Williams, Jeffrey

From:

Williams, Jeffrey

Sent:

Monday, January 11, 2021 11:50 AM

To:

Michael Boyce; Bernard, Dana

Subject:

RE: Kingsley (Ziggler) lot 28 perc cert rev.

Attachments:

[Untitled].pdf

Hi Mike. I had the file and looked it over. Attached is a revised copy of my spec sheet. I failed to put on there that this lot is under a variance condition for it being upgrade of the well boxes on lots 27 and 26. FYI: the 2014 perc cert had the lots not accurate, but the 2019 revised PC was correct: the lots requiring BAT and low pressure dose drainfields are 27, 28, 33, 34, and pres parcel D.

To that end, the added top portion of the SDA on lot 28 is less than 200' from the well box on lot 27. One option might be to revise the well box depending on the location of the actual drilled well. Also, revise the BAT note to state: MDE has approved a variance to allow the SDA on lot 28 to be upgrade of the well areas on lots 26 and 27 with the condition that the sewage disposal system on lot 28 utilize BAT unit and LPD drainfield.

From: Michael Boyce < MBOYCE@eseconsultants.com>

Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 7:52 AM

To: Bernard, Dana <dbernard@howardcountymd.gov> **Cc:** Williams, Jeffrey <jewilliams@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: Kingsley (Ziggler) lot 28 perc cert rev.

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Danna,

I believe the perc cert was submitted before the Holiday break, can I get an update on the review?

Thanks

Michael Boyce

Regional Director - ESE, Survey

ESE Consultants, Inc.

7164 Columbia Gateway Drive, Suite 230, Columbia, MD 21046 P: 410-381-3058 C: 410-365-4175

mboyce@eseconsultants.com w

www.eseconsultants.com

Ryan Ketner

From:

Michael Boyce

Sent:

Monday, December 07, 2020 11:17 AM

To:

Ryan Ketner; Jeff Driscoll FW: Kings Forest Lot 28

Subject: Attachments:

[Untitled].pdf

Ryan,

See what this does for 5 BR layout

Michael Boyce

Regional Director - ESE, Survey

ESE Consultants, Inc.

7164 Columbia Gateway Drive, Suite 230, Columbia, MD 21046

P: 410-381-3058 C: 410-365-4175

mboyce@eseconsultants.com www.eseconsultants.com

From: Williams, Jeffrey <jewilliams@howardcountymd.gov>

Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 11:07 AM

To: Michael Boyce <MBOYCE@eseconsultants.com> **Cc:** Bernard, Dana <dbernard@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: RE: Kings Forest Lot 28

Attached is a new spec sheet for lot 28. After looking at the perc holes again, I gave a bit more effective area for the upper part and gave a bit better application rate for the lower part.

As for the proposed area expansion: we cannot approve a waiver to go to 5' from the property line on new subdivisions and we cannot approve an expansion toward failing hole 143 without additional perc testing. We could look at expansion towards holes 140 and 141. Thanks

Jeff

From: Michael Boyce < MBOYCE@eseconsultants.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 11:41 AM

To: Williams, Jeffrey < jewilliams@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: FW: Kings Forest Lot 28

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Here is the info from benchmark for lot 28

Michael Boyce

Regional Director - ESE, Survey

ESE Consultants, Inc.

7164 Columbia Gateway Drive, Suite 230, Columbia, MD 21046 P: 410-381-3058 C: 410-365-4175 mboyce@eseconsultants.com www.eseconsultants.com

From: Jeff Driscoll < jdriscoll@tollbrothers.com > Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 9:28 AM

To: Michael Boyce < MBOYCE@eseconsultants.com >; John Carney (jcarney@bei-civilengineering.com) < jcarney@bei-

civilengineering.com>

Cc: Daniel Berger < dberger@tollbrothers.com>

Subject: FW: Kings Forest Lot 28

Mike,

John Carney at Benchmark also submitted a septic plan for Lot 28 (see attached). Didn't ESE submit one too? We should review both plans amongst the group, and determine which plan to process and which to remove.

Thanks.

Jeffery S. Driscoll

Vice President, Land Development

Toll Brothers

7164 Columbia Gateway Drive, Suite 230, Columbia, MD 21046

Office: (410) 381-3263 | Cell: (443) 350-1154

Office. (410) 301 3203	CCII. (443) 330

From: jcarney@bei-civilengineering.com <jcarney@bei-civilengineering.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 8:45 AM **To:** Jeff Driscoll < <u>idriscoll@tollbrothers.com</u>>

Subject: FW: Kings Forest Lot 28

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Use caution with links and attachments

Jeff, this is what I had sent to Dana Bernard. I've been following up with her. She is to speak with Jeff Williams today, I'll call her later. John

From: <u>icarney@bei-civilengineering.com</u> <<u>jcarney@bei-civilengineering.com</u>>

Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 11:02 AM

To: Bernard, Dana < dbernard@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: Kings Forest Lot 28

Dana, I received the Lot 28 spec sheet from the other engineer on Kings Forest (formerly Carroll-Ziegler Property). They have concerns about lot 28 that they wanted me to look into. I was able to do a layout of the trenches to show how it would work, see attached. I pulled the perc data and I think there is room for improvement on this lot based on the design.

The owner would like to file a variance to allow the edge of the SDA to be 5' from the property lines. We're looking for some preliminary input at this point and will submit the variance request soon.

For the initial system the perc tests are 142, 146, 147 and 240. They have an average time of about 11.5 minutes, well within the limits of an application rate of 0.8. The spec sheet had 0.6. The 7' depth to beginning of effective area is okay but there appears to be some better results within this area. It also appears that the top of this system has much better perc times, so the first trench is a little shorter but the overall absorption area is provided by the other three trenches being a little bit longer.

For the first repair area I was able to design he trenches in a band along the 430 contour, one vertical foot each side. The tests along this band are 142, 146 and 240 but we added in 141 because of concave area noted in the test notes. These tests have an average time of 15 minutes for an application rate of 0.8. Also I see that test 141 tested at 7' but the profile shows good soils starting at 6'. So I think the specs sheet should be 0.8 application rate and effective area starting at 6' with bottom of trench at 8'. We're requesting at add some area around failing test 143 but we are staying out of the concave area and on the better side of the ridge, the convex area.

For the second repair area it is defined by 140, 141 and 142. We just need a little more width in this area to have consistent trench lengths.

The builder would like to have a preliminary approval of this design so that they can purchase the property with some peace of mind. If these are questions for Jeff just let me know and I can address with him. I will give you a call in a little bit to discuss. Thanks, John

John M. Carney, P.E. Benchmark Engineering, Inc. 8480 Baltimore National Pike, Suite 315 Ellicott City, MD 21043 410-465-6105 ext. 1152

This email has been checked for viruses by AVG antivirus software.

www.avg.com