

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2026

Land Use Department

# Memorandum:

**To:** Liz Burdick, Director of Land Use & Planning  
**From:** Steve Masalin, Public Works Director/Town Engineer *sm*  
**Date:** June 1, 2026  
**Re:** 1947 Center Groton Rd (IWWC Appl. #26-7SITE; P & Z Appl. PZ #26-3SITE)  
**CC:** Hannah Gienau, Zoning & Wetlands Official

I have reviewed the revised plans and stormwater analysis for the subject application. I have the following comments.

## Stormwater Management Report

1. Page 10: The report was updated elsewhere to reflect Ledyard Drainage Ordinance compliance, but not under 2.1 Design Criteria. Also, this goes for the compliance with a 25-year storm under STANDARD 2.
2. Page 15; POST-DEVELOPMENT HYDROLOGIC CONCLUSIONS: The 100-Year Storm Post-Development value for DP-3 (0.05) does not correspond to the calculated value given in the analysis (0.48). The total should also be changed from 19.42 to 19.85.
3. Page 17; SITE DESIGN SUMMARY: The applicant is seeking a waiver to the 2024 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual stipulation concerning the 50% reduction in the post-development peak 2-year storm flow. The applicant has revised provisions to improve the reduction to 29%, nearly doubling it. Though the Commissions have the ultimate say, I feel comfortable with this within the extended context of significant reductions through the entire range of lower-frequency storms.
4. APPENDIX E; CONVEYANCE MODELING RESULTS
  - a. There is widespread (virtually universal) divergence in the pipe invert elevations cited versus those given on the plans (see sheet C2.50); the plans seem to be correct. This is an original comment that was not resolved and is too extensive to delineate in full detail. The Applicant should ensure a comprehensive review is conducted to ensure correspondence of value in all cases.
  - b. The initial summary "FlexTable: Catch Basin" and "Catchment" tables are illegible as printed.
  - c. Additional Specific Issues
    - 1) Engineering Profile – CB-208 TO MH-200: Pipes 99 and 100 are shown as 18'; the plans show 15".
    - 2) Engineering Profile – CB-410 TO FES-400
      - a) Pipes 84 and 103 have lengths and slopes that do not match the plans.
      - b) The rim elevations for MH-401 and CB-401 do not match the plans.

- 3) Engineering Profile – CB-207 TO FES-200: Two pipes are designated “100.” In each case 30” is cited, whereas the plans show 24”.
- 4) Engineering Profile – CB-405 TO CB-404: The rim elevation shown is 277.67; the plans show 277.17.
- 5) CB-408 TO OCS-4B
  - a) “OCS-4B” should be “CB-411.”
  - b) In the diagram, “CB-403” should be “CB-408.”
  - c) The rim elevation depicted for CB-408 should be 274.50.

Hydrologic Modeling: May need to be rerun to conform to any changes that are material to it.