Questions relating to project's impact on health, safety and welfare.

1. What is a safe distance from structures and wells for installation of the following types foundations for racking systems?
    a. Driven piles
    b. Helical piles
    c. Ground screws

BW Response: In the August 12th responses, page 1, we replied that there is no specific standard associated with the installation of driven piles, helical piles, or ground screws. To note, as it relates to abutter's wells, the racking is proposed to be installed, at minimum, 50' beyond the property line.

2. What is a safe or acceptable level of vibration at a property line – if any. How are ground vibration levels monitored?

BW Response: In the Geotechnical Report that has been provided to the Board, it states that residential structures should be greater than 52.5 ft from the pile driving site to be safe from damage due to vibration. This has been incorporated into the project plans. BlueWave and our contractors will perform pre- and post-construction surveys on adjacent structures within 100 ft of the work and shall be responsible for any damage that has been incurred as a result of array construction.

Please see the acoustic analysis study that was provided along with the responses on August 12th, as well as the updated version provided with these responses, for more information on sound monitoring. As stated in our responses from May 26th, the project plans to comply with the MADEP noise policy and the Town of Worthington Zoning By-law's standards for an acceptable level of sound from vibration at a property line.

3. Discuss the removal process for each of the following foundation types, including what is left in the soil / bedrock, and potential surface level impacts. For example: will concrete footings be left in the soil / bedrock? will the field need to be regraded to provide a smooth surface for continued agricultural activities?
    a. Driven piles
    b. Helical piles
    c. Ground screws

BW Response: Please see the decommissioning plan and cost estimate that was provided along with the responses on May 26th. Decommissioning will return the land to its pre-project

condition, with all project materials removed. The only concrete added to the site will be the equipment pad area, which will be demolished on-site during decommissioning and transported to an ABC recycling facility. During decommissioning, all racks, cable, electrical equipment, fencing, foundation posts, and utility poles will be removed from the site and recycled or disposed of. All graded areas will be returned to pre-construction conditions, and any graded areas will be seeded to promote revegetation.

4. Update the sound study to include the appropriate monitoring point at the property line of the Lagoy's property. This would include sound monitoring at BOTH sides of the Lagoy's property which abut the project to meet the standard.

BW Response: An updated sound study (26-1104 MA Worthington Ridge Road Sound Study (v3)) has been included in this response. The updated version includes modeled receivers at the south and west property lines of the Lagoy's property which abut the project, along with a modeled receiver at the residence on the property.

The conclusion remains that at the additional modeled receptors, the sound produced will comply with the most stringent requirements of state and local noise regulations with the implementation of barriers as recommended. Furthermore, sound emitted by the project would not produce a noticeable impact on the acoustic environment and would not have an unreasonable adverse effect at any surrounding properties.

5. We expect to require testing of the wells of abutting properties prior to construction, after construction and after any significant event (i.e. battery fire, hazardous material release, etc.). For baseline testing of the wells, which contaminants of concern should be screened?

    a. What chemicals have the potential to be released during a battery fire?

BW Response: As has been addressed throughout submittals, particularly the 1/2/2026 Response to Questions, solar and storage have been widely studied to ensure safety of the equipment with groundwater. Should a major event occur, the MA DEP emergency response plan will be implemented, including a state response and liability on the owner to clean up any waste.

The operation or failure of the PV or BESS system will have no impact on abutter well water. Also, based on feedback during the public hearing, the BESS has been removed from the Water Supply Protection District entirely.

NFPA 855 and the ICC specifically exempt lithium-ion batteries from spill control and neutralization requirements, as lithium-ion batteries do not contain any liquid that could spill from the container. Our recommended tactics are to allow a BESS fire to self-consume and to not apply water, which would eliminate the need for any possible runoff containment in the unlikely event that the runoff would contain any contaminants. Exposure cooling efforts on non-affected equipment would be similar to rain filtering over the unaffected equipment, and there is no real possibility of contamination occurring from this effort.

6. To your knowledge have there been any incidents in the U.S. of contamination of wells from an event at a large-scale solar generation facility? If so, please provide the details.

BW Response: In the January 2nd responses, page 9, we provided reference and link to a compiled fact sheet by The National Laboratory of the Rockies (formerly National Renewable Energy Laboratory). In 2025, the Lab analyzed potential environmental and human health impacts from PV modules, concluding that "scientific studies to date demonstrate PV module constituents are unlikely to leach in levels that pose a risk to human health and the environment."

7. Does the revised stormwater design remove the risks of impacts to the septic systems of the abutters?

BW Response: The water quality swale adjacent to the abutter property line that had been included in previous plans has been removed and is not included in the revised stormwater design dated August 5, 2026. To note, as it relates to abutter's wells and septic systems, the racking is proposed to be installed, at minimum, 50' beyond the property line. As is provided in Appendix C of the 5/26/2026 Response to Questions, the Certificate of Insurance includes liability insurance that could cover corrective actions needed concerning abutter septic systems, in the unlikely scenario there is an impact.

8. What effect will the three types of mounting systems below have on the bedrock aquifer?
    a. Driven piles
    b. Helical piles
    c. Ground screws

BW Response: The mounting systems used for the project will not have an impact on the bedrock aquifer. Please see the geotechnical report that was provided on July 2nd for additional details.

9. Are there any monitoring options available during the construction phase to determine whether there are any adverse effects on the bedrock aquifer? If so, please describe the options.

BW Response: Please see the geotechnical report provided on July 2nd for information on post-construction monitoring and recommendations for testing during the construction phase.

10. We know there is a section of the project site where the slope is greater (13 - 15%). How large is the section of the site with a slope greater than 10%? Where and how steep is the steepest slope grade? Please provide a plan showing the steeper (above 10%) slopes, and illustrating how the stormwater flow is directed / captured /

mitigated from those steeper slopes.

There are approximately 12,000 square feet of slopes greater than 10% within the array footprint. Please see the slope figure attached, which includes the Limit-of-Work boundary and the array footprint.