June 26, 2023

Linda Hansen
Conservation Administrator
Wayland Conservation Commission
Wayland Town Hall
41 Cochituate Road
Wayland, MA 01778

Re: 2nd Stormwater Peer Review
Herb Chambers 533 Boston Post Road, LLC
533 Boston Post Road, Wayland, MA
DEP File No.322-1006

Dear Ms. Hansen and Commission Members:

This letter is being submitted in response to the 2nd peer review comments provided by the Horsley Witten Group, Inc. (HW) via email on June 13, 2023, regarding the Herb Chambers Bentley, Lamborghini, Rolls Royce, Maserati, Alfa Romeo - 533 Boston Post Road / Route 20, Wayland, Massachusetts. Crocker Design Group, LLC (CDG) offers the following response to the comments below.

The original comments provided by HW from May 1, 2023, are indicated below in standard text and CDG's response in **bold** *text*. The comments provided during the 2nd peer review from June 13, 2023, are indicated below in *italic* text, followed by CDG's response in **bold** text, dated June 26, 2023.

Stormwater Review

HW reviewed the proposed stormwater management design per the requirements of the Massachusetts Stormwater Management Handbook (MSH) dated February 2008 and the Stormwater and Land Disturbance Bylaw Regulations for the Town of Wayland (Stormwater Bylaw) adopted in 2019.

The proposed project is required to comply with the most recent version of the MSH, therefore, we used the MSH as the basis for organizing our comments. However, in instances where the additional criteria listed under the Town of Wayland Stormwater Bylaw require further recommendations, we referenced these as well.

1. *Standard 1: No new stormwater conveyances (e.g. outfalls) may discharge untreated stormwater directly to or cause erosion in wetlands or waters of the Commonwealth.*
    a. The existing and proposed stormwater management for the Site discharges into an existing BVW located along the southerly lot line. The Applicant proposes a riprap overflow around wetland flag (WF) WF4 and WF5 to avoid erosion and sedimentation transport into the wetlands. It appears that the proposed grading between WF4 and WF7 crosses the property boundary. HW recommends that the Applicant revise the proposed grading or provide the appropriate signatures to allow the grading on the adjacent property.

        CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The applicant owns both properties. Any necessary documentation

needed for approval of the temporary grading and disturbance will be provided.

June 13, 2023: The applicant has stated that both properties are owned by the Applicant.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

b. The Applicant provided the sizing calculations for a Preformed Scour Hole or plunge pool in Section 4.4 - Rip Rap Splash Pad of the Stormwater Report. HW was not able to confirm the 25-year flow rate listed in the Scour Hole Calculation table. Furthermore, there appear to be two separate 15-inch pipes discharging to the plunge pool compared to one 18-inch pipe as shown in the table. HW recommends that the Applicant revise the calculations provided to be consistent with the design plans.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The plunge pool calculation has been updated to incorporate the two outfall pipes and the 25-year storm event flow rates for each. See Section 4.5 of the revised stormwater report for the revised plunge pool calculations.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has revised the Rip Rap Splash Pad calculations. HW recommends that the Applicant clarify the stone listed as D50 proposed on the detail included on Sheet C9-1.

CDG Response 06/26/23: The Rip Rap Splash Pad Detail on Sheet C9-1 has been updated to call out the stone listed as D50.

c. As recommended by the Applicant the riprap / level spreader / plunge pool should be inspected after the first large storm event to inspect for erosion and to verify the stone size is adequate. HW recommends that the Conservation Commission consider requiring this inspection as a Special Condition and to provide documentation to the Commission confirming the outfall is operating properly.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has no issue with this suggested Condition.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

d. The Applicant is piping the existing and proposed roof runoff directly to the wetland at Outfall #2. Roof runoff is considered clean, so the Applicant is not required to provide pretreatment. The Applicant provided a Storm Sewer Profile for the various closed pipe networks. It does not appear that the Applicant has added the roof drainpipe to the drain network after outlet control structure (OCS) #3, at drain manhole (DMH) #8. HW recommends that the Applicant revisit the closed drainage network and include the runoff from the roof as part of the proposed flow. Furthermore, HW recommends thatthe Applicant clarify the total proposed velocity including the roof runoff discharging at Outfall #1 and Outfall #2 into the plunge pool to confirm there will be no erosion in the wetlands.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The closed drainage network has been revised to incorporate the runoff from the roof. The pipe size has been revised from a 15" HDPE to an 18" HDPE Pipe. See Section 7 of the revised stormwater report.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has revised the pipe sizing calculations to incorporate the roof runoff. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

2. *Standard 2: Stormwater management systems shall be designed so that post-development peak discharge rates do not exceed pre-development peak discharge rates.*

The Applicant described the Existing (Pre-Development) and the Proposed (Post-Development) catchment areas, surface conditions, and discharge values provided in the Stormwater Report for the Site. Furthermore, the Applicant utilized the HydroCAD software program which incorporates the TR55/TR-20 methodology for hydrologic analysis.

a. The Applicant utilized an exfiltration rate under proposed conditions of 1.02 inches per hour (iph). The borings conducted by Northeast Geotech and included in the Stormwater Report indicate that the soils are primarily loamy sand consistent with Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) "B". The exfiltration rate of 1.02 iph is considered reasonable for the design. No further action required.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

   June 13, 2023: No further action required.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

b. The Applicant has proposed a rain garden to capture the runoff from watershed P1-D. PI-D includes approximately 1,500 sf of impervious cover from the rear driveway. The Applicant has not included the rain garden in its HydroCAD model which may be considered conservative. However, the Applicant does not document that the rain garden is properly sized to manage the impervious cover directed towards it. HW recommends that the Applicant provide the sizing calculations for the rain garden. HW further recommends that the Applicant confirm that no runoff from the adjacent property to the west flows onto the site and into this rain garden.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The Stormwater Report has been revised to show the rain garden has been adequately sized to treat the water quality storm events for the small drainage area that is captured by the rain garden. See section 4.6 Rain Garden Sizing of the revised Stormwater Report for sizing calculations. Also, the adjacent property drains to two catch basins at an oil/water separator near the property line on the adjacent property. The proposed highpoint is at the property line to keep all runoff from the adjacent property, on the adjacent property.

   June 13, 2023: The Applicant has provided the sizing calculations for the rain garden and confirmed that the adjacent property does not flow onto this site. HW has no further comment.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

c. HW recommends that the Applicant provide a list of the plant species, sizes, and number of plants proposed for the rain garden.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The landscape plan has been revised to incorporate a list of plant species, sizes, and number of plants proposed in the rain garden. See Sheet L-1 for more information in the revised site development plan set.

   June 13, 2023: The Applicant has provided the information requested on Sheet L-1. HW has no further comment.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

d. It appears that the Applicant has modelled an 18-inch pipe as the primary outflow from Pond UG-3. The plan set has labeled this pipe as a 15-inch. HW recommends that the Applicant revise the plans or the calculations for consistency.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: We have revised the plans to be consistent with the calculations

performed. The plan set now shows an 18-inch HDPE pipe.

June 13, 2023: The applicant has revised the plan as suggested. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

e. A majority of the existing paved surface and building located within the Town of Wayland will be captured and treated by a series of deep sump catch basins followed by proprietary water quality units before conveyance to a sub-surface detention or infiltration practice. The pavement area along the north and east side of the building is proposed to be collected via deep sump catch basins followed by proprietary water quality units and subsequently detained in two subsurface chamber systems. UG#1, UG#2, and UG#3 all discharge to the resource area via a level spreader. A small area of the proposed driveway at the southwest corner will be directed in a rain raingarden. The proposed infiltration practice and rain garden are considered Low Impact Development practices and will manage stormwater at the source of impervious cover for a portion of the property. No further action required.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

June 13, 2023: No further action required.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

f. There appear to be minor inconsistencies with the time of concentrations noted in the report as compared to the HydroCAD calculations. The discrepancy should not affect the calculations. No further action required.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

June 13, 2023: No further action required.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

g. It appears there will be approximately 290 sf of proposed impervious cover within the 30-foot buffer zone, not including the riprap plunge pool. The Applicant will be removing approximately 2,330 sf of impervious material from within the 30-foot buffer. HW defers to the Conservation Commission the allowance of the proposed 290 sf of impervious area. HW notes that there are 8 parking spaces within this area.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

June 13, 2023: HW defers to the Conservation Commission regarding the allowance of 290 sf of impervious area within the 30-foot buffer zone.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

h. The proposed erosion controls around the proposed plunge pool are on the adjacent property. As noted above HW recommends that the Applicant provide the appropriate documentation from the abutting property owner allowing the proposed work.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The abutting property is owned by the applicant. The applicant will provide any documentation showing the allowance of the proposed temporary erosion controls and grading on the adjacent property.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has stated that the two properties have the same owner.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

i. It appears that the HydroCAD model for the ½-inch and 1-inch storms are incorrectly

modeled. The water quality storm events should not be modeled with a weighted curve number. The ½-inch storm requires a depth of ½-inch and the 1-inch storm a depth of 1-inch. HW recommends that the Applicant revisit these storm events to confirm the runoff depths are accurately modeled.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: CDG has revised the HydroCAD model to confirm the ½-inch and 1-inch storm events are modeled correctly. See the revised stormwater report for more information.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has provided the revised HydroCAD model or the ½ inch and 1-inch storm events. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

3. *Standard 3 requires that the annual recharge from the post-development site shall approximate the annual recharge from pre-development conditions based on soil type.*

   a. The Applicant has included a Boring/Test Pit Plan indicating that 16 test borings were conducted throughout the Site. Borings B-11 and B-12, and test pits 21-01D and 21-02D were conducted in the general location of the proposed infiltration system, UG#3. Based on the Boring/Test Pit Plan the average Estimated Seasonal High Groundwater (ESHGW) is at elevation 119.3. However, it is common practice to use the highest recorded reading for design purposes within the footprint of the system (elevation 119.8 at Boring B-11). The proposed subsurface infiltration chambers have a bottom of stone elevation of 120.50 (Sheet C-5). As such, the required 2 feet of separation to the ESHGW table is not maintained. The detail sheet has conflicting information with a bottom of stone elevation at 121.00. Additionally, boring B-12 indicates an organic loam layer at a 5-foot depth. HW recommends that the bottom of the system be raised to provide the required 2 feet of separation and that the organic layer be completely removed prior to the installation of the infiltration practice and that clean fill material be placed below the system with an infiltration rate of at least 1.02 iph.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The bottom of the system has been raised to 121.80, providing 2 feet of separation. Please note the stone layer at the base of the chamber system is not accounted for in our HydroCAD model and is specified to provide a stable base to install the concrete chambers on and prevent future settlement. Also, a note has been added to the detail sheet calling for the organic loam layer to be excavated and removed and the system be backfilled with clean, granular fill with an infiltration rate of at least 1.02 iph.

   June 13, 2023: The Applicant has raised the bottom elevation of UG#3 and added a note to remove the organic layer beneath the system. HW has no further comment.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

   b. Per MSH, Volume 3, a mounding analysis is required when the vertical separation from the bottom of the exfiltration system to the seasonal high groundwater table is less than four feet and the recharge system is proposed to attenuate the peak discharge from a 10-year or higher 24-hour storm. HW recommends that the Applicant provide the required mounding analysis.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: A mounding analysis has been performed for the infiltration system and the results of that analysis have been included in Section 4 of the revised stormwater report. The results of the analysis showed the water table does not intercept the bottom of the system.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has provided a mounding analysis in the Stormwater Report as requested. HW recommends that the Applicant clarify how the depth of 72 feet used for the saturated thickness was determined. HW notes that the deepest boring on the site was to a depth of 31 feet.

CDG Response 06/26/23: The soils borings performed did not extend to the depth of bedrock. As such, CDG performed research with the MassDEP Well Database. The Well Database provided a well at 480 Boston Post Road in Wayland indicating bedrock was 144 feet below grade. Also, we note provided well information for the surrounding properties. The Well Database included mostly shallow wells (30 to 40 ft) and did not list that bedrock was encountered. As a result, CDG used the 144 feet to bedrock found at 480 Boston Post Road and applied a factor of safety of 2.0 yielding a saturated thickness of 72 feet for our mounding analysis.

c. The Applicant has proposed two subsurface detention basins and one subsurface infiltration system. The detention basins appear to be placed approximately 1.5 feet above groundwater therefore cannot qualify as infiltration systems. HW suggests that the Applicant allow these systems to infiltrate therefore providing the benefits of recharge without taking credit for infiltration because the systems do not meet the design criteria.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Systems UG-1 and UG-2 have been revised to allow for infiltration and we have not taken credit for infiltration in our HydroCAD model or our recharge calculations.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has agreed to allow the two detention basins to infiltrate without taking any additional credit. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

4. *Standard 4 requires that the stormwater management system be designed to remove 80% Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and be sized to capture the required water quality volume from the tributary area (Town of Wayland - 1.0-inch).*

   a. The Applicant provided the water quality flow calculations in accordance with the Standard Method to Convert Required Water Quality Volume to a Discharge Rate for Sizing Flow Based Manufactured Proprietary Stormwater Treatment Practices. HW is satisfied that the Applicant has provided the required 1-inch of water quality volume for the proposed development. No further action required.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

   June 13, 2023: No further action required.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

   b. The Applicant provided the required TSS calculation sheets. No further action required.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

   June 13, 2023: No further action required.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

5. *Standard 5 is related to projects with Land Uses having Higher Potential Pollutant Loads (LUHPPL).*

a. The proposed project is an expansion to a car dealership and service center. A LUHPPL includes exterior fleet storage areas, exterior vehicle service and equipment cleaning areas, and commercial vehicle washing. HW agrees with the Applicant that the property use is not considered fleet storage. However, we recommend that the property owner and on-site management provide a signed letter to the Conservation Commission documenting that it understands that activities including exterior vehicle service, equipment cleaning, and commercial vehicle washing are not allowed on this property. The Conservation Commission may choose to include receipt of this letter as a Special Condition. HW notes that the O&M Plan includes a paragraph regarding activities prohibited on site. A signed O&M Plan provided to the Town may be adequate to address this comment.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The O&M Plan has been revised to say the exterior fleet storage areas, exterior vehicle service and equipment cleaning areas, and commercial vehicle washing are prohibited on the site.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has revised the O&M Plan to specifically exclude the exterior fleet cleaning areas under Activities Prohibited on Site. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

b. HW received a report, titled *Continuing Chapter 21E Investigation / LSP Opinion for the Commercial property, 533 Boston Post Road, Wayland, MA RTN #3-3351,* prepared by T.S. Alving and Associates, dated July 31, 1996. The report notes that levels of certain volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were identified in the groundwater adjacent to the south side of the building. HW recommends that the Applicant confirm that the proposed infiltration system can be installed as designed with the potential of contaminated soil or groundwater in the area. HW further recommends that the soil is characterized at the bottom of bed excavation to ensure the underlying soils meet the leachability criteria.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The Continuing Chapter 21E Investigation / LSP Opinion for the Commercial property, 533 Boston Post Road, Wayland, MA RTN #3-3351, prepared by T.S. Alving and Associates, dated July 31, 1996, has been reviewed by CDG and we have notified the applicant of the findings. The applicant has retained the services of BL Companies to perform additional testing of the soils below the proposed infiltration system. If the test results yield soils above RCS-1 criteria, then the applicant will remove and dispose of the material at a certified facility for the given soils encountered. The applicant will then backfill the excavated area with clean, granular fill. If the test results of the soils beneath the system yield less than RCS-1, the infiltration system will be installed as shown on the design plans. This approach allows for the subsurface infiltration system to be installed as designed regardless of the results of the environmental testing scheduled to take place.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has agreed to retain the services of BL Companies to direct any necessary removal of contaminated material and the installation of the infiltration system. The Conservation Commission may choose to include receipt of the recommendations of the LSP as a condition of approval.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

6. *Standard 6 is related to projects with stormwater discharging into a critical area, a Zone II or an Interim Wellhead Protection Area of a public water supply.*

a. There are no critical areas associated with this project. However, the proposed

plunge pool discharges into an area designated by NHESP as Priority Habitat of Rare Species. A portion of the project site is located adjacent to the Great Meadows National Wildlife Refuge and is mapped within Estimated Habitat of Rare Wildlife (EH 1038) and Priority Habitat of Rare Species (PH 1436). The Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) is the regulatory authority with respect to rare species habitat, and the Applicant is required to file a copy of the NOI with NHESP if work is to occur within rare species habitat. The Applicant provided a copy of the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife response letter dated January 16, 2019, which states that the proposed project will not adversely affect the actual Resource Area.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

June 13, 2023: No further action required.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

7. *Standard 7 is related to projects considered Redevelopment.*

   a. The existing site includes 76,513 sf of impervious cover. The proposed site includes 89,481 sf. The project qualifies as a mix of new development and redevelopment. The Applicant intends to design the stormwater system to meet the requirements for new development and in doing so will improve the existing stormwater management. HW recommends that the Applicant adequately address the other comments in this letter to confirm compliance with Standard 7.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

   June 13, 2023: No further action required.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

8. *Standard 8 requires a plan be developed and implemented to control construction related impacts including erosion, sedimentation, or other pollutant sources.*

   a. The Applicant provided a Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan (Sheet C-3.1) and erosion control details (Sheet C-3.2). HW recommends that dewatering locations be shown on Sheet C-3.1 to ensure they are not located within the 100-foot buffer zone.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Dewatering locations have been added to Sheet C-3.1. All are located outside the 100 foot buffer to the wetlands.

   June 13, 2023: The Applicant has added a note regarding dewatering on Sheet C-3.2. HW has no further comment.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

   b. Notes should be added indicating “no concrete washout is permitted on-site” or provide detail and location for a contained concrete washout area.

   CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The note “no concrete washout is permitted on-site” has been added to the plans.

   June 13, 2023: The Applicant has stated that a note has been added. However, HW was not able to locate it.

   CDG Response 06/26/23: See General Plan Notes Sheet C1-1 for the note on “no concrete washout is permitted on-site”

c. The Limit of Work (LOW) line is not clear at the northeast corner of the property. Additionally, the LOW line runs through an 18-inch diameter tree. The LOW should be adjusted to encompass the projection of the tree canopy for erosion control.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The limit of work line has been revised to encompass the projection of the tree canopy for erosion control.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has revised the LOW line as suggested. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

d. The proposed project requires land disturbance of greater than 1 acre. Therefore, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) per the EPA NPDES Construction General Permit will be required. HW recommends that the Applicant provide a copy of the SWPPP to the Town a minimum of 14 days prior to land disturbance.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: We have included a draft SWPPP with our application and will provide the Town with a copy of the finalized SWPPP at least 14 days prior to any land disturbance on site.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has submitted a draft SWPPP. The Conservation Commission may choose to require receipt of a final signed SWPP a minimum of 14 days prior to land disturbance.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

9. *Standard 9 requires a Long-Term Operation and Maintenance (O & M) Plan is developed and implemented to ensure that the stormwater management system functions as designed.*

a. The Applicant provided an Operations and Maintenance Plan (O&M Plan) within the Stormwater Report. HW reminds the Applicant that this document should be a separately bound document that is signed by the Property Owner and provided to the on-site management.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The O&M Plan is now bound as a separate document.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has provided a revised O&M Plan. The Conservation Commission may choose to require receipt of a signed version prior to land disturbance.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

b. HW recommends that the Applicant include maintenance of the rain garden in the O&M Plan.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The O&M Plan now includes the maintenance of the rain garden.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has included maintenance of the rain garden as suggested. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

c. The Town of Wayland requires applicants to incorporate source controls of contaminants to minimize stormwater pollution. The Applicant must be fully aware that the site operations for a car dealership are critical. In the event of a spill on this property the necessary procedures must be in place to avoid any contaminants from getting into the resource area.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: The site will be equipped with spill kits to handle a spill on this property to avoid any contaminants from getting into the resource area.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has included a section on Hazardous Waste and Spill Control Containment in the O&M Plan. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

d. HW recommends that the Applicant include a simple sketch that clearly labels all stormwater practices included in the O&M Plan.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: A map showing and labeling all stormwater practices has been included in the O&M Plan.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has included a simple sketch as suggested. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

e. HW recommends that the Applicant designate snow storage areas suitable for the parking lot on the O&M sketch.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Snow Storage has been added to the O&M Site Plan that is included in the O&M Plan.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has designated snow storage on the sketch included in the O&M Plan. HW has no further comment.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

10. Standard 10 requires an Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement be provided.

a. The Applicant has provided an unsigned Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement in accordance with Standard 10. HW recommends that the Conservation Commission require receipt of a signed statement from the property owner prior to land disturbance.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: A signed illicit discharge statement has been included in the revised Stormwater Report.

June 13, 2023: The Applicant has provided an Illicit Discharge Statement signed by the engineer. The statement should be signed by the Property Owner. HW recommends that the Conservation Commission require receipt of a signed statement from the property owner prior to land disturbance.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

11. Additional Comments:

a. The Applicant has provided a Planting Plan, Sheet L-1. The Applicant intends to remove one 26-inch tree, an 18-inch tree, and an 8-inch tree. The Applicant has proposed to plant 3 deciduous trees, 59 junipers, and 379 shrub plantings. The planting plan meets the Wayland Conservation Commission Replacement Planting Guidelines.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

June 13, 2023: No further comment required.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged

b. The Existing Conditions Plan illustrates the Limit of the Town of Wayland Floodplain District at elevation 124 as well as the 100-year flood plain designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) at elevation 121.

CDG RESPONSE 6/9/23: Acknowledged.

June 13, 2023: No further comment required.

CDG Response 06/26/23: Acknowledged.

Should you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact David Newhall, P.E. at dnewhall@crockerdesigngroup.com or 781-919-0808. We look forward to presenting to the Commission at the upcoming hearing on Wednesday June 28, 2023.

Sincerely,
Crocker Design Group LLC

David Newhall P.E.
Project Manager