

December 14, 2019

Elizabeth Nijkamp

RE: Bent Grass Residential Filing No. 2 – Pre-Development Grading  
Response to “Bent Grass EGP” Comments

Dear Elizabeth,

Below please find a list of your comments received via email 12/12/19 along with our response in bold:

1. There is questionable grading at the interface between the floodplain and the proposed grading that comes up to the designated “no construction area” where I see things like a channel (or pond) graded in and it just stops a foot short of the construction fencing. This will create ponding that I do not think you have the water rights to create a pond without an outfall. This is the major item of concern with the resubmittal. This appears to happen at five locations, please correct me if I am wrong. Please address this issue.

**Response: Our intention was to have the overall development plans approved quickly which would allow the entire development to be graded and avoid any ponding issues. To address this concern, we included 6” PVC pipe from each low area into the existing channel. These pipes are designed based on the “Sediment Basin (SB), SC-7” detail and include a pipe along with a riser. In addition, rip rap was added to the overflow areas for armor against erosion. A note was added to the plans indicating no grading is allowed in the Floodplain, only installation of the rip rap and 6” PVC pipe.**

2. PDR report comments have not been addressed with the exception of the revision date on the cover of the document. From what I see we provided only the pages with comments to you on the redlined version of the last comments sent out, these minor comments should not have been overlooked.

**Response: We apologize for not making these corrections. The Preliminary Drainage report was revised to accommodate the original comments.**


3. An additional area of concern for me as the Engineer Manager is that in your letter of intent (page 2 of 3 under drainage) you state that you agree to repair the existing embankment failures and reconstruct the existing pond outfall structure. Although you state in your response to our comments on the GEC plan when you plan on doing this, I feel it is prudent that this information (as to the fact that this shall be done with SF 19-014 and before any impervious surface construction happens) should be included in your LOI. As a side note, attachment 3 in your LOI is a preliminary grading plan, not a final grading plan.

**Response: The Letter of Intent was revised to more clearly address your concerns. Attachment 3 label was changed from Final to Preliminary.**

4. Lastly, all files should have the EGP file number (you can have both SF and EGP) on the cover. At this point it is easier for me to do this task for you on all documents as I approve them. I will also add a note on the GEC that you cannot grade on “others” property until you obtain an easement (offsite grading to the south) (BTW, your GEC checklist should not have NA for offsite grading).

**Response: We added the EGP number to the Letter of Intent, GEC Plans and Drainage Report. Thank you for adding this number to the remaining documents.**

Sincerely,  
GALLOWAY

  
Grant Dennis, PE  
Project Manager  
[GrantDennis@GallowayUS.com](mailto:GrantDennis@GallowayUS.com)

