

August 16, 2024

To: Mr. Gregory Rondeau, Chairman
Town of Franklin Planning Board
355 East Central Street
Franklin, MA 02038

A&M Project #: 1362-25
Re: 6 Forge Parkway
Industrial Building
Response to Review Comments

Copy: Donegal, LLC

Dear Mr. Rondeau,

Allen & Major (A&M) is in receipt of review comments from the BETA Group, Inc., dated July 10 for the above referenced project. Please find A&M's responses to these comments below. The most recent comments are provided along with A&M's responses in **bold**. For ease of review, comments that have been addressed are omitted.

BETA Group, Inc.:

P6. Plans have been revised to minimize encroachment for entering vehicles, show a high visibility crosswalk, show revised driveway limits so trucks don't traverse the sidewalk, and exiting movements have been provided. Turning movements for the exiting WB-67 design vehicle show significant encroachment into the opposing travel lane in the site driveway as well as Forge Parkway for a right-hand turn. Left-hand turning movements, which are not anticipated to be frequent, are shown traversing the raised median on Forge Parkway. As currently designed, the proposed driveway is not adequate to accommodate the WB-67 design vehicle.

A&M Response: Updated truck turning plans have been submitted and are based upon discussions with BETA. The northern side of the existing driveway has been increased further to allow for additional clearances for truck movements. Based upon the updated plans, all truck movements, both ingress and egress do not impact the clear path of travel for cars in the opposing movements.

SW8: New test pits conducted within the limits of Infiltration System 2 indicate estimated seasonal high groundwater at elevations 265.3 (TP-102, weeping) and 266.9 (TP-103, redox). Revise the system, which currently has a proposed bottom of stone elevation of 266.0, to provide a minimum of 2 feet of separation to groundwater.

A&M: TP-102, TP-103 and TP-104 have been shown on the plans based upon field survey information and the surface elevation are representative of this. Based upon comparison of the frimpter analysis of the conducted test pits without redox features and weeping only, the data was not consistent with information gathered from other test pits which exhibited redox features. For Infiltration System 2 you have two good data points from Redox features that show adequate separation of the system. We understand that should conditions change in the field during construction that alternate measures may be warranted.

SW9: Test Pit TP-101 indicates that groundwater was encountered at elevation 271.3 with no redox features noted. Additional information (e.g. frimpter analysis or well data) should be provided to support that the observed groundwater elevation is representative of the estimated seasonal high. BETA notes that no groundwater was encountered at the elevation of the redox features identified in TP-103.

A&M: Based upon comparison of the frimpter analysis of the conducted test pits without redox features and weeping only, the data was not consistent with information gathered from other test pits which exhibited redox features. Based upon this comparison, it is our professional opinion that the weeping encountered within the test pits is consistent with water level elevations throughout the site and should be utilized to determine the ESHWT.

Very Truly Yours,

ALLEN & MAJOR ASSOCIATES, INC



Michael A. Malynowski, PE - Senior Project Manager

Attachments:

1. Site Development Plans, revised as of August 15, 2024
2. Architectural Elevations & Renderings
3. Groundwater evaluation calculations