Custom Soil Resource Report Soil Map



MAP LEGEND)	MAP INFORMATION		
Area of Int	erest (AOI) Area of Interest (AOI)	8	Spoil Area Stony Spot	The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:12,000.		
Soils	Soil Map Unit Polygons	00 V	Very Stony Spot Wet Spot	Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.		
Special	Soil Map Unit Points Point Features		Other Special Line Features	Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL: Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)		
o X	Blowout Water Features Borrow Pit Streams and Canals		tures Streams and Canals	Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercato projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts		
≫ ◇	Clay Spot Closed Depression	+++ ~	Rails Interstate Highways	distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.		
*	Gravel Pit Gravelly Spot	~	US Routes Major Roads	This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.		
Ø A	Landfill Lava Flow	Local Roads		Soil Survey Area: State of Connecticut Survey Area Data: Version 19, Sep 13, 2019		
**	Marsh or swamp Mine or Quarry		Aerial Photography	Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.		
0	Perennial Water			Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Mar 20, 2019—Mar 27, 2019		
+	Saline Spot			The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor		
 = ^	Severely Eroded Spot			shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.		
ð Ø	Slide or Slip Sodic Spot					

Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
3	Ridgebury, Leicester, and Whitman soils, 0 to 8 percent slopes, extremely stony	7.3	4.9%
12	Raypol silt loam	0.5	0.3%
29B	Agawam fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Agawam fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 6.0 percent slopes 6.0	
52C	Sutton fine sandy loam, 2 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony	2.6	1.7%
61B	Canton and Charlton fine sandy loams, 0 to 8 percent slopes, very stony	51.1	34.3%
62C	Canton and Charlton fine sandy loams, 3 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony	1.7	1.1%
73C	Charlton-Chatfield complex, 0 to 15 percent slopes, very rocky	41.4	27.8%
75C	Hollis-Chatfield-Rock outcrop complex, 3 to 15 percent slopes	0.0	0.0%
75E	Hollis-Chatfield-Rock outcrop complex, 15 to 45 percent slopes	21.0	14.1%
85B	Paxton and Montauk fine sandy loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes, very stony	13.1	8.8%
701B	Ninigret fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	4.3	2.9%
Totals for Area of Interest		149.0	100.0%

March 21, 2019

BL Companies 355 Research Parkway Meriden, CT 06450



Attn: Mr. Christopher Albino, P.E. – Senior Project Manager / Principal

- P: (203) 608 2509
- E: calbino@blcompanies.com

Re: Addendum to Geotechnical Engineering Report – *In-Situ* Permeability Testing Photovoltaic Installation 117 Oil Mill Road Waterford, Connecticut Terracon Project No. J2185052

Dear Mr. Albino:

At your request, Terracon Consultants, Inc. (Terracon) has completed this addendum to our Geotechnical Engineering Report, dated May 22, 2018, for the above-referenced project. The additional services included performing *in-situ* permeability testing at 13 locations throughout the site. Our services were conducted in general accordance with our supplemental proposal dated January 23, 2019. The General Conditions in our report apply to the *in-situ* testing in this letter.

1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

The project site is an approximately 140-acre parcel west of Oil Mill Road and north of Parkway North, in the town of Waterford, Connecticut. The site undulates between relative highs and lows, generally sloping downward to the west from approximately Elevations 240 to 100 feet. The majority of the site is heavily wooded. However, portions of the site have been cleared, presumably in anticipation of site development.

Our understanding of the project comes from our recent conversations and review of the site plan titled *"SWMB – Geotech Boring Locations"*, Project No. 17D3515, Sheet No. EXH-1, dated July 30, 2018, by BL Companies of Meriden, Connecticut. As such, we understand that the project will include the construction of 13 stormwater management basins within the solar power facility. Cuts and fills, up to about 10 feet, are anticipated for site and stormwater detention development.

Terracon Consultants, Inc. 201 Hammer Mill Road Rocky Hill, CT 06067 P (860) 721 1900 F (860) 721 1939 terracon.com



2.0 FIELD EXPLORATION AND GEOLOGIC DESCRIPTION

Field Exploration Description

The approximate exploration and test locations, which are shown in Exhibit A-2, were obtained using a handheld GPS unit (estimated horizontal accuracy of about ± 10 feet) and approximate elevations were obtained by interpolating from 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle maps, including Montville, Connecticut (1983) and Niantic, Connecticut (1983). Ground surface elevations rounded to the nearest foot are shown on the individual exploration logs. The locations of the explorations and tests as well as their elevations should be considered accurate only to the degree implied by the method used to define them.

Terracon advanced 13 test probes (INF-1 through INF-13) between February 22 and April 1, 2019 for the purpose of performing *in-situ* infiltration tests. With the exception of INF-6, INF-7, and INF-8, the probes were advanced using 3¹/₄-inch inside diameter continuous flight hollow-stem augers or 4-inch diameter continuous flight solid stem augers powered by an all-terrain vehicle (ATV) mounted Diedrich D-50 rotary drill rig. INF-6, INF-7, and INF-8 were in an area that was inaccessible to our drill rig and therefore were advanced by hand using a 2-inch diameter auger.

Select soil samples were collected in the field and placed in labeled bags and glass jars and transported to our Rocky Hill (Hartford) laboratory for further review by a Terracon geotechnical engineer, laboratory testing, and classification. Information provided on the exploration logs attached to this report includes soil descriptions, exploration depths, and groundwater conditions. Field logs of the explorations were prepared by a Terracon field engineer. These logs included visual classifications of the materials encountered during drilling as well as interpretation by our field engineer of the subsurface conditions between samples. Final exploration logs included with this report represent further interpretation by the geotechnical engineer of the field logs and incorporate, where appropriate, modifications based on observations and laboratory classification of the samples.

Geotechnical Characterization

Based on our knowledge of the site, the subsurface conditions consist of forest mat underlain by glacial till over bedrock. The glacial till consists of brown, medium dense to very dense silty, silty sand (SM), with gravel, occasional to frequent cobbles and boulders. Bedrock, the upper several feet of which is weathered, consists of gray granitic gneiss.

INF-1 through INF-5, INF-9, INF-12, and INF-13 terminated without refusal in the glacial till at a depth of approximately 10 feet below existing grade. INF-6 terminated on a probable boulder in the glacial till at a depth of approximately 2 feet. INF-7, INF-8, INF-10, and INF-11 terminated on bedrock at depths ranging from approximately 2 to 4 feet.



Groundwater

With the exception of INF-1 and INF-2, groundwater was not encountered at the time of our explorations. Fluctuations in groundwater level may occur because of seasonal variations in the amount of rainfall, runoff, and other factors. Additionally, grade adjustments on and around the site, as well as surrounding drainage improvements, may affect the water table. The possibility of groundwater level fluctuations should be considered when developing the design and construction plans for the project. Groundwater levels are tabulated below:

Boring	ing Depth to Groundwater While Drilling (feet)	
INF-1	0.5	
INF-2	1.0	

3.0 IN-SITU PERMEABILITY TESTING

Between February 22 and March 15, 2019, Terracon performed *in-situ* soil hydraulic conductivity testing at 13 locations (INF-1 through INF-13) using falling head infiltration testing. Testing was performed by installing 2-inch diameter PVC well pipe to the bottom of the test hole. Granular filter media (i.e. coarse sand) was placed at the bottom of the pipe to prevent scouring and silting. The pipes were then filled with water to the top of pipe and allowed to presoak. Following the presoaking period, infiltration testing was performed in general accordance with the *2004 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual* by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection. The results are tabulated below.

Soils at the appropriate test depths from each location were collected and classified using the USDA Textural Triangle. Classification was by visual/manual procedures. Results of the field permeability testing is summarized below:

Test No.	Approximate Depth (feet)	Material at Test Depth	Textural Class	Infiltration Rate, K, (inches/hour)
INF-1	10	Weathered Rock	Loamy Sand	<0.1
INF-2	10	Glacial Till	Loamy Sand	No Movement ¹
INF-3	10	Glacial Till	Loamy Sand	No Movement ¹
INF-4	10	Glacial Till	Loamy Sand	No Movement ¹
INF-5	10	Glacial Till	Loamy Sand	No Movement ¹



Addendum to Geotechnical Engineering Report – *In-Situ* Permeability Testing Photovoltaic Installation • Waterford, Connecticut

March 21, 2019 Terracon Project No. J2185052

Test No.	Approximate Depth (feet)	Material at Test Depth	Textural Class	Infiltration Rate, K, (inches/hour)
INF-6	2	Glacial Till	Loamy Sand	2.8
INF-7	2	Bedrock	Not Applicable	No Movement ¹
INF-8	3.6	Bedrock	Not Applicable	No Movement ¹
INF-9	10	Glacial Till	Loamy Sand	3.0
INF-10	2.6	Weathered Rock	Loamy Sand	<0.1
INF-11	4	Bedrock	Not Applicable	0.1
INF-12	10	Glacial Till	Loamy Sand	2.3
INF-13	10	Glacial Till	Loamy Sand	2.3
1. No perceivable movement in water level after 60 minutes.				

Individual permeability tests only measure the hydraulic conductivity in the immediate vicinity of the test, and may not be representative of the average hydraulic conductivity of the soil. Additionally, field hydraulic conductivity values are generally accurate to an order of magnitude.

Various factors may influence field infiltration testing results, including lack of soil saturation, a non-homogenous soil profile surrounding the test interval, the presence of bedrock, gravel, cobbles, boulders, or deleterious material, or variation in soil density. Field infiltration values should be evaluated based on the measured data in conjunction with published values for the material.



We trust that this report meets your current needs. We appreciate the opportunity to have been of service to you on this project. Should you require further information, please contact us.

Sincerely, Terracon Consultants, Inc.

Brian D. Opp, P.E.	Stephen C. Lanne, P.E.
Senior Engineer	Geotechnical Department Manager

/bdo/J2185052

APPENDIX A – FIELD EXPLORATION

Exhibit A-1Site Location MapExhibit A-2Test Location DiagramExhibits A-3 to A-15Test Probe Logs (INF-1 through INF-13)

APPENDIX B – SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Exhibit B-1	General Notes
Exhibit B-2	Unified Soil Classification System
Exhibit B-3	Description of Rock Properties

