

January 29, 2021

Heather Charles Lis, Assistant Conservation Officer
Town of Hingham
210 Central Street
Hingham, MA 02043

Re: Revised Submittal 01/10/2021
100 Industrial Park Road
Hingham, MA

Dear Ms. Charles Lis:

We are in receipt of your January 21, 2021, email containing comments regarding the project noted above. In addition to a reply email on Monday, January 25 and a follow-up telephone conversation with Alexander Klose, our Project Engineer, on Tuesday, January 26, our responses are indicated below in ***bold italic*** text and are as follows:

Limit of Disturbance & Landscaping

1. As I'm reviewing the plans again, I still don't understand why the LOD doesn't include the entire current leaching bed area as shown on the plans in the eastern corner of the site. I have made this comment previously but have not seen the LOD change in this area. Based on the Demolition Plan (DM-2) it seems the LOD is intended to encompass the area where pipes and structures are, but I believe there are disturbed areas/sand just outside this area based on my site visit, which may correspond with the limits of the leaching bed as shown on the plans. Similarly, if I'm correct then I would expect that the entire area within the leaching bed as shown on the plans, should be included in the area to be seeded/planted (Supplemental Buffer Plantings Area "B") on the various Landscape Plans (LL-2, etc.). To summarize, please clarify, or move the LOD further to the east and south in this area to include the entire existing leaching bed area.

Response: As discussed, the LOD and demolition plan were revised from the previous submission to be brought outside the existing tree limits. After a field investigation it was determined that no structural component of the system is expected to lie outside the cleared area. We want to be clear with the contractor, if approved, that the existing trees are not to be removed in this area. If a portion of the system lies within the canopy and would cause a removal, we want to be sure this is brought to our attention

and the attention of the owner to ensure the removal with the absolute least amount of disturbance.

Stormwater Management

2. Thank you very much for conducting additional test pits to evaluate the potential for additional recharge, which I understand is not feasible in the northwestern portion of the site unfortunately. Have you considered whether recharge would be feasible in the northern corner or along the northeastern edge of the property along the highway easement? Or at the southerly corner of the existing building to remain (as opposed to the area beyond the building to be removed)? I'm asking to ensure all possible locations and infiltration measures are considered in accordance with the stormwater standards.

Response: As discussed, the test pits that were investigated were selected because we believe the northwest corner of the Site was the only viable area to conduct infiltration remaining on-site. The northern corner and the northeastern edge were not considered viable due to the proximity of a proposed septic replacement and proximity to the building and drainage swale within the Route 3 ROW, respectively. Additionally, infiltration along the northern portion of the Site, which is topographically the highest elevation of the Site, is not feasible due to an inability to capture the majority of stormwater runoff from the proposed impervious surfaces and route it to this location (other than the roof, which has an existing functioning discharge point). The southern portion of the Site was not considered due to the AUL in that area from the existing Foundry Building. The limits of the area that are not recommended for infiltration is enclosed as an exhibit to the "Response to LSP Questions and LSP Opinion" letter.

AUL/LSP

3. I would like to request that the Licensed Site Professional attend the next Commission meeting. Given the Activity Use Limitation on site, the concerns and questions raised at the last meeting regarding contamination, and the challenges with recharge on site, I think the Commission should have the opportunity to hear from the LSP directly and ask any questions prior to issuing a decision. I understand some items have been addressed with the Planning Board, however it would be very helpful if the Commission could discuss these and any other items directly. I also think it would be helpful and appropriate to have a written opinion from the LSP regarding the suitability of any additional feasible locations for infiltration, and confirmation that the proposed constructed stormwater wetland is appropriate given the AUL and the recently released Periodic Review of the Temporary Solution report, dated December 2020, including the proposed alteration to the wetland restoration area identified in this report and prior AUL-related documentation.

Response: Please refer to the enclosed Sanborn Head “Response to LSP Questions and LSP Opinion” letter dated January 29, 2021 for responses to these questions. As discussed, the LSP will be attending the next meeting for both the Planning Board and Conservation Commission to ensure any remaining questions are answered by the appropriate professional.

We trust this addresses your concerns. Should you require additional information, please feel free to contact me at 203-608-2438.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'KH', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kevin Hixson
Senior Project Manager