

December 31, 2025

Town Hall  
Conservation Commission  
101 Main Street  
Ashland, MA 01721

Attn: Becca Solomon, Conservation Agent

**Re: YMCA Review Comments  
30 Memorial Drive**

Dear Ms. Solomon and Members of the Commission,

Bohler Engineering MA, LLC is in receipt of an email comment letter from Becca Solomon, dated December 11, 2025. On behalf of the applicant, MetroWest Young Men's Christian Association, Inc. (MetroWest YMCA), Bohler offers the following responses. For clarity, the original comments are in *italics*, while our responses are directly below in **bold** type.

*Comment 1. Roof drains are still not labelled on sheet C-401.*

**Response: Please see plan sheet C-402 for the roof drain label. Plan sheet C-401 is a general overall plan sheet and does not contain the detailed grading or drainage information shown on plan sheets C-402 and C-403.**

*Comment 2. Snow storage has been moved as requested but is now within 10 feet of the proposed sidewalk and may present an icing concern that should be reviewed by DPW prior to acceptance.*

**Response: The perimeter of the parking lot is the most practical place for snow storage. Please note that most of the parking lot perimeter along Memorial Drive will drain back into the parking lot and not toward the proposed sidewalk along Memorial Drive.**

*Comment 3. Dimensions of the subsurface infiltration basins still do not seem to be on the plans. If I have missed these are on the plans and I have missed them, please highlight the dimensions and send them to me.*

**Response: Infiltration basin dimensions are shown within the basins on plan sheet C-402 and on the infiltration basin details on plan sheets C-904, C-905, and C-906.**

*Comment 4. A soil sieve analysis and additional test pits were recommended for Infiltration Basin 2 (previously infiltration basin 3). I am not in receipt of these additional materials. Please forward. If they have not been done, please explain why they have not.*

**Response: The recommended additional soil testing was performed in August, 2025, and pertinent information relative to the drainage design including soil borings, sieve test analyses, and a summary of infiltration rates from the original 2024 geotechnical report and a September 26, 2025 report addendum are included in Appendix C of the Drainage Report.**

*Comment 5. The surface infiltration basin has been greatly revised and now includes perforated subdrain, a yard grate, and a catch basin, which would appear to connect to an FES*

*beyond the emergency spillway and potentially take sediment from the bottom of the basin and allow it to exit towards the wetlands. Please explain the intent of this design.*

**Response:** The infiltration basin has been revised as recommended by the peer review comments to provide an emergency spillway. Yard drains were also added to regulate the outflow and provide a controlled piped discharge to a riprap armored point at the base of the proposed slope. These improvements reduce the potential for water to overflow the previously proposed grassed berm.

The subdrain has been added as a result of the additional soil testing noted above, which indicated that the native soils in the area of this basin are poorly drained, with an approximate infiltration rate of 0.33 in/hr. The subdrain is proposed to reduce the potential for standing water and associated mosquito breeding habitat in such close proximity to the recreational fields.

Please see our responses to the next two comments regarding sediment loading.

*Comment 6. The surface infiltration basin is still without a forebay.*

**Response:** A sediment forebay has been added at the northwest corner of the east playing field at the end of the grassed swale conveying water from the access road catch basin. It is the Applicant's opinion that sediment generation at the rear of the building will be negligible. Please note that although a very small area of the ELC parking lot will drain to the rear of the building, the majority of impervious area consists of the emergency access drive, and that drive will not be in everyday use. Therefore, there would be little to no generation of sediment on the access drive, other than possibly in the winter for sanding of the drive needed to keep the drive clear of snow as a fire lane.

In spite of the negligible sediment loading, the area has been designed to comply with the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook requirements for water quality for the two possible paths of travel to the surface basin:

- The piped discharge will be treated by a combination of a catch basin with deep sump (25% TSS removal) and sediment forebay (25% TSS removal). Additional sediment removal within the grass swale between the catch basin's pipe outlet and the sediment forebay is not credited in the calculations.
- The overland flow between the fire lane and the infiltration basin over the playing field is considered by MassDEP standards to be a grassed filter strip greater than fifty feet long with a TSS removal rate of 45%.

Both of the above result in, or exceed the MassDEP's requirement of at least 44% TSS removal prior to infiltration. TSS calculations documenting the above are included in Appendix F of the Drainage Report.

*Comment 7. Confirmation has not been provided as to the surface infiltration basins ability to handle phosphorus and nitrogen loads from fertilizers on the soccer fields.*

**Response:** Please see the above response for a description of pretreatment to the surface infiltration basin. Please note that the playing fields are not intended to be professional-grade playing fields but will be more of a "backyard" type field that will not require extensive, if any, maintenance beyond regular mowing.

The surface basin is capable of completely storing the runoff from one inch of rainfall with zero discharge. Calculations demonstrating this are included in Appendix F of the Drainage Report. Per the "Stormwater Best Management Practices Performance Analysis" document prepared for the EPA in December, 2008 and revised in March, 2010, infiltration basins with a 0.27 in/hr infiltration

rate that are capable of storing 1.0 inch of rainfall are expected to remove approximately 94% of phosphorus. Charts from page 124 and 136 of this document are included in Appendix F of the Drainage Report. With zero discharge from the basin for a one-inch "first flush" storm, the removal rate of phosphorous and nitrogen is more likely to be closer to 100%.

*Comment 8. The NPDES and SWPPP are still not referred to in the Erosion and Sedimentation Control notes on C-102.*

**Response:** References to the NPDES and SWPPP were included as note #29 in the MA Erosion and Sediment Control Notes on plan sheet C-803 and have been added in note #29 in the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Notes on plan sheet C-102 as requested.

We trust the above as well as the attached information are sufficient for your continued review of the project. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (508) 480-9900.

Sincerely,

**Bohler Engineering MA, LLC**



Andrew Platt



Lucien DiStefano

Cc: Jasmin Farinacci, Town Planner