

I want to thank the board, the developer and everyone else that has taken the time to hear my concerns regarding the project. Both the chair of the ZBA and the Developer have stated publicly and privately that it is illegal for a project to like this to increase the volume of water heading to an abutters property by even 1 gallon. I have also been assured the independent consulting firm retained by the town will check and double check all the paperwork to make sure this does not happen. I read Stantec's recommendations regarding the adjacent culvert but was a little disappointed when they did not acknowledge the catch basin on the north side of Rt. 140 that actually feeds that culvert and will handle all the run-off from the approach of the proposed road and sidewalks. It was again, overlooked or not included. Basically all the impervious road below CB1 and CB2 600 square feet or so of impervious ground (not including sheet/surface water) will drain into the catch basin, from there it will end up directly unmitigated and untreated on my property. This issue is complex. I believe it is important to highlight a couple facts about the catch basins and culverts on both the north and south side of 140. They are not operating in the capacity they were designed to. There is no drainage easement granted to the state or anyone else on the my side the southside of 140. Curiously enough there is a drainage easement granted to the state for the north side. That may go a long way to back up my claim the site the funeral home now sits on was all cat tails, it was filled in and pushed into the culvert and buried. The development of the funeral home and Hazeltine and Whitney has forced all the water towards the northside culvert. The stream has been covered up and basically been buried so the water is flowing underground. The catch basins and culverts were not designed to handle all the water that had been forced there way. If they were meant to work together they would have been built in line with each other. The culvert on the north side is roughly 12-16 feet

north of where the culvert on the south side is installed. On my property there is water flowing out of the dilapidated culvert on the south side and that has created one stream, curiously enough there is a second flowing stream that day lights on my property probably 15-20 feet lower in elevation directly in line (Approx. 200 feet south) with the culvert on the north side. My point is these culverts and catch basins were not designed to handle the water being pushed through them. One was for the water run off for the north side and one was designed to handle the run off from the south side if 140 That's it. The culverts are only 16 inches in diameter not the referenced 18".

Now to the drainage maps and the corresponding Hydro-Cad files. For the record. I understand these stamped elevations may have not been verified in the field. That said, I have identified the elevations for PND3 BASIN 3 on the elevation maps. Page 123 (183 on the pdf) on the hydro CAD report is what appears to be the flow and volume calculations for the area I am questioning. Would It be reasonable to assume the elevation of catch basin 3 and catch basin 4 at 336 should be used instead of the elevation of 335? The CB-3 and CB-4 will be installed at 336, there is no way they will catch the water running on the downside of them until the elevation hits 335?

The elevation used for the lowest point is 330, I believe that to be the center of Rt140 because that's right where it is on the map. The existing catch basin on the North side that has been overlooked is at least 6 inches lower due to the crown in the road. I believe 329.5 should be the low point. The elevations of 336 and 229.5 (not 331 and 335 as currently detailed) I believe should be the numbers used for a more accurate projection, furthermore I believe the culvert on my property

should be included in a hydrological study of some sort? That is where all the water from the approach and sidewalks will be heading. The culvert on the south side is more than 10 feet in elevation lower from where the new water will be entering the catch basin so I believe we will need a 500 year study to show an accurate projection. All of these omissions and inconsistencies have made me feel like If this is what they have to do with the paperwork to force this through imaging what they will do with a shovel?

I found out that after Pleasant Street, this water goes in a pipe for over 1100 feet until the bottom of Station Street. Over 500 feet of underground pipe after daylight I believe helps my case. I believe if nothing can be done to stop the water flow, 300' of underground pipe should be installed from the south side of rt140 and the north side of Pleasant Street. My previous neighbors on 60 Main Street had their head wall removed and a pipe installed back in the 1990's so what I am asking for is not uncommon to the neighborhood. I don't believe it is unreasonable either, the developer is putting the sewer pipe and the gas pipe directly through a wet land, why can I get one through my property to handle the additional water flow? There is no drainage easement on my property or my neighbors on Pleasant Street, so this water should not be here in the first place. I would like a special order of conditions placed on the the permit that allows me to lease the land required for the pipe and drainage (not 1 inch more) to the builder with the express intent of using it for and maintaining underground drainage. Second I would like the reclamation of my property and to be able to do with it as I wish. For the record, I have confirmed everything I am saying in a teams meeting I had with 8 engineers from MA DOT last week 2/16 at 9 am. Some of you may recognize these names (Anne Sullivan, Timothy Dexter, Hanan Fouad, Lawrence Cash, Ross Goodale, Jonathan Freeman, Jessica Leone, and Darryl Gallant) I have a meeting on my

property with MA DOT engineer Ross Goodale and a couple other engineers before the end of the month to access the current situation and the conditions moving forward. They would not be coming to my property for no reason. I only want what's fair, the whole premise for this project is equity and inclusion, why should my neighbor and I loose equity and not be included?