Berkshire Design Group

October 20, 2026

Conway Planning Board
Town of Conway
32 Main Street
Conway, MA 01341

RE: Engineering Peer Review — Follow-Up on Applicant's September 29, 2026 Response
Roaring Brook Road Solar Development Project
0 Roaring Brook Road, Conway, MA 01341 (Map 412 Lot 8)

Dear Board Members:

Berkshire Design Group, Inc. (BDG) has reviewed the applicant's September 29, 2026 response letter and associated Attachments A through D, prepared by Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc. on behalf of Roaring Brook Solar, LLC (d/b/a Bluewave Solar). This letter provides BDG's follow-up comments on the items addressed in the September 29 submittal.

For each item below, the original comment or question is reproduced in regular font, followed by the applicant's September 29 response in italics, and BDG's follow-up in bold. Where applicable, status tags follow BDG's prior convention: CLOSED, OPEN, BOARD FINDING REQUIRED, or BOARD DECISION.

Planning Board Comments from August 11, 2026 Public Hearing

1. Request for the Applicant to provide a percentage breakdown of the proposed development on slopes 15–18%, and greater than 18%.

   The table below summarizes the slopes within the proposed fence limits in total and associated with the revised proposed layout. The table addresses both the correcting of the original discrepancy, as well as updated values to reflect the revised layout after relocation of the equipment pad. This table and the revised layout are included on Sheet C102 in the revised set of Issued for Permitting Plans included as Attachment A to this letter.

Table 1. Approximate Areas of Proposed Fenced Limits by Slope

	Area within Fence ±			Area Under Racks ±		
	(square feet, SF)	(acres, AC)	%	(square feet, SF)	(acres, AC)	%
Area within Fence	1,193,832	27.40	100%	229,973	5.27	100%
Slopes 18% or greater	60,252	1.38	5%	434	0.01	0.2%
Slopes 15% – 18%	118,649	2.72	10%	21,510	0.49	9.3%
Slopes up to 15%	1,014,931	23.30	85%	208,029	4.77	90.5%

As discussed at the August 11th Public Hearing, the proposed layout has been revised to exclude slopes greater than 18% for placement of tables, and to minimize development on slopes between 15–18% to the

greatest extent practicable. It is the applicant's opinion that this project is a good opportunity for the Board to grant a waiver for development on slopes up to 18% for multiple reasons, including the proposed location on existing vegetated ground cover. A Waiver Request Letter is included with this submittal in Attachment B.

BDG: The comment was addressed. The slope waiver justification in Attachment B, are addressed in BDG's engineering memorandum dated October 8, 2026. The Board's determination on the waiver remains the open item for this comment. BOARD FINDING REQUIRED.

2. Request for the Applicant to review moving the equipment pad from the current proposed location to an area behind the existing barns.

Upon further discussion with the landowner and Mr. Jeff Lacey of the Planning Board, which took place on site on September 2nd, the proposed BESS pad has been relocated behind the barn. As discussed at the August 11th Planning Board meeting, the Fire Chief would like a 1.5x height protection radius around the existing structures onsite. The height of the existing barn was measured to be approximately 30 feet (FT) which resulted in a protection radius of 45 FT. The proposed equipment pad area, including the BESS, has been relocated to the area behind the barn outside of this 45 FT protection radius.

To address the stormwater requirements, the site's stormwater design has been modified. The detention basin location has been relocated adjacent to the new pad location, south of the access road. A revised Stormwater Report is included as Attachment C.

Additionally, a row of evergreen trees has been added directly adjacent to the north side of the pad to provide screening from the road. During the on-site meeting, it was determined that screening directly in front of the pad would be much more effective than the previously proposed screening at the northwest property corner. As a result of this revision, the landscape buffer at the corner of the northern property line along Roaring Brook Rd and parallel to Route 116 has been removed from the plans. The revised Issued for Permitting Plans are included as Attachment A to this letter.

BDG: Comment addressed. As noted in the applicant's response, the change is reflected on the re-submitted stormwater management design. BDG has reviewed the stormwater design and supporting calculations. In our opinion, the project continues to comply with the Massachusetts Stormwater Standards as designed. Note that the array area is designed to conform with MassDEP Wetlands Program Policy 17-1 such that stormwater models are based on groundcover below and between panels. CLOSED

3. Request for the Applicant to review adding a landscape berm along Roaring Brook Road.

As a result of the relocated BESS pad described above, the Landscape Plans have been updated to depict a row of evergreen trees along the north side of the pad to provide additional screening. With the pad effectively screened from the north and west (road-facing) sides, the previously proposed vegetative buffer at the corner of the northwestern property line along Roaring Brook Rd and parallel to Route 116 has been removed from the plans. The revised landscaping plans are included in Attachment A.

BDG: The applicant's response is accurately reflected in the plans. At the October 8, 2026 Public Hearing, the Board requested that the northwest-corner screening be reinstated in addition to, not in place of, the evergreens along the north side of the pad. BDG recommends the applicant restore the northwest-corner vegetative buffer in the next plan revision.

The underlying question of whether a landscape berm along Roaring Brook Road is required or desired remains a Board policy judgment. BDG offers no engineering objection to either outcome. OPEN BOARD DECISION

Peer Review Comments from BDG

The following items are carried over from BDG's September 4, 2026 follow-up letter. For each item, the original comment is reproduced in regular font, followed by the applicant's September 29 response in italics, and BDG's follow-up in bold.

12. §9.3(h)(4) — Landscape/Screening Plan. BDG previously commented on the adequacy of screening on the western (Roaring Brook Road) boundary and requested confirmation regarding existing screening on the south and east boundaries.

    The Landscaping Plans provided in Attachment A have been revised to replace White Pine with White Spruce to address the Board's concerns regarding branch drop. As a result of the relocated equipment pad, the previous screening options of faux hedging or stockade fence are no longer proposed. Instead, evergreens are proposed along the north side of the relocated pad as previously described in this letter.

    BDG: The substitution of White Spruce for White Pine is responsive to the Board's branch-drop concern. White Spruce is a well-suited native evergreen for the proposed screening role and is appropriate to the climate and site conditions.

    The direct screening of the relocated BESS pad by evergreens on the north side of the pad is a reasonable substitute for the previously proposed faux hedge or stockade fence options, in our opinion. The screening approach at the pad location is consistent with the requirements of §9.3(h)(4).

    The removal of the previously proposed northwest-corner vegetative buffer is addressed in PB-3 above and remains an open item pending restoration in the next plan revision. CLOSED

18. §9.3(o)(3) — BESS Decommissioning. BDG previously requested that the applicant either provide a manufacturer take-back commitment for the BESS cells at end of life or add a line item to the decommissioning estimate accounting for recycling/disposal of the cells.

    Email correspondence between Weston & Sampson and Battery Recyclers of America documenting the unit price of $0.70 per pound has been included in the Decommissioning Estimate which has been reissued as an attachment to this letter (Attachment D). The estimate has also been updated to reflect the revised DC capacity of the proposed system to align with the layout included in Attachment A.

    BDG: Comment addressed. CLOSED

Review of Revised Stormwater Management Report (Attachment C)

BDG has reviewed the revised Stormwater Management Report dated September 2026 submitted with the September 29 package. The submission meets the applicable requirements of the Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards and MassDEP Wetlands Program Policy 17-1. BDG has no further comments on the stormwater submission. CLOSED.

Geotechnical Report (October 2026) — Hearing Follow-Up

At the October 8, 2026 Public Hearing, the Board asked whether construction of the array may encounter bedrock, which would require additional noisy construction work. In response, the applicant submitted a Geotechnical Report prepared by Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc., which is now part of the project record. BDG has reviewed the report.

The report documents a subsurface exploration program consisting of ten borings (B-1 through B-10) drilled to a depth of 17 feet, and twelve test pits (TP-1 through TP-12) excavated to a depth of 10 feet. No bedrock was encountered in any of the borings or test pits; the surficial geology is characterized as glacial till. The report confirms that bedrock is not expected to be encountered during foundation installation.

The subsurface conditions encountered are described in the report as suitable to support either driven-post or screw-post foundations for the solar array. The report notes that cobbles and boulders are present within the glacial till, and that shallow refusal of some post foundations may be encountered. The report identifies pre-drilling or offsetting of piles as the standard response.

BDG's engineering review of the geotechnical report confirms that the Board's specific concern — the potential for noisy bedrock-related construction work — is unlikely to be encountered. To the extent boulders or cobbles are encountered, the geotechnical engineer recommends pre-drilling. Based on our research, pre-drilling activity is similar or less noisy than pile driving. CLOSED

Please let us know if additional engineering review would be useful at any point during the Board's continued review. BDG is pleased to assist as the application proceeds.

Sincerely,

Berkshire Design Group, Inc.

Christopher S. Chamberland, P.E.
Principal Civil Engineer

cc: Melinda Costello, P.E., Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc.