

From: [Scott horsley](#)
To: [David Morgan](#)
Cc: cmleich@comcast.net; [Michael Mobile](#)
Subject: Re: Whitestone Report - Thorndike
Date: Monday, February 3, 2025 12:39:39 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Thanks David. Thanks for sending the BSC report with the attached soil logs.

I was able to contact Trevor Fletcher at Graz Engineering this morning. As it turns out Whitestone (the town's consultant) did not perform the test pits themselves. They subcontracted the work to Graz Engineering. Trevor told me that he performed the test pits with BSC and collaborated with them on the interpretation of estimated seasonal high groundwater (ESHGW). I am also noting that the notation of "some mottling" (which is an indicator of redox conditions) as noted by Trevor in the Whitestone report was not included in the BSC soil logs for that same test pit in their March 13, 2024 report. We were hoping for an independent, third-party analysis and interpretation.

I continue to be concerned about using 4.0 feet elevation as a reliable ESHGW on which to base engineering design. Furthermore, as you know, BSC is now suggesting that they do not need to perform a groundwater mounding analysis on the large infiltration system based upon this 4.0 elevation and purportedly having 4 feet vertical separation. We believe that there are some significant groundwater mounding issues that are not being evaluated at this location.

As I suggested a year ago in my comment letters and oral testimony before the Commission - the applicant should install monitoring wells and use a continuous recorder (pressure transducer) to document groundwater levels throughout the Spring months (March, April, and May). This could have easily been done last year. However, instead, BSC elected to make periodic, discrete water level measurements (instead of a continuous recorder) and missed the high groundwater levels during those months as evidenced by both the USGS Lexington well and our own wells installed on Dorothy Road (both of those wells used continuous recorders).

Yes, I am happy for you to pass all of this correspondence along to the Commission at your discretion. I believe the process should be totally transparent. Scott

Scott Horsley
Water Resources Consultant
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/horsleyscott/>
Cell: (508)-364-7818

On Mon, Feb 3, 2025 at 11:43 AM David Morgan <dmorgan@town.arlington.ma.us> wrote:

Hi Scott,

Thanks for your note. Would you like me to include it as correspondence for the Commission to review?

Soil logs were included for the test pits dug in 2023 (see Appendix C here [BSC Test Pit Summary Report - 03-13-2024](#)) but not for the latest round. We did not receive notice of the new pits being dug and could not request that they be witnessed. The activity was outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. I think it would be reasonable for the Commission to request them at Thursday's hearing and will suggest it to the chairs.

Cheers,

David

David Morgan | Environmental Planner + Conservation Agent | Department of Planning and Community Development | 781.316.3012

Arlington values equity, diversity, and inclusion. We are committed to building a community where everyone is heard, respected, and protected.

From: Scott horsley <scotthorsley208@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 2, 2025 4:41 PM
To: David Morgan <dmorgan@town.arlington.ma.us>
Cc: Chris Leich <cmleich@comcast.net>
Subject: Whitestone Report - Thorndike

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

David: I am preparing for the upcoming Con Comm meeting on Thorndike. We are concerned about the applicant's reliance on the Whitestone report and specifically using 4.0 feet as a reliable estimated seasonal high groundwater (ESHWG) elevation. As you may know, the applicant is relying on that elevation to avoid providing a groundwater mounding analysis on the largest infiltration system for the project - one that we believe is problematic.

I have noticed that the Whitestone report discounts redox observations in TP-7 as an indicator of ESHGW. The redox level suggests an elevation of 5.8 feet rather than 4.0 feet. I think that their reported redox level here fits reasonably with ESHGW elevations that I would expect on-site (5.0 - 6.0 feet).

Recently I noticed that in the Whitestone Report, the summary of the test pit logs indicated that the actual excavations and soil observations were not actually done by Whitestone, but instead by an apparent subcontractor. There is a note indicating that Trevor Fletcher did them. He works for Graz Engineering, not Whitestone (see attachment). I confirmed this with Whitestone representatives on the phone - they indicated that they had subcontracted the work.

Furthermore, we note that there are no soil logs attached to the Whitestone Report - just a summary table. This is unusual. It is standard practice to include the actual soil logs - this is the work done by Graz. Do you have them? If not, can we request them through Whitestone.

Given the importance of this ESHGW issue, it seems imperative that we have the actual data (soil logs) that Whitestone (and now BSC) is relying on to make this ESHGW determination.

Thanks in advance. Call me with questions. Scott

Scott Horsley

Water Resources Consultant

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/horsleyscott/>

Cell: (508)-364-7818