Nitsch Engineering

2 Center Plaza, Suite 430
Boston, MA 02108-1928
T: 617-338-0063
F: 617-338-6472

www.nitscheng.com

November 11, 2015

Mr. John G. Radcliffe
Chairman
New Bedford Conservation Commission
New Bedford City Hall
133 William Street
New Bedford, MA 02744

RE: Nitsch Project #9972
Raw Seafoods, Inc.
Samuel Barnet Boulevard
New Bedford, MA

Dear Mr. Radcliffe:

This letter is in regard to the proposed Raw Seafoods facility located on Samuel Barnet Boulevard in the New Bedford Business Park in New Bedford, Massachusetts. Nitsch Engineering has reviewed the following items submitted as part of the proposed project:

- Plans entitled, "Proposed Site Development – Raw Seafoods, Inc., Samuel Barnet Boulevard, New Bedford, Massachusetts," prepared by Field Engineering Co., revised through November 2, 2015;
- Notice of Intent application for Proposed Cold Storage Facility, Samuel Barnet Boulevard, Map 133, Lot 63, New Bedford, Massachusetts, prepared by Field Engineering Co., dated October 22, 2015;
- Report entitled, "Stormwater Management System Report, Raw Seafoods, Inc. Proposed Cold Storage Facility, Samuel Barnet Boulevard, New Bedford, Massachusetts," prepared by Field Engineering Co., dated October 8, 2015; and
- Report entitled, "Stormwater Management System Report, Addendum 1, Raw Seafoods, Inc. Proposed Cold Storage Facility, Samuel Barnet Boulevard, New Bedford, Massachusetts," prepared by Field Engineering Co., dated October 22, 2015.

In addition, the following report was provided by the Conservation Office:

- Report entitled, "Phase II – Limited Subsurface Investigations, Greater New Bedford Industrial Foundation, Map 133, Lot 63 Samuel Barnet Boulevard, New Bedford, Massachusetts," prepared by Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc., dated June 28, 2013.

Nitsch Engineering has reviewed the recently submitted information. We have the following comments:

1. A small portion of the site driveway is within the 25-foot no activity zone. The proposed work in this area includes a sliver of the site driveway and a short segmental retaining wall.
2. The construction of the proposed rail spur includes work within wetlands including filling 4,640 sf of Bordering Vegetated Wetlands and an additional 3,290 sf of Riverfront Area. Although a profile of the proposed rail spur is provided, details such as the type of wall/abutment should be provided. It does not appear that there is any proposed plantings or stabilization of the slopes that tie into the abutment. We recommend that some type of stabilization plan for these slopes be provided. Also, the vegetation in the buffer zone and wetlands area is extremely thick. The applicant should provide additional details regarding construction including how the disturbance to the buffer zone area will be confined to the square footages shown on the plans. Monitoring of the construction will be important to insure that the area of disturbance is limited to the square footages described on the plans.
3. The applicant's wetland scientist should confirm the elevation of the proposed wetlands replication area. The proposed replication area is graded to two low points at elevation 80. The proposed wet basin has been graded to an elevation of 79.

4. We disagree with the Time of Concentration described in the proposed drainage calculations for post conditions watersheds 1 and 2. The applicants engineer has delineated flow paths parallel to the proposed face of the building. The grading between the building and the site drive will direct water away from the building per Massachusetts building code and towards the driveway. Therefore, we think a more accurate flow path is within the site driveway, which will result in a shorter Time of Concentration that may impact the performance of both basins 1 and 2. We also disagree with the use of Grass: Dense as a run-off coefficient for sheet flow, and recommend that Grass: Short be used. Grass: Short should be used when calculating the Time of Concentration for post conditions watershed 3 as well.
5. The outlet orifice shown on the detail for Detention Basin 1 should be revised to be consistent with the drainage calculations.
6. The pipe sizing calculations do not include sizing for the 24-inch pipe that flows parallel to the wetlands. This pipe is shown as .25%, which is really flat. The applicants engineer should confirm that the pipe can convey the flow for the 10-year storm and provide calculations.
7. The Long Term Pollution Prevention Plan should include language prohibiting storing snow in the proposed basins.
8. The emergency spillway in Wet Basin #2 is shown in the sediment forebay. We recommend that it be relocated so that flows from the main storage of the basin flow through the emergency spillway.
9. The site plans show two areas of what is presumed to be expansion parking. The drainage area plans only show one area of expansion parking. Both areas should be included in the drainage calculations.
10. During the site visit, we observed the presence of monitoring wells which typically indicate that testing has been done with regards to the presence of hazardous materials onsite. This was a concern since the project includes a significant amount of groundwater infiltration. Therefore, we reviewed the Phase II report that was performed for the site. Based on the review of the Phase II report, there are no concerns with regards to infiltrating groundwater on the site.

If you have any questions, please call us at 617-338-0063.

Very truly yours,

Nitsch Engineering, Inc.

Scott D. Turner, PE, AICP, LEED AP ND
Director of Planning

SDT/vas

P:\9972 New Bedford NOIPR\Correspondence\Outgoing\2015-11-11 Raw Seafoods review letter.docx