

# ***PGB ENGINEERING, LLC***

CIVIL ENGINEERING DESIGN & CONSULTING

49 TUPELO ROAD  
MARSHFIELD, MA 02050-1739

Tel.: 781-834-8987  
PGBEngineeringLLC@gmail.com

February 3, 2026

Hingham Planning Board  
210 Central Street  
Hingham, MA 02043

Subject: **Hingham Center for Active Living, Bare Cove Park Drive, Site Plan**

Dear Planning Board Members:

This is to advise that we have reviewed the following documents pertaining to the proposed Center for Active Living facility off Bare Cove Park Drive:

- Site Plan (22 sheets), revised February 3, 2026, prepared by SLR International Corporation (SLR)
- Stormwater Management Plan, dated February 3, 2026, prepared by SLR
- Postconstruction Stormwater Management Operation and Maintenance Plan, dated February 2, 2026, prepared by SLR
- Comment Response Letter, dated February 2, 2026, prepared by SLR

The documents have been prepared to address comments contained in our January 9, 2026 letter to the Board as well as comments we sent to SLR via email on February 2, 2026<sup>1</sup>. Below are the comments from our January 9<sup>th</sup> letter in plain text, followed by the current status of each in **bold text**.

1. The existing and proposed watershed maps are missing from Appendix A of the Stormwater Management Plan. These should be provided so that we can confirm the modeled drainage patterns. **Addressed – the watershed maps are included in the Stormwater Management Plan and we have confirmed the watershed modeling.**
2. As noted in the Stormwater Management Plan, test holes are required at each of the proposed infiltration facilities to confirm soil textural analysis and depth to seasonal high groundwater. We note that the borings in proximity of the proposed rain garden and infiltration basin IB-2 indicate bedrock at depths close to the bottom elevations of these facilities. Test holes would verify the feasibility of these facilities. **Addressed – test holes were excavated on January 23, 2026 at the locations of the proposed infiltration systems. We visited the site during the testing to confirm soil textural analysis. The proposed infiltration facilities have been revised accordingly based on soil texture and depths to bedrock.**
3. The drawdown calculations utilize different infiltration rates than those used in the HydroCAD model for the infiltration facilities. These should be consistent and test holes would confirm the appropriate infiltration rates to be used. **Addressed – the infiltration**

---

<sup>1</sup> Copy of email attached with current status of comments in red text.

**rates used in the drawdown calculations are consistent with the rates used in the HydroCAD model.**

4. We recommend that the open-air infiltration basins have four inches of topsoil (loam) to enhance infiltration. We also recommend that the sediment forebays have 8- to 12-inches of topsoil to limit infiltration. **Addressed – the details have been revised to specify the depths of topsoil recommended. We note that the only infiltration basins proposed now are the rain garden and infiltration basins IB-1 and IB-2, the stormwater management basins are now all designed as sediment forebays with 8-inches of topsoil.**
5. Additional coordination is required between the Utilities Plan (Sheet UT) and the details. Sheet UT specifies the bottom elevation of the proposed gravel infiltration trenches and refers the reader to Sheet SD-5 for additional information related to the trenches (i.e. the widths). The Gravel Infiltration Trench Detail on Sheet SD-5 shows a varying width of the trenches and refers the reader to Sheet UT for the individual trench widths. A table of trench widths and depths on Sheet SD-5 would be helpful. **Addressed – a table listing trench widths and bottom elevations has been added to Sheet SD-5.**
6. We recommend that the filter fabric around the gravel infiltration trenches (including the trenches in the bottoms of the infiltration basins and rain garden) wrap over the top of the 3/4-inch crushed stone layer to keep sediment out of the crushed stone. This will make maintenance easier as only the top twelve inches of ‘clean broken stone’ will need to be removed and cleaned/replaced when filled with sediment. **Addressed – the Gravel Infiltration Trench Detail on Sheet SD-5 has been revised to show the filter fabric as recommended.**
7. We assume that the Riprap Spillway detail on Sheet SD-5 is the spillway for infiltration basin IB-1, however, it is not labeled. This detail, as well as the Forebay Overflow Weir Section Detail (also on Sheet SD-5), should show a concrete cut-off wall (curb or similar) with the top elevation at the design weir elevation so that water does not flow through the stone of the spillways before reaching the design elevation. **Addressed – the details on Sheet SD-5 have been labeled accordingly and revised to specify concrete curb cut-off walls.**
8. The Nyoplast Drain Basin With Dome Grate detail on Sheet SD-5 should specify a sump in the basins (yard drains). We recommend a minimum two-foot sump but deeper sumps would perform better. **Addressed – the detail specifies a minimum two-foot sump as recommended.**
9. The drain manhole at the end of the isolator row of the subsurface infiltration system should have outlet inverts specified, with the invert into the isolator row lower than the invert to the manifold leading the other rows of chambers. **Addressed – the invert to the isolator row is specified to be about two feet lower than the invert to the manifold.**

10. The proposed inspection ports on the subsurface infiltration system should be a minimum of six-inch diameter to allow for easier inspection and maintenance. Locations of the inspection ports should be shown in plan and there should be one on each end chamber in each row to allow for cleaning. **Addressed – the inspection ports are specified to be six-inch diameter, and they are shown in plan on Sheet UT.**
11. Sheet SD-6 includes details for reinforced concrete (RC) and high-density polyethylene (HDPE) flared end sections. For durability we recommend that all flared end sections be reinforced concrete. **Addressed – the HDPE flared end detail has been removed from the plans.**
12. The Storm Water Maintenance Program on Sheet UT should be consistent with the Schedule for Inspection and Maintenance (Schedule) included in the Postconstruction Stormwater Management Operation and Maintenance Plan (gravel trenches and yard drains should be included on Sheet UT). The inspection frequencies specified in the Schedule should be utilized with the following recommended changes:
  - a. Yard Drains should be inspected and cleaned four times per year, consistent with catch basins.
  - b. Basins and forebays should be mowed regularly with other grass areas to prevent growth of woody vegetation.  
**Addressed – the text on Sheet UT and the Schedule are consistent and the frequencies of yard drain inspections and mowing of basins and forebays have been revised as recommended.**
13. The Construction Entrance (CE) detail on Sheet SE-2 should specify the minimum length of the construction entrance to be fifty feet. **Addressed – the length of the construction entrance is specified to be fifty feet minimum.**
14. The Erosion Checks described in the Sediment & Erosion Control Specifications on Sheet SE-2 are straw bales, yet the erosion checks specified in plan on Sheet SE-1 and detailed on Sheet SE-2 are compost filter tubes. **Addressed – all references to straw bales have been changed to compost filter tubes.**

Please give us a call should you have any questions.



Very truly yours,

PGB Engineering, LLC

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrick G. Brennan".

Patrick G. Brennan, P.E.

PGB  
enc.



Patrick Brennan <pgbengineeringllc@gmail.com>

---

## RE: HCAL Preliminary Site Plan/Application Review

---

Patrick Brennan <pgbengineeringllc@gmail.com>

Mon, Feb 2, 2026 at 6:38 PM

To: Mark Arigoni <marigoni@slrconsulting.com>, agoralski@slrconsulting.com

Cc: "Wentworth, Emily" <wentworthe@hingham-ma.gov>, "planning@hingham-ma.gov" <planning@hingham-ma.gov>, "jdirk@rdva.com" <jdirk@rdva.com>, "Murphy, Susan" <smurphy@daintorpy.com>, "Wante, Chris" <cwante@edmstudiocreates.com>, "Frey, JR" <freyj@hingham-ma.gov>, Nick Havan <nhavan@slrconsulting.com>

Andrew,

I've gone through the revised plans and calculations and offer the following that you may want to change prior to submitting hard copies:

1. There should not be any infiltration through the sediment forebay. This is why I had asked for the thickness of loam to be 8"-12" and the detail has been changed to reflect that. If you would like to use the sediment forebay as an infiltration basin then CMH18 and DMH22 should be hydrodynamic separators.
2. Since the forebay has been removed from Stormwater Basin SWB-4, DMH10 and CB 13 should be hydrodynamic separators (alternatively, just DMH10 could be a hydrodynamic separator with CB13 routed to DMH10).
3. DMH1 should list the NW invert at EI. 22.30 (outlet to the isolator row).

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Pat

PGB Comments (2/3/26):

1. The sediment forebay has been eliminated and DMH18 & DMH22 are specified to be hydrodynamic separators.
2. SWB-4 is now designed as a sediment forebay (all SWB's are designed as forebays) and no infiltration is modeled through it.
3. The outlet from DMH1 to the isolator row is specified to be 22.3.

Patrick G. Brennan, P.E.  
PGB ENGINEERING, LLC  
49 Tupelo Road  
Marshfield, MA 02050  
(p) 781-834-8987  
(m) 781-799-0279  
[pgbengineeringllc@gmail.com](mailto:pgbengineeringllc@gmail.com)

[Quoted text hidden]