

**REQUIRED STATE AND FEDERAL PERMITS** CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PERMIT NHDES ALTERATION OF TERRAIN PERMIT NHDES SHORELAND PERMIT NHDES WETLANDS BUREAU DREDGE AND FILL

	REVISIONS:	DATE:
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		









ROADWAY HAS THE BASE COURSE TO DESIGN ELEVATION AND THE ASSOCIATED DRAINAGE IS COMPLETE AND STABLE.



1. STONE FOR A STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE SHALL BE 3 INCH STONE, RECLAIMED STONE, OR RECYCLED CONCRETE EQUIVALENT. 2. THE LENGTH OF THE STABILIZED ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 50 FEET, EXCEPT FOR A SINGLE

RESIDENTIAL LOT WHERE A 30 FOOT MINIMUM LENGTH WOULD APPLY. 3. THE THICKNESS OF THE STONE FOR THE STABILIZED ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 6 INCHES. 4. THE WIDTH OF THE ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN THE FULL WIDTH OF THE ENTRANCE WHERE INGRESS OR EGRESS OCCURS OR 10 FEET, WHICH EVER IS GREATER. 5. GEOTEXTILE FILTER CLOTH SHALL BE PLACED OVER THE ENTIRE AREA PRIOR TO PLACING THE STONE. FILTER CLOTH IS NOT

REQUIRED FOR A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE LOT. 6. ALL SURFACE WATER THAT IS FLOWING TO OR DIVERTED TOWARD THE CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE SHALL BE PIPED BENEATH THE ENTRANCE. IF PIPING IS IMPRACTICAL, A BERM WITH 5:1 SLOPES THAT CAN BE CROSSED BY VEHICLES MAY BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THE PIPE. 7. THE ENTRANCE SHALL BE MAINTAINED IN A CONDITION THAT WILL PREVENT TRACKING OR FLOWING OF SEDIMENT ONTO PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY. THIS MAY REQUIRE PERIODIC TOP DRESSING WITH ADDITIONAL STONE AS CONDITIONS DEMAND AND REPAIR AND/OR CLEAN OUT OF ANY MEASURES USED TO TRAP

SEDIMENT. ALL SEDIMENT SPILLED, WASHED, OR TRACKED ONTO PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY MUST BE REMOVED PROMPTLY STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE

## WINTER MAINTENANCE

1. ALL DISTURBED AREAS THAT DO NOT HAVE AT LEAST 85% VEGETATIVE COVERAGE PRIOR TO OCTOBER 15TH, SHALL BE STABILIZED BY APPLYING MULCH AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. ALL SIDE SLOPES, STEEPER THAN 4:1, THAT ARE NOT DIRECTED TO SWALES OR DETENTION BASINS, SHALL BE LINED WITH BIODEGRADABLE/PHOTODEGRADABLE "JUTE MATTING" (EXCELSIOR'S CURLEX II OR EQUAL). ALL OTHER SLOPES SHALL BE MULCHED AND TACKED AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. THE APPLICATION OF MULCH AND/OR JUTE MATTING SHALL NOT OCCUR OVER EXISTING SNOW COVER. IF THE SITE IS ACTIVE AFTER OCTOBER 15TH, ANY SNOW THAT ACCUMULATES ON DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE REMOVED PRIOR TO SPRING THAW ALL AREAS WILL BE STABILIZED, AS DIRECTED ABOVE.

2. ALL SWALES THAT DO NOT HAVE FULLY ESTABLISHED VEGETATION SHALL BE EITHER LINED WITH TEMPORARY JUTE MATTING OR TEMPORARY STONE CHECK DAMS (APPROPRIATELY SPACED). STONE CHECK DAMS WILL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT THE WINTER MONTHS. IF THE SWALES ARE TO BE MATTED WITH PERMANENT LINERS OR RIPRAP WITH ENGINEERING FABRIC, THIS SHALL BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO WINTER SHUTDOWN OR AS SOON AS THEY ARE PROPERLY GRADED AND SHAPED

3. PRIOR TO OCT. 15TH ALL ROADWAY AND PARKING AREAS SHALL BE BROUGHT UP TO AND THROUGH THE BANK RUN GRAVEL APPLICATION. IF THESE AREAS' ELEVATIONS ARE PROPOSED TO REMAIN BELOW THE PROPOSED SUBGRADE ELEVATION, THE SUBGRADE MATERIAL SHALL BE ROUGHLY CROWNED AND A 3" LAYER OF CRUSHED GRAVEL SHALL BE PLACED AND COMPACTED. THIS WILL ALLOW THE SUBGRADE TO SHED RUNOFF AND WILL REDUCE ROADWAY EROSION. THIS CRUSHED GRAVEL DOES NOT HAVE TO CONFORM TO NH DOT 304.3, BUT SHALL HAVE BETWEEN 15–25% PASSING THE #200 SIEVE AND THE LARGEST STONE SIZE SHALL BE 2". IF THE SITE IS ACTIVE AFTER NOVEMBER 15TH, ANY ACCUMULATED SNOW SHALL BE REMOVED FROM ALL ROADWAY AND PARKING AREAS.

4. AFTER OCTOBER 15TH, THE END OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S AVERAGE GROWING SEASON, NO ADDITIONAL LOAM SHALL BE SPREAD ON SIDE SLOPES AND SWALES. THE STOCKPILES THAT WILL BE LEFT UNDISTURBED UNTIL SPRING SHALL BE SEEDED BY THIS DATE. AFTER OCTOBER 15TH, ANY NEW OR DISTURBED PILES SHALL BE MULCHED AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. ALL STOCKPILES THAT WILL REMAIN THROUGHOUT THE WINTER SHALL BE SURROUNDED WITH SILT FENCING.

## SEEDING SPECIFICATIONS

1. GRADING AND SHAPING

A. SLOPES SHALL NOT BE STEEPER THAN 2:1;3:1 SLOPES OR FLATTER ARE PREFERRED. WHERE MOWING WILL BE DONE, 3:1 SLOPES OR FLATTER ARE RECOMMENDED.

2. SEEDBED PREPARATION A. SURFACE AND SEEPAGE WATER SHOULD BE DRAINED OR DIVERTED FROM THE SITE TO PREVENT DROWNING OR WINTER KILLING OF THE PLANTS.

B. STONES LARGER THAN 4 INCHES AND TRASH SHOULD BE REMOVED BECAUSE THEY INTERFERE WITH SEEDING AND FUTURE MAINTENANCE OF THE AREA. WHERE FEASIBLE, THE SOIL SHOULD BE TILLED TO A DEPTH OF ABOUT 4 INCHES TO PREPARE A SEEDBED AND MIX FERTILIZER AND LIME INTO THE SOIL. THE SEEDBED SHOULD BE LEFT IN REASONABLY FIRM AND SMOOTH CONDITION. THE LAST TILLAGE OPERATION SHOULD BE PERFORMED ACROSS THE SLOPE WHEREVER PRACTICAL. 3. ESTABLISHING A STAND

A. LIME AND FERTILIZER SHOULD BE APPLIED PRIOR TO OR AT THE TIME OF SEEDING AND INCORPORATED INTO THE SOIL KINDS AND AMOUNTS OF LIME AND FERTILIZER SHOULD BE BASED ON AN EVALUATION OF SOIL TESTS. REFER TO LIGHTING & LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR FERTILIZER REQUIREMENTS.

B. SEED SHOULD BE SPREAD UNIFORMLY BY THE METHOD MOST APPROPRIATE FOR THE SITE. METHODS INCLUDE BROADCASTING, DRILLING AND HYDROSEEDING. WHERE BROADCASTING IS USED, COVER SEED WITH .25 INCH OF SOIL OR LESS, BY CULTIPACKING OR RAKING.

C. A NEW ENGLAND NATIVE SEED MIXTURE SHALL BE USED. REFER TO MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS FOR RATES OF SEEDING.

D. WHEN SEEDED AREAS ARE MULCHED, PLANTINGS MAY BE MADE FROM EARLY SPRING TO EARLY OCTOBER. WHEN SEEDED AREAS ARE NOT MULCHED, PLANTINGS SHOULD BE MADE FROM EARLY SPRING TO MAY 20 OR FROM AUGUST 10 TO SEPTEMBER 1.

4. MULCH A. HAY, STRAW, OR OTHER MULCH, WHEN NEEDED, SHOULD BE APPLIED IMMEDIATELY AFTER SEEDING.

B. MULCH WILL BE HELD IN PLACE USING APPROPRIATE TECHNIQUES FROM THE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE FOR MULCHING. HAY OR STRAW MULCH SHALL BE PLACED AT A RATE OF 90 LBS PER 1000 SQ. FT. 5. MAINTENANCE TO ESTABLISH A STAND

A. PLANTED AREA SHOULD BE PROTECTED FROM DAMAGE BY FIRE, GRAZING, TRAFFIC, AND DENSE WEED GROWTH. B. FERTILIZATION NEEDS SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY ONSITE INSPECTIONS. SUPPLEMENTAL FERTILIZER IS USUALLY THE KEY TO FULLY COMPLETE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STAND BECAUSE MOST PERENNIAL STAKE 2 TO 3 YEARS TO

BECOME ESTABLISHED. C. IN WATERWAYS, CHANNELS, OR SWALES WHERE UNIFORM FLOW CONDITIONS ARE ANTICIPATED, OCCASIONAL MOWING MAY BE NECESSARY TO CONTROL GROWTH OF WOODY VEGETATION.







#### CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR POROUS ASPHALT THE UNH STORM WATER CENTER INSTALLATION RECOMMENDATIONS

INSTALLATION

- A. PERCOLATION BEDS (REFERS TO NO 57 STONE) . OWNER SHALL BE NOTIFIED AT LEAST 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ALL PERCOLATION BED AND POROUS PAVING WORK.
- 2. SUB GRADE PREPARATION A.EXISTING SUB GRADE UNDER BED AREAS SHALL NOT BE COMPACTED OR SUBJECT TO EXCESSIVE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT TRAFFIC PRIOR TO STONE BED PLACEMENT. B. WHERE EROSION OF SUB GRADE HAS CAUSED ACCUMULATION OF FINE MATERIALS AND/OR SURFACE PONDING, THIS MATERIAL SHALL BE
- REMOVED WITH LIGHT EQUIPMENT AND THE UNDERLYING SOILS SCARIFIED TO A MINIMUM DEPTH OF 6 INCHES WITH A YORK RAKE OR EQUIVALENT AND LIGHT TRACTOR. C. BRING SUB GRADE OF STONE PERCOLATION BED TO LINE, GRADE, AND ELEVATIONS INDICATED. FILL AND LIGHTLY REGRADE ANY AREAS DAMAGED BY EROSION, PONDING, OR TRAFFIC COMPACTION BEFORE THE PLACING OF STONE. ALL BED BOTTOMS ARE LEVEL GRADE.
- 3. RECHARGE BED INSTALLATION (REFERS TO NO 3 STONE) A.UPON COMPLETION OF SUB GRADE WORK, THE ENGINEER SHALL BE NOTIFIED AND SHALL INSPECT AT HIS DISCRETION BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH PERCOLATION BED INSTALLATION.
- B.PERCOLATION BED AGGREGATE SHALL BE PLACED IMMEDIATELY AFTER APPROVAL OF SUB GRADE PREPARATION. ANY ACCUMULATION OF DEBRIS OR SEDIMENT WHICH HAS TAKEN PLACE AFTER APPROVAL OF SUB GRADE SHALL BE REMOVED PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF AGGREGATE AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE OWNER. C.INSTALL COARSE AGGREGATE NO. 3 (1 1/2" STONE) IN 8-INCH MAXIMUM LIFTS. LIGHTLY COMPACT EACH LAYER WITH EQUIPMENT, KEEPING
- EQUIPMENT MOVEMENT OVER STORAGE BED SUBGRADES TO A MINIMUM. INSTALL AGGREGATE TO GRADES INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS. D. INSTALL 3" LIFT PEA GRAVEL LAYER TO PREVENT MIGRATION OF FINES FROM THE FILTER COARSE (NHDOT 304.1)
- E.INSTALL FILTER COARSE (NHDOT 304.1 SAND LESS THAN 2% FINES) IN 2, 4" LIFTS. LIGHTLY COMPACT EACH LAYER WITH EQUIPMENT, KEEPING EQUIPMENT MOVEMENT OVER STORAGE BED SUBGRADES TO A MINIMUM. INSTALL AGGREGATE TO GRADES INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS. F.INSTALL CHOKER BASE COURSE (AASHTO # 57 STONE) AGGREGATE EVENLY OVER SURFACE OF STONE BED, SUFFICIENT TO ALLOW PLACEMENT OF PAVEMENT, AND NOTIFY ENGINEER FOR APPROVAL. CHOKER BASE COURSE SHALL BE SUFFICIENT TO ALLOW FOR EVEN PLACEMENT OF ASPHALT BUT NO THICKER THAN 4-INCH IN DEPTH.
- 4. SURROUNDING AREAS A.BEFORE THE POROUS PAVEMENT IS INSTALLED, ADJACENT SOIL AREAS SHOULD BE SLOPED AWAY FROM ALL PAVEMENT EDGES, TO PREVENT POTENTIAL SEDIMENT FROM WASHING ONTO THE PAVEMENT SURFACE. B.TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, A SEQUENCE OF SWALES SHOULD BE EXCAVATED INTO ALL EARTHEN (UNPAVED) AREAS AT LEAST ON THE UPHILL SIDES OF
- THE PAVEMENT, AND WHERE NECESSARY, TO BELOW THE CURB OR PAVEMENT ELEVATION. IT'S SHAPE AND PAINTINGS CAN BE INTEGRATED WITH THE PROJECT'S ARCHITECTURE AND LANDSCAPE, AND DESIGNED TO MAXIMIZE INFILTRATION. SWALE OVERFLOW, WHEN IT OCCURS, CAN BE DISCHARGED FROM ONE SWALE TO ANOTHER BY CONNECTING PIPES UNDER DRIVEWAYS. C.BUILDING BASEMENTS AND FOUNDATIONS SHOULD BE WATERPROOFED AS NECESSARY, WHERE THE POROUS PAVEMENT ABUTS BUILDINGS.
- B. POROUS ASPHALT . TRANSPORTING MATERIAL
- A.TRANSPORTING OF MIX TO THE SITE SHALL BE IN VEHICLES WITH SMOOTH, CLEAN DUMP BEDS THAT HAVE BEEN SPRAYED WITH A NON-PETROLEUM RELEASE AGENT. B. THE MIX SHALL BE COVERED DURING TRANSPORT TO CONTROL COOLING.
- POROUS BITUMINOUS ASPHALT SHALL NOT BE STORED IN EXCESS OF 90 MINUTES BEFORE PLACEMENT. ASPHALT PLACEMENT
- A.THE POROUS BITUMINOUS SURFACE COURSE SHALL BE LAID IN ONE LIFT DIRECTLY OVER THE CHOKER COARSE, FILTER COARSE, AND CRUSHED STONE BASE COURSE TO A 4-INCH FINISHED THICKNESS. THE SURFACE CAN BE LAID IN TWO LIFTS IF SECOND LIFT IS DONE WITHIN 10 BUSINESS AND THE INITIAL COURSE IS CLEAN AND FREE OF SEDIMENT.
- B. THE LAYING TEMPERATURE OF THE BITUMINOUS MIX SHALL BE BETWEEN 300 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT AND 350 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT (BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ASPHALT SUPPLIER). C.INSTALLATION SHALL TAKE PLACE WHEN AMBIENT TEMPERATURES ARE 55 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT OR ABOVE, WHEN MEASURED IN THE SHADE AWAY
- FROM ARTIFICIAL HEAT. D. THE USE OF A REMIXING MATERIAL TRANSFER DEVICE BETWEEN THE TRUCKS AND THE PAVER IS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED TO ELIMINATE COLD LUMPS
- IN THE MIX. E. THE POLYMER-MODIFIED ASPHALT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO RAKE, A WELL-HEATED SCREED SHOULD BE USED TO MINIMIZE THE NEED FOR RAKING. F. COMPACTION OF THE SURFACE COURSE SHALL TAKE PLACE WHEN THE SURFACE IS COOL ENOUGH TO RESIST A 10-TON ROLLER. (140°F. SURFACE TEMPERATURE) ONE OR TWO PASSES IS ALL THAT IS REQUIRED FOR PROPER COMPACTION. MORE ROLLING COULD CAUSE A REDUCTION IN THE SURFACE POROSITY WHICH IS UNACCEPTABLE.
- 4. IN THE EVENT CONSTRUCTION SEDIMENT IS INADVERTENTLY DEPOSITED ON THE FINISHED POROUS SURFACE. IT MUST BE IMMEDIATELY REMOVED BY VACUUMING.
- AFTER FINAL ROLLING, NO VEHICULAR TRAFFIC OF ANY KIND SHALL BE PERMITTED ON THE SURFACE UNTIL COOLING AND HARDENING HAS TAKEN PLACE, AND IN NO CASE WITHIN THE FIRST 48 HOURS. PROVIDE BARRIERS AS NECESSARY AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE OWNER TO PREVENT VEHICULAR USE: REMOVE AT THE DISCRETION OF THE ENGINEER. STRIPING PAINT FOR TRAFFIC LANES AND PARKING BAYS SHALL BE CHLORINATED RUBBER BASE, FACTORY MIXED, NON-BLEEDING, FAST DRYING, BEST QUALITY, WHITE TRAFFIC PAINT WITH A LIFE EXPECTANCY OF TWO YEARS UNDER NORMAL TRAFFIC USE.
- A.PAVEMENT-MARKING PAINT; LATEX, WATER-BASE EMULSION, READY-MIXED, COMPLYING WITH PS TT-P-1952. B.SWEEP AND CLEAN SURFACE TO ELIMINATE LOOSE MATERIAL AND DUST.
- C.PAINT 4 INCH WIDE TRAFFIC LANE STRIPING IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAYOUTS OF PLAN. APPLY PAINT WITH MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT TO PRODUCE UNIFORM STRAIGHT EDGES. APPLY IN TWO COATS AT MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDED RATES. PROVIDE CLEAR, SHARP LINES USING WHITE TRAFFIC PAINT, INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH NHDOT SPECIFICATIONS. WORK SHALL BE DONE EXPERTLY THROUGHOUT, WITHOUT STAINING OR INJURY TO OTHER WORK.
- RANSITION TO ADJACENT IMPERVIOUS BITUMINOUS PAVING SHALL BE MERGED NEATLY WITH FLUSH, CLEAN LINE. FINISHED PAVING SHALL BE EVEN, WITHOUT POCKETS, AND GRADED TO ELEVATIONS SHOWN ON DRAWING. 7. POROUS PAVEMENT BEDS SHALL NOT BE USED FOR EQUIPMENT OR MATERIALS STORAGE DURING CONSTRUCTION, AND UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHALL VEHICLES BE ALLOWED TO DEPOSIT SOIL ON PAVED POROUS SURFACES.
- 8. REPAIR OF DAMAGED PAVING A.ANY EXISTING PAVING ON OR ADJACENT TO THE SITE THAT HAS BEEN DAMAGED AS A RESULT OF CONSTRUCTION WORK SHALL HE REPAIRED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE OWNER WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COST TO THE OWNER. 9 FIFLD QUALITY CONTROL
- A. THE FULL PERMEABILITY OF THE PAVEMENT SURFACE SHALL BE TESTED BY APPLICATION OF CLEAN WATER AT THE RATE OF AT LEAST 5 GPM OVER THE SURFACE, USING A HOSE OR OTHER DISTRIBUTION DEVISE. WATER USED FOR THE TEST SHALL BE CLEAN, FREE OF SUSPENDED SOLIDS AND DELETERIOUS LIQUIDS AND WILL BE PROVIDED AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE OWNER. ALL APPLIED WATER SHALL INFILTRATE DIRECTLY WITHOUT PUDDLE FORMATION OR SURFACE RUNOFF, AND SHALL BE OBSERVED BY THE ENGINEER AND OWNER.
- B. TEST IN-PLACE BASE AND SURFACE COURSE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR THICKNESS AND SURFACE SMOOTHNESS. REPAIR OR REMOVE AND REPLACE UNACCEPTABLE WORK AS DIRECTED BY THE OWNER. C.SURFACE SMOOTHNESS: TEST FINISHED SURFACE FOR SMOOTHNESS AND EVEN DRAINAGE, USING A TEN-FOOT TO CENTERLINE OF PAVED AREA. SURFACE WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED IF GAPS OR RIDGES EXCEED 3116 OF AN INCH.



- 1. 4" FRICTION COARSE CONSISTS OF COARSER AGGREGATE AND STIFFER BINDER. SEE TABLE 2. A WORKING COURSE 4" THICK CONSISTS OF AASHTO NO. 57 STONE. 3. 6" UNDERDRAIN TO BE SET ABOVE CRUSHED GRAVEL BOTTOM TO ALLOW FOR STORAGE
- AND INFILTRATION. 2.4" OF WATER CAN BE DETAINED UNDER THE UNDERDRAIN. 4. TOP COAT SHOULD BE VACUUMED A MINIMUM OF TWICE A YEAR.
- . ADJACENT AREAS TO POROUS PAVEMENT SHOULD BE GRADED AWAY FROM PAVEMENT TO PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM RUNNING ONTO POROUS AREA AND CLOGGING PORES. ROOF RUNOFF CAN FLOW ONTO PAVEMENT OR INTO SUBBASE MATERIAL.

## POROUS PAVEMENT

NOT TO SCALE

## MIX SUMMARY POROUS ASPHALT PAVEMENT MIX THE UNH STORM WATER CENTER

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 01, 2006

POROUS ASPHALT SHALL BE FOUR INCHES THICK WITH A BITUMINOUS MIX OF 6% TO 6.5% BY WEIGHT DRY AGGREGATE AND AIR VOIDS OF 18-22%. IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM D6390, DRAIN DOWN OF THE BINDER SHALL BE NO GREATER THAN 0.3%. IF MORE ABSORPTIVE AGGREGATES, SUCH AS LIMESTONE, ARE USED IN THE MIX, THEN THE AMOUNT OF BITUMEN IS TO BE BASED ON THE TESTING PROCEDURES OUTLINED IN THE NATIONAL ASPHALT PAVEMENT ASSOCIATION'S INFORMATION SERIES 131 - "PERVIOUS ASPHALT PAVEMENTS" (2003) OR NHDOT EQUIVALENT. MIX SUPPLIERS MAY HAVE A SUITABLE IN-HOUSE SPECIFICATION FOR OPEN GRADED FRICTION COURSE (OGFC) THAT CAN BE USED.

USE NEAT ASPHALT BINDER MODIFIED WITH AN ELASTOMERIC POLYMER TO PRODUCE A BINDER MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF PG 76-22 AS SPECIFIED IN AASHTO MP- I. THE ELASTOMER POLYMER SHALL BE STYRENE-BUTADIENE-STYRENE (SBS), OR APPROVED EQUAL, APPLIED AT A RATE OF 3% BY WEIGHT OF THE TOTAL BINDER. THE COMPOSITE MATERIALS SHALL BE THOROUGHLY BLENDED AT THE ASPHALT REFINERY OR TERMINAL PRIOR TO BEING LOADED INTO THE TRANSPORT VEHICLE. THE POLYMER MODIFIED ASPHALT BINDER SHALL BE HEAT AND STORAGE STABLE. AGGREGATE SHALL BE MINIMUM 90% CRUSHED MATERIAL AND HAVE A GRADATION OF:

COMPOSITION OF MIXTURE

SIEVE SIZE (INCH/MM)PERCENT PASSING0.75/191000.50/12.585-1000.375/9.555-75N0.4/4.7510-25N0.8/2.365-10N0.200/0.0752-4TOTAL AGGREGATE93-.5-94% ASPHALT OF TOTAL MIX6-6.5 ADD HYDRATED LIME AT A DOSAGE RATE OF 1.0% BY WEIGHT OF THE TOTAL DRY AGGREGATE TO MIXES CONTAINING GRANITE. HYDRATED LIME SHALL MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASTM C 977. THE ADDITIVE MUST BE ABLE TO PREVENT THE SEPARATION OF THE ASPHALT BINDER FROM THE AGGREGATE AND ACHIEVE A REQUIRED TENSILE STRENGTH RATIO (TSR) OF AT LEAST 80% ON THE ASPHALT MIX WHEN TESTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AASHTO T 283. THE ASPHALTIC MIX SHALL BE TESTED FOR ITS RESISTANCE TO STRIPPING BY WATER IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM D-1664. IF THE ESTIMATED COATING AREA IS NOT ABOVE 95 PERCENT, ANTI-STRIPPING AGENTS SHALL BE ADDED TO THE ASPHALT.

NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL THE CONTRACTOR HAS SUBMITTED AND THE ENGINEER HAS APPROVED A MIX DESIGN INCLUDING THE PERCENTAGE OF EACH INGREDIENT INCLUDING BINDER, POLYMER, AND THE JOB-MIX FORMULA FROM SUCH A COMBINATION. THE JOB-MIX FORMULA SHALL ESTABLISH A SINGLE PERCENTAGE OF AGGREGATE PASSING SIEVE AND A SINGLE PERCENTAGE OF BITUMINOUS MATERIAL TO BE ADDED TO THE AGGREGATE. NO CHANGE IN THE JOB-MIX FORMULA MAY BE MADE WITHOUT WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE ENGINEER. THE JOB-MIX FORMULA MUST FALL WIT H THE MASTER RANGE SPECIFIED IN COMPOSITION OF MIXTURE TABLE.

TRANSPORTING MATERIAL: SEE CONSTRUCTION AND INSTALL SPECIFICATIONS

FOR QUESTIONS ON MIX SPECIFICATIONS CONTACT ROBERT ROSEEN, PHD, AT THE UNH STORM WATER CENTER. 603-862-4024.

MAINTENANCE SPECIFICATIONS FOR POROUS ASPHALT PARKING LOT AREAS AND LOW VOLUME ROADS THE UNH STORM WATER CENTER WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 01, 2006

THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS WILL HELP ASSURE THAT THE PAVEMENT IS MAINTAINED TO PRESERVE ITS HYDROLOGIC EFFECTIVENESS.

WINTER MAINTENANCE:

1. SANDING FOR WINTER TRACTION IS PROHIBITED. DEICING IS PERMITTED (NAC1, MGC12, OR EQUIVALENT). REDUCED SALT APPLICATION IS POSSIBLE AND CAN BE A COST SAVINGS FOR WINTER MAINTENANCE. NONTOXIC, ORGANIC DEICERS, APPLIED EITHER AS BLENDED, MAGNESIUM CHLORIDE-BASED LIQUID PRODUCTS OR AS PRETREATED SALT, ARE PREFERABLE. 2. PLOWING IS ALLOWED, BLADE SHOULD BE SET APPROXIMATELY 1" ABOVE ROAD SURFACE. ICE AND LIGHT SNOW ACCUMULATION ARE GENERALLY NOT AS PROBLEMATIC AS FOR STANDARD ASPHALT. SNOW WILL ACCUMULATE DURING HEAVIER STORMS AND SHOULD BE PLOWED.

ROUTINE MAINTENANCE;

- . ASPHALT SEAL COATING MUST BE ABSOLUTELY FORBIDDEN. SURFACE SEAL COATING IS NOT REVERSIBLE. 2. THE PAVEMENT SURFACE SHOULD BE VACUUMED 2 OR 3 TIMES PER YEAR, AND AT ANY ADDITIONAL TIMES SEDIMENT IS SPILLED, ERODED, OR TRACKED ONTO THE SURFACE. 3. PLANTED AREAS ADJACENT TO PERVIOUS PAVEMENT SHOULD BE WELL MAINTAINED TO PREVENT SOIL WASHOUT ONTO THE PAVEMENT. IF ANY BARE SPOTS OR ERODED AREAS ARE OBSERVED WITHIN THE PLANTED AREAS, THEY SHOULD BE REPLANTED AND/OR STABILIZED AT ONCE.
- 4. IMMEDIATELY CLEAN ANY SOIL DEPOSITED ON PAVEMENT. SUPERFICIAL DIRT DOES NOT NECESSARILY CLOG THE PAVEMENT VOIDS. HOWEVER, DIRT THAT IS GROUND IN REPEATEDLY BY TIRES CAN LEAD TO CLOGGING. THEREFORE, TRUCKS OR OTHER HEAVY VEHICLES SHOULD BE PREVENTED FROM TRACKING OR SPILLING DIRT ONTO THE PAVEMENT 5. DO NOT ALLOW CONSTRUCTION STAGING, SOIL/MULCH STORAGE, ETC. ON UNPROTECTED PAVEMENT SURFACE 6. REPAIRS: POTHOLES OF LESS THAN 50 SQUARE FEET CAN BE PATCHED BY ANY MEANS SUITABLE WITH STANDARD PAVEMENT OR A PERVIOUS MIX IS PREFERRED. FOR AREAS GREATER THAN 50 SQ. FT. IN NEED OF REPAIR, APPROVAL OF PATCH TYPE SHOULD BE SOUGHT FROM A QUALIFIED ENGINEER. ANY REQUIRED REPAIR OF DRAINAGE STRUCTURES SHOULD
- BE DONE PROMPTLY TO ENSURE CONTINUED PROPER FUNCTIONING OF THE SYSTEM. 7. WRITTEN AND VERBAL COMMUNICATION TO THE POROUS PAVEMENT'S FUTURE OWNER SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THE PAVEMENT'S SPECIAL PURPOSE AND SPECIAL MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS SUCH AS THOSE LISTED HERE.
- 8. A PERMANENT SIGN SHOULD BE ADDED AT THE ENTRANCE AND END OF THE POROUS ASPHALT AREA TO INFORM RESIDENTS AND MAINTENANCE STAFF OF THE SPECIAL NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PAVEMENT, AND ITS SPECIAL MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS.

SIGNAGE SHOULD READ AS FOLLOWS:

REMAINDER OF PROJECT HAS BEEN

PAVED WITH POROUS PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS:

- 1. PLOW WITH SLIGHTLY RAISED BLADE ONLY
- 2. SANDING OF SURFACE PROHIBITED 3. DEICING PERMITTED (NAC1, MGC12 OR EQUIVALENT)
- 4. SEAL COATING PROHIBITED 5. CLEANING BY PRESSURIZED AIR OR WATER PROHIBITED
- 6.DRY VACUUM SEMI-ANNUALLY

REMAINDER OF PROJECT HAS BEEN PAVED WITH POROUS PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS: \*PLOW WITH SLIGHTLY RAISED BLADE ONLY\* \*SANDING OF SURFACE PROHIBITED\* \*DEICING PERMITTED (NAC1, MGC12 OR EQUIVALENT)\* \*SEAL-COATING PROHIBITED\* \*CLEANING BY PRESSURIZED AIR OR WATER PROHIBITED\* \*DRY VACUUM SEMI-ANNUALLY\*

SIGN DETAIL

NOT TO SCALE

SIEVE SIZE (INCH/MM) 0.75/19 0.50/12.5 0.375/9.5 NO.4/4.75 NO.8/2.36 NO.200/0.075 (#200)

45° BEND (SCH 40 PVC) BUILDING/ FOUNDATION









Land Planning • Civil Engineering Landscape Architecture • Septic Design & Evaluation Stratham, NH

Exeter Planning Board, David Sharples, Town Planner Town Planning Office, Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

May 15, 2024

Re: Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Avenue – Commercial Site Plan Response to Second Round of TRC Comments

Dear Mr. Chairman & Members of the Board:

We are in receipt of a second review letter from the Town Planner summarizing the Technical Review Committee's comments, dated April 16, 2024 and we offer the following responses to the noted comments. Each comment is followed by our response in **bold**.

### FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Comments provided to Applicant's representative by Deputy Fire Chief Jason Fritz at the March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024 TRC meeting. Requested information regarding the storage of electric vehicles and charging stations. **Response:** 

### **CONSERVATION & SUSTINABILITY PLANNER COMMENTS**

• The project as presented does not meet stormwater requirements. Presented a solution that provides an average of 60% removal efficiency, however our regulations require a min of 60%.

**Response:** We have revised the design to use porous pavement which removes 60% of Total Nitrogen per NHDES when greater than 75 feet from surface water.

• Please ensure the wetland scientist stamp on the plans and wetland who prepared the report match.

**Response:** The wetland scientist stamps have been coordinated to match.

- I can find no record of a project that proposed impervious cover of this amount in our shoreland district after regulations were adopted.
  Response: Comment noted.
- I would encourage the wetland scientist report be revised removing vague language as it

introduces confusion. Example: Unclear if wetlands B4-6 are manmade. If there is not definitive evidence, our buffer requirements must be adhered to. Additionally, it is not clear if all wetlands were surveyed for vernal pool indicator species. The statement "potentially adequate pool" is a value judgement and not a regulatory term. Either VP indicator species were present or not. They should all be checked.

**Response:** The language in the wetland report has been revised and the revised report is submitted as part of this response.

• Not previously shared at the meeting: There is no key to understand the different symbols for the significant trees on the plans submitted today.

**Response:** Large trees are all shown on the Existing Conditions Plan. Those to be removed are coded with (TBR) after the size of the tree while those to remain just contain the size. The TBR abbreviation is listed in the legend.

Thank you for your timely and professional review of the submitted plans. We hope the information provided address your concerns. Please feel free to contact our office if you have any additional question and/or comments.

Very Truly Yours,

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O. Smith

Christian O. Smith, PE Principal



Land Planning • Civil Engineering Landscape Architecture • Septic Design & Evaluation Stratham, NH

Exeter Planning Board, David Sharples, Town Planner Town Planning Office, Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

Re: Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Avenue – Commercial Site Plan Response to Second Round of Underwood Engineers Comments

Dear Mr. Chairman & Members of the Board:

We are in receipt of a 2<sup>nd</sup> review letter from Underwood Engineers, dated March 8, 2024 and we offer the following responses to the noted comments. Each comment is followed by our response in *italicized bold*.

#### Site Plan

**10.** The proposed usage of vehicle storage near sensitive wetlands areas and in the Shoreland Zone is concerning. Please confirm the entirety of the paved area will be curbed for containment of leaks / spills. Please note vertical granite curb is required. Will there be any other resources kept onsite or procedures in place for immediate spill response?

*Beals Response: The entire vehicle storage area will be paved and surrounded with vertical granite curbing. No other resources will be stored onsite.* 

While UE recognizes that there are no standard requirements for spill response equipment, we recommend that spill response kits be maintained on site. We defer further comment to the Conservation Commission.

*Response:* We have added note #14 to the Site Plan (Sheet 3) indicating that a spill response kit be maintained on site.

**11.** It has been indicated that vehicles may be stored inside the building. No architectural plans have been received. It is unclear how and where the vehicles will be driven into the building.

Beals Response: Architectural elevations for the proposed building are being prepared and will be submitted under separate cover.

The original comment still stands.

Response: Elevations and a floor plan have been provided as part of this submission.

12. The radii at all driveway entrances should be labeled.

Beals Response: Driveway radii have been added to the plan.

We recommend increasing the radii at the westernmost site entrance to improve access for large vehicles, including fire apparatus.

May 15, 2024

## Response: Radii at the westernmost site entrance has been increased from 10-feet to 15-feet.

**15.** Please clarify the need for 3 access points from the southern side of GTE Road.

Beals Response: We are continuing to review the requirement for the access road around the building with both the fire department and the owner. This access road will be limited as much as possible.

#### The original comment still stands.

## Response: The easternmost access point behind the building has been removed, leaving 2 access points to the project site.

**16.** The description of the project says the lot will be for display and storage of vehicles. Will the lot be open to customers to view the vehicles? If customers and staff will be walking between the existing Foss Motors lot, across GTE Road, is a crosswalk warranted? If this is the case, the proximity of the crossing to the intersection of Route 108 and GTE Road is concerning for pedestrian safety, and consideration should be given to moving the entrance further away from Route 108.

Beals Response: While the majority of customers will continue to visit the main dealership site, customers would also be welcome at the new site. Pedestrian travel to the site is not anticipated. Customers will be able to drive to the site or ne taken by a salesperson's vehicle. The location of the access driveway was reviewed during the design. Shifting the driveway further to the east increases that slope to over 17% due to the existing grades.

#### Our original comment still stands.

#### Response: This will be discussed with the Planning Board.

**17.** If trucks or other vehicles are stacked to make a left-hand turn onto Route 108, visibility of vehicles turning onto GTE Road may be limited for drivers crossing from the existing Foss Motors lot to the new lot.

Beals Response: We are expecting very low volume of traffic to this access driveway and do not anticipate an unusual conflict at this location.

#### The original comment still stands. We defer further comment to the Planning Board.

Response: This will be discussed with the Planning Board.

#### Grading and Drainage Plan

21. Has the existing 36" drainage pipe crossing the lot been inspected to assess condition?

*Beals Response: A note has been added to the plans indicated the existing 36" drainage pipe shall be inspected.* 

The new note should also indicate that any issues found during inspection should be relayed to the design engineer for resolution.

*Response:* Note 8 on the Grading, Drainage, & Erosion Control Plan (Sheet 3) has been revised to include the above comment.

**23.** The grade of the short drive between the existing Foss motors lot and GTE Road is 13% and sheets water directly into GTE Road. Crowning of this drive is recommended. Additionally, the rapid grade change may cause some vehicles to bottom out.

Beals Response: The access drive has been crowned.

Follow-up comment: Consider improving the transition grades on both ends for a smoother profile.

Response: The transition grades at the top and bottom of the access drive have been smoothed for more gentle transitions.

#### Utility Plan

**26.** Indicate the distance, in both directions, of the nearest inline valves on the Route 108 water main relative to the proposed connection.

Beals Response: We will continue to coordinate with Exeter DPW to define the water location and requirements.

Acknowledged. We note the proposed connection shown should be pulled back to the existing water main shown.

Response: The water line connection has been pulled back to the existing main.

#### Stormwater Design and Modeling

**34.** Provide a narrative and calculations for pollutant loading and removal volumes. We note the Stormtech (detention) systems do not meet required removals for nitrogen or phosphorous.

Beals Response: ADS BayFilters have been added to the outlet control structure along with test results showing at least a 60% removal for total nitrogen and total phosphorous to meet Town regulations.

Acknowledged. Please see comments regarding the BayFilters below.

Response: The BayFilters have been removed from the drainage design in lieu of porous pavement.

**35.** The volume of water and the rate leaving the site during the 2-year storm is greater in the post-development condition. This is prohibited in the Town of Exeter per the site and subdivision regulations, section 9.3.1.5.

Beals Response: The post-development conditions have been revised to reflect the plan changes.

Acknowledged. Please see the new comment below regarding increased volumes leaving the site.

*Response:* The volume and rate of water leaving the site now comply to the Town of *Exeter regulations.* 

#### New Comments

**38.** Crossing #1, as noted on the Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control sheet, indicates 4 inches of vertical clearance, with the existing PVC sewer over the proposed HDPE drain line. This clearance conflict will require additional detail and construction measures to attain proper compaction. Notes requiring that the joints of the respective pipes be appropriately staggered and consideration for sleeving the sewer should be given.

## Response: Note #21 on the Utility Plan (Sheet 4) has been added to provide additional notes regarding the crossing.

**39.** Revise the label for the DMH labeled as "DMH #XXX" downstream of the outlet control structure on the Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control Plan.

#### Response: This has been revised as part of the new drainage layout.

**40.** The angle of the sewer service should be revised to direct the flow downstream.

#### Response: The angle of the sewer line has been revised.

**41.** The revised location of the Stormtech system, directly over the existing 36" culvert, renders the existing pipe inaccessible for replacement or repair. More importantly, there is no way to know how the existing pipe was installed, or what compaction level the material received during installation or during the years since installation. The cross culvert, like all culverts, is a conduit risk for rapid conveyance of water through the ground. Positioning a detention basin above the culvert presents an increased risk of slope failure should the detained water find a path to the culvert to follow if the membrane layer tears or fails. Please discuss.

## Response: The StormTech system has been removed from the drainage design in lieu of porous pavement.

**42.** The Stormtech detail sheets notes several items to be designed/determined by engineer, including manifold and underdrain sizing, depth of stone under the system, the outlet structure with weir and DMH's with elevated bypass manifold. The submission, including the plans as appropriate, should include the required information for those elements.

## Response: The StormTech system has been removed from the drainage design in lieu of porous pavement.

**43.** The project will result in a significant increase in stormwater run-off volume leaving the site and onto the adjacent town-owned parcel. Volume increases 45% (or approximately 169,000 gallons) during a 10-year storm. UE notes that the 100-year flood elevation of Wheelwright Creek is elevation 8 and that the downstream culvert inverts are around elevation 7. Modeling the cross-parcel culvert, taking the flood elevation into account and including any tailwater effects from flood water will have on its capacity, is prudent. Please discuss the effect of the increase in volume of stormwater exiting the site on the town-owned parcel.

Response: The stormwater volume leaving the site is now being reduced in all storm events with the introduction of porous pavement and the stone infiltration trench, along with the removal of the access driveway around the building.

**44.** It is unclear what storm the BayFilters are designed for. Please clarify in the stormwater report.

Response: The BayFilters have been removed from the drainage design in lieu of porous pavement.

**45.** We note any pollutant removal capability of the BayFilters is heavily contingent on system maintenance. As the filters clog over time, pollutant removal decreases. The BayFilters are not addressed in the I&M plan. It is noted maintenance requires use of a vacuum truck and filter replacement. What assurances can be provided to the Town that the units will receive proper and timely maintenance?

## Response: The BayFilters have been removed from the drainage design in lieu of porous pavement.

- **46.** The following details should be added to the plans:
  - a. BayFilter details
  - b. Outlet control structure, plan view and elevation, with dimensions
  - c. Concrete washout pit

#### Responses:

- a. The BayFilters have been removed from the drainage design in lieu of porous pavement.
- b. The outlet control structure has been removed from the drainage design.
- c. Rather than proposing a concrete washout pit within the shoreland district, note #15 has been added to the Site Plan (Sheet 3) to remove excess concrete from the site.

Thank you for your timely and professional review of the submitted plans. We hope the information provided address your concerns. Please feel free to contact our office if you have any additional question and/or comments.

Very Truly Yours, BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC

Christian O. Smith

Christian O. Smith, PE Principal



# CIVIL ENGINEERS:

**BEALS**•ASSOCIATES PLLC 70 PORTSMOUTH AVE, STRATHAM, N.H. 03885 PHONE: 603-583-4860, FAX. 603-583-4863



# LAND SURVEYORS:



# WETLAND/SOIL CONSULTANT:

GOVE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC. **8 CONTINENTAL DRIVE**, BLDG 2 UNIT H EXETER, NH 03833 1-603-778-0644

LOCATION MAP	<u>SHEET #</u>	TI
<b>R B 101</b>		CC
	1	EX
OFF CONNER	2	SI
EXETER NIAY	3	GR
RESERVOIR	4	UΊ
DEARBORN DRIVE DRIVE	5	LI
	6	ER
AUBURN:ST WINDEMERE DEARBORN	7-8	CC
HIGH ST	9	UΊ
SCALE: 1"=600'	10	EX

## PLAN SET LEGEND

5/8" REBAR DRILL HOLE	•			
CONC. BOUND		VGC	VERTICAL GRANITE CURB	
DRAIN MANHOLE	D	OVERHEAD ELEC. LINE		
SEWER MANHOLE	S	FENCING	X	
EXISTING LIGHT POLE	¢	DRAINAGE LINE	D	
EXISTING CATCH BASIN		SEWER LINE	S	
PROPOSED CATCH BASIN	Ħ	GAS LINE		
WATER GATE	wv M	WATER LINE	W	
WATER SHUT OFF	nso	STONE WALL		
HYDRANT	УС	TREE LINE	······································	
PINES, ETC.	*	ABUT. PROPERTY LINES		
MAPLES, ETC.	e a s	EXIST. PROPERTY LINES		
EXIST. SPOT GRADE	96×69	BUILDING SETBACK LINES		
PROP. SPOT GRADE	96x69	EXIST. CONTOUR	<u> </u>	
DOUBLE POST SIGN		PROP. CONTOUR		
SINGLE POST SIGN	- <del>- 0 -</del>	SOIL LINES		PB CASE
PINES, ETC. MAPLES, ETC. EXIST. SPOT GRADE PROP. SPOT GRADE DOUBLE POST SIGN SINGLE POST SIGN	96x69 96x69 00	ABUI. PROPERTY LINES EXIST. PROPERTY LINES BUILDING SETBACK LINES EXIST. CONTOUR PROP. CONTOUR SOIL LINES	100	PB

## **DRAWING INDEX**

## [TLE

OVER SHEET XISTING CONDITIONS PLAN (DOUCET SURVEY) TE PLAN RADING, DRAINAGE, & EROSION CONTROL FILITY PLAN GHTING & LANDSCAPE PLAN **ROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL DETAILS ONSTRUCTION DETAILS** TILITY DETAILS XETER LADDER TRUCK MANEUVERING PLAN

## RECORD OWNER/APPLICANT

MENISCUS FINANCIAL HOLDINGS, LLC 133 PORTSMOUTH AVE. (NH ROUTE 108) EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

**REQUIRED STATE AND FEDERAL PERMITS** CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PERMIT NHDES ALTERATION OF TERRAIN PERMIT NHDES SHORELAND PERMIT NHDES WETLANDS BUREAU DREDGE AND FILL

	REVISIONS:	DATE:
1	REVISED PER REVIEW COMMENTS	3/28/24
2	REVISED PER REVIEW COMMENTS	5/15/24
3		
4		
5		

# 23-7

CHAIRMAN SIGNATURE:









- OWNER.

- SHALL BE REASONABLY MAINTAINED AND WHEN DEAD OR REMOVED, MUST BE REASONABLY REPLACED.



Luminair	e Schec	lule		
Symbol	Qty	Label	Description	Tag
	6	P4	COOPER: GALN-SA3D-730-U-T4FT-CXX-HSS	MOUNTED ON 25' VALMONT POLE: DS330-400Q250-D1
	4	W2	COOPER: GWC-SA1B-730-U-T2-CXX	WALL MTD 14' AFG
	2	W4	$COOPEB \cdot GWC-SA1C-730-U-T4FT-CXX$	WALL MTD 14' AFG

Parking Lot

Illuminance (Fc) Average = 1.40 Maximum = 3.7 Minimum = 0.4Avg/Min Ratio = 3.50



ROADWAY HAS THE BASE COURSE TO DESIGN ELEVATION AND THE ASSOCIATED DRAINAGE IS COMPLETE AND STABLE.



1. STONE FOR A STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE SHALL BE 3 INCH STONE, RECLAIMED STONE, OR RECYCLED CONCRETE EQUIVALENT. 2. THE LENGTH OF THE STABILIZED ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 50 FEET, EXCEPT FOR A SINGLE

RESIDENTIAL LOT WHERE A 30 FOOT MINIMUM LENGTH WOULD APPLY. 3. THE THICKNESS OF THE STONE FOR THE STABILIZED ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 6 INCHES. 4. THE WIDTH OF THE ENTRANCE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN THE FULL WIDTH OF THE ENTRANCE WHERE INGRESS OR EGRESS OCCURS OR 10 FEET, WHICH EVER IS GREATER. 5. GEOTEXTILE FILTER CLOTH SHALL BE PLACED OVER THE ENTIRE AREA PRIOR TO PLACING THE STONE. FILTER CLOTH IS NOT

REQUIRED FOR A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE LOT. 6. ALL SURFACE WATER THAT IS FLOWING TO OR DIVERTED TOWARD THE CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE SHALL BE PIPED BENEATH THE ENTRANCE. IF PIPING IS IMPRACTICAL, A BERM WITH 5:1 SLOPES THAT CAN BE CROSSED BY VEHICLES MAY BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THE PIPE. 7. THE ENTRANCE SHALL BE MAINTAINED IN A CONDITION THAT WILL PREVENT TRACKING OR FLOWING OF SEDIMENT ONTO PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY. THIS MAY REQUIRE PERIODIC TOP DRESSING WITH ADDITIONAL STONE AS CONDITIONS DEMAND AND REPAIR AND/OR CLEAN OUT OF ANY MEASURES USED TO TRAP

SEDIMENT. ALL SEDIMENT SPILLED, WASHED, OR TRACKED ONTO PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY MUST BE REMOVED PROMPTLY STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE

## WINTER MAINTENANCE

1. ALL DISTURBED AREAS THAT DO NOT HAVE AT LEAST 85% VEGETATIVE COVERAGE PRIOR TO OCTOBER 15TH, SHALL BE STABILIZED BY APPLYING MULCH AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. ALL SIDE SLOPES, STEEPER THAN 4:1, THAT ARE NOT DIRECTED TO SWALES OR DETENTION BASINS, SHALL BE LINED WITH BIODEGRADABLE/PHOTODEGRADABLE "JUTE MATTING" (EXCELSIOR'S CURLEX II OR EQUAL). ALL OTHER SLOPES SHALL BE MULCHED AND TACKED AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. THE APPLICATION OF MULCH AND/OR JUTE MATTING SHALL NOT OCCUR OVER EXISTING SNOW COVER. IF THE SITE IS ACTIVE AFTER OCTOBER 15TH, ANY SNOW THAT ACCUMULATES ON DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE REMOVED PRIOR TO SPRING THAW ALL AREAS WILL BE STABILIZED, AS DIRECTED ABOVE.

2. ALL SWALES THAT DO NOT HAVE FULLY ESTABLISHED VEGETATION SHALL BE EITHER LINED WITH TEMPORARY JUTE MATTING OR TEMPORARY STONE CHECK DAMS (APPROPRIATELY SPACED). STONE CHECK DAMS WILL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT THE WINTER MONTHS. IF THE SWALES ARE TO BE MATTED WITH PERMANENT LINERS OR RIPRAP WITH ENGINEERING FABRIC, THIS SHALL BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO WINTER SHUTDOWN OR AS SOON AS THEY ARE PROPERLY GRADED AND SHAPED

3. PRIOR TO OCT. 15TH ALL ROADWAY AND PARKING AREAS SHALL BE BROUGHT UP TO AND THROUGH THE BANK RUN GRAVEL APPLICATION. IF THESE AREAS' ELEVATIONS ARE PROPOSED TO REMAIN BELOW THE PROPOSED SUBGRADE ELEVATION, THE SUBGRADE MATERIAL SHALL BE ROUGHLY CROWNED AND A 3" LAYER OF CRUSHED GRAVEL SHALL BE PLACED AND COMPACTED. THIS WILL ALLOW THE SUBGRADE TO SHED RUNOFF AND WILL REDUCE ROADWAY EROSION. THIS CRUSHED GRAVEL DOES NOT HAVE TO CONFORM TO NH DOT 304.3, BUT SHALL HAVE BETWEEN 15–25% PASSING THE #200 SIEVE AND THE LARGEST STONE SIZE SHALL BE 2". IF THE SITE IS ACTIVE AFTER NOVEMBER 15TH, ANY ACCUMULATED SNOW SHALL BE REMOVED FROM ALL ROADWAY AND PARKING AREAS.

4. AFTER OCTOBER 15TH, THE END OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S AVERAGE GROWING SEASON, NO ADDITIONAL LOAM SHALL BE SPREAD ON SIDE SLOPES AND SWALES. THE STOCKPILES THAT WILL BE LEFT UNDISTURBED UNTIL SPRING SHALL BE SEEDED BY THIS DATE. AFTER OCTOBER 15TH, ANY NEW OR DISTURBED PILES SHALL BE MULCHED AT A RATE OF 3-4 TONS PER ACRE. ALL STOCKPILES THAT WILL REMAIN THROUGHOUT THE WINTER SHALL BE SURROUNDED WITH SILT FENCING.

## SEEDING SPECIFICATIONS

1. GRADING AND SHAPING

A. SLOPES SHALL NOT BE STEEPER THAN 2:1;3:1 SLOPES OR FLATTER ARE PREFERRED. WHERE MOWING WILL BE DONE, 3:1 SLOPES OR FLATTER ARE RECOMMENDED.

2. SEEDBED PREPARATION A. SURFACE AND SEEPAGE WATER SHOULD BE DRAINED OR DIVERTED FROM THE SITE TO PREVENT DROWNING OR WINTER KILLING OF THE PLANTS.

B. STONES LARGER THAN 4 INCHES AND TRASH SHOULD BE REMOVED BECAUSE THEY INTERFERE WITH SEEDING AND FUTURE MAINTENANCE OF THE AREA. WHERE FEASIBLE, THE SOIL SHOULD BE TILLED TO A DEPTH OF ABOUT 4 INCHES TO PREPARE A SEEDBED AND MIX FERTILIZER AND LIME INTO THE SOIL. THE SEEDBED SHOULD BE LEFT IN REASONABLY FIRM AND SMOOTH CONDITION. THE LAST TILLAGE OPERATION SHOULD BE PERFORMED ACROSS THE SLOPE WHEREVER PRACTICAL. 3. ESTABLISHING A STAND

A. LIME AND FERTILIZER SHOULD BE APPLIED PRIOR TO OR AT THE TIME OF SEEDING AND INCORPORATED INTO THE SOIL KINDS AND AMOUNTS OF LIME AND FERTILIZER SHOULD BE BASED ON AN EVALUATION OF SOIL TESTS. REFER TO LIGHTING & LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR FERTILIZER REQUIREMENTS.

B. SEED SHOULD BE SPREAD UNIFORMLY BY THE METHOD MOST APPROPRIATE FOR THE SITE. METHODS INCLUDE BROADCASTING, DRILLING AND HYDROSEEDING. WHERE BROADCASTING IS USED, COVER SEED WITH .25 INCH OF SOIL OR LESS, BY CULTIPACKING OR RAKING.

C. A NEW ENGLAND NATIVE SEED MIXTURE SHALL BE USED. REFER TO MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS FOR RATES OF SEEDING.

D. WHEN SEEDED AREAS ARE MULCHED, PLANTINGS MAY BE MADE FROM EARLY SPRING TO EARLY OCTOBER. WHEN SEEDED AREAS ARE NOT MULCHED, PLANTINGS SHOULD BE MADE FROM EARLY SPRING TO MAY 20 OR FROM AUGUST 10 TO SEPTEMBER 1.

4. MULCH A. HAY, STRAW, OR OTHER MULCH, WHEN NEEDED, SHOULD BE APPLIED IMMEDIATELY AFTER SEEDING.

B. MULCH WILL BE HELD IN PLACE USING APPROPRIATE TECHNIQUES FROM THE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE FOR MULCHING. HAY OR STRAW MULCH SHALL BE PLACED AT A RATE OF 90 LBS PER 1000 SQ. FT. 5. MAINTENANCE TO ESTABLISH A STAND

A. PLANTED AREA SHOULD BE PROTECTED FROM DAMAGE BY FIRE, GRAZING, TRAFFIC, AND DENSE WEED GROWTH. B. FERTILIZATION NEEDS SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY ONSITE INSPECTIONS. SUPPLEMENTAL FERTILIZER IS USUALLY

THE KEY TO FULLY COMPLETE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STAND BECAUSE MOST PERENNIAL STAKE 2 TO 3 YEARS TO BECOME ESTABLISHED.

C. IN WATERWAYS, CHANNELS, OR SWALES WHERE UNIFORM FLOW CONDITIONS ARE ANTICIPATED, OCCASIONAL MOWING MAY BE NECESSARY TO CONTROL GROWTH OF WOODY VEGETATION.









CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR POROUS ASPHALT THE UNH STORM WATER CENTER INSTALLATION RECOMMENDATIONS

INSTALLATION

- A. PERCOLATION BEDS (REFERS TO NO 57 STONE) . OWNER SHALL BE NOTIFIED AT LEAST 24 HOUR'S PRIOR TO ALL PERCOLATION BED AND POROUS PAVING WORK.
- 2. SUB GRADE PREPARATION A.EXISTING SUB GRADE UNDER BED AREAS SHALL NOT BE COMPACTED OR SUBJECT TO EXCESSIVE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT TRAFFIC PRIOR TO STONE BED PLACEMENT. B. WHERE EROSION OF SUB GRADE HAS CAUSED ACCUMULATION OF FINE MATERIALS AND/OR SURFACE PONDING, THIS MATERIAL SHALL BE
- REMOVED WITH LIGHT EQUIPMENT AND THE UNDERLYING SOILS SCARIFIED TO A MINIMUM DEPTH OF 6 INCHES WITH A YORK RAKE OR EQUIVALENT AND LIGHT TRACTOR C. BRING SUB GRADE OF STONE PERCOLATION BED TO LINE, GRADE, AND ELEVATIONS INDICATED. FILL AND LIGHTLY REGRADE ANY AREAS DAMAGED BY EROSION, PONDING, OR TRAFFIC COMPACTION BEFORE THE PLACING OF STONE. ALL BED BOTTOMS ARE LEVEL GRADE.
- 3. RECHARGE BED INSTALLATION (REFERS TO NO 3 STONE) A.UPON COMPLETION OF SUB GRADE WORK, THE ENGINEER SHALL BE NOTIFIED AND SHALL INSPECT AT HIS DISCRETION BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH PERCOLATION BED INSTALLATION. B.PERCOLATION BED AGGREGATE SHALL BE PLACED IMMEDIATELY AFTER APPROVAL OF SUB GRADE PREPARATION. ANY ACCUMULATION OF DEBRIS
- OR SEDIMENT WHICH HAS TAKEN PLACE AFTER APPROVAL OF SUB GRADE SHALL BE REMOVED PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF AGGREGATE AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE OWNER. C.INSTALL COARSE AGGREGATE NO. 3 (1 1/2" STONE) IN 8-INCH MAXIMUM LIFTS. LIGHTLY COMPACT EACH LAYER WITH EQUIPMENT, KEEPING EQUIPMENT MOVEMENT OVER STORAGE BED SUBGRADES TO A MINIMUM. INSTALL AGGREGATE TO GRADES INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS.
- D. INSTALL 3" LIFT PEA GRAVEL LAYER TO PREVENT MIGRATION OF FINES FROM THE FILTER COARSE (NHDOT 304.1) E.INSTALL FILTER COARSE (NHDOT 304.1 SAND LESS THAN 2% FINES) IN 2, 4" LIFTS. LIGHTLY COMPACT EACH LAYER WITH EQUIPMENT, KEEPING
- EQUIPMENT MOVEMENT OVER STORAGE BED SUBGRADES TO A MINIMUM. INSTALL AGGREGATE TO GRADES INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS. F.INSTALL CHOKER BASE COURSE (AASHTO # 57 STONE) AGGREGATE EVENLY OVER SURFACE OF STONE BED, SUFFICIENT TO ALLOW PLACEMENT OF PAVEMENT, AND NOTIFY ENGINEER FOR APPROVAL. CHOKER BASE COURSE SHALL BE SUFFICIENT TO ALLOW FOR EVEN PLACEMENT OF ASPHALT BUT NO THICKER THAN 4-INCH IN DEPTH. 4. SURROUNDING AREAS
- A.BEFORE THE POROUS PAVEMENT IS INSTALLED, ADJACENT SOIL AREAS SHOULD BE SLOPED AWAY FROM ALL PAVEMENT EDGES, TO PREVENT POTENTIAL SEDIMENT FROM WASHING ONTO THE PAVEMENT SURFACE. B.TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, A SEQUENCE OF SWALES SHOULD BE EXCAVATED INTO ALL EARTHEN (UNPAVED) AREAS AT LEAST ON THE UPHILL SIDES OF
- THE PAVEMENT, AND WHERE NECESSARY, TO BELOW THE CURB OR PAVEMENT ELEVATION. IT'S SHAPE AND PAINTINGS CAN BE INTEGRATED WITH THE PROJECT'S ARCHITECTURE AND LANDSCAPE, AND DESIGNED TO MAXIMIZE INFILTRATION. SWALE OVERFLOW, WHEN IT OCCURS, CAN BE DISCHARGED FROM ONE SWALE TO ANOTHER BY CONNECTING PIPES UNDER DRIVEWAYS. C.BUILDING BASEMENTS AND FOUNDATIONS SHOULD BE WATERPROOFED AS NECESSARY, WHERE THE POROUS PAVEMENT ABUTS BUILDINGS.

B. POROUS ASPHALT . TRANSPORTING MATERIAL

- A.TRANSPORTING OF MIX TO THE SITE SHALL BE IN VEHICLES WITH SMOOTH, CLEAN DUMP BEDS THAT HAVE BEEN SPRAYED WITH A NON-PETROLEUM RELEASE AGENT. B. THE MIX SHALL BE COVERED DURING TRANSPORT TO CONTROL COOLING.
- POROUS BITUMINOUS ASPHALT SHALL NOT BE STORED IN EXCESS OF 90 MINUTES BEFORE PLACEMENT. ASPHALT PLACEMENT
- A.THE POROUS BITUMINOUS SURFACE COURSE SHALL BE LAID IN ONE LIFT DIRECTLY OVER THE CHOKER COARSE, FILTER COARSE, AND CRUSHED STONE BASE COURSE TO A 4-INCH FINISHED THICKNESS. THE SURFACE CAN BE LAID IN TWO LIFTS IF SECOND LIFT IS DONE WITHIN 10 BUSINESS AND THE INITIAL COURSE IS CLEAN AND FREE OF SEDIMENT.
- B. THE LAYING TEMPERATURE OF THE BITUMINOUS MIX SHALL BE BETWEEN 300 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT AND 350 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT (BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ASPHALT SUPPLIER).
- C.INSTALLATION SHALL TAKE PLACE WHEN AMBIENT TEMPERATURES ARE 55 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT OR ABOVE, WHEN MEASURED IN THE SHADE AWAY FROM ARTIFICIAL HEAT. D. THE USE OF A REMIXING MATERIAL TRANSFER DEVICE BETWEEN THE TRUCKS AND THE PAVER IS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED TO ELIMINATE COLD LUMPS
- IN THE MIX E. THE POLYMER-MODIFIED ASPHALT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO RAKE, A WELL-HEATED SCREED SHOULD BE USED TO MINIMIZE THE NEED FOR RAKING. F. COMPACTION OF THE SURFACE COURSE SHALL TAKE PLACE WHEN THE SURFACE IS COOL ENOUGH TO RESIST A 10-TON ROLLER. (140°F. SURFACE TEMPERATURE) ONE OR TWO PASSES IS ALL THAT IS REQUIRED FOR PROPER COMPACTION. MORE ROLLING COULD CAUSE A REDUCTION IN THE SURFACE POROSITY WHICH IS UNACCEPTABLE.
- 4. IN THE EVENT CONSTRUCTION SEDIMENT IS INADVERTENTLY DEPOSITED ON THE FINISHED POROUS SURFACE, IT MUST BE IMMEDIATELY REMOVED BY VACUUMING.
- AFTER FINAL ROLLING, NO VEHICULAR TRAFFIC OF ANY KIND SHALL BE PERMITTED ON THE SURFACE UNTIL COOLING AND HARDENING HAS TAKEN PLACE, AND IN NO CASE WITHIN THE FIRST 48 HOURS. PROVIDE BARRIERS AS NECESSARY AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE OWNER TO PREVENT VEHICULAR USE: REMOVE AT THE DISCRETION OF THE ENGINEER. STRIPING PAINT FOR TRAFFIC LANES AND PARKING BAYS SHALL BE CHLORINATED RUBBER BASE, FACTORY MIXED, NON-BLEEDING, FAST DRYING, BEST QUALITY, WHITE TRAFFIC PAINT WITH A LIFE EXPECTANCY OF TWO YEARS UNDER NORMAL TRAFFIC USE.
- A.PAVEMENT-MARKING PAINT; LATEX, WATER-BASE EMULSION, READY-MIXED, COMPLYING WITH PS TT-P-1952. B.SWEEP AND CLEAN SURFACE TO ELIMINATE LOOSE MATERIAL AND DUST.
- C.PAINT 4 INCH WIDE TRAFFIC LANE STRIPING IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAYOUTS OF PLAN. APPLY PAINT WITH MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT TO PRODUCE UNIFORM STRAIGHT EDGES. APPLY IN TWO COATS AT MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDED RATES. PROVIDE CLEAR, SHARP LINES USING WHITE TRAFFIC PAINT, INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH NHDOT SPECIFICATIONS.
- WORK SHALL BE DONE EXPERTLY THROUGHOUT, WITHOUT STAINING OR INJURY TO OTHER WORK. RANSITION TO ADJACENT IMPERVIOUS BITUMINOUS PAVING SHALL BE MERGED NEATLY WITH FLUSH, CLEAN LINE. FINISHED PAVING SHALL BE EVEN, WITHOUT POCKETS, AND GRADED TO ELEVATIONS SHOWN ON DRAWING. 7. POROUS PAVEMENT BEDS SHALL NOT BE USED FOR EQUIPMENT OR MATERIALS STORAGE DURING CONSTRUCTION, AND UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHALL VEHICLES BE ALLOWED TO DEPOSIT SOIL ON PAVED POROUS SURFACES.
- 8. REPAIR OF DAMAGED PAVING A.ANY EXISTING PAVING ON OR ADJACENT TO THE SITE THAT HAS BEEN DAMAGED AS A RESULT OF CONSTRUCTION WORK SHALL HE REPAIRED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE OWNER WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COST TO THE OWNER. 9 FIFLD QUALITY CONTROL
- A.THE FULL PERMEABILITY OF THE PAVEMENT SURFACE SHALL BE TESTED BY APPLICATION OF CLEAN WATER AT THE RATE OF AT LEAST 5 GPM OVER THE SURFACE, USING A HOSE OR OTHER DISTRIBUTION DEVISE. WATER USED FOR THE TEST SHALL BE CLEAN, FREE OF SUSPENDED SOLIDS AND DELETERIOUS LIQUIDS AND WILL BE PROVIDED AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE OWNER. ALL APPLIED WATER SHALL INFILTRATE DIRECTLY WITHOUT PUDDLE FORMATION OR SURFACE RUNOFF, AND SHALL BE OBSERVED BY THE ENGINEER AND OWNER.
- B.TEST IN-PLACE BASE AND SURFACE COURSE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR THICKNESS AND SURFACE SMOOTHNESS. REPAIR OR REMOVE AND REPLACE UNACCEPTABLE WORK AS DIRECTED BY THE OWNER. C.SURFACE SMOOTHNESS: TEST FINISHED SURFACE FOR SMOOTHNESS AND EVEN DRAINAGE, USING A TEN-FOOT TO CENTERLINE OF PAVED AREA. SURFACE WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED IF GAPS OR RIDGES EXCEED 3116 OF AN INCH.

## MINIMUM COMPACTION REQUIREMENTS

COMPACTION SHALL BE PERFORMED TO NOT LESS THAN NINETY-FIVE PERCENT (95%) MAXIMUM DENSITY AS DETERMINED IN A LABORATORY COMPACTION TEST, PERFORMED UNDER THE SPECIFICATIONS OF ASTM D1557-64T, METHOD "A", (BACK FILL MATERIAL OF A STONY NATURE SHALL BE TESTED UNDER METHOD "C" OR "D" OF THE SAME ASTM DESIGNATION) OR OTHER APPROVED ASTM OR AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (AASHTO) SPECIFICATIONS. SUCH TEXT SHALL ALSO BE USED FOR ESTABLISHING THE OPTIMUM MOISTURE CONTENT OF THE MATERIALS. THE IN-PLACE DRY UNIT WEIGHT OF THE COMPACTED MATERIALS SHALL BE DETERMINED BY METHODS SPECIFIED UNDER ASTM "D" 1556-58T OR OTHER APPROVED ASTM OR AASHTO SPECIFICATIONS. THE IN-PLACE COMPACTION TEST TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVED LABORATORY COMPACTION TEST.

TABLE 5. POROUS ASPHALT MIX DESIGN CRITERIA.	
SIEVE SIZE (INCH/MM)	PERCENT PASSING (%
0.75/19	100
0.50/12.5	85–100
0.375/9.5	55–75
NO.4/4.75	10–25
NO.8/2.36	5–10
NO.200/0.075 (#200)	2–4
BINDER CONTENT (AASHTO T164)	6.0-6.5%
AIR VOID CONTENT BY CORELOK (ASTM D6752)*	16.0-20.0%
AIR VOID CONTENT BY PARAFFIN WAX (AASHTO T27	5 )*18.0-22.0%
DRAINDOWN (ASTM D6390)**	<= 0.3 %
RETAINED TENSILE STRENGTH (AASHTO 283)***	>= 80 %

\* EITHER METHOD IS ACCEPTABLE

\*\*CELLULOSE OR MINERAL FIBERS MAY BE USED TO REDUCE DRAINDOWN. \*\*\*IF THE TSR (RETAINED TENSILE STRENGTH) VALUES FALL BELOW 80% WHEN TESTED PER NAPA IS 131

(WITH A SINGLE FREEZE THAW CYCLE RATHER THAN 5). STEP 4, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL EMPLOY AN ANTISTRIP ADDITIVE, SUCH AS HYDRATED LIME (ASTM C977) OR A FATTY AMINE, TO RAISE THE TSR VALUE ABOVE 80%.

#### MIX SUMMARY POROUS ASPHALT PAVEMENT MIX THE UNH STORM WATER CENTER

POROUS ASPHALT SHALL BE FOUR INCHES THICK WITH A BITUMINOUS MIX OF 6% TO 6.5% BY WEIGHT DRY AGGREGATE AND AIR VOIDS OF 18-22%. IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM D6390, DRAIN DOWN OF THE BINDER SHALL BE NO GREATER THAN 0.3%. IF MORE ABSORPTIVE AGGREGATES, SUCH AS LIMESTONE, ARE USED IN THE MIX. THEN THE AMOUNT OF BITUMEN IS TO BE BASED ON THE TESTING PROCEDURES OUTLINED IN THE NATIONAL ASPHALT PAVEMENT ASSOCIATION'S INFORMATION SERIES 131 - "PERVIOUS ASPHALT PAVEMENTS" (2003) OR NHDOT EQUIVALENT. MIX SUPPLIERS MAY HAVE A SUITABLE IN-HOUSE SPECIFICATION FOR OPEN GRADED FRICTION COURSE (OGFC) THAT CAN BE USED.

USE NEAT ASPHALT BINDER MODIFIED WITH AN ELASTOMERIC POLYMER TO PRODUCE A BINDER MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF PG 76-22 AS SPECIFIED IN AASHTO MP- I. THE ELASTOMER POLYMER SHALL BE STYRENE-BUTADIENE-STYRENE (SBS), OR APPROVED EQUAL, APPLIED AT A RATE OF 3% BY WEIGHT OF THE TOTAL BINDER. THE COMPOSITE MATERIALS SHALL BE THOROUGHLY BLENDED AT THE ASPHALT REFINERY OR TERMINAL PRIOR TO BEING LOADED INTO THE TRANSPORT VEHICLE. THE POLYMER MODIFIED ASPHALT BINDER SHALL BE HEAT AND STORAGE STABLE. AGGREGATE SHALL BE MINIMUM 90% CRUSHED MATERIAL AND HAVE A GRADATION OF:

COMPOSITION OF MIXTURE SIEVE SIZE (INCH/MM)PERCENT PASSING0.75/191000.50/12.585-1000.375/9.555-75N0.4/4.7510-25N0.8/2.365-10N0.200/0.0752-4TOTAL

AGGREGATE93-.5-94% ASPHALT OF TOTAL MIX6-6.5 ADD HYDRATED LIME AT A DOSAGE RATE OF 1.0% BY WEIGHT OF THE TOTAL DRY AGGREGATE TO MIXES CONTAINING GRANITE. HYDRATED LIME SHALL MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASTM C 977. THE ADDITIVE MUST BE ABLE TO PREVENT THE SEPARATION OF THE ASPHALT BINDER FROM THE AGGREGATE AND ACHIEVE A REQUIRED TENSILE STRENGTH RATIO (TSR) OF AT LEAST 80% ON THE ASPHALT MIX WHEN TESTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AASHTO T 283. THE ASPHALTIC MIX SHALL BE TESTED FOR ITS RESISTANCE TO STRIPPING BY WATER IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM D-1664. IF THE ESTIMATED COATING AREA IS NOT ABOVE 95 PERCENT, ANTI-STRIPPING AGENTS SHALL BE ADDED TO THE ASPHALT.

NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL THE CONTRACTOR HAS SUBMITTED AND THE ENGINEER HAS APPROVED A MIX DESIGN INCLUDING THE PERCENTAGE OF EACH INGREDIENT INCLUDING BINDER, POLYMER, AND THE JOB-MIX FORMULA FROM SUCH A COMBINATION. THE JOB-MIX FORMULA SHALL ESTABLISH A SINGLE PERCENTAGE OF AGGREGATE PASSING SIEVE AND A SINGLE PERCENTAGE OF BITUMINOUS MATERIAL TO BE ADDED TO THE AGGREGATE. NO CHANGE IN THE JOB-MIX FORMULA MAY BE MADE WITHOUT WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE ENGINEER. THE JOB-MIX FORMULA MUST FALL WIT H THE MASTER RANGE SPECIFIED IN COMPOSITION OF MIXTURE TABLE.

TRANSPORTING MATERIAL: SEE CONSTRUCTION AND INSTALL SPECIFICATIONS

FOR QUESTIONS ON MIX SPECIFICATIONS CONTACT ROBERT ROSEEN, PHD, AT THE UNH STORM WATER CENTER. 603-862-4024.

MAINTENANCE SPECIFICATIONS FOR POROUS ASPHALT PARKING LOT AREAS AND LOW VOLUME ROADS THE UNH STORM WATER CENTER

THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS WILL HELP ASSURE THAT THE PAVEMENT IS MAINTAINED TO PRESERVE ITS HYDROLOGIC EFFECTIVENESS.

## WINTER MAINTENANCE:

1. SANDING FOR WINTER TRACTION IS PROHIBITED. DEICING IS PERMITTED (NAC1, MGC12, OR EQUIVALENT). REDUCED SALT APPLICATION IS POSSIBLE AND CAN BE A COST SAVINGS FOR WINTER MAINTENANCE. NONTOXIC, ORGANIC DEICERS, APPLIED EITHER AS BLENDED, MAGNESIUM CHLORIDE-BASED LIQUID PRODUCTS OR AS PRETREATED SALT, ARE PREFERABLE. 2. PLOWING IS ALLOWED, BLADE SHOULD BE SET APPROXIMATELY 1" ABOVE ROAD SURFACE. ICE AND LIGHT SNOW ACCUMULATION ARE GENERALLY NOT AS PROBLEMATIC AS FOR STANDARD ASPHALT. SNOW WILL ACCUMULATE DURING HEAVIER STORMS AND SHOULD BE PLOWED.

## ROUTINE MAINTENANCE;

- 1. ASPHALT SEAL COATING MUST BE ABSOLUTELY FORBIDDEN. SURFACE SEAL COATING IS NOT REVERSIBLE. 2. THE PAVEMENT SURFACE SHOULD BE VACUUMED 2 OR 3 TIMES PER YEAR, AND AT ANY ADDITIONAL TIMES SEDIMENT IS SPILLED, ERODED, OR TRACKED ONTO THE SURFACE. 3. PLANTED AREAS ADJACENT TO PERVIOUS PAVEMENT SHOULD BE WELL MAINTAINED TO PREVENT SOIL WASHOUT ONTO THE PAVEMENT. IF ANY BARE SPOTS OR ERODED AREAS ARE OBSERVED WITHIN THE PLANTED AREAS, THEY SHOULD BE
- REPLANTED AND/OR STABILIZED AT ONCE. 4. IMMEDIATELY CLEAN ANY SOIL DEPOSITED ON PAVEMENT. SUPERFICIAL DIRT DOES NOT NECESSARILY CLOG THE PAVEMENT VOIDS. HOWEVER, DIRT THAT IS GROUND IN REPEATEDLY BY TIRES CAN LEAD TO CLOGGING. THEREFORE, TRUCKS OR OTHER HEAVY VEHICLES SHOULD BE PREVENTED FROM TRACKING OR SPILLING DIRT ONTO THE PAVEMENT.
- 5. DO NOT ALLOW CONSTRUCTION STAGING, SOIL/MULCH STORAGE, ETC. ON UNPROTECTED PAVEMENT SURFACE 6. REPAIRS: POTHOLES OF LESS THAN 50 SQUARE FEET CAN BE PATCHED BY ANY MEANS SUITABLE WITH STANDARD PAVEMENT OR A PERVIOUS MIX IS PREFERRED. FOR AREAS GREATER THAN 50 SQ. FT. IN NEED OF REPAIR, APPROVAL OF PATCH TYPE SHOULD BE SOUGHT FROM A QUALIFIED ENGINEER. ANY REQUIRED REPAIR OF DRAINAGE STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DONE PROMPTLY TO ENSURE CONTINUED PROPER FUNCTIONING OF THE SYSTEM.
- 7. WRITTEN AND VERBAL COMMUNICATION TO THE POROUS PAVEMENT'S FUTURE OWNER SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THE PAVEMENT'S SPECIAL PURPOSE AND SPECIAL MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS SUCH AS THOSE LISTED HERE. 8. A PERMANENT SIGN SHOULD BE ADDED AT THE ENTRANCE AND END OF THE POROUS ASPHALT AREA TO INFORM
- RESIDENTS AND MAINTENANCE STAFF OF THE SPECIAL NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PAVEMENT, AND ITS SPECIAL MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS.



## NOTES:

- 1. 4" FRICTION COARSE CONSISTS OF COARSER AGGREGATE AND STIFFER BINDER. SEE TABLE
- 2. A WORKING COURSE 4" THICK CONSISTS OF AASHTO NO. 57 STONE 3. 6" UNDERDRAIN TO BE SET ABOVE CRUSHED GRAVEL BOTTOM TO ALLOW FOR STORAGE
- AND INFILTRATION. 2.4" OF WATER CAN BE DETAINED UNDER THE UNDERDRAIN. 4. TOP COAT SHOULD BE VACUUMED A MINIMUM OF TWICE A YEAR.
- 5. ADJACENT AREAS TO POROUS PAVEMENT SHOULD BE GRADED AWAY FROM PAVEMENT TO PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM RUNNING ONTO POROUS AREA AND CLOGGING PORES. ROOF RUNOFF CAN FLOW ONTO PAVEMENT OR INTO SUBBASE MATERIAL.

## POROUS PAVEMENT





energia de la constante de <b>FIL</b>	TER MEDIA MI	XTURES			
	Percent of	G	Gradation of material		
Component Material	Mixture by Volume	Sieve No.	Percent by Weight Passing Standard Sieve		
rena de la compañía de Carlos <b>F</b>	ilter Media Opt	tion A			
ASTM C-33 concrete sand	50 to 55	1. A.			
Loamy sand topsoil, with fines as indicated	20 to 30	200	15 to 25		
Moderately fine shredded bark or wood fiber mulch, with fines as indicated	20 to 30	200	< 5		
F	ilter Media Op	tion B			
Moderately fine shredded bark or wood fiber mulch, with fines as indicated	20 to 30	200	< 5		
Network and the	the second second	10	85 to 100		
	70 40 80	20	70 to 100		
Loanly course sand	/0 10 80	60	15 to 40		
	1				



















## SCHEMATIC









1/8" = 1'-0"





 $4 \frac{\text{SOUTH ELEVATION}}{1/8" = 1'-0"}$ 



# ELEVATIONS

1/8" = 1'-0"



## DRAINAGE ANALYSIS & SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN

Prepared for:

Foss Motors Commercial Site Plan

Prepared by:

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC 70 Portsmouth Avenue Stratham, NH 03885

Project Number: NH-1471 133 Portsmouth Avenue / NH Route 108 Exeter, New Hampshire February 13, 2024 Revised May 15, 2024



## **Table of Contents**

1.0	Analysis Summary	Pages 1-2
2.0	Existing Conditions Analysis	Page 2
3.0	Proposed Subdivision Analysis	Pages 2-3
4.0	Sediment & Erosion Control Best Management Practices	Pages 3-6
5.0	Conclusion	Page 6

Appendix I - Existing Conditions Analysis WQV (1-Inch) 24 Hour Summary 2-Year 24-Hour Summary 10-Year 24-Hour Complete 25-Year 24-Hour Summary 50-Year 24-Hour Summary

Appendix II - Proposed Conditions Analysis WQV (1-Inch) 24 Hour Summary 2-Year 24-Hour Summary 10-Year 24-Hour Complete 25-Year 24-Hour Summary 50-Year 24-Hour Summary

Appendix III - Charts, Graphs, and Calculations

Appendix IV - Plans USGS Quadrangle Sheet W-1 Existing Conditions Watershed Plan Sheet W-2 Proposed Conditions Watershed Plan

### **1.0 ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Foss Motors proposes to construct a commercial site plan to establish a 22,500 sf storage accessory use to the existing car dealership located on the parcel to the north on Portsmouth Avenue (NH Route 108) in Exeter New Hampshire. A drainage analysis of 6.2 acres of the proposed site improvement was conducted for the purpose of estimating the peak rate of stormwater run-off and to subsequently design adequate drainage structures. Two models were compiled: one for the area in its existing (pre-construction) condition and a second for its proposed (post-construction) condition. The analysis was conducted using Extreme Precipitation data provided by Cornell University for the following 24-hour duration storm events, including increasing all 24-hour rainfall data by 15% as required since Exeter is within the designated "coastal region" by NHDES:

Storm Event	Rainfall Depth (inches)
WQV	1.00
2-Year	3.70
10-Year	5.65
25-Year	7.19
50-Year	8.63

These storm events use the USDA SCS TR-20 method within the HydroCAD Stormwater Modeling System environment to model the rainfall and predict stormwater runoff flows and volumes. A Type III storm pattern was used in the model. The purpose of this analysis is to estimate the peak rates of run-off from the site for detention adequacy purposes, and to compare the peak rate of run-off between the existing and proposed conditions.

### Peak Rate of Discharge

		Component Peak Rate of Discharge (CFS)				
Analysis Point #						
Analysis Point	Condition	WQV	2-Year	10-Year	25-Year	50-Year
Description						
Reach #100 -	Existing	0.34	4.99	10.59	15.41	20.08
Southwest	Proposed	0.33	3.77	9.46	15.00	19.64
Reach #200 -	Existing	0.00	0.14	0.67	1.27	1.88
South	Proposed	0.00	0.07	0.32	0.57	1.29
Reach #300 -	Existing	0.02	0.16	0.54	0.92	1.34
Southeast	Proposed	0.02	0.16	0.54	0.92	1.34

Analysis Point # Analysis Point Description	Condition	2-Year Storm Volume (Acre-Feet)
Reach #100 - Southwest	Existing	0.603
	Proposed	0.434
Reach #200 - South	Existing	0.025
	Proposed	0.010
Reach #300 - Southeast	Existing	0.025
	Proposed	0.025

## **Channel Protection**

As shown above, all post-development storm events either reduce or match the pre-development peak discharge rates. Also, channel protection volumes are either reduced or match when comparing post-development to pre-development.

The proposed storage accessory use includes a paved area for additional vehicle storage and travel ways. Other than the entrances from GTE Road into the site, the parking area consists of porous pavement. The proposed improvement area includes three separate subcatchments. The peak rate of run-off in the proposed conditions is controled with the addition of the porous pavement, a bioretention pond, and a stone infiltration trench along with altering subcatchments to reduce the runoff. All pavement and roof runoff receives treatment from filter media within the porous pavement, bioretention pond, and stone infiltration trench prior to discharging towards the adjacent wetlands and storage to the north. In addition, the potential for increased erosion and sedimentation is handled by way of silt barriers surrounding the disturbed areas. The use of Best Management Practices per the Rockingham Conservation District / DES Handbook have been applied to the design of these structures and will be observed during all stages of construction. All land disturbed during construction will be stabilized within 30 days of groundbreaking. Existing wetlands and abutters will suffer no adverse effects resulting from this proposed development.

### 2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

The existing property is located on a parcel consisting of a paved roadway, lawn area, brush, and woodlands with wetlands in and adjacent to the site. The existing topography is such that the site analysis is divided into three subcatchments within the area proposed to be improved. Final Reach #100 flows to the existing wetland and storage area to the northeast of the proposed improvement area and ultimately through the existing 36-inch culvert through the site, Reach #200 flows towards the south towards the Exeter Reservoir, and Reach #300 flows towards the southeast towards the Exeter Reservoir.

Classified by Site-Specific Soil Mapping within the developed areas and NRCS Soil Survey for other contributing areas, the site is composed of relatively flat slopes and soils categorized into the Hydrologic Soil Groups (HSG) B and C.
### 3.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

The addition of the impervious area, clearing of trees, and re-grading of the site causes an increase in the curve number (Cn) and a decrease in the time of concentration (Tc) which results in a potential increase in peak rates of run-off from the site. To reduce these flows to pre-development conditions, various stormwater management systems will be proposed. Porous pavement is provided within the parking area that includes a pipe network with catchbasins and underdrains. There is also a bioretention pond that captures, treats, and stores runoff from a portion of GTE Road. Additionally, a stone infiltration trench along the southern end of the building captures, treats, and stores runoff from the roof, a portion of GTE Road, and the pavement for the firetruck turnaround. The proposed development divides the site into three similar post-construction subcatchments (Reach #300 being identical to the pre-development condition). The runoff is directed to the points of analysis through HydroCAD "reaches" and "ponds".

During construction, appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) will be applied so as to negate the potential for sediment-laden run-off to discharge off-site prior to the final stabilization of the proposed grading. The structures outlined in this proposal provide for adequate treatment of stormwater run-off for sediment control.

### 4.0 SEDIMENT & EROSION CONTROL PLANS BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMP's)

The proposed site development is protected from erosion and the roadways and abutting properties are protected from sediment by the use of Best Management Practices as outlined in the <u>New Hampshire Stormwater Manual</u>. Any area disturbed by construction will be re-stabilized within 30 days, and abutting properties and wetlands will not be adversely affected by this development. All swales and drainage structures will be constructed and stabilized prior to having run-off directed to them.

4.1 Silt Barrier / Construction Fence

The plan set demonstrates the location of silt barriers for sediment control. Sheet E-1, Erosion and Sediment Control Details, has the specifications for installation and maintenance of the silt barriers selected for the site. In areas where the limits of construction need to be emphasized to operators, construction fence for added visibility will be installed. Orange construction fence will be VISI Perimeter Fence by Conwed Plastic Fencing, or approved equal. The four-foot construction fencing is to be installed using six-foot posts buried at least two feet into the ground spaced six to eight feet apart.

### 4.2 Vegetated Stabilization

All areas that are disturbed during construction will be stabilized with vegetated material within 30 days of disturbance. Construction will be managed in such a manner that erosion is prevented and that no abutter's property will be subjected to any siltation, unless otherwise permitted. All

areas to be planted with grass for long-term cover will follow the specifications on Sheet E-1 using the seeding mixture below:

Mixture C	<b>Pounds per Acre</b>	Pounds per 1,000 sf
Tall Fescue	20	0.45
Creeping Red Fescue	20	0.45
Birdsfoot Trefoil	8	0.20
Total	48	1.10

### 4.3 Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit

A temporary gravel construction entrance/exit provides an area where mud can be dislodged from tires before the vehicle leaves the construction site to reduce the amount of mud and sediment transported onto paved municipal and state roads. The stone size for the gravel pad should be between 1- and 2-inch coarse aggregate and the pad itself constructed to a minimum length of 50' for the full width of the access road. The aggregate should be placed at least six inches thick. Plan and profile view details are shown on Sheet E1 - Sediment and Erosion Control Detail Plan.

### 4.2 Drainage Swales / Stormwater Conveyance Channels

Drainage swales will be stabilized with vegetation for long term cover as outlined below using seed mixture C. As a general rule, velocities in the swale should not exceed 3.0 feet per second for a vegetated swale although velocities as high as 4.5 FPS are allowed under certain soil conditions.

### 4.5 Level Spreaders

Level spreaders enable any run-off directed towards them to be spread evenly into sheet flow prior to discharge into wetlands or treatment by a filter strip, thus allowing for better filter strip efficiency and a lesser potential for erosion.

### 4.6 Vegetated Buffers

Vegetated buffers are areas of land with natural or planted vegetation designed to receive sheet run-off from upgradient development. These natural areas, preferably wooded, are effective in removing sediment and sediment-laden pollutants from such run-off, although their effectiveness is severely diminished when forced to deal with concentrated flow and must therefore be equipped with a level-spreading device. Vegetated buffers should not have a slope exceeding fifteen percent and have a minimum length of seventy-five feet.

### 4.6 Filter Strips

Filter strips are areas of land with natural or planted vegetation designed to receive sheet run-off from upgradient development. These natural areas, preferably wooded, are effective in removing sediment and sediment-laden pollutants from such run-off, although their effectiveness is severely diminished when forced to deal with concentrated flow and must therefore be equipped with a level-spreading device. Filter strips should not have a slope exceeding fifteen percent and have a minimum length of seventy-five feet.

### 4.4 Environmental Dust Control

Dust will be controlled on the site using multiple Best Management Practices. Mulching and temporary seeding will be the first line of protection to be utilized where problems occur. If dust problems are not solved by these applications, the use of water and calcium chloride can be applied. Calcium chloride will be applied at a rate that will keep the surface moist but not cause pollution.

### 4.5 Construction Sequence

- 1. Cut and remove trees in construction areas as directed or required.
- 2. Construct and/or install temporary and permanent sediment erosion and detention control facilities, as required. Erosion, sediment, and facilities shall be installed and stabilized prior to any earth moving operation, and prior to directing run-off to them.
- 3. Clear, cut, grub, and dispose of debris in approved facilities.
- 4. Excavate and stockpile topsoil / loam. All disturbed areas shall be stabilized immediately after grading.
- 5. Construct the paved area, underground detention pond with associated drainage structures, and building.
- 6. Begin permanent and temporary seeding and mulching. All cut and fill slopes and disturbed areas shall be seeded and mulched as required or directed.
- 7. Daily, or as required, construct temporary berms, drainage ditches, sediment traps, etc. to prevent erosion on the site and prevent any siltation of abutting waters or property.
- 8. Inspect and maintain all erosion and sediment control measures during construction.
- 9. Complete permanent seeding and landscaping.
- 10. Remove temporary erosion control measures after seeding areas have established themselves and site improvements are complete. Smooth and re-vegetate all disturbed areas.
- 11. All swales and drainage structures will be constructed and stabilized prior to having run-off being directed to them.
- 4.6 Temporary Erosion Control Measures
  - 1. The smallest practical area of land shall be exposed at any one time.
  - 2. Erosion and sediment control measures shall be installed as shown on the plans and at locations as required, or directed by the engineer.
  - 3. All disturbed areas shall be returned to original grades and elevations. Disturbed areas shall be loamed with a minimum of 4" of loam and seeded with not less than 1.10 pound of seed per 1,000 square feet (48 pounds per acre) of area.

- 4. Silt barriers shall be inspected periodically and after every rainstorm during the life of the project. All damaged areas shall be repaired and sediment deposits shall periodically be removed and properly disposed of.
- 5. After all disturbed areas have been stabilized, the temporary erosion control measures are to be removed and the area disturbed by the removal smoothed and revegetated.
- 6. Areas must be seeded and mulched within 5 days of final grading, permanently stabilized within 15 days of final grading, or temporarily stabilized within 30 days of initial disturbance of soil.
- 4.7 Inspection and Maintenance Schedule

Silt barriers shall be inspected during and after storm events to ensure that the fence still has integrity and is not allowing sediment to pass.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

This proposed site development on Portsmouth Avenue (NH Route 108) in Exeter, NH will have no adverse effect on the abutting property owners by way of stormwater run-off or siltation. Appropriate steps will be taken to eliminate erosion and sedimentation; these will be accomplished through the construction of a drainage system consisting of porous pavement, a bioretention pond, and an stone infiltration trench. The Best Management Practices developed by the State of New Hampshire have been utilized in the design of this system and these applications will be enforced throughout the construction process.

An Alteration of Terrain Permit (RSA 485: A-17) is required for this project due to the area of disturbance being more than 50,000 square feet within a shoreland protection area.

Respectfully Submitted,

BEALS ASSOCIATES, PLLC.

Christian O. Smith

Christian O Smith, PE Principal

# Appendix I

# **Existing Conditions Analysis**

WQV (1-Inch) 24-Hour Summary 2-Year 24-Hour Summary

**10-Year 24-Hour Complete** 

**25-Year 24-Hour Summary** 

**50-Year 24-Hour Summary** 



# Area Listing (all nodes)

Are	a CN	Description
(acres	3)	(subcatchment-numbers)
0.02	3 61	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG B (3.0)
1.66	9 74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C (1.1, 1.2, 3.0)
0.01	1 48	Brush, Good, HSG B (3.0)
0.17	7 65	Brush, Good, HSG C (1.1, 3.0)
0.58	0 98	Paved parking, HSG C (1.1, 1.2, 3.0)
1.25	8 55	Woods, Good, HSG B (1.2, 2.0, 3.0)
2.48	6 70	Woods, Good, HSG C (1.1, 1.2, 2.0, 3.0)
6.20	4 70	TOTAL AREA

# Soil Listing (all nodes)

Area	Soil	Subcatchment
(acres)	Group	Numbers
0.000	HSG A	
1.292	HSG B	1.2, 2.0, 3.0
4.913	HSG C	1.1, 1.2, 2.0, 3.0
0.000	HSG D	
0.000	Other	
6.204		TOTAL AREA

Subcatchment 1.1: North Subcat	Runoff Area=98,624 sf 14.64% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.12" Flow Length=451' Tc=11.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.23 cfs 0.023 af
Subcatchment 1.2: Southwest Subcat	Runoff Area=121,015 sf 7.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.08" Flow Length=726' Tc=24.3 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.12 cfs 0.017 af
Subcatchment 2.0: South Subcat	Runoff Area=30,220 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.00" Flow Length=179' Tc=15.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.05" Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.02 cfs 0.002 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	t Inflow=0.34 cfs 0.040 af Outflow=0.34 cfs 0.040 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - South	Inflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af Outflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeast	Inflow=0.02 cfs 0.002 af Outflow=0.02 cfs 0.002 af
Reach 101R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L	Avg. Flow Depth=0.11' Max Vel=2.78 fps Inflow=0.23 cfs 0.023 af =366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=0.23 cfs 0.023 af

Total Runoff Area = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 0.042 af Average Runoff Depth = 0.08" 90.65% Pervious = 5.624 ac 9.35% Impervious = 0.580 ac

Subcatchment 1.1: North Subcat	Runoff Area=98,624 sf 14.64% Impervious Runoff Depth=1.49" Flow Length=451' Tc=11.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=2.86 cfs 0.281 af
Subcatchment 1.2: Southwest Subcat	Runoff Area=121,015 sf 7.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=1.39" Flow Length=726' Tc=24.3 min CN=WQ Runoff=2.58 cfs 0.322 af
Subcatchment 2.0: South Subcat	Runoff Area=30,220 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.43" Flow Length=179' Tc=15.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.14 cfs 0.025 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.64" Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.16 cfs 0.025 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	t Inflow=4.99 cfs 0.603 af Outflow=4.99 cfs 0.603 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - South	Inflow=0.14 cfs 0.025 af Outflow=0.14 cfs 0.025 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeast	Inflow=0.16 cfs 0.025 af Outflow=0.16 cfs 0.025 af
Reach 101R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L	Avg. Flow Depth=0.37' Max Vel=5.93 fps Inflow=2.86 cfs 0.281 af =366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=2.92 cfs 0.281 af

Total Runoff Area = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 0.652 af Average Runoff Depth = 1.26" 90.65% Pervious = 5.624 ac 9.35% Impervious = 0.580 ac

Subcatchment 1.1: North Subcat	Runoff Area=98,624 sf 14.64% Impervious Runoff Depth=2.97" Flow Length=451' Tc=11.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=5.95 cfs 0.560 af
Subcatchment 1.2: Southwest Subcat	Runoff Area=121,015 sf 7.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=2.85" Flow Length=726' Tc=24.3 min CN=WQ Runoff=5.58 cfs 0.661 af
Subcatchment 2.0: South Subcat	Runoff Area=30,220 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=1.34" Flow Length=179' Tc=15.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.67 cfs 0.077 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=1.63" Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.54 cfs 0.064 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	t Inflow=10.59 cfs 1.221 af Outflow=10.59 cfs 1.221 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - South	Inflow=0.67 cfs 0.077 af Outflow=0.67 cfs 0.077 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeast	Inflow=0.54 cfs 0.064 af Outflow=0.54 cfs 0.064 af
Reach 101R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L	Avg. Flow Depth=0.52' Max Vel=7.37 fps Inflow=5.95 cfs 0.560 af =366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=6.05 cfs 0.560 af

Total Runoff Area = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 1.362 af Average Runoff Depth = 2.63" 90.65% Pervious = 5.624 ac 9.35% Impervious = 0.580 ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 1.1: North Subcat

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

Runoff = 5.95 cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume= Routed to Reach 101R : Existing Culvert 0.560 af, Depth= 2.97"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

A	rea (sf)	CN E	Description					
	7,697	65 E	65 Brush, Good, HSG C					
	62,761	70 V	Voods, Go	od, HSG C				
	13,731	74 >	75% Gras	s cover, Go	bod, HSG C			
	14,435	98 F	Paved park	ing, HSG C				
	98,624	٧	Weighted Average					
	84,189	8	5.36% Per	vious Area				
	14,435	1	4.64% Imp	pervious Ar	ea			
Тс	Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description			
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)				
4.7	50	0.0360	0.18		Sheet Flow, Sheet			
					Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.92"			
3.4	202	0.0198	0.98		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru grass			
					Short Grass Pasture Kv= 7.0 fps			
3.0	199	0.0498	1.12		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru woods			
					Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps			
11.1	451	Total						

## Summary for Subcatchment 1.2: Southwest Subcat

Runoff = 5.58 cfs @ 12.35 hrs, Volume= 0.661 af, Depth= 2.85" Routed to Reach #100 : Analysis Point - Southwest

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Area (sf)	CN	Description			
7,950	55	Woods, Good, HSG B			
44,576	70	Woods, Good, HSG C			
58,973	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C			
9,516	98	Paved parking, HSG C			
121,015		Weighted Average			
111,499		92.14% Pervious Area			
9,516		7.86% Impervious Area			

#### NH-1471 Existing Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC

Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65" Printed 5/10/2024 HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Page 3

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
11.5	50	0.1060	0.07		Sheet Flow, Sheet
					Woods: Dense underbrush n= 0.800 P2= 2.92"
8.9	378	0.0103	0.71		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru grass
					Short Grass Pasture Kv= 7.0 fps
3.9	298	0.0637	1.26		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru woods
					Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
24.3	726	Total			

### Summary for Subcatchment 2.0: South Subcat

Runoff = 0.67 cfs @ 12.26 hrs, Volume= 0.077 af, Depth= 1.34" Routed to Reach #200 : Analysis Point - South

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Α	rea (sf)	CN E	Description					
	29,826	55 V	Voods, Go	od, HSG B				
	394	70 V	<u>Voods, Go</u>	<u>od, HSG C</u>				
	30,220	V	Weighted Average					
	30,220	100.00% Pervious Area						
Tc	Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description			
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)				
14.1	50	0.0640	0.06		Sheet Flow, Sheet			
					Woods: Dense underbrush n= 0.800 P2= 2.92"			
1.5	129	0.0868	1.47		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru woods			
					Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps			
15.6	170	Total						

15.6 179 i otal

# Summary for Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat

Runoff 0.54 cfs @ 12.27 hrs, Volume= 0.064 af, Depth= 1.63" = Routed to Reach #300 : Analysis Point - Southeast

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Area (sf)	CN	Description
475	48	Brush, Good, HSG B
17,025	55	Woods, Good, HSG B
983	61	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG B
29	65	Brush, Good, HSG C
567	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
9	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C
1,308	98	Paved parking, HSG C
20,396		Weighted Average
19,088		93.59% Pervious Area
1,308		6.41% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
15.7	50	0.0490	0.05		Sheet Flow, Sheet
1.3	103	0.0728	1.35		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru woods Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
17.0	153	Total			

### Summary for Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwest

[40] Hint: Not Described (Outflow=Inflow)

Inflow Ar	rea =	5.042 ac, 1	10.90% Impervious	, Inflow Depth = 2	.91" for 10-YR event
Inflow	=	10.59 cfs @	12.23 hrs, Volum	e= 1.221 af	
Outflow	=	10.59 cfs @	12.23 hrs, Volum	e= 1.221 af	, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

### Summary for Reach #200: Analysis Point - South

[40] Hint: Not Described (Outflow=Inflow)

Inflow Are	ea =	0.694 ac,	0.00% Impervious,	Inflow Depth = $1.3$	34" for 10-YR event
Inflow	=	0.67 cfs @	12.26 hrs, Volume	= 0.077 af	
Outflow	=	0.67 cfs @	12.26 hrs, Volume	= 0.077 af,	Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

## Summary for Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeast

[40] Hint: Not Described (Outflow=Inflow)

Inflow A	Area	=	0.468 ac,	6.41% Imperv	vious, Inflow De	pth = 1.63	' for 10-`	YR event
Inflow		=	0.54 cfs @	12.27 hrs, Vo	olume=	0.064 af		
Outflow	V	=	0.54 cfs @	12.27 hrs, Vo	olume=	0.064 af, A	tten= 0%,	Lag= 0.0 min

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

## Summary for Reach 101R: Existing Culvert

[52] Hint: Inlet/Outlet conditions not evaluated [90] Warning: Qout>Qin may require smaller dt or Finer Routing

Inflow Area = 2.264 ac, 14.64% Impervious, Inflow Depth = 2.97" for 10-YR event Inflow = 5.95 cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume= 0.560 af Outflow = 6.05 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 0.560 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 1.0 min Routed to Reach #100 : Analysis Point - Southwest Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Max. Velocity= 7.37 fps, Min. Travel Time= 0.8 min Avg. Velocity = 2.35 fps, Avg. Travel Time= 2.6 min

Peak Storage= 300 cf @ 12.19 hrs Average Depth at Peak Storage= 0.52' , Surface Width= 2.27' Bank-Full Depth= 3.00' Flow Area= 7.1 sf, Capacity= 92.24 cfs

36.0" Round Pipe n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior Length= 366.0' Slope= 0.0191 '/' Inlet Invert= 14.10', Outlet Invert= 7.10'

Subcatchment 1.1: North Subcat	Runoff Area=98,624 sf 14.64% Impervious Runoff Depth=4.26" Flow Length=451' Tc=11.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=8.60 cfs 0.804 af
Subcatchment 1.2: Southwest Subcat	Runoff Area=121,015 sf 7.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=4.14" Flow Length=726' Tc=24.3 min CN=WQ Runoff=8.15 cfs 0.958 af
Subcatchment 2.0: South Subcat	Runoff Area=30,220 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=2.27" Flow Length=179' Tc=15.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.27 cfs 0.131 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=2.61" Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.92 cfs 0.102 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	t Inflow=15.41 cfs 1.761 af Outflow=15.41 cfs 1.761 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - South	Inflow=1.27 cfs 0.131 af Outflow=1.27 cfs 0.131 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeast	Inflow=0.92 cfs 0.102 af Outflow=0.92 cfs 0.102 af
Reach 101R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L	Avg. Flow Depth=0.62' Max Vel=8.20 fps Inflow=8.60 cfs 0.804 af =366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=8.74 cfs 0.804 af

Total Runoff Area = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 1.994 af Average Runoff Depth = 3.86" 90.65% Pervious = 5.624 ac 9.35% Impervious = 0.580 ac

NH-1471 Existing	Type III 24-hr	50-YR Rair	nfall=8.63"
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC		Printed	5/10/2024
HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solution	is LLC		Page 2

Subcatchment 1.1: North Subcat	Runoff Area=98,624 sf 14.64% Impervious Runoff Depth=5.53" Flow Length=451' Tc=11.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=11.16 cfs 1.042 af
Subcatchment 1.2: Southwest Subcat	Runoff Area=121,015 sf 7.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=5.39" Flow Length=726' Tc=24.3 min CN=WQ Runoff=10.65 cfs 1.249 af
Subcatchment 2.0: South Subcat	Runoff Area=30,220 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=3.25" Flow Length=179' Tc=15.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.88 cfs 0.188 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=3.62" Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.34 cfs 0.141 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwe	st         Inflow=20.08 cfs         2.291 af           Outflow=20.08 cfs         2.291 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - South	Inflow=1.88 cfs 0.188 af Outflow=1.88 cfs 0.188 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeas	t Inflow=1.34 cfs 0.141 af Outflow=1.34 cfs 0.141 af
Reach 101R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L	Avg. Flow Depth=0.71' Max Vel=8.84 fps Inflow=11.16 cfs 1.042 af =366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=11.33 cfs 1.042 af

Total Runoff Area = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 2.620 af Average Runoff Depth = 5.07" 90.65% Pervious = 5.624 ac 9.35% Impervious = 0.580 ac

# **Appendix II**

# **Proposed Conditions Analysis**

WQV (1-Inch) 24-Hour Summary

2-Year 24-Hour Summary

**10-Year 24-Hour Complete** 

**25-Year 24-Hour Summary** 

**50-Year 24-Hour Summary** 



# Area Listing (all nodes)

Area	CN	Description
(acres)		(subcatchment-numbers)
0.164	61	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG B (2.2, 2.3, 3.0)
0.862	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.2, 3.0)
0.011	48	Brush, Good, HSG B (3.0)
0.140	65	Brush, Good, HSG C (1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.0)
0.070	98	Paved parking, HSG B (2.2)
1.908	98	Paved parking, HSG C (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.2, 3.0)
0.288	98	Roofs, HSG B (2.1)
0.229	98	Roofs, HSG C (2.1)
0.758	55	Woods, Good, HSG B (1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 3.0)
1.773	70	Woods, Good, HSG C (1.2, 1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 3.0)
6.204	80	TOTAL AREA

# Soil Listing (all nodes)

Area	Soil	Subcatchment
(acres)	Group	Numbers
0.000	HSG A	
1.292	HSG B	1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.0
4.913	HSG C	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.0
0.000	HSG D	
0.000	Other	
6.204		TOTAL AREA

NH-1471 Proposed Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 Hy	"Type III 24-hr 1-inch Rainfall=1.00 Printed 5/10/2024 droCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 4
Time span=0. Runoff by SCS Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-I	00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q nd method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment1.1: To Culvert #1	Runoff Area=5,470 sf 21.55% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.18" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.02 cfs 0.002 af
Subcatchment 1.2: To Existing 36" Culv	rert Runoff Area=93,154 sf 17.06% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.14" Flow Length=397' Tc=8.4 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.28 cfs 0.025 af
Subcatchment1.3: To CB#1	Runoff Area=15,839 sf 47.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.39" Flow Length=435' Tc=9.9 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.13 cfs 0.012 af
Subcatchment 1.4: To Porous Pavemer	t Runoff Area=37,577 sf 93.17% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.74" Flow Length=96' Tc=63.7 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.27 cfs 0.053 af
Subcatchment 1.5: To Porous Pavemer	t Runoff Area=21,269 sf 95.91% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.76" Flow Length=93' Tc=64.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.16 cfs 0.031 af
Subcatchment1.6: To South	Runoff Area=26,188 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.01" Flow Length=311' Tc=16.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.00 cfs 0.001 af
Subcatchment2.1: Building Roof	Runoff Area=22,500 sf 100.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.79" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.43 cfs 0.034 af
Subcatchment 2.2: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=15,592 sf 30.94% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.25" Flow Length=186' Tc=9.9 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.08 cfs 0.007 af
Subcatchment2.3: To CB#7	Runoff Area=12,270 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.00" Flow Length=170' Tc=11.4 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=0.05" Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.02 cfs 0.002 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	t Inflow=0.33 cfs 0.039 af Outflow=0.33 cfs 0.039 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - Southeast	Inflow=0.00 cfs_0.000 af Outflow=0.00 cfs_0.000 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeast	Inflow=0.02 cfs_0.002 af
Reach 3R: Proposed Culvert #1 12.0" Round Pipe n=0.012	Avg. Flow Depth=0.06' Max Vel=1.07 fps Inflow=0.02 cfs 0.002 af L=56.0' S=0.0054 '/' Capacity=2.83 cfs Outflow=0.02 cfs 0.002 af
Reach 4R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L	Avg. Flow Depth=0.13' Max Vel=3.07 fps Inflow=0.35 cfs 0.039 af =366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=0.33 cfs 0.039 af
<b>Pond 1P: Infiltration Trench</b> Discarded=0.38 cfs 0.042 af Primary=0.00 c	Peak Elev=25.08' Storage=39 cf Inflow=0.51 cfs 0.041 af s 0.000 af Secondary=0.00 cfs 0.000 af Outflow=0.38 cfs 0.042 af

Type III 24-hr 1-inch Rainfall=1.00"

 Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC
 Printed 5/10/2024

 HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC
 Page 5

Pond BP: Bioretention Pond	Peak Elev=23.14' Storage=127 cf Inflow=0.13 cfs 0.012 af Outflow=0.06 cfs 0.012 af
Pond CB#1: CB#1	Peak Elev=0.00' 12.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=232.0' S=0.0050 '/' Primary=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond CB#2: CB#2	Peak Elev=21.84' Inflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=126.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond CB#3: CB#3	Peak Elev=21.11' Inflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=62.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond DMH#1: DMH#1	Peak Elev=24.50' Inflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=52.0' S=0.0288 '/' Outflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond DMH#2: DMH#2	Peak Elev=19.50' Inflow=0.06 cfs 0.012 af 18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=65.0' S=0.0051 '/' Outflow=0.06 cfs 0.012 af
Pond DMH#3: DMH#3	Peak Elev=19.17' Inflow=0.06 cfs 0.012 af 18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=10.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=0.06 cfs 0.012 af
Pond PP-E: Porous Pavemen Dis	t East Peak Elev=23.17' Storage=26 cf Inflow=0.16 cfs 0.031 af carded=0.14 cfs 0.031 af Primary=0.00 cfs 0.000 af Outflow=0.14 cfs 0.031 af
Pond PP-W: Porous Pavemen Dis	It West         Peak Elev=23.18'         Storage=71 cf         Inflow=0.27 cfs         0.053 af           carded=0.23 cfs         0.053 af         Primary=0.00 cfs         0.000 af         Outflow=0.23 cfs         0.053 af
Total Runoff A	rea = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 0.167 af Average Runoff Depth = 0.32

= 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 0.167 af Average Runoff Depth = 0.32" 59.78% Pervious = 3.709 ac 40.22% Impervious = 2.495 ac

NH-1471 Proposed		Type III 24-hr 2	-YR Rainfall=3.70"
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC	draCAD Cathurana Calutiana I	10	Printed 5/10/2024
HydroCAD® 10.20-4b S/II 01754 @ 2023 Hy	arocad Soliware Solutions L		Page I
Time span=0.	00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs,	721 points	
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-I	nd method - Pond routing	by Dyn-Stor-Ind n	nethod
Subcatchment1.1: To Culvert #1	Runoff Area=5,470 sf	21.55% Impervious	Runoff Depth=1.70"
	Tc=6.0	min CN=WQ Rur	noff=0.22 cfs 0.018 af
Subcatchment 1.2: To Existing 36" Culv	rert Runoff Area=93,154 sf Flow Length=397' Tc=8.4	17.06% Impervious min CN=WQ Rur	Runoff Depth=1.55" noff=3.09 cfs 0.276 af
Subcatchment 1 3: To CB#1	Runoff Area=15 839 sf	47 86% Impervious	Runoff Depth=2.38"
	Flow Length=435' Tc=9.9	min CN=WQ Rur	noff=0.76 cfs 0.072 af
Subcatchment 1.4: To Porous Pavemen	t Runoff Area=37,577 sf	93.17% Impervious	Runoff Depth=3.32"
	Flow Length=96' Tc=63.7	min CN=WQ Rur	noff=1.16 cfs 0.239 af
Subcatchment 1.5: To Porous Pavemen	t Runoff Area=21,269 sf	95.91% Impervious	Runoff Depth=3.38"
	Flow Length=93' Tc=64.6	min CN=WQ Rur	noff=0.66 cfs 0.138 af
Subcatchment 1.6: To South	Runoff Area=26,188 sf	0.00% Impervious	Runoff Depth=1.19"
	Flow Length=311' Tc=16.1	min CN=WQ Rur	noff=0.57 cfs 0.059 af
Subcatchment2.1: Building Roof	Runoff Area=22,500 sf	100.00% Impervious	Runoff Depth=3.47"
	1c=6.0	min CN=WQ Rur	noff=1./3 cfs 0.149 af
Subcatchment 2.2: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=15,592 sf	30.94% Impervious	Runoff Depth=1.56"
	Flow Length - 166 1C-9.9	min CN-WQ Rui	1011-0.45 CIS 0.047 al
Subcatchment2.3: To CB#7	Runoff Area=12,270 sf	0.00% Impervious	Runoff Depth=0.45"
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0	6.41% Impervious min CN=WQ Rur	"Runoff Depth=0.64 hoff=0.16 cfs_0.025 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	t	Infi Outfi	low=3.77 cfs_0.434 af low=3.77 cfs_0.434 af
Deach #200: Analysis Daint Coutheast		Inf	1000-007 of 0.0010 of
Reach #200: Analysis Point - Southeast		Outf	low=0.07 cfs 0.010 af
Parch #200: Analysis Point Southard		Inf	low-0.16 cfc 0.025 of
Reach #300. Analysis Fornt - Southeast		Outf	low=0.16 cfs 0.025 af
Reach 3R: Proposed Culvert #1	Ava Flow Depth=0.19' M	ax Vel=2.11 fns Infl	ow=0.22 cfs_0.018 af
12.0" Round Pipe n=0.012	L=56.0' S=0.0054 '/' Capa	acity=2.83 cfs Outfl	ow=0.21 cfs 0.018 af
Reach 4R: Existing Culvert	Ava Flow Depth=0.39' M	ax Vel=6.08 fps Infl	ow=3 46 cfs_0 375 af
36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L	=366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capad	city=92.24 cfs Outfl	ow=3.34 cfs 0.375 af
Pond 1P: Infiltration Trench	Peak Elev=28.24' St	orage=1.972 cf Infl	ow=2.16 cfs_0.196 af
Discarded=0.38 cfs 0.188 af Primary=0.00 c	s 0.000 af Secondary=0.35	5 cfs 0.009 af Outfl	ow=0.73 cfs 0.196 af

Type III 24-hr 2-YR Rainfall=3.70"

 Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC
 Printed 5/10/2024

 HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC
 Page 2

Pond BP: Bioretention Pond	Peak Elev=25.74' Storage=979 cf Inflow=0.76 cfs 0.072 af Outflow=0.17 cfs 0.072 af
Pond CB#1: CB#1	Peak Elev=0.00' 12.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=232.0' S=0.0050 '/' Primary=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond CB#2: CB#2	Peak Elev=21.88' Inflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=126.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond CB#3: CB#3	Peak Elev=21.15' Inflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=62.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond DMH#1: DMH#1	Peak Elev=24.77' Inflow=0.35 cfs 0.009 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=52.0' S=0.0288 '/' Outflow=0.35 cfs 0.009 af
Pond DMH#2: DMH#2	Peak Elev=19.75' Inflow=0.52 cfs 0.081 af 18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=65.0' S=0.0051 '/' Outflow=0.52 cfs 0.081 af
Pond DMH#3: DMH#3	Peak Elev=19.43' Inflow=0.52 cfs 0.081 af 18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=10.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=0.52 cfs 0.081 af
Pond PP-E: Porous Pavemen	t East Peak Elev=23.41' Storage=1,869 cf Inflow=0.66 cfs 0.138 af carded=0.18 cfs 0.138 af Primary=0.00 cfs 0.000 af Outflow=0.18 cfs 0.138 af
Pond PP-W: Porous Paveme Dis	nt West         Peak Elev=23.43'         Storage=3,361 cf         Inflow=1.16 cfs         0.239 af           carded=0.29 cfs         0.239 af         Primary=0.00 cfs         0.000 af         Outflow=0.30 cfs         0.239 af
Total Runoff A	rea = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 1.033 af Average Runoff Depth = 2.00

Total Runoff Area = 6.204 acRunoff Volume = 1.033 afAverage Runoff Depth = 2.00"59.78% Pervious = 3.709 ac40.22% Impervious = 2.495 ac

NH-1471 Proposed Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 Hy	Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5. Printed 5/10/2 droCAD Software Solutions LLC Page	65″ 024 <u>ge 1</u>
Time span=0. Runoff by SCS Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-I	00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q nd method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method	
Subcatchment1.1: To Culvert #1	Runoff Area=5,470 sf 21.55% Impervious Runoff Depth=3 Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.42 cfs 0.03	.24" 4 af
Subcatchment 1.2: To Existing 36" Culv	<b>vert</b> Runoff Area=93,154 sf 17.06% Impervious Runoff Depth=3 Flow Length=397' Tc=8.4 min CN=WQ Runoff=6.36 cfs 0.54	.05" ∙3 af
Subcatchment1.3: To CB#1	Runoff Area=15,839 sf 47.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=4 Flow Length=435' Tc=9.9 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.32 cfs 0.12	.10" 24 af
Subcatchment 1.4: To Porous Pavemer	nt Runoff Area=37,577 sf 93.17% Impervious Runoff Depth=5 Flow Length=96' Tc=63.7 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.80 cfs 0.37	.24" 7 af
Subcatchment 1.5: To Porous Pavemer	nt Runoff Area=21,269 sf 95.91% Impervious Runoff Depth=5 Flow Length=93' Tc=64.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.03 cfs 0.21	.31" 6 af
Subcatchment 1.6: To South	Runoff Area=26,188 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=2 Flow Length=311' Tc=16.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.31 cfs 0.13	.60" 60 af
Subcatchment 2.1: Building Roof	Runoff Area=22,500 sf 100.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=5 Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=2.66 cfs 0.23	.41" 33 af
Subcatchment 2.2: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=15,592 sf 30.94% Impervious Runoff Depth=2 Flow Length=186' Tc=9.9 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.91 cfs 0.08	.94" 8 af
Subcatchment2.3: To CB#7	Runoff Area=12,270 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=1 Flow Length=170' Tc=11.4 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.32 cfs 0.03	.37" 2 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=1 Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.54 cfs 0.06	.63" 54 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	t Inflow=9.46 cfs 0.99 Outflow=9.46 cfs 0.99	)4 af )4 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - Southeas	Inflow=0.32 cfs 0.03 Outflow=0.32 cfs 0.03	52 af 52 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeas	Inflow=0.54 cfs 0.06 Outflow=0.54 cfs 0.06	64 af 64 af
Reach 3R: Proposed Culvert #1 12.0" Round Pipe n=0.012	Avg. Flow Depth=0.26' Max Vel=2.58 fps Inflow=0.42 cfs 0.03 L=56.0' S=0.0054 '/' Capacity=2.83 cfs Outflow=0.42 cfs 0.03	4 af 4 af
Reach 4R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L	Avg. Flow Depth=0.60' Max Vel=8.06 fps Inflow=8.04 cfs 0.86 =366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=8.19 cfs 0.86	i4 af i4 af
<b>Pond 1P: Infiltration Trench</b> Discarded=0.38 cfs 0.257 af Primary=0.00 c	Peak Elev=29.03' Storage=2,494 cf Inflow=3.53 cfs 0.32 fs 0.000 af Secondary=2.36 cfs 0.064 af Outflow=2.75 cfs 0.32	1 af 1 af

Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Printed 5/10/2024 Page 2

Prepared by Beals Associate HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754	es, PLLC Printed 5/10/ © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC Pa	2024 age 2
Pond BP: Bioretention Pond	Peak Elev=26.16' Storage=1,505 cf Inflow=1.32 cfs 0.1 Outflow=0.82 cfs 0.1	124 af 124 af
Pond CB#1: CB#1	Peak Elev= 12.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=232.0' S=0.0050 '/' Primary=0.00 cfs 0.0	=0.00' )00 af
Pond CB#2: CB#2	Peak Elev=22.31' Inflow=0.70 cfs 0.0 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=126.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=0.70 cfs 0.0	)67 af )67 af
Pond CB#3: CB#3	Peak Elev=21.68' Inflow=1.07 cfs 0.0 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=62.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=1.07 cfs 0.0	)99 af )99 af
Pond DMH#1: DMH#1	Peak Elev=25.28' Inflow=2.36 cfs 0.0 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=52.0' S=0.0288 '/' Outflow=2.36 cfs 0.0	)64 af )64 af
Pond DMH#2: DMH#2	Peak Elev=20.33' Inflow=2.60 cfs 0.2 18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=65.0' S=0.0051 '/' Outflow=2.60 cfs 0.2	288 af 288 af
Pond DMH#3: DMH#3	Peak Elev=19.96' Inflow=2.60 cfs 0.2 18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=10.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=2.60 cfs 0.2	288 af 288 af
Pond PP-E: Porous Pavemen Dis	It East         Peak Elev=23.51'         Storage=2,721 cf         Inflow=1.03 cfs         0.2           scarded=0.19 cfs         0.184 af         Primary=0.36 cfs         0.033 af         Outflow=0.56 cfs         0.2	216 af 216 af
Pond PP-W: Porous Paveme Dis	nt West         Peak Elev=23.53'         Storage=4,702 cf         Inflow=1.80 cfs         0.33           scarded=0.32 cfs         0.310 af         Primary=0.70 cfs         0.067 af         Outflow=1.02 cfs         0.33	377 af 377 af
Total Runoff A	rea = 6 204 ac Runoff Volume = 1 840 af Average Runoff Depth	= 3 56

Total Runoff Area = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 1.840 af Average Runoff Depth = 3.56" 59.78% Pervious = 3.709 ac 40.22% Impervious = 2.495 ac

# Summary for Subcatchment 1.1: To Culvert #1

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

Runoff	=	0.42 cfs @	12.10 hrs,	Volume=
Routed	to Read	ch 3R : Propo	sed Culvert	#1

0.034 af, Depth= 3.24"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

A	rea (sf)	CN	Description					
	1,384	65	Brush, Goo	d, HSG C				
	2,907	74	>75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG C			
	1,179	98	Paved park	ing, HSG C				
	5,470		Weighted A	verage				
	4,291		78.45% Pervious Area					
	1,179		21.55% Impervious Area					
Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft	e Velocity ) (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description			
6.0					Direct Entry,			

# Summary for Subcatchment 1.2: To Existing 36" Culvert

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

Runoff	=	6.36 cfs @	12.12 hrs,	Volume=
Routed	l to Re	ach 4R : Existin	g Culvert	

0.543 af, Depth= 3.05"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Α	rea (sf)	CN E	Description				
	3,820	65 E	5 Brush, Good, HSG C				
	62,762	70 V	Voods, Go	od, HSG C			
	10,684	74 >	75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG C		
	15,888	98 F	Paved park	ing, HSG C			
	93,154	۷	Veighted A	verage			
	77,266	8	2.94% Per	vious Area			
	15,888	1	7.06% Imp	pervious Ar	ea		
_		~			<b>—</b> • • •		
IC	Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description		
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)			
3.0	50	0.1120	0.28		Sheet Flow, Sheet		
					Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.92"		
2.4	148	0.0224	1.05		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru grass		
					Short Grass Pasture Kv= 7.0 fps		
3.0	199	0.0498	1.12		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru woods		
					Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps		
8.4	397	Total					

## Summary for Subcatchment 1.3: To CB#1

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

Runoff = 1.32 cfs @ 12.14 hrs, Volume= Routed to Pond BP : Bioretention Pond 0.124 af, Depth= 4.10"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

	Area (sf)	CN D	Description						
	8,258	74 >	74 >75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C						
	7,581	98 F	aved park	ing, HSG C	;				
	15,839	V	Veighted A	verage					
	8,258	5	2.14% Per	vious Area					
	7,581	4	7.86% Imp	pervious Are	ea				
Т	c Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description				
(min	) (feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)					
6.6	5 50	0.0150	0.13		Sheet Flow, Sheet Flow - Grass				
					Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.92"				
3.0	) 370	0.0100	2.03		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF - Pavement				
					Paved Kv= 20.3 fps				
0.3	3 15	0.0200	0.99		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF - Grass				
					Short Grass Pasture Kv= 7.0 fps				
9.9	9 435	Total							

## **Summary for Subcatchment 1.4: To Porous Pavement West**

[47] Hint: Peak is 782% of capacity of segment #3

Runoff = 1.80 cfs @ 12.82 hrs, Volume= 0.377 af, Depth= 5.24" Routed to Pond PP-W : Porous Pavement West

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Area (sf)	CN	Description
2,567	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C
35,010	98	Paved parking, HSG C
37,577		Weighted Average
2,567		6.83% Pervious Area
35,010		93.17% Impervious Area

NH-147	1 Propo	osed		Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"	
Prepare	d by Bea	als Assoc	ciates, PL	LC	Printed 5/10/2024
HydroCAI	D® 10.20-	4b s/n 01	754 © 202	3 HydroCAE	Software Solutions LLC Page 5
Tc (min)	Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description
				(05)	Obset Flow, Obset Flow, Orses
2.8	31	0.0490	0.18		Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.92"
60.0 0.9	65	0.0010	1.17	0.23	Direct Entry, Flow through selects Pipe Channel, 6.0" Round Area= 0.2 sf. Perim= 1.6', r= 0.13'

63.7 96 Total

#### Summary for Subcatchment 1.5: To Porous Pavement East

n= 0.010 PVC, smooth interior

[47] Hint: Peak is 444% of capacity of segment #3

1.03 cfs @ 12.83 hrs, Volume= 0.216 af, Depth= 5.31" Runoff = Routed to Pond PP-E : Porous Pavement East

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

A	rea (sf)	CN E	<b>Description</b>		
	869	74 >	75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG C
	20,400	98 F	aved park	ing, HSG C	;
	21,269	V	Veighted A	verage	
	869	4	.09% Perv	ious Area	
	20,400	9	5.91% Imp	pervious Are	ea
Т	المربع مرالم	01	\/_l!	0	Description
IC	Length	Siope	velocity	Capacity	Description
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)	
3.7	28	0.0200	0.13		Sheet Flow, Sheet Flow - Grass
					Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.92"
60.0					Direct Entry, Flow through selects
0.9	65	0.0010	1.17	0.23	Pipe Channel,
					6.0" Round Area= 0.2 sf Perim= 1.6' r= 0.13'
					n= 0.010 PVC, smooth interior
64.6	93	Total			

# Summary for Subcatchment 1.6: To South

0.130 af, Depth= 2.60" Runoff 1.31 cfs @ 12.23 hrs, Volume= = Routed to Reach #100 : Analysis Point - Southwest

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65" Printed 5/10/2024 LLC Page 6

Prepared by Beals	Associate	es, PLLC	
HydroCAD® 10.20-4b	s/n 01754	© 2023 HydroCAD	Software Solutions LLC

A	rea (sf)	CN [	Description					
	1,964	55 V	5 Woods, Good, HSG B					
	12,987	70 V	Voods, Go	od, HSG C				
	11,237	74 >	75% Gras	s cover, Go	bod, HSG C			
	26,188	١	Weighted Average					
	26,188	1	00.00% Pe	ervious Are	а			
Tc	Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description			
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)				
13.2	50	0.0750	0.06		Sheet Flow,			
					Woods: Dense underbrush n= 0.800 P2= 2.92"			
2.9	261	0.0910	1.51		Shallow Concentrated Flow,			
					Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps			
16.1	311	Total						

# Summary for Subcatchment 2.1: Building Roof

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

Runoff = 2.66 cfs @ 12.09 hrs, Volume= Routed to Pond 1P : Infiltration Trench 0.233 af, Depth= 5.41"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

A	rea (sf)	CN	Description		
	12,535	98	Roofs, HSG	ВВ	
	9,965	98	Roofs, HSC	S C	
	22,500		Weighted A	verage	
	22,500		100.00% Im	pervious A	Area
Tc	Length	Slope	e Velocity	Capacity	Description
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft	(ft/sec)	(cfs)	
6.0					Direct Entry,
					-

## **Summary for Subcatchment 2.2: Southeast Subcat**

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

Runoff = 0.91 cfs @ 12.14 hrs, Volume= 0.088 af, Depth= 2.94" Routed to Pond 1P : Infiltration Trench

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

NH-1471 Proposed Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC

Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65" Printed 5/10/2024 HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 7

A	rea (sf)	CN [	Description				
	2,568	55 V	Voods, Go	od, HSG B			
	5,775	61 >	75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG B		
	3,058	98 F	Paved park	ing, HSG B			
	882	65 E	Brush, Goo	d, HSG C			
	529	70 V	Voods, Go	od, HSG C			
	1,014	74 >	•75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG C		
	1,766	<u>98</u> F	Paved park	<u>ing, HSG C</u>			
	15,592	١	Veighted A	verage			
	10,768	69.06% Pervious Area					
	4,824	3	30.94% Imp	pervious Are	ea		
Тс	Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description		
<u>(min)</u>	(feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)			
8.4	50	0.0580	0.10		Sheet Flow, Sheet Flow - Woods		
					Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.92"		
1.5	136	0.0449	1.48		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF - Grass		
					Short Grass Pasture Kv= 7.0 fps		
9.9	186	Total					

# Summary for Subcatchment 2.3: To CB#7

[49] Hint: Tc<2dt may require smaller dt

0.32 cfs @ 12.21 hrs, Volume= 0.032 af, Depth= 1.37" Runoff = Routed to Reach #200 : Analysis Point - Southeast

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Α	rea (sf)	CN I	Description					
	11,481	55	Noods, Go	od, HSG B				
	395	61 🗧	>75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG B			
	394	70	70 Woods, Good, HSG C					
	12,270	١	Neighted A	verage				
	12,270 100.00% Pervious Area							
Tc	Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description			
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)				
9.4	50	0.0440	0.09		Sheet Flow, Sheet Flow - Woods			
					Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.92"			
2.0	120	0.0401	1.00		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF - Woods			
					Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps			
11.4	170	Total						

### Summary for Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat

Runoff	=	0.54 cfs @	12.27 hrs,	Volume=	0.064 af,	Depth=	1.63"
Route	d to Re	each #300 : Ana	lysis Point -	Southeast		-	

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65"

Α	rea (sf)	CN [	Description		
	475	48 E	Brush, Goo	d, HSG B	
	17,025	55 V	Voods, Go	od, HSG B	
	983	61 >	75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG B
	29	65 E	Brush, Goo	d, HSG C	
	567	70 V	Voods, Go	od, HSG C	
	9	74 >	•75% Gras	s cover, Go	ood, HSG C
	1,308	98 F	Paved park	ing, HSG C	
	20,396	١	Veighted A	verage	
	19,088	ç	3.59% Per	vious Area	
	1,308	6	6.41% Impe	ervious Area	а
Tc	Length	Slope	Velocity	Capacity	Description
(min)	(feet)	(ft/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cfs)	
15.7	50	0.0490	0.05		Sheet Flow, Sheet
					Woods: Dense underbrush n= 0.800 P2= 2.92"
1.3	103	0.0728	1.35		Shallow Concentrated Flow, SCF thru woods
					Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
17.0	153	Total			

## Summary for Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwest

[40] Hint: Not Described (Outflow=Inflow)

Inflow A	Area =	4.580 ac, 40.13% Impervious, I	nflow Depth = 2.61"	for 10-YR event
Inflow	=	9.46 cfs @ 12.20 hrs, Volume=	0.994 af	
Outflow	/ =	9.46 cfs @ 12.20 hrs, Volume=	0.994 af, At	ten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

### Summary for Reach #200: Analysis Point - Southeast

[40] Hint: Not Described (Outflow=Inflow)

Inflow Area	a =	1.156 ac, 5	64.26% Imp	ervious,	Inflow	Depth =	0.3	3" for	10-ነ	/R ever	nt
Inflow	=	0.32 cfs @	12.21 hrs,	Volume	=	0.032	af				
Outflow	=	0.32 cfs @	12.21 hrs,	Volume	=	0.032	af,	Atten= 0	%,	Lag= 0.	0 min

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

# Summary for Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeast

[40] Hint: Not Described (Outflow=Inflow)

Inflow A	rea =	0.468 ac,	6.41% Impervious,	Inflow Depth = $1.6$	63" for 10-YR event
Inflow	=	0.54 cfs @	12.27 hrs, Volume	= 0.064 af	
Outflow	=	0.54 cfs @	12.27 hrs, Volume	= 0.064 af,	Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

# Summary for Reach 3R: Proposed Culvert #1

[52] Hint: Inlet/Outlet conditions not evaluated

Inflow Area = 0.126 ac, 21.55% Impervious, Inflow Depth = 3.24" for 10-YR event Inflow = 0.42 cfs @ 12.10 hrs, Volume= 0.034 af Outflow = 0.42 cfs @ 12.10 hrs, Volume= 0.034 af, Atten= 1%, Lag= 0.3 min Routed to Reach 4R : Existing Culvert

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Max. Velocity= 2.58 fps, Min. Travel Time= 0.4 min Avg. Velocity = 0.81 fps, Avg. Travel Time= 1.2 min

Peak Storage= 9 cf @ 12.11 hrs Average Depth at Peak Storage= 0.26' , Surface Width= 0.88' Bank-Full Depth= 1.00' Flow Area= 0.8 sf, Capacity= 2.83 cfs

12.0" Round Pipe n= 0.012 Concrete pipe, finished Length= 56.0' Slope= 0.0054 '/' Inlet Invert= 26.80', Outlet Invert= 26.50'



# Summary for Reach 4R: Existing Culvert

[52] Hint: Inlet/Outlet conditions not evaluated [90] Warning: Qout>Qin may require smaller dt or Finer Routing

Inflow Area = 3.979 ac, 46.19% Impervious, Inflow Depth = 2.61" for 10-YR event Inflow = 8.04 cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= 0.864 af Outflow = 8.19 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 0.864 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.9 min Routed to Reach #100 : Analysis Point - Southwest

Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65" Printed 5/10/2024 LLC Page 10

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Max. Velocity= 8.06 fps, Min. Travel Time= 0.8 min Avg. Velocity = 2.29 fps, Avg. Travel Time= 2.7 min

Peak Storage= 372 cf @ 12.19 hrs Average Depth at Peak Storage= 0.60', Surface Width= 2.41' Bank-Full Depth= 3.00' Flow Area= 7.1 sf, Capacity= 92.24 cfs

36.0" Round Pipe n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior Length= 366.0' Slope= 0.0191 '/' Inlet Invert= 14.10', Outlet Invert= 7.10'



# **Summary for Pond 1P: Infiltration Trench**

[87] Warning: Oscillations may require smaller dt or Finer Routing (severity=39)

Inflow Area	ı =	0.874 ac, 7	71.73% Imp	ervious, Inflo	w Depth =	4.40"	for 10-Y	R event
Inflow	=	3.53 cfs @	12.10 hrs,	Volume=	0.321	af		
Outflow	=	2.75 cfs @	12.23 hrs,	Volume=	0.321	af, Att	en= 22%,	Lag= 7.5 min
Discarded	=	0.38 cfs @	11.60 hrs,	Volume=	0.257	af		-
Primary	=	0.00 cfs @	0.00 hrs,	Volume=	0.000	af		
Routed	to Reacl	h #200 : Ana	alysis Point -	Southeast				
Secondary	=	2.36 cfs @	12.23 hrs,	Volume=	0.064	af		
Routed	to Pond	DMH#1 : DI	MH#1					

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 29.03' @ 12.23 hrs Surf.Area= 1,650 sf Storage= 2,494 cf Flood Elev= 31.00' Surf.Area= 1,650 sf Storage= 4,785 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 23.5 min (784.0 - 760.5)

Volume	Invert A	vail.Storage	Storage Descr	iption	
#1	25.00'	4,785 cf	Custom Stage	e Data (Prismatio	)Listed below (Recalc)
Elevation	Surf.Are	a Voids	Inc.Store	Cum.Store	
(feet)	(sq-1	t) (%)	(cubic-feet)	(cubic-feet)	
25.00	1,65	0 0.0	0	0	
26.00	1,65	0 30.0	495	495	
30.00	1,65	0 40.0	2,640	3,135	
31.00	1,65	0 100.0	1,650	4,785	

NH-1471 Proposed Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC

Type III 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=5.65" Printed 5/10/2024 HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 11

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Discarded	25.00'	10.000 in/hr Exfiltration over Surface area
#2	Primary	30.00'	50.0' long x 3.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir
	·		Head (feet) 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60 1.80 2.00
			2.50 3.00 3.50 4.00 4.50
			Coef. (English) 2.44 2.58 2.68 2.67 2.65 2.64 2.64 2.68 2.68
			2.72 2.81 2.92 2.97 3.07 3.32
#3	Secondary	27.80'	15.0" Round Culvert
			L= 275.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500
			Inlet / Outlet Invert= 27.80' / 27.50' S= 0.0011 '/' Cc= 0.900
			n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 1.23 sf

**Discarded OutFlow** Max=0.38 cfs @ 11.60 hrs HW=25.06' (Free Discharge) **1=Exfiltration** (Exfiltration Controls 0.38 cfs)

Primary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=25.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater) ←2=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs)

Secondary OutFlow Max=2.13 cfs @ 12.23 hrs HW=28.94' TW=25.22' (Dynamic Tailwater) -3=Culvert (Barrel Controls 2.13 cfs @ 2.38 fps)

### **Summary for Pond BP: Bioretention Pond**

Inflow Area	=	0.364 ac, 4	7.86% Impe	ervious, Inflow D	epth = 4.	10" for 10-Y	'R event
Inflow	=	1.32 cfs @	12.14 hrs,	Volume=	0.124 af		
Outflow	=	0.82 cfs @	12.34 hrs,	Volume=	0.124 af,	Atten= 38%,	Lag= 12.5 min
Primary	=	0.82 cfs @	12.34 hrs,	Volume=	0.124 af		•
Routed	to Pond	DMH#2 : DM	1H#2				

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 26.16' @ 12.35 hrs Surf.Area= 1.421 sf Storage= 1,505 cf Flood Elev= 26.50' Surf.Area= 1,710 sf Storage= 2,033 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 62.1 min calculated for 0.124 af (100% of inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 60.7 min (841.9 - 781.1)

Volume	Inv	ert Ava	il.Storage	e Storage Descr	ription		
#1 22.		50'	2,033 c	f Custom Stage	e Data (Conic)List	ed below (Recalc)	
Elevatio (fee	on et)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Voids (%)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)	
22.50		496	0.0	0	0	496	
23.50		496	40.0	198	198	575	
25.00		496	30.0	223	422	693	
26.00		1,292	100.0	863	1,284	1,496	
26.50		1,710	100.0	748	2,033	1,920	
Device	Routing	In	vert Oı	utlet Devices			
#1 Primary 21.43'				. <b>0" Round Culvert</b> : 126.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 et / Outlet Invert= 21.43' / 20.80' S= 0.0050 '/' Cc= 0.900 : 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 0.79 sf			
NH-1471 Proposed	Type III 24-hr	10-YR Rain	fall=5.65"				
---	----------------	------------	------------				
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC		Printed	5/10/2024				
HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions	LLC		Page 12				
			-				

#2	Device 1	26.00'	12.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate C= 0.600
			Limited to weir flow at low heads
#3	Device 1	22.50'	3.0" Round Culvert
			L= 116.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500
			Inlet / Outlet Invert= 22.50' / 22.50' S= 0.0000 '/' Cc= 0.900
			n= 0.010 PVC, smooth interior, Flow Area= 0.05 sf

Primary OutFlow Max=0.75 cfs @ 12.34 hrs HW=26.14' TW=20.29' (Dynamic Tailwater) 1=Culvert (Passes 0.75 cfs of 5.62 cfs potential flow) 2=Orifice/Grate (Weir Controls 0.56 cfs @ 1.24 fps) -3=Culvert (Barrel Controls 0.19 cfs @ 3.79 fps)

# Summary for Pond CB#1: CB#1

[43] Hint: Has no inflow (Outflow=Zero)

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Primary	23.10'	<b>12.0" Round Culvert</b> L= 232.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 23.10' / 21.94' S= 0.0050 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 0.79 sf

**Primary OutFlow** Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=0.00' TW=21.84' (Dynamic Tailwater) **1=Culvert** (Controls 0.00 cfs)

# Summary for Pond CB#2: CB#2

Inflow Area	=	0.863 ac, 9	3.17% Impe	ervious, Inflow [	Depth =	0.93"	for 10-`	YR event
Inflow	=	0.70 cfs @	13.43 hrs,	Volume=	0.067	af		
Outflow	=	0.70 cfs @	13.43 hrs,	Volume=	0.067	af, Atte	en= 0%,	Lag= 0.0 min
Primary	=	0.70 cfs @	13.43 hrs,	Volume=	0.067	af		·
Routed t	o Pond	CB#3 : CB#3	3					

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 22.31' @ 13.46 hrs Flood Elev= 27.90'

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Primary	21.84'	<b>15.0" Round Culvert</b> L= 126.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 21.84' / 21.21' S= 0.0050 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 1.23 sf

Primary OutFlow Max=0.69 cfs @ 13.43 hrs HW=22.31' TW=21.68' (Dynamic Tailwater) -1=Culvert (Outlet Controls 0.69 cfs @ 2.44 fps)

# Summary for Pond CB#3: CB#3

 Inflow Area =
 1.351 ac, 94.16% Impervious, Inflow Depth =
 0.88" for 10-YR event

 Inflow =
 1.07 cfs @
 13.45 hrs, Volume=
 0.099 af

 Outflow =
 1.07 cfs @
 13.45 hrs, Volume=
 0.099 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

 Primary =
 1.07 cfs @
 13.45 hrs, Volume=
 0.099 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

 Routed to Pond DMH#2 : DMH#2

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 21.68' @ 13.45 hrs Flood Elev= 29.75'

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Primary	21.11'	<b>15.0" Round Culvert</b> L= 62.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 21.11' / 20.80' S= 0.0050 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 1.23 sf

Primary OutFlow Max=1.05 cfs @ 13.45 hrs HW=21.68' TW=20.00' (Dynamic Tailwater) **1=Culvert** (Barrel Controls 1.05 cfs @ 2.85 fps)

## Summary for Pond DMH#1: DMH#1

Inflow	=	2.36 cfs @	12.23 hrs,	Volume=	0.064 af		
Outflow	=	2.36 cfs @	12.23 hrs,	Volume=	0.064 af,	Atten= 0%,	Lag= 0.0 min
Primary	=	2.36 cfs @	12.23 hrs,	Volume=	0.064 af		-
Routed	to Pond	DMH#2 : DM	IH#2				

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 25.28' @ 12.23 hrs Flood Elev= 30.50'

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Primary	24.50'	<b>15.0" Round Culvert</b> L= 52.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 24.50' / 23.00' S= 0.0288 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 1.23 sf

Primary OutFlow Max=2.13 cfs @ 12.23 hrs HW=25.22' TW=20.25' (Dynamic Tailwater) **1=Culvert** (Inlet Controls 2.13 cfs @ 2.89 fps)

# Summary for Pond DMH#2: DMH#2

 Inflow Area =
 1.715 ac, 84.34% Impervious, Inflow Depth =
 2.01" for 10-YR event

 Inflow =
 2.60 cfs @
 12.26 hrs, Volume=
 0.288 af

 Outflow =
 2.60 cfs @
 12.26 hrs, Volume=
 0.288 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

 Primary =
 2.60 cfs @
 12.26 hrs, Volume=
 0.288 af

 Routed to Pond DMH#3 : DMH#3
 DMH#3

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs

Peak Elev= 20.33' @ 12.31 hrs Flood Elev= 29.10'

 

 Device
 Routing
 Invert
 Outlet Devices

 #1
 Primary
 19.37'
 **18.0" Round Culvert** L= 65.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 19.37' / 19.04' S= 0.0051 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 1.77 sf

Primary OutFlow Max=2.21 cfs @ 12.26 hrs HW=20.29' TW=19.95' (Dynamic Tailwater) -1=Culvert (Outlet Controls 2.21 cfs @ 2.81 fps)

# Summary for Pond DMH#3: DMH#3

[58] Hint: Peaked 0.16' above defined flood level

Inflow Area	=	1.715 ac, 8	4.34% Imp	ervious, Inflow D	Depth = 2.0	1" for 10-YR event	
Inflow	=	2.60 cfs @	12.26 hrs,	Volume=	0.288 af		
Outflow	=	2.60 cfs @	12.26 hrs,	Volume=	0.288 af,	Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 m	nin
Primary	=	2.60 cfs @	12.26 hrs,	Volume=	0.288 af	-	
Routed	to Reacl	h 4R : Existin	g Culvert				

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 19.96' @ 12.26 hrs Flood Elev= 19.80'

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Primary	19.04'	18.0" Round Culvert
			L= 10.0' CPP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 19.04' / 18.99' S= 0.0050 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 1.77 sf

Primary OutFlow Max=2.52 cfs @ 12.26 hrs HW=19.95' TW=14.66' (Dynamic Tailwater) **1=Culvert** (Barrel Controls 2.52 cfs @ 3.24 fps)

# Summary for Pond PP-E: Porous Pavement East

[87] Warning: Oscillations may require smaller dt or Finer Routing (severity=20)

Inflow Area	ı =	0.488 ac, 9	95.91% Imp	ervious,	Inflow De	epth =	5.31'	' for	10-Y	R even	t
Inflow	=	1.03 cfs @	12.83 hrs,	Volume	=	0.216	af				
Outflow	=	0.56 cfs @	13.48 hrs,	Volume	=	0.216	af, A	tten= 4	6%,	Lag= 3	9.2 min
Discarded	=	0.19 cfs @	13.48 hrs,	Volume	=	0.184	af				
Primary	=	0.36 cfs @	13.48 hrs,	Volume	=	0.033	af				
Routed	to Pond	CB#3 : CB#	3								

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 23.51' @ 13.48 hrs Surf.Area= 19,771 sf Storage= 2,721 cf Flood Elev= 26.10' Surf.Area= 19,771 sf Storage= 19,716 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 86.7 min ( 889.0 - 802.3 )

# NH-1471 Proposed

Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC

HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Volume	Inver	t Ava	il.Stora	ge Storage Descr	iption		
#1	23.17	1	19,716	cf Custom Stage	e Data (Prismatic	Listed below (Recalc)	
Elevatio (fee 23.1 24.1 24.4 25.4	on S et) 17 17 12	Gurf.Area (sq-ft) 19,771 19,771 19,771 19,771	Voids (%) 0.0 40.0 40.0 30.0	Inc.Store (cubic-feet) 0 7,908 1,977 5,931	Cum.Store (cubic-feet) 0 7,908 9,886 15 817		
25.4	76	19,771	40.0	2.689	18,506		
26.1	10	19,771	18.0	1,210	19,716		
Device	Routing	In	vert	Outlet Devices			
#1	Discarded	23	6.17' (	0.300 in/hr Exfiltrat	tion over Surface	area	
#2	Primary	23	6.42' (     	Conductivity to Grou 6.0" Round Culver L= 65.0' CMP, squ Inlet / Outlet Invert= n= 0.010 PVC, smc	nductivity to Groundwater Elevation = 22.33' <b>"Round Culvert X 17.00</b> 65.0' CMP, square edge headwall, Ke= 0.500 et / Outlet Invert= 23.42' / 23.10' S= 0.0049 '/' Cc= 0.900 0.010 PVC, smooth interior, Flow Area= 0.20 sf		

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.19 cfs @ 13.48 hrs HW=23.51' (Free Discharge) **1=Exfiltration** (Controls 0.19 cfs)

Primary OutFlow Max=0.36 cfs @ 13.48 hrs HW=23.51' TW=21.68' (Dynamic Tailwater) 2=Culvert (Barrel Controls 0.36 cfs @ 1.27 fps)

# Summary for Pond PP-W: Porous Pavement West

[87] Warning: Oscillations may require smaller dt or Finer Routing (severity=18)

Inflow Area	ı =	0.863 ac, 9	3.17% Impe	ervious, Inflow	Depth =	5.24"	for 10-Y	R event
Inflow	=	1.80 cfs @	12.82 hrs,	Volume=	0.377 a	af		
Outflow	=	1.02 cfs @	13.43 hrs,	Volume=	0.377 a	af, Atte	n= 43%,	Lag= 36.9 min
Discarded	=	0.32 cfs @	13.43 hrs,	Volume=	0.310 a	af		-
Primary	=	0.70 cfs @	13.43 hrs,	Volume=	0.067 a	af		
Routed	to Pond	CB#2 : CB#2	2					

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-72.00 hrs, dt= 0.10 hrs Peak Elev= 23.53' @ 13.43 hrs Surf.Area= 32,239 sf Storage= 4,702 cf Flood Elev= 26.10' Surf.Area= 32,239 sf Storage= 32,149 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 87.1 min (889.8 - 802.8)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description
#1	23.17'	32,149 cf	Custom Stage Data (Prismatic)Listed below (Recalc)

# NH-1471 Proposed Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC

Elevatio (fee	on S et)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Void (%	s Inc.Store ) (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)						
23.1	7	32,239	0.0	) 0	0						
24.1	7	32,239	40.	) 12,896	12,896						
24.4	12	32,239	40.	) 3,224	16,120						
25.4	12	32,239	30.	) 9,672	25,791						
25.7	<b>'</b> 6	32,239	40.0	) 4,385	30,176						
26.10		32,239	18.	) 1,973	32,149						
Device	Routing	In	vert	Outlet Devices							
#1	Discarded	1 23	.17'	0.300 in/hr Exfiltra	tion over Surface	erea					
#2	Primary	23	.42'	Conductivity to Groundwater Elevation = 22.33' 6.0" Round Culvert X 22.00							
				Inlet / Outlet Invert= n= 0.010 PVC, smo	23.42' / 23.10' Sooth interior, Flow	// Cc= 0.900 / Area= 0.20 sf					

**Discarded OutFlow** Max=0.32 cfs @ 13.43 hrs HW=23.53' (Free Discharge) **1=Exfiltration** (Controls 0.32 cfs)

**Primary OutFlow** Max=0.70 cfs @ 13.43 hrs HW=23.53' TW=22.31' (Dynamic Tailwater) **2=Culvert** (Barrel Controls 0.70 cfs @ 1.42 fps)

NH-1471 Proposed	Type III 24-hr 25-YR Rainfall=7.19"
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC	Printed 5/10/2024
HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 Hy	rdroCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 1
Time span=0. Runoff by SCS Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-I	00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q nd method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment 1.1: To Culvert #1	Runoff Area=5,470 sf 21.55% Impervious Runoff Depth=4.56" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.60 cfs 0.048 af
Subcatchment 1.2: To Existing 36" Culv	<b>/ert</b> Runoff Area=93,154 sf 17.06% Impervious Runoff Depth=4.35" Flow Length=397' Tc=8.4 min CN=WQ Runoff=9.16 cfs 0.775 af
Subcatchment 1.3: To CB#1	Runoff Area=15,839 sf 47.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=5.52" Flow Length=435' Tc=9.9 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.78 cfs 0.167 af
Subcatchment 1.4: To Porous Pavemer	nt Runoff Area=37,577 sf 93.17% Impervious Runoff Depth=6.76" Flow Length=96' Tc=63.7 min CN=WQ Runoff=2.31 cfs 0.486 af
Subcatchment 1.5: To Porous Pavemer	nt Runoff Area=21,269 sf 95.91% Impervious Runoff Depth=6.84" Flow Length=93' Tc=64.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.31 cfs 0.278 af
Subcatchment 1.6: To South	Runoff Area=26,188 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=3.85" Flow Length=311' Tc=16.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.96 cfs 0.193 af
Subcatchment 2.1: Building Roof	Runoff Area=22,500 sf 100.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=6.95" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=3.39 cfs 0.299 af
Subcatchment 2.2: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=15,592 sf 30.94% Impervious Runoff Depth=4.16" Flow Length=186' Tc=9.9 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.32 cfs 0.124 af
Subcatchment 2.3: To CB#7	Runoff Area=12,270 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=2.31" Flow Length=170' Tc=11.4 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.57 cfs 0.054 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=2.61" Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.92 cfs 0.102 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	t Inflow=15.00 cfs 1.505 af Outflow=15.00 cfs 1.505 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - Southeas	t Inflow=0.57 cfs 0.054 af Outflow=0.57 cfs 0.054 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeas	t Inflow=0.92 cfs 0.102 af Outflow=0.92 cfs 0.102 af
Reach 3R: Proposed Culvert #1 12.0" Round Pipe n=0.012	Avg. Flow Depth=0.31' Max Vel=2.85 fps Inflow=0.60 cfs 0.048 af L=56.0' S=0.0054 '/' Capacity=2.83 cfs Outflow=0.59 cfs 0.048 af
Reach 4R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L=	Avg. Flow Depth=0.77' Max Vel=9.22 fps Inflow=13.36 cfs 1.312 af 366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=13.13 cfs 1.312 af
<b>Pond 1P: Infiltration Trench</b> Discarded=0.38 cfs 0.307 af Primary=0.00 c	Peak Elev=29.54' Storage=2,830 cf Inflow=4.65 cfs 0.423 af fs 0.000 af Secondary=3.11 cfs 0.117 af Outflow=3.49 cfs 0.424 af

NH-1471 Proposed

Type III 24-hr 25-YR Rainfall=7.19"

Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Printed 5/10/2024 Page 2

Pond BP: Bioretention Pond	Peak Elev=26.27' Storage=1,658 cf Inflow=1.78 cfs 0.167 af Outflow=1.54 cfs 0.167 af
Pond CB#1: CB#1	Peak Elev=0.00' 12.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=232.0' S=0.0050 '/' Primary=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond CB#2: CB#2	Peak Elev=22.54' Inflow=1.39 cfs 0.135 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=126.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=1.39 cfs 0.135 af
Pond CB#3: CB#3	Peak Elev=21.96' Inflow=2.15 cfs 0.206 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=62.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=2.15 cfs 0.206 af
Pond DMH#1: DMH#1	Peak Elev=25.41' Inflow=3.11 cfs 0.117 af 15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=52.0' S=0.0288 '/' Outflow=3.11 cfs 0.117 af
Pond DMH#2: DMH#2	Peak Elev=20.73' Inflow=4.62 cfs 0.490 af 18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=65.0' S=0.0051 '/' Outflow=4.62 cfs 0.490 af
Pond DMH#3: DMH#3	Peak Elev=20.34' Inflow=4.62 cfs 0.490 af 18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=10.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=4.62 cfs 0.490 af
Pond PP-E: Porous Pavemen Dis	t East Peak Elev=23.56' Storage=3,055 cf Inflow=1.31 cfs 0.278 af carded=0.20 cfs 0.208 af Primary=0.77 cfs 0.071 af Outflow=0.97 cfs 0.278 af
Pond PP-W: Porous Paveme Dis	Int West         Peak Elev=23.58' Storage=5,310 cf         Inflow=2.31 cfs         0.486 af           carded=0.33 cfs         0.351 af         Primary=1.39 cfs         0.135 af         Outflow=1.72 cfs         0.487 af
Total Runoff A	rea = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 2.526 af Average Runoff Depth = 4.89

off Area = 6.204 ac Runoff Volume = 2.526 af Average Runoff Depth = 4.89" 59.78% Pervious = 3.709 ac 40.22% Impervious = 2.495 ac

NH-1471 Proposed Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 Hy	"Type III 24-hr 50-YR Rainfall=8.63 Printed 5/10/2024 droCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 3
Time span=0 Runoff by SCS Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-	.00-72.00 hrs, dt=0.10 hrs, 721 points 5 TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-Q Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment 1.1: To Culvert #1	Runoff Area=5,470 sf 21.55% Impervious Runoff Depth=5.84" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.77 cfs 0.061 af
Subcatchment1.2: To Existing 36" Cul	v <b>ert</b> Runoff Area=93,154 sf  17.06% Impervious  Runoff Depth=5.62" Flow Length=397'  Tc=8.4 min  CN=WQ  Runoff=11.87 cfs  1.001 af
Subcatchment1.3: To CB#1	Runoff Area=15,839 sf 47.86% Impervious Runoff Depth=6.88" Flow Length=435' Tc=9.9 min CN=WQ Runoff=2.22 cfs 0.208 af
Subcatchment 1.4: To Porous Paveme	nt Runoff Area=37,577 sf 93.17% Impervious Runoff Depth=8.19" Flow Length=96' Tc=63.7 min CN=WQ Runoff=2.79 cfs 0.589 af
Subcatchment1.5: To Porous Pavement	nt Runoff Area=21,269 sf 95.91% Impervious Runoff Depth=8.27" Flow Length=93' Tc=64.6 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.58 cfs 0.337 af
Subcatchment1.6: To South	Runoff Area=26,188 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=5.08" Flow Length=311' Tc=16.1 min CN=WQ Runoff=2.59 cfs 0.255 af
Subcatchment 2.1: Building Roof	Runoff Area=22,500 sf 100.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=8.39" Tc=6.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=4.08 cfs 0.361 af
Subcatchment 2.2: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=15,592 sf 30.94% Impervious Runoff Depth=5.36" Flow Length=186' Tc=9.9 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.71 cfs 0.160 af
Subcatchment 2.3: To CB#7	Runoff Area=12,270 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth=3.30" Flow Length=170' Tc=11.4 min CN=WQ Runoff=0.84 cfs 0.078 af
Subcatchment 3.0: Southeast Subcat	Runoff Area=20,396 sf 6.41% Impervious Runoff Depth=3.62" Flow Length=153' Tc=17.0 min CN=WQ Runoff=1.34 cfs 0.141 af
Reach #100: Analysis Point - Southwes	st Inflow=19.64 cfs 2.008 af Outflow=19.64 cfs 2.008 af
Reach #200: Analysis Point - Southeas	t Inflow=1.29 cfs 0.081 af
Reach #300: Analysis Point - Southeas	t Inflow=1.34 cfs 0.141 af
Reach 3R: Proposed Culvert #1 12.0" Round Pipe n=0.012	Avg. Flow Depth=0.35' Max Vel=3.05 fps Inflow=0.77 cfs 0.061 af L=56.0' S=0.0054 '/' Capacity=2.83 cfs Outflow=0.76 cfs 0.061 af
Reach 4R: Existing Culvert 36.0" Round Pipe n=0.013 L=	Avg. Flow Depth=0.88' Max Vel=9.91 fps Inflow=17.81 cfs 1.753 af =366.0' S=0.0191 '/' Capacity=92.24 cfs Outflow=17.25 cfs 1.753 af
<b>Pond 1P: Infiltration Trench</b> Discarded=0.38 cfs 0.349 af Primary=0.45 c	Peak Elev=30.03' Storage=3,179 cf Inflow=5.72 cfs 0.521 af fs 0.004 af Secondary=3.96 cfs 0.169 af Outflow=4.79 cfs 0.521 af

NH-1471 Proposed	Type III 24-hr 50-YR Rainfall=8.63"
Prepared by Beals Associates, PLLC	Printed 5/10/2024
HydroCAD® 10.20-4b s/n 01754 © 2023 HydroCAE	O Software Solutions LLC Page 4
Pond BP: Bioretention Pond	Peak Elev=26.32' Storage=1,746 cf Inflow=2.22 cfs 0.208 af Outflow=2.08 cfs 0.208 af

Pond CB#1: CB#1	Peak Elev=0.00'
	12.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=232.0' S=0.0050 '/' Primary=0.00 cfs 0.000 af
Pond CB#2: CB#2	Peak Elev=22.74' Inflow=2.01 cfs 0.205 af
	15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=126.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=2.01 cfs 0.205 af
Pond CB#3: CB#3	Peak Elev=22.19' Inflow=3.13 cfs 0.314 af
	15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=62.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=3.13 cfs 0.314 af
Pond DMH#1: DMH#1	Peak Elev=25.57' Inflow=3.96 cfs 0.169 af
	15.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=52.0' S=0.0288 '/' Outflow=3.96 cfs 0.169 af
Pond DMH#2: DMH#2	Peak Elev=21.00' Inflow=6.01 cfs 0.691 af
	18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=65.0' S=0.0051 '/' Outflow=6.01 cfs 0.691 af
Pond DMH#3: DMH#3	Peak Elev=20.58' Inflow=6.01 cfs 0.691 af
	18.0" Round Culvert n=0.013 L=10.0' S=0.0050 '/' Outflow=6.01 cfs 0.691 af
Pond PP-E: Porous Paveme	nt East Peak Elev=23.59' Storage=3,291 cf Inflow=1.58 cfs 0.337 af
Di	scarded=0.21 cfs 0.228 af Primary=1.13 cfs 0.109 af Outflow=1.33 cfs 0.337 af
Pond PP-W: Porous Paveme	ent West Peak Elev=23.62' Storage=5,754 cf Inflow=2.79 cfs 0.589 af
Di	scarded=0.34 cfs 0.384 af Primary=2.01 cfs 0.205 af Outflow=2.35 cfs 0.589 af

Total Runoff Area = 6.204 acRunoff Volume = 3.191 afAverage Runoff Depth = 6.17"59.78% Pervious = 3.709 ac40.22% Impervious = 2.495 ac

# Appendix III

# **Charts, Graphs, and Calculations**

# **Extreme Precipitation Tables**

# Northeast Regional Climate Center

Data represents point estimates calculated from partial duration series. All precipitation amounts are displayed in inches.

Metadata for Point										
Smoothing	Yes									
State	New Hampshire									
Location	New Hampshire, United States									
Latitude	42.988 degrees North									
Longitude	70.933 degrees West									
Elevation	0 feet									
Date/Time	Mon Nov 06 2023 13:52:49 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time)									

Coastal Region (Add 15%)
2-Year = 3.70 in
10-Year = 5.65 in
25-Year = 7.19 in
50-Year = 8.63 in

# **Extreme Precipitation Estimates**

	5min	10min	15min	30min	60min	120min		1hr	2hr	3hr	6hr	12hr	24hr	48hr		1day	2day	4day	7day	10day	
1yr	0.26	0.40	0.50	0.66	0.82	1.04	1yr	0.71	0.99	1.22	1.57	2.05	2.68	2.91	1yr	2.38	2.80	3.21	3.92	4.55	1yr
2yr	0.32	0.50	0.62	0.82	1.02	1.30	2yr	0.88	1.18	1.52	1.94	2.50	<mark>3.22</mark>	3.57	<mark>2yr</mark>	2.85	3.44	3.95	4.69	5.34	2yr
5yr	0.37	0.58	0.73	0.98	1.25	1.62	5yr	1.08	1.47	1.90	2.45	3.16	4.10	4.60	5yr	3.63	4.42	5.06	5.98	6.75	5yr
10yr	0.41	0.65	0.83	1.12	1.46	1.90	10yr	1.26	1.73	2.25	2.92	3.78	<mark>4.91</mark>	5.56	10yr	4.35	5.35	6.10	7.19	8.07	10yr
25yr	0.48	0.77	0.98	1.35	1.79	2.36	25yr	1.55	2.15	2.80	3.67	4.79	<mark>6.25</mark>	7.16	25yr	5.53	6.88	7.82	9.18	10.22	25yr
50yr	0.54	0.87	1.11	1.56	2.10	2.79	50yr	1.81	2.54	3.33	4.38	5.74	<mark>7.50</mark>	8.67	<mark>50yr</mark>	6.64	8.34	9.44	11.06	12.23	50yr
100yr	0.60	0.98	1.26	1.80	2.45	3.30	100yr	2.12	3.00	3.96	5.24	6.88	9.00	10.51	100yr	7.97	10.10	11.40	13.32	14.63	100yr
200yr	0.69	1.12	1.45	2.08	2.87	3.90	200yr	2.48	3.55	4.70	6.24	8.23	10.82	12.73	200yr	9.57	12.24	13.77	16.05	17.52	200yr
500yr	0.82	1.34	1.75	2.54	3.55	4.86	500yr	3.06	4.43	5.88	7.86	10.44	13.78	16.41	500yr	12.20	15.78	17.68	20.55	22.25	500yr

## **Lower Confidence Limits**

	5min	10min	15min	30min	60min	120min		1hr	2hr	3hr	6hr	12hr	24hr	48hr		1day	2day	4day	7day	10day	
1yr	0.24	0.37	0.45	0.60	0.74	0.89	1yr	0.64	0.87	0.94	1.26	1.56	2.28	2.54	1yr	2.02	2.44	2.89	3.39	4.00	1yr
2yr	0.32	0.49	0.60	0.81	1.00	1.19	2yr	0.87	1.16	1.37	1.82	2.33	3.11	3.51	2yr	2.75	3.37	3.86	4.58	5.14	2yr
5yr	0.36	0.55	0.68	0.93	1.19	1.42	5yr	1.03	1.39	1.62	2.12	2.74	3.84	4.29	5yr	3.40	4.13	4.74	5.63	6.35	5yr
10yr	0.39	0.61	0.75	1.05	1.35	1.62	10yr	1.17	1.59	1.82	2.40	3.07	4.43	5.00	10yr	3.92	4.81	5.52	6.53	7.32	10yr
25yr	0.45	0.69	0.86	1.23	1.61	1.94	25yr	1.39	1.90	2.12	2.78	3.58	4.90	6.10	25yr	4.34	5.87	6.74	7.92	8.87	25yr
50yr	0.50	0.76	0.95	1.37	1.84	2.23	50yr	1.59	2.18	2.36	3.12	4.01	5.55	7.09	50yr	4.91	6.81	7.83	9.19	10.24	50yr
100yr	0.56	0.85	1.07	1.54	2.12	2.56	100yr	1.83	2.51	2.65	3.48	4.47	6.25	8.21	100yr	5.53	7.90	9.10	10.62	11.78	100yr
200yr	0.63	0.95	1.20	1.74	2.43	2.94	200yr	2.10	2.87	2.95	3.87	4.98	7.02	9.63	200yr	6.21	9.26	10.58	12.27	13.58	200yr
500yr	0.74	1.10	1.42	2.06	2.93	3.55	500yr	2.53	3.47	3.42	4.46	5.78	8.15	11.73	500yr	7.21	11.28	12.90	14.79	16.36	500yr

# **Upper Confidence Limits**

	5min	10min	15min	30min	60min	120min		1hr	2hr	3hr	6hr	12hr	24hr	48hr		1day	2day	4day	7day	10day	
1yr	0.28	0.44	0.54	0.72	0.89	1.08	1yr	0.76	1.06	1.26	1.72	2.18	2.98	3.10	1yr	2.63	2.98	3.58	4.31	5.01	1yr
2yr	0.33	0.51	0.63	0.86	1.06	1.26	2yr	0.91	1.23	1.48	1.95	2.49	3.41	3.66	2yr	3.01	3.52	4.05	4.84	5.64	2yr
5yr	0.40	0.62	0.77	1.05	1.34	1.62	5yr	1.16	1.58	1.87	2.49	3.18	4.37	4.91	5yr	3.87	4.72	5.40	6.35	7.17	5yr
10yr	0.47	0.73	0.90	1.26	1.63	1.97	10yr	1.40	1.93	2.26	3.03	3.83	5.43	6.14	10yr	4.81	5.90	6.75	7.89	8.81	10yr
25yr	0.58	0.89	1.11	1.58	2.08	2.56	25yr	1.79	2.50	2.93	3.94	4.91	7.68	8.28	25yr	6.79	7.96	9.04	10.52	11.55	25yr
50yr	0.68	1.04	1.30	1.86	2.51	3.11	50yr	2.16	3.04	3.56	4.81	5.96	9.62	10.39	50yr	8.52	9.99	11.32	13.10	14.21	50yr
100yr	0.81	1.22	1.52	2.20	3.02	3.78	100yr	2.61	3.70	4.33	5.88	7.24	12.07	13.04	100yr	10.68	12.54	14.15	16.36	17.50	100yr
200yr	0.94	1.42	1.80	2.61	3.64	4.61	200yr	3.14	4.51	5.29	7.19	8.78	15.18	16.24	200yr	13.43	15.62	17.73	20.42	21.56	200yr
500yr	1.17	1.75	2.25	3.26	4.64	5.97	500yr	4.00	5.83	6.86	9.42	11.35	20.58	21.94	500yr	18.21	21.09	23.84	27.40	28.47	500yr



# Pollutant Removal Efficiencies for Best Management Practices for Use in Pollutant Loading Analysis

Best Management Practice (BMP) removal efficiencies for pollutant loading analysis for total suspended solids (TSS), total nitrogen (TN), and total phosphorus (TP) are presented in the table below. These removal efficiencies were developed by reviewing various literature sources and using best professional judgment based on literature values and general expectation of how values for different BMPS should relate to one another. The intent is to update this information and add BMPs and removal efficiencies for other parameters as more information/data becomes available in the future.

NHDES will consider other BMP removal efficiencies if sufficient documentation is provided.

Please note that all BMPs must be designed in accordance with the specifications in the Alteration of Terrain (AoT) Program Administrative Rules (Env-Wq 1500). If BMPs are not designed in accordance with the AoT Rules, NHDES may require lower removal efficiencies to be used in the analysis.

<u>BMP in Series</u>: When BMPs are placed in series, the BMP with the highest removal efficiency shall be the efficiency used in the model for computing annual loadings. Adding efficiencies together is generally not allowed because removals typically decrease rapidly with decreasing influent concentration and, in the case of primary BMPs (i.e., stormwater ponds, infiltration and filtering practices), pre-treatment is usually part of the design and is therefore, most likely already accounted for in the efficiencies cited for these BMPs.

Pollutant R	Values Accepted for Loading Analyses					
BMP Type	ВМР	Notes	Lit. Ref.	TSS	TN	ТР
	Wet Pond		B, F	70%	35%	45%
<b>.</b>	Wet Extended Detention Pond		A, B	80%	55%	68%
Stormwater Ponds	Micropool Extended Detention Pond	ТВА				
	Multiple Pond System	TBA				
	Pocket Pond	TBA				
	Shallow Wetland		A, B, F, I	80%	55%	45%
Stormwater	Extended Detention Wetland		A, B, F, I	80%	55%	45%
Wetlands	Pond/Wetland System	TBA				
	Gravel Wetland		Н	95%	85%	64%
	Infiltration Trench (≥75 ft from surface water)		B, D, I	90%	55%	60%
	Infiltration Trench (<75 ft from surface water)		B, D, I	90%	10%	60%
Infiltration Practices	Infiltration Basin (≥75 ft from surface water)		A, F, B, D, I	90%	60%	65%
	Infiltration Basin (<75 ft from surface water)		A, F, B, D, I	90%	10%	65%
	Dry Wells			90%	55%	60%
	Drip Edges			90%	55%	60%
	Aboveground or Underground Sand Filter that infiltrates WQV (≥75 ft from surface water)		A, F, B, D, I	90%	60%	65%
	Aboveground or Underground Sand Filter that infiltrates WQV (<75 ft from surface water)		A, F, B, D, I	90%	10%	65%
	Aboveground or Underground Sand Filter with underdrain		A, I, F, G, H	85%	10%	45%
Filtering	Tree Box Filter	TBA				
Practices	Bioretention System		I, G, H	90%	65%	65%
	Permeable Pavement that infiltrates WQV (≥75 ft from surface water)		A, F, B, D, I	90%	60%	65%
	Permeable Pavement that infiltrates WQV (<75 ft from surface water)		A, F, B, D, I	90%	10%	65%
	Permeable Pavement with underdrain		Use TN and TP values for sand filter w/ underdrain and outlet pipe	90%	10%	45%

Pollutant Ro	Values Accepted for Loading Analyses					
BMP Type	/IP Type BMP Notes Lit. Ref.				TN	ТР
Treatment Swales	Flow Through Treatment Swale	ТВА				
Vegetated Buffers	Vegetated Vegetated Buffers A, B, I		A, B, I	73%	40%	45%
	Sediment Forebay	TBA				
	Vegetated Filter Strip		A, B, I	73%	40%	45%
	Vegetated Swale		A, B, C, F, H, I	65%	20%	25%
Pre-	Flow-Through Device - Hydrodynamic Separator		A, B, G, H	35%	10%	5%
Treatment Practices	Flow-Through Device - ADS Underground Multichamber Water Quality Unit (WQU)		G, H	72%	10%	9%
	Other Flow-Through Devices	TBA				
	Off-line Deep Sump Catch Basin		J, K, L, M	15%	5%	5%



# GOVE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC

SITE-SPECIFIC SOIL SURVEY REPORT For 127 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH By GES, Inc. Project # 2023094 Date: 1-4-2024

## 1. MAPPING STANDARDS

*Site-Specific Soil Mapping Standards for New Hampshire and Vermont.* SSSNNE Special Publication No. 3, Version 7.0, July, 2021.

This map product is within the technical standards of the National Cooperative Soil Survey. It is a special purpose product, intended for infiltration requirements by the NH DES Alteration of Terrain Bureau. The soil map was produced by a professional soil scientist and is not a product of the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. This report accompanies the soil map.

The site-specific soil map (SSSM) was produced 1'-4-2024; prepared by JP Gove, CSS #004, GES, Inc.

Soils were identified with the New Hampshire State-wide Numerical Soils Legend, USDA NRCS, Durham, NH. Issue # 10, January 2011.

Hydrologic Soil Group was determined using SSSNNE Special Publication No. 5, Ksat Values for New Hampshire Soils, September 2009.

High Intensity Soil Map symbols, based upon SSSNNE Special Publication 1, December 2017, were added to the Soil Legend.

Scale of soil map: Approximately 1'' = 40'.

Contours Interval: 2 feet

## 2. LANDFORMS & EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The site is located on a mostly disturbed area. What remains for natural soil is a hill of glacial outwash and valleys of marine sediments. The disturbed areas are cut faces at the sides of the hill, or graded flat in the valley.

## 3. DATE SOIL MAP PRODUCED

Date(s) of on-site field work: 1-4-2024

Date(s) of test pits: 1-4-2024

Test pits recorded by: James P. Gove, CSS #004

## 4. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION AND SIZE OF SITE

City or town where soil mapping was conducted: Exeter

Location: Tax Map 52, Lot 112-2

Size of area: Approximately 5 acres

Was the map for the entire lot? no

If no, where was the mapping conducted on the parcel: limited to south of GTE Road.

Total lot area is 6.24 acres. Area soil mapped is

## 5. PURPOSE OF THE SOIL MAP

Was the map prepared to meet the requirement of Alteration of Terrain? Yes

If no, what was the purpose of the map? n/a

Who was the map prepared for? Beals Associates, PLLC

## 6. SOIL IDENTIFICATION LEGEND

Map Unit Symb	ool Map Unit Na	ame	HISS	S Symbo	l Hydrolo	ogic Soil Group
33	Scitico silt loam		5	553		С
24	Agawam fine sa	indy loam	2	211		В
500/dfccc	Udorthents loan	my	3	363		С
600/ffccc	00/ffccc Endoaquents loamy		5	563		С
SLOPE PHASE:						
0-8%	В	8-15%	С		15-25%	D
25%-50%	E	50%+	F			

# 7. NARRATIVE MAP UNIT DESCRIPTIONS

SITE-SPECIFIC MAP UNIT: 33

CORRELATED SOIL SERIES: Scitico silt loam

LANDSCAPE SETTING: Valleys

CHARACTERISTIC SURFACE FEATURES: Forested, no surface stones.

DRAINAGE CLASS: Poorly Drained

PARENT MATERIAL: Marine silts

NATURE OF DISSIMILAR INCLUSIONS: Poorly drained Shaker fine sandy loam at borders of wetlands.

Ap, 0-6 inches, silt loam, 10YR3/2, 5YR5/6 redox, granular, friable, no coarse fragments, ESHWT at 0 inches, perched.

Cg, 6-20 inches, silty clay loam, 2.5Y5/2, 5YR6/6 redox, blocky, firm, no coarse fragments, OBSWT at 10 inches, perched, no lithic contact.

SITE-SPECIFIC MAP UNIT: 24

CORRELATED SOIL SERIES: Agawam fine sandy loam

LANDSCAPE SETTING: Top of hill

CHARACTERISTIC SURFACE FEATURES: Forested, no surface stones.

DRAINAGE CLASS: Well Drained

PARENT MATERIAL: Glacial Outwash

NATURE OF DISSIMILAR INCLUSIONS: Moderately well drained Eldridge fine sandy loam at the transition from the hill side to the wetland boundary.

Ap, 0-6 inches, fine sandy loam, 10YR3/3, granular, friable, no coarse fragments.

Bw, 6-24 inches, fine sandy loam, 10YR5/6, granular, friable, no coarse fragments.

C, 24-45 inches, loamy sand, 2.5Y5/4, no redox, massive, friable, no coarse fragments, no ESHWT, no OBSWT, no lithic contact.

SITE-SPECIFIC MAP UNIT: 500/dfccc

CORRELATED SOIL SERIES: Udorthents, loamy

LANDSCAPE SETTING: Flat graded areas and cut faces.

CHARACTERISTIC SURFACE FEATURES: Grass, no surface stones.

DRAINAGE CLASS: Moderately Well Drained

PARENT MATERIAL: Mixed Fill over Marine silts

NATURE OF DISSIMILAR INCLUSIONS: Moderately well drained Boxford silt loam at borders of graded areas.

Fill, 0-20 inches, sandy loam to loamy sand, 10YR4/4, massive, friable, 10% gravel coarse fragments.

Cg, 20-40 inches, silty clay loam, 2.5Y5/2, 5YR5/6 redox, blocky, firm, no coarse fragments, ESHWT at 20 inches, OBSWT at 30 inches, perched, no lithic contact.

------

SITE-SPECIFIC MAP UNIT: 600/ffccc

CORRELATED SOIL SERIES: Endoaquents, loamy

LANDSCAPE SETTING: Ditches and swales.

CHARACTERISTIC SURFACE FEATURES: Grass or shrub-shrub, no surface stones.

DRAINAGE CLASS: Poorly Drained

PARENT MATERIAL: Marine silts – graded or dredged.

NATURE OF DISSIMILAR INCLUSIONS: Poorly drained Scitico silt loam at borders of graded areas.

C, 0-10 inches, silt loam, 2.5Y5/3, 5YR5/6 redox, massive, friable, no coarse fragments, ESHWT at 0 inches, perched.

Cg, 10-30 inches, silty clay loam, 2.5Y5/2, 5YR5/6 redox, blocky, firm, no coarse fragments, OBSWT at 10 inches, perched, no lithic contact.

\_\_\_\_\_

## 8. <u>RESPONSIBLE SOIL SCIENTIST</u>



Certified Soil Scientist Number: 004

## 9. OTHER DISTINGUISHING FEATURES OF SITE

Is the site in a natural condition? No

If no, what is the nature of the disturbance? Cut faces and flat graded areas. Only natural is remaining forested areas.

8 Continental Dr Unit H, Exeter, NH 03833-7507 Ph (603) 778 0644 / Fax (603) 778 0654 www.gesinc.biz info@gesinc.biz



United States Department of Agriculture

Natural Resources Conservation Service A product of the National Cooperative Soil Survey, a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local participants Custom Soil Resource Report for Rockingham County, New Hampshire



# Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/? cid=nrcs142p2\_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require

alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

# Contents

Preface	2
How Soil Surveys Are Made	5
Soil Map	
Soil Map	9
Legend	10
Map Unit Legend	11
Map Unit Descriptions	11
Rockingham County, New Hampshire	
26B—Windsor loamy sand, 3 to 8 percent slopes	13
38B—Eldridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	14
299—Udorthents, smoothed	15
699—Urban land	
W—Water	16
References	17

# **How Soil Surveys Are Made**

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil

scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and

identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.

# Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.



	MAP L	EGEND	)	MAP INFORMATION				
Area of Int	terest (AOI)		Spoil Area	The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at				
	Area of Interest (AOI)	۵	Stony Spot	1.24,000.				
Soils	Soil Man Linit Dalvaana	00	Very Stony Spot	Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.				
		Ŷ	Wet Spot					
~		Δ	Other	Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil				
	Soil Map Unit Points		Special Line Features	line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of				
Special	Point Features	Water Fea	atures	contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.				
S IN IN	Borrow Pit	$\sim$	Streams and Canals					
	Clay Spot	Transport	ation	Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map				
衆	Classed Depression	+++	Rails	measurements.				
$\sim$		~	Interstate Highways	Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service				
a de la compañía de la		~	US Routes	Web Soil Survey URL:				
00	Gravelly Spot	~	Major Roads	Coordinate System. Web Wercator (EFSG.3037)				
0	Landfill	$\approx$	Local Roads	Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator				
٨.	Lava Flow	Backgrou	ind	projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the				
عليه	Marsh or swamp	Mar	Aerial Photography	Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more				
衆	Mine or Quarry			accurate calculations of distance or area are required.				
0	Miscellaneous Water			This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as				
0	Perennial Water			of the version date(s) listed below.				
$\vee$	Rock Outcrop			Soil Survey Area: Rockingham County, New Hampshire				
+	Saline Spot			Survey Area Data: Version 26, Aug 22, 2023				
°.°	Sandy Spot			Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales				
÷	Severely Eroded Spot			1:50,000 or larger.				
٥	Sinkhole			Date(s) aerial images were photographed: May 22 2022—.lun				
ò	Slide or Slip			5, 2022				
ø	Sodic Spot			The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.				

	1		
Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
26B	Windsor loamy sand, 3 to 8 percent slopes	0.2	1.2%
38B	Eldridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	6.2	37.8%
299	Udorthents, smoothed	7.2	43.4%
699	Urban land	2.1	12.9%
W	Water	0.8	4.7%
Totals for Area of Interest		16.5	100.0%

# **Map Unit Legend**

# **Map Unit Descriptions**

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate

pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An *association* is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

# **Rockingham County, New Hampshire**

# 26B—Windsor loamy sand, 3 to 8 percent slopes

### **Map Unit Setting**

National map unit symbol: 2svkf Elevation: 0 to 1,210 feet Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 71 inches Mean annual air temperature: 39 to 55 degrees F Frost-free period: 140 to 250 days Farmland classification: Farmland of local importance

### **Map Unit Composition**

Windsor and similar soils: 85 percent Minor components: 15 percent Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

## **Description of Windsor**

### Setting

Landform: Outwash terraces Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Loose sandy glaciofluvial deposits derived from granite and/or schist and/or gneiss

## **Typical profile**

*Oe - 0 to 1 inches:* moderately decomposed plant material *A - 1 to 3 inches:* loamy sand

Bw - 3 to 25 inches: loamy sand

C - 25 to 65 inches: sand

## **Properties and qualities**

Slope: 3 to 8 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Excessively drained
Runoff class: Negligible
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to very high (1.42 to 99.90 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Maximum salinity: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 4.5 inches)

## Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 2s Hydrologic Soil Group: A Ecological site: F145XY008MA - Dry Outwash Hydric soil rating: No

#### **Minor Components**

#### Hinckley

Percent of map unit: 10 percent Landform: Eskers Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope Down-slope shape: Convex Across-slope shape: Convex Ecological site: F145XY008MA - Dry Outwash Hydric soil rating: No

#### Deerfield, loamy sand

Percent of map unit: 5 percent Landform: Terraces Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Ecological site: F144AY027MA - Moist Sandy Outwash Hydric soil rating: No

## 38B—Eldridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes

#### Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9cnb Elevation: 90 to 1,000 feet Mean annual precipitation: 30 to 55 inches Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 54 degrees F Frost-free period: 120 to 180 days Farmland classification: All areas are prime farmland

#### Map Unit Composition

*Eldridge and similar soils:* 80 percent *Minor components:* 20 percent *Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.* 

#### **Description of Eldridge**

### Setting

Parent material: Outwash over glaciolacustrine

#### **Typical profile**

H1 - 0 to 8 inches: fine sandy loam
H2 - 8 to 23 inches: loamy fine sand
H3 - 23 to 62 inches: loamy very fine sand

## **Properties and qualities**

Slope: 3 to 8 percent Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches Drainage class: Moderately well drained Runoff class: Medium

#### **Custom Soil Resource Report**

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately low to moderately high (0.06 to 0.60 in/hr) Depth to water table: About 12 to 24 inches Frequency of flooding: None Frequency of ponding: None Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: High (about 9.9 inches)

#### Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 2w Hydrologic Soil Group: C/D Ecological site: F144AY027MA - Moist Sandy Outwash Hydric soil rating: No

#### **Minor Components**

#### Boxford

Percent of map unit: 5 percent Hydric soil rating: No

## Well drained inclusion

Percent of map unit: 5 percent Hydric soil rating: No

#### Squamscott

Percent of map unit: 5 percent Landform: Marine terraces Hydric soil rating: Yes

### Scitico

Percent of map unit: 5 percent Landform: Marine terraces Hydric soil rating: Yes

## 299—Udorthents, smoothed

#### Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9cmt Elevation: 0 to 840 feet Mean annual precipitation: 44 to 49 inches Mean annual air temperature: 48 degrees F Frost-free period: 155 to 165 days Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

#### Map Unit Composition

*Udorthents and similar soils:* 100 percent *Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.* 

#### **Description of Udorthents**

Properties and qualities Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Excessively drained Depth to water table: More than 80 inches Frequency of flooding: None Frequency of ponding: None

## 699—Urban land

#### Map Unit Composition

*Urban land:* 85 percent *Minor components:* 15 percent *Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.* 

#### **Minor Components**

#### Not named

Percent of map unit: 15 percent Hydric soil rating: No

#### W-Water

#### Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9cq3 Elevation: 200 to 2,610 feet Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

#### Map Unit Composition

*Water:* 100 percent *Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.* 

# References

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.

Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.

Federal Register. September 18, 2002. Hydric soils of the United States.

Hurt, G.W., and L.M. Vasilas, editors. Version 6.0, 2006. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.

National Research Council. 1995. Wetlands: Characteristics and boundaries.

Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/ nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2\_054262

Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2\_053577

Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2 053580

Tiner, R.W., Jr. 1985. Wetlands of Delaware. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Wetlands Section.

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Waterways Experiment Station Technical Report Y-87-1.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National forestry manual. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/ home/?cid=nrcs142p2 053374

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National range and pasture handbook. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/ detail/national/landuse/rangepasture/?cid=stelprdb1043084

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/ nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2\_054242

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/? cid=nrcs142p2\_053624

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. 1961. Land capability classification. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 210. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2\_052290.pdf

# STORMWATER MANAGEMENT / BMP INSPECTION & MAINTENANCE PLAN

## Foss Motors 127 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, NH NH-1471 February 2024 Revised May 15, 2024

Proper construction, inspections, maintenance, and repairs are key elements in maintaining a successful stormwater management program on a developed property. Routine inspections ensure permit compliance and reduce the potential for deterioration of infrastructure or reduced water quality.

For the purpose of this Stormwater Management Program, a significant rainfall event is considered an event of three (3) inches or more in a 24-hour period or at least 0.5 inches in a one-hour period. During construction, inspections should be conducted every two weeks or after a 0.25" rainfall event in a 24-hour period per the EPA NPDES Phase II SWPPP, until the entire disturbed area is fully restabilized. Upon full stabilization of the project and filing of an NOI, inspections need only be conducted after a significant rainfall event as described above or as described in the maintenance guidelines below.

*During construction activities* Tim Foss with an address of 133 Portsmouth Avenue, Exeter, New Hampshire and a phone of 603.772.7777 or their heirs and/or assigns, shall be responsible for inspections and maintenance activities for the above project site. Foss Motors shall be responsible for ongoing inspection and maintenance of the porous pavement, bioretention pond, stone infiltration trench, and related drainage infrastructure. The owner shall document the transfer of responsibility in writing to the NHDES AoT Bureau.

The owner is responsible to ensure that any subsequent owner has copies of the Log Form and Annual Report records and fully understands the responsibilities of this plan. The grantor owner(s) will ensure this document is provided to the grantee owner(s) by duplicating the Ownership Responsibility Sheet which is found toward the back of this document, which will be maintained with the Inspection & Maintenance Logs and provided to the Town of Exeter and/or NHDES Alteration of Terrain Bureau upon request.

#### **Documentation:**

A maintenance log (i.e., report) will be kept summarizing inspections, maintenance, and any corrective actions taken. The log will include the date on which each inspection or maintenance task was performed, a description of the inspection findings or maintenance completed, and the name of the inspector or maintenance personnel performing the task (see Stormwater System Operation and Maintenance Plan Inspection & Maintenance Manual Checklist attached). If a maintenance task

Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Avenue Exeter, NH

requires the clean-out of any sediments or debris, the location where the sediment and debris was disposed after removal shall be indicated.

#### **Best Management Practices (BMP) Maintenance Guidelines**

The following provides a list of recommendations and guidelines for managing the Stormwater facilities. The cited areas, facilities, and measures will be inspected and the identified deficiencies will be corrected. Clean-out must include the removal and legal disposal of any accumulated sediments and debris.

#### **DURING CONSTRUCTION**

#### **1. Stabilized Construction Entrance**

A temporary gravel construction entrance provides an area where mud can be dislodged from tires before the vehicle leaves the construction site to reduce the amount of mud and sediment transported onto paved municipal and state roads. The stone size for the pad should be between 1 and 2-inch coarse aggregate, and the pad itself constructed to a minimum length of 50' for the full width of the access road. The aggregate should be placed at least six inches thick. A plan view and profile are shown on Sheet E1 - Sediment and Erosion Control Detail Plan.

#### 2. Dust Control

Dust will be controlled on the site using multiple BMPs. Mulching and temporary seeding will be the first line of protection to be utilized where problems occur. If dust problems are not solved by these applications, the use of water and calcium chloride can be applied. Calcium chloride will be applied at a rate that will keep the surface moist but not cause pollution.

#### 3. Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control Devices / Barriers

**Function** – Temporary erosion and sediment control devices are utilized during construction period to divert, store and filter stormwater from non-stabilized surfaces. These devices include, but are not limited to: silt fences, hay bales, filters, sediment traps, stone check dams, mulch and erosion control blankets.

**Maintenance** – Temporary erosion and sediment control devices shall be inspected and maintained on a weekly basis and following a significant storm event (>0.5-inch rain event) throughout the construction period to ensure that they still have integrity and are not allowing sediment to pass. Sediment build-up in swales will be removed if it is deeper than six inches. Sediment is to be removed from sumps in the catch basin semi-annually. Refer to the Site Plan drawings for the maintenance of temporary erosion and sediment control devices.

#### 4. Invasive Species

THE NH COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE PROHIBITS THE COLLECTION, POSSESSION, IMPORTATION, TRANSPORTATION, SALE, PROPAGATION, TRANSPLANTATION, OR CULTIVATION OF PLANTS BANNED BY NH LAW RSA Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Avenue Exeter, NH

430:53 AND NH CODE ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AGR 3800. THE PROJECT SHALL MEET ALL REQUIREMENTS AND THE INTENT OF. RSA 430:53 AND AGR 3800 RELATIVE TO INVASIVE SPECIES.

#### POST CONSTRUCTION / LONG TERM MAINTENANCE:

#### 5. Catch Basins/Manholes

Inspect catch basins 2 times per year (preferably in spring and fall) to ensure that the catch basins are working in their intended fashion and that they are free of debris. Clean structures when sediment depths reach 12" from invert of outlet. If the basin outlet is designed with a hood to trap floatable materials (i.e. Snout), check to ensure watertight seal is working. Remove floating debris and hydrocarbons at the time of the inspection.

#### 6. Culverts

Inspect culverts 2 times per year (preferably in spring and fall) to ensure that the culverts are working in their intended fashion and that they are free of debris. Remove any obstructions to flow; remove accumulated sediments and debris at the inlet, at the outlet, and within the conduit and to repair any erosion damage at the culvert's inlet and outlet. Repair/replace culvert if it becomes crushed or deteriorated.

#### 7. Vegetated Areas

Inspect slopes and embankments early in the growing season to identify active or potential erosion problems. Replant bare areas or areas with sparse growth. Where rill erosion is evident, armor the area with an appropriate lining or divert the erosive flows to on-site areas able to withstand the concentrated flows. The facilities will be inspected after major storms and any identified deficiencies will be corrected.

#### 8. Roadways and Paved Surfaces

Clear accumulations of winter sand along roadways at least once a year, preferably in the spring. Accumulations on pavement may be removed by pavement sweeping. Accumulations of sand along road shoulders may be removed by grading excess sand to the pavement edge and removing it manually or by a front-end loader.

#### 9. Winter Maintenance

The plowing and application of de-icing materials shall be conducted by a certified Green Snow Pro contractor trained in best management practices for road salt/deicing at the expense of the owner. No snow dump shall be allowed onsite. In the event that snow storage areas are inundated in any given winter, snow will be trucked offsite and disposed of in a legal fashion.

### **10. Stormwater Infiltration Facilities**

• Inspect all upstream pre-treatment measures for sediment and floatables accumulation. Remove and dispose of sediments or debris as needed.

## Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Avenue Exeter, NH

- The infiltration facility will be inspected within the first three months after construction.
- After the initial three months, the infiltration facility will be inspected 2 times per year to ensure that the filter is draining within 72 hours of a rain event equivalent to 1/2" or more.
- Failure to drain in 72 hours will require part or all of the top 3 inches of the infiltration area to be removed and replaced with new like material. If the infiltration system does not drain within 72-hours following a rainfall event, then a qualified professional should assess the condition of the facility to determine measures required to restore infiltration function.
- Vegetated infiltration ponds or swales will be mowed at least annually or otherwise maintained to control the growth of woody vegetation and to control the accumulation of sediments in order to maintain the water quality volume. Any woody vegetation or accumulated sediment must be removed.
- The facilities will be inspected after major storms and any identified deficiencies will be corrected.

## 11. Bioretention Basin

- The perimeter should be mowed at least annually and the embankments periodically.
- Systems should be inspected at least twice annually, and following any rainfall event exceeding 2.5 inches in a 24-hour period, with maintenance or rehabilitation conducted as warranted by such inspection.
- Pretreatment measures should be inspected at least twice annually, and cleaned of accumulated sediment as warranted by inspection, but no less than once annually.
- Trash and debris should be removed at each inspection.
- At least once annually, system should be inspected for drawdown time.
- If bioretention system does not drain within 72-hours following a rainfall event, then a qualified professional should assess the condition of the facility to determine measures required to restore infiltration function, including but not limited to removal of accumulated sediments or reconstruction of the filter media.
- The pre-treatment forebays will need occasional removal of sediment (every 5 years, or when 50% of capacity is lost, whichever occurs first). Inspections should ensure that no sediment is reaching the gravel.
- All structural components, which include, but are not limited to, level spreader, vegetation, pipes, orifice structures, and spillway structures, should be inspected and any deficiencies repaired. This includes a visual inspection of all storm water control structures for damage and/or accumulation of sediment.
- Vegetation should be inspected at least annually, and maintained in healthy condition, including pruning, removal and replacement.
- All dead or dying vegetation within the extents of the basin should be removed, as well as all herbaceous vegetation rootstock when overcrowding is observed and any vegetation that has a negative impact on storm water flowage through the facility. Any invasive vegetation encroaching upon the perimeter of the facility should be pruned or removed. Wetland plantings typically become well established, but occasional replanting to maintain minimum 50% coverage may be needed.

## **12. Porous Pavement**

- Check for standing water remaining on the surface of the pavement after a precipitation event within 30 minutes.
- 1-2 times per year, use a vacuum sweeper to remove sediment from porous pavement. Use of a power washer or compressed air blower at an angle of 30 degrees or less can be effective.
- As part of vacuuming, inspect adjacent vegetated areas to verify no signs of erosion and run-on to permeable pavement. Repair or replace any damaged structural parts if required.
- Check for debris accumulation, particularly in the winter.
- Loose debris such as leaves or trash can be removed using a power/leaf blower or gutter broom.
- Fall and spring cleanup should be accompanied by pavement vacuuming.
- Accumulation of sediment and organic debris on the pavement surface.
- Repairs to damaged pavement should be repaired as they are identified.

## **13. Invasive Species**

## **Background**

Invasive plants are introduced, alien, or non-native plants, which have been moved by people from their native habitat to a new area. Some exotic plants are imported for human use such as landscaping, erosion control, or food crops. They also can arrive as "hitchhikers" among shipments of other plants, seeds, packing materials, or fresh produce. Some exotic plants become invasive and cause harm by:

- Becoming weedy and overgrown;
- Killing established shade trees;
- Obstructing pipes and drainage systems;
- Forming dense beds in water;
- Lowering water levels in lakes, streams, and wetlands;
- Destroying natural communities;
- Promoting erosion on stream banks and hillsides; and
- Resisting control except by hazardous chemical.

During maintenance activities, check for the presence of invasive plants and remove in a safe manner. They should be controlled as described on the following fact sheet prepared by the University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension entitled Methods for Disposing Non-Native Invasive Plant dated January 2010.

In the event that invasive species are noticed growing in any of the stormwater management practices, the invasive vegetation shall be removed completely to include root matter and disposed of properly. Prior to disposal, the vegetation shall be placed on and completely cover with a plastic tarp for a period of two – three weeks until plants are completely dead. If necessary or to expedite the process, spray only the invasive vegetation and roots with a systemic nonselective herbicide after placement on the tarp (to prevent chemical migration) and then cover.

Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Avenue Exeter, NH

## Annual Report

Description: The owner is responsible to keep an **Inspection & Maintenance Activity Log** that documents inspection, maintenance, and repairs to the storm water management system, and a **Deicing Log** to track the amount and type of deicing material applied to the site. The original owner is responsible to ensure that any subsequent owner (s) have copies of the <u>Stormwater System</u> <u>Operation and Maintenance Plan & Inspection and Maintenance Manual</u>, copies of past logs and check lists. This includes any owner association for potential condominium conversion of the property. The Annual Report will be prepared and submitted to the Town of Exeter DPW upon request.

#### **Disposal Requirements**

Disposal of debris, trash, sediment, and other waste materials should be done at suitable disposal/recycling sites and in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal waste regulations.

## STORMWATER SYSTEM OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLAN

## Inspection & Maintenance Manual Checklist Commercial Development Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Aveune Exeter, NH

BMP / System	Minimum Inspection Frequency	Minimum Inspection Requirements	Maintenance / Cleanout Threshold
Stabilized Construction Entrance	Weekly	Inspect adjacent roadway for sediment tracking Inspect stone for sediment accumulation	Sweep adjacent roadways as soon as sediment is tracked Top dress with additional stone when necessary to prevent tracking
Sediment Control Devices / Barriers	Weekly	Inspect accumulated sediment level, rips, and tears	Repair or replace damaged lengths Remove and dispose of accumulated sediment once level reaches 1/3 of barrier height
Pavement Sweeping	Spring and Fall	Removal of sand and litter from impervious areas	N/A
Litter/Trash Removal	Routinely	Inspect dumpsters, outdoor waste receptacles area, and yard areas, as well as ponds and swale areas.	Site will be free of litter/trash.
Deicing Agents	N/A	N/A	Use salt as the primary agent for roadway safety during winter.
Landscaping	Maintained as required and mulched each Spring	N/A	Trash/debris and weed removal
Drainage Pipes, Catchbasins & Drain Manholes	Spring and Fall	Check for sediment accumulation & clogging.	More than 2" sediment depth
Bioretention Pond	Spring and Fall and after every	Sediment accumulation.	Remove sediment as needed.

	2.5" or rain or	Inspect embankments, inlet	Remove trash & debris from
	greater in a 24-	and outlet structures, and	system and appurtenances.
	hour period	appurtenances.	
		72 Hour drowdown time	Now embankment and
			remove woody vegetation.
			Take corrective measures of
		evaluation.	filtration media if required.
			·
			Remove dead & diseased
			vegetation along with all
		Increase swale	debris; take corrective
	Spring and Fall	vegetation and sediment	measures, reseed and repair
	and after every		grass swale il required.
Infiltration Trench	2.5" of rain or		Mow grass swale.
	greater in a 24-	72-Hour drawdown time	0
	hour period	evaluation and vegetation	Restore infiltration by
		evaluation.	removing accumulated
			sediments and reconstruction
			of the infiltration basin as
			necessary.
			Remove debris from porous
		Check for standing water.	pavement and adjacent areas.
Porous Pavement	Spring and Fall		
		Check for damaged	Vacuum sweep pavement.
		pavement.	Repair damaged pavement
			Ropan admaged pavement.
	Spring and Fall	Check for sediment buildup	Remove excess sediment and
Riprap Outlet	and after every	and displaced stones	trash/debris.
Protection/Level	2.5" of rain or		Immediately repair and
Spreaders	greater in a 24-	Inspect for torn or visible	replace stope and/or fabric ac
	hour period	fabric.	
			necessary.
		Submit Annual Report to	
Annual Report	1 time per year	Town of Exeter Inspector	
		upon request	
1			

Inspection Notes:

## STORMWATER SYSTEM OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLAN

## Inspection & Maintenance Manual Log Form Commercial Development Foss Motors – 127 Portsmouth Aveune Exeter, NH

BMP / System	Date Inspected	Inspected By	Cleaning/Repair (List Items & Comments)	Date Repaired	Repairs Performed By

CHECKLIST FOR INSPECTION	OF BIO	RETENT	TION SYSTEM	
Location:		Insp	ector:	
Date: Time:		Site	Conditions:	
Date Since Last Rain Event:				
Inspection Items	Satisfactor Unsatisfac	ry (S) or tory (U)	Comments/Corrective Action	
1. Initial Inspection After Planting and Mulching				
Plants are stable, roots not exposed:	S	U		
Surface is at design level, typically 4" below overpass:	S	U		
Overflow bypass / inlet (if available) is functional:	S	U		
2. Debris Cleanup (2 times a year minimum, Spring & Fall)				
Litter, leaves, and dead vegetation removed from	S	U		
Prune perennial vegetation:	S	U		
3. Standing Water (1 time a year, After large storm events)	•			
No evidence of standing water after 72 hours:	S	U		
4. Short Circuiting & Erosion (1 times a year, After large storm	events)			
No evidence of animal burrows or other holes:	S	U		
No evidence of erosion:	S	U		
5. Drought Conditions (As needed)				
Water plants as needed:	S	U		
Dead or dying plants:	S	U		
6. Overflow Bypass / Inlet Inspection (1 times a year, After la	irge storm eve	nts)		
No evidence of blockage or accumulated leaves:	S	U		
Good condition, no need for repair:	S	U		
7. Vegetation Coverage (once a year)				
50 % coverage established throughout system by first year:	S	U		
Robust coverage by year 2 or later:	S	U		
8. Mulch Depth (if applicable, once every 2 years)				
Mulch at original design depth after tilling or replacement:	S	U		
9. Vegetation Health (once every 3 years)				
Dead or decaying plants removed from the system:	S	U		
10. Tree Pruning (once every 3 years)				
Prune dead, diseased, or crossing branches:	S	U	-	
Corrective Action Needed			Due Date	
1.				
2.				
3.				

CHECKLIST FOR INSPECTION OF PERMEABLE PAVEMENT				
Location:				
Inspector:	Inspector:			
Date:				
Time:				
Site Conditions:				
Date Since Last Rain Event:				
Inspection Items Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U)			Comments/Corrective Action	
1. Salt / Deicing (Winter/Spring)				
Use salt only for ice management	s	U		
Accumulated salt removed in spring	s	U		
2. Debris Cleanup (1-2 times per year minimum, Spring/Fall)				
Remove sediment and organic debris using vacuum street sweeper	s	U		
Clean catch basins (if available)	s	U		
3. Controlling Run-On				
Adjacent vegetated areas show no signs of erosion and run-on to permeable pavement	s	U		
<ol> <li>Outlet / Catch Basin Inspection (if available) (1-2 times per year, after large storm events)</li> </ol>			n	
No evidence of blockage	S	U		
Good condition, no need for cleaning/repair	s	U		
5. Poorly Drained Pavement				
Recently cleaned and vacuumed S U				
6. Pavement Condition				
No evidence of deterioration	S	U		
7. Signage / Stockpiling (As Needed)				
No evidence of damage	S	U		
Proper signage posted indicating usage for traffic load	S	U		
No stockpiling of materials and other unauthorized uses	s	U		
Corrective Action Needed			Due Date	
1.				
2.				
3.				
Inspector's Signature			Date	

Anti-icing Route Data Form					
Truck Station:					
Date:					
Air Temperature	Pavement Temperature	Relative Humidity	Dew Point	Sky	
Baasan far annlyin					
Reason for applyin	ıg.				
Route:					
Chemical:					
Application Time:					
Application Amour	Application Amount:				
Observation (first day):					
Observation (after event):					
Observation (before next application);					
Name:					



## Methods for Disposing Non-Native Invasive Plants

Prepared by the Invasives Species Outreach Group, volunteers interested in helping people control invasive plants. Assistance provided by the Piscataquog Land Conservancy and the NH Invasives Species Committee. Edited by Karen Bennett, Extension Forestry Professor and Specialist.



Tatarian honeysuckle Lonicera tatarica USDA-NRCS PLANTS Database / Britton, N.L., and A. Brown. 1913. An illustrated flora of the northern United States, Canada and the British Possessions. Vol. 3: 282.

Non-native invasive plants crowd out natives in natural and managed landscapes. They cost taxpayers billions of dollars each year from lost agricultural and forest crops, decreased biodiversity, impacts to natural resources and the environment, and the cost to control and eradicate them.

Invasive plants grow well even in less than desirable conditions such as sandy soils along roadsides, shaded wooded areas, and in wetlands. In ideal conditions, they grow and spread even faster. There are many ways to remove these nonnative invasives, but once removed, care is needed to dispose the removed plant material so the plants don't grow where disposed.

Knowing how a particular plant reproduces indicates its method of spread and helps determine

the appropriate disposal method. Most are spread by seed and are dispersed by wind, water, animals, or people. Some reproduce by vegetative means from pieces of stems or roots forming new plants. Others spread through both seed and vegetative means.

Because movement and disposal of viable plant parts is restricted (see NH Regulations), viable invasive parts can't be brought to most transfer stations in the state. Check with your transfer station to see if there is an approved, designated area for invasives disposal. This fact sheet gives recommendations for rendering plant parts nonviable.

Control of invasives is beyond the scope of this fact sheet. For information about control visit <u>www.nhinvasives.org</u> or contact your UNH Cooperative Extension office.

#### **New Hampshire Regulations**

Prohibited invasive species shall only be disposed of in a manner that renders them nonliving and nonviable. (Agr. 3802.04)

No person shall collect, transport, import, export, move, buy, sell, distribute, propagate or transplant any living and viable portion of any plant species, which includes all of their cultivars and varieties, listed in Table 3800.1 of the New Hampshire prohibited invasive species list. (Agr 3802.01)

## How and When to Dispose of Invasives?

To prevent seed from spreading remove invasive plants before seeds are set (produced). Some plants continue to grow, flower and set seed even after pulling or cutting. Seeds can remain viable in the ground for many years. If the plant has flowers or seeds, place the flowers and seeds in a heavy plastic bag "head first" at the weeding site and transport to the disposal site. The following are general descriptions of disposal methods. See the chart for recommendations by species.

**Burning:** Large woody branches and trunks can be used as firewood or burned in piles. For outside burning, a written fire permit from the local forest fire warden is required unless the ground is covered in snow. Brush larger than 5 inches in diameter can't be burned. Invasive plants with easily airborne seeds like black swallow-wort with mature seed pods (indicated by their brown color) shouldn't be burned as the seeds may disperse by the hot air created by the fire.

**Bagging (solarization):** Use this technique with softertissue plants. Use heavy black or clear plastic bags (contractor grade), making sure that no parts of the plants poke through. Allow the bags to sit in the sun for several weeks and on dark pavement for the best effect.

Tarping and Drying: Pile material on a sheet of plastic



Japanese knotweed Polygonum cuspidatum USDA-NRCS PLANTS Database / Britton, N.L., and A. Brown. 1913. An illustrated flora of the northern United States, Canada and the British Possessions. Vol. 1: 676.

and cover with a tarp, fastening the tarp to the ground and monitoring it for escapes. Let the material dry for several weeks, or until it is clearly nonviable.

Chipping: Use this method for woody plants that don't reproduce vegetatively.

**Burying:** This is risky, but can be done with watchful diligence. Lay thick plastic in a deep pit before placing the cut up plant material in the hole. Place the material away from the edge of the plastic before covering it with more heavy plastic. Eliminate as much air as possible and toss in soil to weight down the material in the pit. Note that the top of the buried material should be at least three feet underground. Japanese knotweed should be at least 5 feet underground!

**Drowning:** Fill a large barrel with water and place soft-tissue plants in the water. Check after a few weeks and look for rotted plant material (roots, stems, leaves, flowers). Well-rotted plant material may be composted. A word of caution- seeds may still be viable after using this method. Do this before seeds are set. This method isn't used often. Be prepared for an awful stink!

**Composting:** Invasive plants can take root in compost. Don't compost any invasives unless you know there is no viable (living) plant material left. Use one of the above techniques (bagging, tarping, drying, chipping, or drowning) to render the plants nonviable before composting. Closely examine the plant before composting and avoid composting seeds.

Be diligent looking for seedlings for years in areas where removal and disposal took place.

## **Suggested Disposal Methods for Non-Native Invasive Plants**

This table provides information concerning the disposal of removed invasive plant material. If the infestation is treated with herbicide and left in place, these guidelines don't apply. Don't bring invasives to a local transfer station, unless there is a designated area for their disposal, or they have been rendered non-viable. This listing includes wetland and upland plants from the New Hampshire Prohibited Invasive Species List. The disposal of aquatic plants isn't addressed.

Woody Plants	Method of Reproducing	Methods of Disposal
Norway maple (Acer platanoides) European barberry (Berberis vulgaris) Japanese barberry (Berberis thunbergii) autumn olive (Elaeagnus umbellata) burning bush (Euonymus alatus)	Fruit and Seeds	<ul> <li>Prior to fruit/seed ripening</li> <li>Seedlings and small plants <ul> <li>Pull or cut and leave on site with roots exposed. No special care needed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Larger plants <ul> <li>Use as firewood.</li> <li>Make a brush pile.</li> <li>Chip.</li> <li>Burn.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Morrow's honeysuckle (Lonicera morrowii) Tatarian honeysuckle (Lonicera tatarica) showy bush honeysuckle (Lonicera x bella) common buckthorn (Rhamnus cathartica) glossy buckthorn (Frangula alnus)		<ul> <li>After fruit/seed is ripe</li> <li>Don't remove from site.</li> <li>Burn.</li> <li>Make a covered brush pile.</li> <li>Chip once all fruit has dropped from branches.</li> <li>Leave resulting chips on site and monitor.</li> </ul>
oriental bittersweet (Celastrus orbiculatus) multiflora rose (Rosa multiflora)	Fruits, Seeds, Plant Fragments	<ul> <li>Prior to fruit/seed ripening</li> <li>Seedlings and small plants</li> <li>Pull or cut and leave on site with roots exposed. No special care needed.</li> <li>Larger plants</li> <li>Make a brush pile.</li> <li>Burn.</li> </ul>
	<b>V</b>	<ul> <li>After fruit/seed is ripe Don't remove from site.</li> <li>Burn.</li> <li>Make a covered brush pile.</li> <li>Chip – only after material has fully dried (1 year) and all fruit has dropped from branches. Leave resulting chips on site and monitor.</li> </ul>

Non-Woody Plants	Method of Reproducing	Methods of Disposal
<pre>garlic mustard (Alliaria petiolata) spotted knapweed (Centaurea maculosa) • Sap of related knapweed can cause skin irritation and tumors. Wear gloves when handling. black swallow-wort (Cynanchum nigrum) • May cause skin rash. Wear gloves and long sleeves when handling. pale swallow-wort (Cynanchum rossicum) giant hogweed (Heracleum mantegazzianum) • Can cause major skin rash. Wear gloves and long sleeves when handling. dame's rocket (Hesperis matronalis) perennial pepperweed (Lepidium latifolium) purple loosestrife (Lythrum salicaria) Japanese stilt grass (Microstegium vimineum) mile-a-minute weed (Polygonum perfoliatum)</pre>	Fruits and Seeds	<ul> <li>Prior to flowering Depends on scale of infestation Small infestation <ul> <li>Pull or cut plant and leave on site with roots exposed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Large infestation <ul> <li>Pull or cut plant and pile. (You can pile onto or cover with plastic sheeting).</li> <li>Monitor. Remove any re-sprouting material.</li> </ul> </li> <li>During and following flowering <ul> <li>Do nothing until the following year or remove flowering heads and bag and let rot.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Small infestation <ul> <li>Pull or cut plant and leave on site with roots exposed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Large infestation <ul> <li>Pull or cut plant and leave on site with roots exposed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Large infestation <ul> <li>Pull or cut plant and pile remaining material. (You can pile onto plastic or cover with plastic sheeting).</li> <li>Monitor. Remove any re-sprouting material.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
common reed ( <i>Phragmites australis</i> ) Japanese knotweed ( <i>Polygonum cuspidatum</i> ) Bohemian knotweed ( <i>Polygonum x bohemicum</i> )	Fruits, Seeds, Plant Fragments Primary means of spread in these species is by plant parts. Although all care should be given to preventing the dispersal of seed during control activities, the presence of seed doesn't materially influence disposal activities.	<ul> <li>Small infestation <ul> <li>Bag all plant material and let rot.</li> <li>Never pile and use resulting material as compost.</li> <li>Burn.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Large infestation <ul> <li>Remove material to unsuitable habitat (dry, hot and sunny or dry and shaded location) and scatter or pile.</li> <li>Monitor and remove any sprouting material.</li> <li>Pile, let dry, and burn.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

January 2010

UNH Cooperative Extension programs and policies are consistent with pertinent Federal and State laws and regulations, and prohibits discrimination in its programs, activities and employment on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran's, marital or family status. College of Life Sciences and Agriculture, County Governments, NH Dept. of Resources and Economic Development, Division of Forests and Lands, NH Fish and Game ,and U.S. Dept. of Agriculture cooperating.

# Appendix IV

Plans



