Est. 2003

ECOSYSTEM SOLUTIONS INC

RI: 401.741.3263
MA: 508.997.0268
www.ecosystem-solutions.com

January 14, 2026

Project no. W25-2196

Tracy Shriver, Planning Board Chair
Hingham Town Hall
210 Central Street
Hingham, MA 02043

RE: Proposed Senior Center, aka Hingham Center for Active Living
Special Permit w/ Site Plan Review

Chair Shriver,

Thank you for letting me present at the January 13, 2026 public hearing. I represent Bare Cove Preservation, LLC in this matter. During the hearing, I was asked to submit my comments, in writing, to the Planning Board. My comments focus on the Stormwater Report and associated documents. You may be skeptical of my qualifications as a non-engineer to comment. I have 28 years of experience, 22 of which have been in Massachusetts, performing peer reviews for Conservation Commissions. Site Plan Review at Planning Board and Stormwater Review at the Conservation Commission tend to overlap, specifically in regards to stormwater. I regularly review Stormwater Checklists and Reports for ConCom Notice of Intent applications, and keep my comments to issues related to overarching design parameters. I do not opine on engineering calculations. You will find my comments below. Please forward them to the design engineer and peer review engineer.

Comments

1. The July 2025 soil testing does not necessarily correspond with the footprint of infiltration practices. Sheet UT shows test hole locations w/ no corresponding numbers or soil data. If these are among the test pits to be conducted during construction, as stated in Section 2.1 of the Stormwater Management Plan, this is unacceptable. All testing should be done prior to construction and work based on a design where all parameters have obtained prior and approved by the Planning Board. For example, certain basins, such as Stormwater Basin 2 are labeled on the site plan (Sheet UT) as "Test Pit to be conducted prior to Construction." Again, this is unacceptable.

2. Agree w/ PGB Engineering peer review, esp. #2 RE shallow to ledge areas. For example, Stormwater Basin 3 (“SWB-3”) is next to boring SLR-2, which exhibited 4 feet to bedrock. The Subsurface Infiltration Basin (“UG-1”) , which is immediately west of SWB-3 has no known test hole performed within the footprint of the infiltration practice. Waiting until construction begins to make this determination is too late.

3. Pp. 110-112 has calcs for infiltration rates in order to determine if the infiltration practice will have a drawdown time of 72 hours or less. The specific infiltration practice name, such as Stormwater Management Basin 2 is referenced. Yet we know that no test holes have been dug in the footprint of the infiltration practices to-date. The K value is the Rawls Rate or infiltration rate in inches/hour, but we don't know where those values are coming from if the soil hasn't been analyzed. For example, Stormwater Basin 3, which I just mentioned has no test hole, has been calculated to completely drain in 23.68 hours based on a Rawls Rate of a soil that has yet to be analyzed. And we know that ledge is shallow in some places. The calculations are misleading.

4. What is the soil budget for the site. Will there be an excess or deficit of soil after grading? If excess, where will the soil be transported to, is there a concern about soils within the UD soil map unit, will may contain fill material of unknown origin and composition, and is a soil removal permit therefore required?

5.O&M notes and Site plan (Sheet UT) notes should correspond. To expand on this, there are plan notes on Sheet UT regarding stormwater maintenance & inspections, and there are different notes on the stormwater maintenance & inspections in the O&M Plan. They differ significantly. Through most of the notes, those on Sheet UT, as opposed to the O&M Plan, are more comprehensive. They need to correspond and at a minimum the O&M notes should be as detailed as those on the site plan.

6.Recommend adding SIGNED O&M as an in-perpetuity Special Condition.

7. In the O&M Plan, individual BMP's are listed. They do not necessarily correspond with those listed on the site plan, specifically plan sheet UT. For example, yard drain ("YD") 41 does not exist, yet YD 40 is shown on the site plan. A more egregious omission is for the water quality units ("DMH"), where the O&M Plan lists DMH 12 & 16, but is missing DMH 1,2,4,8,19,24,25,26,28,31, and 36. They need to correspond exactly.

8.Some acronyms on Sheet UT are missing (e.g. "RS"). Spelled out as Riprap Spillway, but not "RS" as shown on O&M Plan. The two should correspond exactly.

9.Stormwater Report states that test borings were done in July 2025. This is not an effective way of determining soil properties such as water table depth, especially in a soil map unit labeled UD-Udorthents, which describes disturbed or filled areas where original soils have been cut or covered. For example, Stormwater Basins 2 and 3 are proposed within the UD soil map unit. Recommend full open test pits with a MA licensed soil evaluator, before the project is approved.

Sincerely,

Brandon B. Faneuf, MSc
PWS, RPSS