



January 8, 2025

Breeka Li Goodlander, PWS, CERPIT
Conservation Director
Town of Franklin Conservation Commission
355 East Central Street
Franklin, MA 02038

**Re: 1199 West Central Street - Garelick Farms
MassDEP File No. CE 159-1322
Response to Peer Review 2**

Dear Ms. Goodlander:

On behalf of the Applicant, Dandreo Brothers General Contractors, Tighe & Bond is submitting the following response to peer review comments in support of the proposed Drainage Resiliency Improvement Project at 1199 West Central Street in Franklin, Massachusetts at the existing Garelick Farms facility. The peer review of the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted to the Franklin Conservation Commission was prepared by BETA, in a letter dated November 20, 2025. Tighe & Bond provided a response to comments, accompanied by supporting documentation and plan changes in a package to the Commission dated December 4, 2025. BETA provided a response to that package in correspondence dated December 30, 2025. The following letter identifies the comments presented in the follow-up peer review letter. Any comment requiring additional discussion is provided in bold lettering.

Plan and General Comments

A1. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) has not issued a file number as of this writing.

Tighe & Bond Response (T&B): MassDEP issued a file number the same day as BETA's letter without comment. The File No. is CE 159-1322.

A2. The following elements are missing from the provided Plan Set:

- a. A north arrow reference should be provided on the plans per Bylaw Regulations Section 7.18.1.3.

T&B: This information has been added to the plan set.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

- b. Existing and proposed vegetation referenced in Bylaw Regulation Section 7.18.1.5 and 7.18.1.6 should be included on the plans, including individual trees/shrubs with a diameter greater than 1" proposed for removal. It is BETA's understanding that the Commission generally increases the size threshold for tree location based on the Project and therefore defers to the Commission on this matter. The existing and proposed tree line should be shown, and the proposed trees located along the limits of trenching should be qualified as being either removed or retained.

T&B: This information has been added to the plan set.

BETA2: Comment remains. The existing/proposed conditions tree lines are not depicted along the northern portion of the Site adjacent to the 1A Wetland Series where trees are present. The existing conditions plan appears to show a tree line in this area, but it does not encompass the locations of the individual trees that are depicted. The site plans depict a tree line in this area with a proposed conditions line weight, but it does not appear to correlate with the proposed clearing for the headwall. The tree lines should be revised as appropriate.

T&B2: The existing/proposed tree lines have been added to the project plans in the area of the proposed drainage pipe and outfall installation. A note has been added on sheet C-102 to indicate that brush will be cleared within the limit of work in the area. The proposed condition tree line referred to in BETA's second round review comment appears to be the revision cloud used to indicate changes throughout various iterations of plan sets. To clarify the difference, revision clouds have been changed to purple.

- c. A Construction Sequence with all proposed activities within Jurisdictional Areas should be provided on the plans per Bylaw Regulations Section 7.18.1.14.

T&B: This information has been added to the plan set on sheet G-003.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

- d. A PLS stamp should be provided on the existing conditions plan.

T&B: The existing conditions plan was not based solely on a land survey provided by a Professional Land Surveyor. Additional data sources, including site plans provided by Garelick Farms, drone survey, partial survey of the existing drainage infrastructure, ground-penetrating radar information, and MassDOT plans were referenced in the development of site plans. We request a waiver of this requirement.

BETA2: BETA defers to the Commission on the requirement to include a PLS stamp on the existing conditions plan.

- e. A PLS stamp should be provided on the existing conditions plan.

T&B: The existing conditions plan was not based solely on a land survey provided by a Professional Land Surveyor. We request a waiver of this requirement.

No response from BETA.

- f. A survey benchmark should be provided on the plans.

T&B: A benchmark has been added to sheets C-102 and C-201.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

Resource Area Boundary Comments

W1. BETA completed a review of the onsite Bank/MAHW and BVW delineation. Bank/MAHW is apparent based on topographic relief and has been accurately delineated. In addition, BETA concurs with the BVW delineation depicted on the plans and located along the 1B/1C Series stream. Generally, the BVW was observed at the toe of slope, where vegetation communities changed from FACU/FAC species to FAC/FACW/Obligate species. Soils within the wetland were observed to have apparent depletions/redoximorphic concentrations and qualifies as a Depleted Under Dark Surface indicator. No other additional areas of BVW were observed at the Site within 100 feet of the proposed work.

T&B: No response required.

Construction Comments

W2. Erosion and sedimentation controls should be depicted on either side of the limits of work throughout the Buffer Zone / RA and downgradient of the proposed plantings within Buffer Zone / RA.

T&B: Erosion and sediment controls have been added to the plan set per the above recommendations.

BETA2: Erosion controls are now depicted along the limits of work throughout the Buffer Zone/RA in locations that will prevent sedimentation to Resource Areas. The Commission could consider including a Special Condition requiring additional erosion controls to be kept on Site to ensure that additional controls can be installed if deemed necessary.

T&B2: The Applicant is amenable to such a condition.

W3. Proposed erosion and sedimentation controls include use of silt fence and straw wattles. Silt fence and straw are not permitted erosion control measures in the Town of Franklin (Pg. 13 of Town of Franklin Best Development Practices Guidebook). The Applicant should coordinate with the Conservation Commission to determine the appropriate erosion control measures for the Site. Twelve (12)-inch diameter compost filter tubes may be an appropriate option commensurate with the scope of the Project.

T&B: Page 13 of the Town of Franklin Best Development Practices Guidebook states that "The Conservation Commission only allows the use of straw wattles and filter mitts as erosion control barriers." The erosion control detail has been revised to remove the silt fence component of the erosion control system, as reflected on sheet C-501, and straw wattles are proposed for erosion and sediment control.

BETA2: BETA defers to the Commission on the approval of the use of straw wattles as erosion controls, as they have discouraged their use in recent years. The use of silt fence and hay/straw bales is referenced within the soil stockpile detail on page C-501 within Section 3.3 of the O&M Plan and should be revised accordingly.

T&B2: The detail on sheet C-501 has been revised to indicate the use of compost filter tubes, and the O&M Plan has been updated to remove references to straw wattles.

W4. Resource Area impacts (both permanent and temporary) should be clearly depicted on the plans. The Applicant should confirm if Bank impacts are required as work (including limits of work/erosion and sedimentation control installation) appears to overlap with Bank along flag 1F- 3.

T&B: The project plans show all permanent and temporary work proposed within resource area buffer zones. Erosion controls are the only impacts proposed within 1 foot of the Bank in the area referenced above and impacts to the Bank itself are not anticipated as a result of erosion control installation and removal. Impacts associated with grading in the vicinity will be limited to areas upland of the resource area. Direct impacts to the Bank are not anticipated.

BETA2: This comment has been addressed with regard to potential Bank impacts. However, the depiction of Resource Area impacts on the plans has not been addressed. In lieu of callouts, the Applicant could consider including the impacts table from the comment response letter on the plans.

T&B2: A summary of resource area impacts table has been added to the plans on sheet C-201.

W5. The limit of existing pavement and vegetated shoulder should be labeled on the plans adjacent to the location where work is proposed.

T&B: Labels have been added to the Site Plans for the limits of existing pavement and vegetative shoulders. See sheet C-102.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

Mitigation Comments

W6. The Applicant should state if vegetation will be removed within Resource Areas or Buffer Zone to complete the Project. Vegetation was observed in the locations where the headwall, outfall, and portions of the pipe are proposed.

T&B: Selective clearing and grubbing of vegetation will be required within Buffer Zone for the installation of the proposed headwall, outfall, and portions of proposed pipe. Removal of trees is not anticipated to be required for this work. A callout has been added to the drawings on sheet C-201 to identify this work.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

W7. Provide specifications of the proposed seed mixture(s) for stabilization of disturbed areas within Buffer Zone and RA on the plans.

T&B: The specifications of the proposed seed mixture for stabilization of disturbed areas within Buffer Zone and RFA are depicted on sheet C-201 of the revised site plans.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

W8. A Planting List with information including species of plantings and number of plantings proposed at the Site should be included on the plans.

T&B: A Planting List with information including species and number of plantings proposed at the Site is depicted on sheet C-201 of the revised site plans.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

W9. A monitoring protocol should be submitted by the Applicant for the proposed mitigation plantings that includes monitoring frequency, corrective actions, metrics for success, and reporting schedule. These plantings (including areas of seeding) should be monitored for two (2) growing seasons to confirm successful establishment.

T&B: A Monitoring Protocol has been prepared and is provided in Attachment 2.

BETA2: BETA recommends the Commission include a Special Condition requiring plantings to be replaced if observed as dead/dying for more than one growing season.

T&B2: The Applicant is amenable to such a condition; however, the Applicant respectfully requests that such a condition be limited to a defined establishment period. The Applicant proposes that replacement be required for plantings that fail within two (2) growing seasons following installation, as is consistent with standard practice for restoration plantings.

W10. Invasive species including Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*), bittersweet (*Celastrus orbiculatus*), Japanese stiltgrass (*Microstegium vimineum*), and callery pear (*Pyrus calleryana*) were observed within the area where the pipe and outfall are proposed within the 100-foot Buffer Zone. The Applicant should provide information on how invasive species will be managed to ensure no further spread occurs during and after construction, and that any post-construction restoration is successful.

T&B: The proposed Monitoring Protocol provided in Attachment 2 addresses the proposed invasive species management within the footprint of the proposed pipe and outfall installation (within the 100-foot Buffer Zone).

BETA2: The Applicant has provided an invasive species control plan that outlines proposed control methods during and post-construction. The Applicant should confirm if herbicide treatment will be used. BETA defers to the Commission on the approval of this plan.

T&B2: No response required.

WPA Performance Standards Comments

The Project proposes permanent impacts to the onsite Riverfront Area and 100-foot Buffer Zone. The Performance Standards at 310 CMR 10.58(5) are being referenced for compliance with RA Performance Standards due to the Site's degraded/previously developed status.

W11. Erosion controls, grading, and the limit-of-work are depicted within 1 foot of the Banks delineated as 1F-1 through 1F-3 and 1E-4. The Applicant should state if Bank impacts are proposed as a result of construction of the headwall. If impacts are not proposed the Applicant should provide information on how Bank and LUW will be protected during construction.

T&B: Erosion controls are the only impacts proposed within 1 foot of the Bank in the area referenced above and impacts to the Bank itself are not anticipated as a result of erosion control installation and removal. Earthwork and grading are proposed at a minimum distance of 3.5 feet from the Top of Bank in this area, and impacts associated with this work will be limited to areas upland of the resource area. Impacts to the Bank are not anticipated as a result of grading in the vicinity.

BETA2: The Applicant has provided reasonable surety with this response that Bank impacts will be avoided; comment addressed.

Riverfront Area (310 CMR 10.58)

W12. Work within RA includes the installation of the headwall and installation of plantings along the southern side of the stream and within the Buffer Zone Mitigation Area. The Applicant should confirm if impacts associated with installation of plantings have been quantified as a part of the RA and Buffer Zone impacts.

T&B: The Massachusetts WPA Riverfront Area General Performance Standards 10.58(4)(d)(1)(d) states "the calculation of square footage of alteration shall exclude... any area of restoration within the riverfront area." We are of the opinion that restoration plantings themselves don't count against the maximum square footage threshold for work in RFA and aren't considered a new or net alteration. As such, impacts associated with the installation of plantings have not been quantified as a part of the RA impacts, but are included in the revised Buffer Zone impacts included herein as Attachment 3.

BETA2: Upon further review, BETA acknowledges and agrees with TB's approach to quantifying RA impacts. Comment addressed.

W13. The Applicant should provide further information regarding the location where restoration of RA is proposed, including existing conditions (e.g., vegetative community) to ensure that restoration is in-kind with existing conditions.

T&B: The proposed RA restoration is located adjacent to the 1-F-F flag series. This portion of the site and existing RA is currently landscaped and mulched. Existing vegetation includes a mix of non-native and native

small shrubs and perennials. The proposed installation of inkberry holly (*Ilex glabra*) in this area is intended to provide a more natural and native landscape. The proposed plantings have been selected due to the highly adaptable nature of the species, and the ecological benefits related to the plant's berries (food source for wildlife). The plant is also a larval host plant for the Henry's elfin butterfly.

BETA2: Permanent impacts to RA have increased from 50 sf to 230 sf according to Table 5-1 Summary of Resource Area Impacts. The Applicant should provide the total area of restoration to ensure that sufficient restoration is being provided for the updated impact totals. In addition, BETA notes that the "New England Native Warm Season Grass Mix" or similar seed mix should be applied to all restoration areas.

T&B2: The total area of restoration has been revised to 230 sf on the project plans. As noted on the drawings, the restoration areas will be seeded with the New England Native Warm Season Grass Mix as noted on revised Sheet C-201.

W14. If the Commission determines the Project is permissible under 310 CMR 10.58(5) then a Special Condition within the Order of Conditions should be included as required under 310 CMR 10.58(5)h that prohibits further alteration within the restoration or mitigation areas, except as may be required to maintain the area in its restored or mitigate condition, and prior to requesting the issuance of the Certificate of Compliance, the Applicant shall demonstrate the restoration or mitigation area has been successfully completed for at least two growing seasons.

T&B: The Applicant acknowledges this comment and is amenable to such a condition.

BETA2: No further comment required.

Bylaw Regulatory Comments

W15. A USGS Topographic Map, a Natural Heritage and Priority Habitats and Estimated Habitats Maps, and a FEMA Flood Plain map are required for NOI submissions to the Franklin Conservation Commission per Bylaw Section 7.17.1.

T&B: A USGS Topographic Map, a Natural Heritage and Priority Habitats and Estimated Habitats Maps, and a FEMA Flood Plain map were all submitted as part of the NOI Application Package submitted to the Commission dated September 2025. Refer to Appendix A of the NOI for these materials.

BETA2: No further comment required.

W16. The Applicant should provide the Construction Sequence on the plans per Bylaw Section 7.15.

T&B: This information has been added to the plan set on sheet G-003.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

W17. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should include a description of the measures that will be taken to properly install and maintain the erosion control devices used during the Project and include the requirement that the erosion control will be inspected weekly and all other criteria set forth in Bylaw Regulation Section 7.12.

T&B: The Soil Erosion and Sediment Control (SESC) Plan has been revised to include all criteria set forth in Bylaw Regulation Section 7.12. A revised Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan is attached as Attachment 4.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

W18. The Applicant submitted a Variance request for the work proposed within the 0-25-foot Buffer Zone and the 25-50-foot Buffer Zone. BETA defers to the Commission on the issuance of this waiver.

T&B: No response required.

BETA2: No further comment required.

Stormwater Management Review

The proposed stormwater management design consists of providing a redundant 36-inch drainpipe to supplement the existing 48-inch drainpipe that currently conveys stormwater to wetlands on the northeast side of the existing building. The additional pipe is designed to alleviate localized flooding that occurs during high-intensity rain events. The design also includes three (3) deep-sump, hooded catch basins that will tie into the proposed 36-inch RCP run. Runoff discharges to a new outfall and accompanying riprap on the northeast side of the existing building.

General

SW1. Provide a plan to accompany the hydraulic calculations (pipe sizing) showing the areas flowing to each catch basin/pipe.

T&B: Existing and proposed drainage area maps are attached as Attachment 5.

BETA2: Existing and proposed drainage area maps were provided. Comment addressed.

SW2. The hydraulic analysis indicates that all proposed pipes are HDPE. Revise to indicate RCP.

T&B: The hydraulic analysis has been revised to indicate RCP. A revised analysis is attached as Attachment 6.

BETA2: Hydraulic analysis revised. Comment addressed.

SW3. The flared end section at the end of the proposed 36-inch pipe run discharges to a 3:1 (±) slope. Additionally, the flared end section is oriented at an angle that is not perpendicular to the slope, which will render the riprap less effective. BETA recommends that the angle of the outlet pipe be reevaluated, and a concrete headwall be utilized to provide an effective flat area where the riprap can dissipate flows and prevent scouring.

T&B: The location of the proposed outfall was selected based on the required outfall elevation and relative proximity of the nearby wetland resource area. A system outlet elevation of 220.0 is required based on upstream drainage system elevations, as well as hydraulic pipe capacities. A perpendicular orientation of the proposed flared end section cannot be achieved at elevation 220.0 without direct impacts to wetlands. However, a winged headwall has been added to the project plans to allow for a flatter grade at the outlet, and adjustments to the riprap outfall protection configuration have been made. See sheet C-201 for updated outfall information.

BETA2: The outfall design has been revised. Comment addressed.

SW4. Recommend providing a detail for the replacement of curb on site.

T&B: A detail for the replacement of curbing has been added to sheet C-501.

BETA2: Detail provided. Comment addressed.

SW5. Provide an existing and proposed drainage area map showing drainage areas and stormwater flow paths (§153-15.A.(2)). Soil boundaries should also be displayed on the map.

T&B: Existing and proposed drainage area maps, displaying soil boundaries, are attached as Attachment 5.

BETA2: Existing and proposed drainage area maps were provided. Comment addressed.

MassDEP Stormwater Standards

The Project as proposed must comply with the Massachusetts Stormwater Standards as outlined by MassDEP. Compliance with these standards is outlined below:

Low Impact Development (LID) Techniques

No LID measures are proposed.

T&B: No response required.

No Untreated Stormwater (Standard Number 1): No new stormwater conveyances (e.g., outfalls) may discharge untreated stormwater directly to or cause erosion in wetlands or waters of the Commonwealth.

The project proposes a new outlet to wetlands that is equipped with a riprap outfall to prevent scouring. Additional calculations are required; Standard 1 is outstanding.

SW6. Provide riprap/outfall sizing calculations.

T&B: Riprap/outfall sizing calculations are attached as Attachment 7.

BETA2: Calculations were provided. Comment addressed.

Post-Development Peak Discharge Rates (Standard Number 2): Stormwater management systems must be designed so that post-development peak discharge rates do not exceed pre-development peak discharge rates.

The Project proposes to alleviate localized flooding during high intensity storm events by providing a redundant 36-inch drainpipe to supplement the existing system and provide backup conveyance to the wetlands north of the existing building. Calculations indicate a decrease in peak discharge rate to all points of analysis. Standard 2 is met.

T&B: No response required.

Recharge To Groundwater (Standard Number 3): Loss of annual recharge to groundwater should be minimized through the use of infiltration measures to maximum extent practicable.

NRCS soil maps indicate that soils in the location of the proposed work are Udorthents, sandy with a hydrologic group rating (HSGR) of A (high infiltration potential), Scarborough and Birdsall soils with a HSG of A/D, and Swansea muck with a HSG of B/D. The Applicant has conducted five (5) test borings at the Site indicating the subsurface soils are predominantly fill at varying depths overlying glacial till. Groundwater was not noted during the test borings.

Groundwater recharge is not proposed as part of the Project as the intent of the design is to alleviate localized flooding on the site. Standard 3 is met to the greatest extent practicable.

T&B: No response required.

SW7. While the proposed 36-inch pipe is intended to convey floodwaters during high-intensity storm events, it will predominantly carry low flows from the parking areas under typical conditions. As the project includes a new outfall to a wetland resource area, BETA recommends that the Applicant evaluate the proposed system's ability to achieve the Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and Total Phosphorus (TP) utilizing infiltration measures. Treatment area would be considered areas that flow to the basins and not the entirety of the project site.

T&B: Infiltrative measures were considered as part of an alternatives analysis during preliminary design development. However, they were ultimately determined to be infeasible due to the highly developed nature of the project site. The complex subsurface utility system existing on-site would require utility relocation in order to site infiltrative features, which would interrupt routine plant operations and present an undue burden on the Applicant.

BETA2: Comment addressed.

Total Suspended Solids (Standard Number 4): For new development, stormwater management systems must be designed to remove 80% of the annual load of Total Suspended Solids (TSS).

The project includes the following treatment train:

Treatment Train	SCM 1	SCM 2	SCM 3	TSS Removal %
A	Deep Sump Catch Basin			25%

The project discharges stormwater runoff to wetlands northeast of the existing building, which discharges to Mine Brook. Mine Brook (segment MA72-14) is listed as a Category 5 water, which requires a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) as listed in the Massachusetts Year 2022 Integrated List of Waters. The impairments for this segment of Mine Brook include E.coli and temperature - both impairments that do not require a TMDL reduction associated with them.

The Project has been designed to provide 25% TSS removal by replacing three (3) existing catch basins with new deep-sump hooded catch basins. Given that the project qualifies as a redevelopment as there is no increase in impervious area, Standard 4 is met to the greatest extent practicable. An improvement to TSS removal is proposed as part of the proposed Project through the implementation of deep-sump, hooded catch basins, which will provide an opportunity for floatable and solids separation prior to runoff discharge at the proposed outfall. Through the replacement of three (3) catch basins, the Project has been designed to provide 25% TSS removal. Given that the project qualifies as a redevelopment as there is no increase in impervious area, Standard 4 of the Massachusetts Stormwater Standards is met to the greatest extent practicable.

T&B: No response required.

Higher Potential Pollutant Loads (Standard Number 5): Stormwater discharges from Land Uses with Higher Potential Pollutant Loads (LUHPPLs) require the use of specific stormwater management BMPs.

The proposed use is considered a LUHPPL. Given the project qualifies as a redevelopment, Standard 5 is met to the greatest extent practicable.

T&B: No response required.

Critical Areas (Standard Number 6): Stormwater discharges to critical areas must utilize certain stormwater management BMPs approved for critical areas.

The project is located outside of any MassDEP wellhead protection areas, including Zone I, II, and any interim Wellhead Protection Areas. Standard 6 is not applicable.

T&B: No response required.

Redevelopment (Standard Number 7): Redevelopment of previously developed sites must meet the Stormwater Management Standards to the maximum extent practicable.

The project does qualify as a redevelopment as the pre- and post-development impervious areas will be the same. Standard 7 is met by improving existing conditions.

T&B: No response required.

Erosion And Sediment Controls (Standard Number 8): Erosion and sediment controls must be implemented to prevent impacts during construction or land disturbance activities.

As the project proposes to disturb greater than one acre of land, a Notice of Intent with EPA and local Conservation Commission was submitted, and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be developed prior to construction beginning. Erosion controls are indicated on the plans including stockpile areas and construction tracking pad. A basic construction sequence and estimated dates are included in Section 2 of the Stormwater management report. Standard 8 requires minor revisions to be met.

SW8. Provide catch basin inlet protection and perimeter controls on the Existing Conditions & Site Preparation Plan.

T&B: No response required.

BETA2: The plans have been revised as requested. Comment addressed.

SW9. Indicate that proposed catch basins will be equipped with inlet protection once installed until the end of construction.

T&B: No response required.

BETA2: The plans have been revised as requested. Comment addressed.

Operations/Maintenance Plan (Standard Number 9): A Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Plan shall be developed and implemented to ensure that stormwater management systems function as designed.

A Long-Term Stormwater Operation & Maintenance Plan was included in Appendix F of the Stormwater Management Report. The O&M Plan indicates responsible parties for the project, routine and non-routine maintenance tasks, and inspection criteria. The O&M Plan also provides guidance on long-term pollution prevention practices for the project. Standard 9 is met.

T&B: No response required.

Illicit Discharges (Standard Number 10): All illicit discharges to the stormwater management system are prohibited. A signed Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement was not provided with the submission. The Stormwater checklist indicates that one will be provided prior to the commencement of construction. Standard 10 is met, pending receipt of the signed illicit discharge statement,

SW10. Provide a signed illicit discharge statement.

T&B: We request that the Commission consider a condition of approval requiring that the signed Illicit Discharge Statement be provided prior to construction.

BETA2: BETA defers to the Commission on including this as a Condition of Approval.

We trust this information will be satisfactory in your review of the Drainage Resiliency Improvements at the Garelick Farms facility. Should you need additional information, please contact me at 413.572.3238 or jchristy@tighebond.com.

Very truly yours,


Jean Christy, PE
PRINCIPAL ENGINEER

Enclosures Revised Site Plans dated January 2026
 Revised Stormwater Erosion and Sediment Control Plan dated January 2026

Copy: Dandreo Brothers General Contractors
 MassDEP CERO Wetlands

G5096 0003

\\tighebond.com\data\Data\Projects\G\G5099 Garelick Farms\0003 Flood Mitigation Design and Permitting\Permitting\Peer Review\1199
West Center Street Response to Comments 2.docx