# MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Nell Donaldson, Planner

**FROM:** David Senus, P.E.

**DATE:** September 18, 2013

**RE:** Bay House Phase II, Final Level III Site Plan Application

Woodard & Curran has reviewed the Final Level III Site Plan/Subdivision Application and response to comments letter for the proposed second phase of the Bay House development located on Newbury Street in Portland, Maine. The project consists of developing a 39 unit, four story residential building.

**Documents Reviewed by W&C**

* Cover Letter with Final Level III Site Plan Application attachments dated September 17, 2013, prepared by Sebago Technics on behalf of 113 Newbury Street, LLC.
* Engineering Plans, Sheets 1-14, dated September 17, 2013, prepared by Sebago Technics on behalf of 113 Newbury Street, LLC.

**Comments**

1. The isolator row callout for the below grade storage system on Sheet 6 appears to be pointing to an adjacent row; not the isolator row.
2. Sheet 14 contains a detail for an “Optional Inspection Port” for the Stormtech chambers. Please clarify the number and location of inspection ports for the storage system.
3. The Grading and Utility Plan (Sheet 6) proposes a “4-inch Tree Pit Underdrain” below the sidewalk along Newbury Street. Upon consultation with City Arborist and DPS staff, unless there is a project-specific design reason for this underdrain, please remove this notation on the plan and the associated detail on Sheet 13.
4. The detail for CB#1 on Sheet 14 should include a grated cover on “Side A” of the catch basin; all other covers on CB#1 and OCS#1 should be solid covers.
5. Review of Stormwater Model – Clarification for Project Record (No Revisions Required): The HydroCAD stormwater model indicates that Pond 5P (Proposed Stormtech Chamber) will have 0 CFS discharge out of the “Primary Outflow” for the 1 year storm event (2.5” event); however, an overall peak discharge rate is reported for the Pond. This appears to be a result of the Reach Routing method utilized in the model. Other routing methods, when utilized in the model, report discharge from the “Primary Outflow” of Pond 5P during the 1 year storm event.

Very little change in overall discharge rate is realized at downstream points regardless of the routing method utilized. As such, there is no need to change or revise the model. We note this for the project record, no revisions are required.