KEVIN L. PATTON, P.E. 36 PATTON ROAD NEWBURGH, N.Y. 12550 845 275-7732 PATTONGEOTECH.COM

REVISED GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT

Table of Contents

BORING LOCATIONS – EXISTING CONDITIONS BORING LOCATIONS – PROPOSED SITE PLAN SUBSURFACE PROFILE SOIL BORING LOGS LABORATORY TEST REPORTS BEDROCK GEOLOGIC MAP SURFICIAL GEOLOGIC MAP USDA SOIL REPORT DATA

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This geotechnical investigation report combines and summarizes the findings of four previous reports, updated to conform to revisions that have been made to the project design. The previous reports were dated March 9, 2021 (Geotechnical Investigation Report, project number 21420,) December 30, 2022 (Geotechnical Investigation Report, project number 22404,) March 17, 2023 (Supplemental Geotechnical Investigation, project number 22404,) and April 20, 2023 (Geotechnical Investigation and Assessment Report, project number 22404.) These investigations included the drilling of soil borings, excavation of test pits, measurement of groundwater elevations and field infiltration rate testing for stormwater controls. The current revision does not include any new field data.

The investigation was performed for use in the design and construction of two large structures, some high retaining walls and related stormwater controls. The attached plans show the locations of the borings and test pits, and of the proposed buildings and related features. The proposed Warehouse 1 is an approximately 850,000-square foot building near the center of the site and Warehouse 2 is a 278,270-square foot building proposed for the northwest panhandle of the site. Loading docks and parking areas will surround most of Warehouse 1 and three sides of Warehouse 2, and a large L-shaped parking lot for semitrailers is proposed for the east end of the site. Stormwater control practices are proposed at several locations around the facility, with the greatest concentration near its south end. The proposed facility layout is greatly influenced by a large hill in the northwest part of the site, which the Warehouse 2 area will be cut into, and which extends into the northwest part of proposed Warehouse 1. Retaining walls are proposed north of Warehouse 1 and west of Warehouse 2, parallel to the property lines, to allow this grade change. The proposed retaining wall north of Warehouse 1 has a maximum exposed height of approximately forty feet, near the corner where it turns to run north behind Warehouse 2; in that area a combination of walls and slopes are proposed to make the grade change. On the east side of Warehouse 2, finished grade will be at approximately 440 feet elevation and the top of the cut will be at elevations of about 475 to 527 feet. Some smaller retaining walls are also proposed, to support roads and paved areas.

The project will generate a significant excess of excavated soil, which is proposed to be disposed of on-site by creating a mound of fill on the west side of the northwest part of the site, under the west side of proposed Warehouse 2 and extending almost to Beaver Dam Road. This fill has a proposed maximum height of approximately 100 feet. It would continue south as a berm approximately 40 to 60 feet high, ending with a 50-foot high knoll of fill near the west end of proposed Warehouse 1.

SETTING AND GEOLOGY

The site is mostly abandoned agricultural land, with a silo and some building remnants in the low areas, three houses with outbuildings on the section along Beaver Dam Road and two houses with outbuildings near the intersection of Neelytown and Beaver Dam Roads. The south and middle parts of the site are lowlying and relatively flat, with light brush and small tree growth, a small pond and a small natural stream which flows to the south. Water is discharged onto the north part of the site by a culvert from the adjacent FedEx Ground facility, which begins on the north side of that side and runs south under the front parking lot. The west and northwest parts of the site are on the end of the above-mentioned hill, which is partly tree-covered, with slopes of about ten to fifteen percent on its east side and a slope of about thirty percent on the west side.

The local bedrock is Ordovician-age siltstone, shale and sandstone of the Normanskill formation. This is medium-hard, medium-gray sedimentary rock, thinly-bedded and moderately folded. It weathers readily to shallow depth when exposed in cuts, typically shedding gravel-size pieces of rock. Where it is covered by soils, the upper two to five feet of the bedrock usually weathers to the extent that it can be easily excavated, but the deeper rock tends to be relatively hard and tight, and sometimes the weathered zone is very thin or is absent. The surface of the shale bedrock in the local region is generally flat or gently undulating due to glacial erosion, with isolated hills formed by soil deposits and on harder knobs of rock.

The New York State Surficial Geologic Map (Albany, 1989) indicates that the local soils consist of lacustrine silt and clay, deposited in a glacial lake that was impounded in the Wallkill Valley by the retreating ice front, which formed a recessional moraine crossing the valley through Walden. Sandy, silty and clayey deposits were encountered in the low areas of the site, over shallow bedrock, but there is also a large till deposit which forms the hill in the northwest part of the site.

The USDA Soil Survey indicates that the native topsoil types in the lower, mostly flat area of the site are predominately Hoosic gravelly sandy loam and Alden silt loam, with some Erie gravelly silt loam and some smaller areas of Raynham silt loam, Rock outcrop-Nassau complex and Bath-Nassau complex soils. Hoosic soils typically form over sandy to gravelly glacial outwash, Alden soils form in low spots that have been silted-in, usually on top of glacial till, and Erie soils typically form over deep deposits of clayey glacial till. Raynham soils form over deposits of silt and very fine sand, of glacial or post-glacial origin. Bath and Nassau soils form over thin deposits of stony, silty glacial till, with bedrock typically at 1.5 to 4.5 feet depth.

The borings in the low areas did not encounter any true till, except for a two-foot thick layer of gravelly till, just above the weathered rock layer in boring B4. Some of the shallow soils were of the Alden type, while the deeper soils and some of the shallow soils were sandy outwash or lacustrine deposits, typical of Hoosic soils, or had a texture and structure intermediate between outwash and till. The Soil Survey also indicates a small area of Rock outcrop-Nassau soils near the northeast corner of the site; boring B14 encountered shallow bedrock at about five feet depth (EL 408) on top of the small knob in that area. The soil there may have originally been till, but has been altered by frost heave and other natural processes.

The hill in the northwest part of the site is shown by the Soil Survey as an area of mostly Pittsfield gravelly loam, with some Erie gravelly silt loam and with Rock outcrop-Nassau complex soils on its east and west slopes, extending close to the proposed northwest building. Pittsfield soils form over glacial till, typically with a silty sand texture, while Erie soils usually form over clayey till, as noted above. The hill is a drumlin, an elongated hill formed under moving glacial ice, which consists of densely-consolidated till. There appears to be a high point in the bedrock near the southwest end of the hill, which may have served as the anchor point for deposition of the drumlin, with shallow bedrock observed in two test pits (P41, P43) on the west side of proposed Warehouse 2. The borings drilled farther up the hill were drilled to depths of 29 to 54 feet without encountering rock. From personal observation during construction of the FedEx Ground site immediately to the north, there was no shallow bedrock in the east slope of the hill where it was indicated on that site by the Soil Survey map.

2. SOIL INVESTIGATION AND TEST RESULTS

A total of twenty-three soil borings were drilled in and near the proposed building areas, six on February 17-18, 2021, during the initial investigation, an additional fourteen between November 11 and 17, 2022, and three more in the northwest part of the site, on January 23-25, 2023. Borings were drilled by the hollowstem auger method, using track-mounted drill rigs. Drilling was performed by General Borings, Inc. of Prospect, Connecticut. The initial subsurface investigation was supervised and witnessed by Wyeth Patton, with the second and third phases inspected by Warren Patton, each under the direction of Kevin Patton, P.E. Soil sampling and testing were performed by the Standard Penetration Test (SPT,) using an Automatic Hammer during the second phase and a Safety Hammer on a cable with a free-spooling drum for the initial phase, both in accordance with ASTM D1586 (Standard Method for Penetration Test and Split-Barrel Sampling of Soils.) The SPT provides the Blow Count "N" Value, equal to the number of blows of the 140 pound steel hammer that were required to drive the 2-inch outside diameter split-spoon sampling tube into the soil, over a twelve-inch increment.

Soil samples are also recovered by the Standard Penetration Test, and additional tests were performed in the field and lab, as noted on the soil boring logs, using a hand penetrometer to test bearing capacity. Soil type and moisture condition must be considered when interpreting the hand penetrometer test results. Strong cohesive soils tend to have high SPT blow counts and high hand penetrometer tests results, and weak soils tend to have low blow counts and low penetrometer results; dense soils that are sensitive to disturbance, such as wet silt, may have high blow counts but low penetrometer results. This test can only be performed on relatively undisturbed samples containing little or no gravel.

Test pits were also excavated at the site, primarily for the evaluation of the proposed stormwater control areas. Stormwater infiltration tests were performed where applicable, per the methods described in NYSDEC Stormwater Design Manual Appendix D. Test pits were excavated to just above the proposed test depths, with the last six to twelve inches dug by hand. Standpipes were seated in the holes, with bentonite clay placed around the perimeter to make a seal, and the pipes were carefully backfilled. They were then pre-soaked overnight, and were tested on the following day. Each test measured the drop in water level within the test pipe, from an initial level of 24 inches above the pipe bottom. Groundwater depth measurements were also made at locations near each of the infiltration tests, where standpipes fitted with slotted well points were installed in test pits and the water depth was measured after allowing it to stabilize; when practical, up to three measurements were made on different days. The groundwater depth determinations were all made during the wet season and are believed to be at or close to the seasonal high water levels for the soil.

Laboratory testing was performed on representative soil samples, for moisture content, particle size distribution and Atterberg Limits. An unconfined compressive strength (UCS) test with strain measurements was also performed in the laboratory on a sample of the deep, hard till. Soil strengths measured with the UCS test are usually on par with those from hand penetrometer tests. USCS classifications of the soil, per ASTM D2487 and D2488, are provided on the logs and on the subsurface profile drawings.

2.1. Soil Boring Blow Count and Laboratory Data

LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

The Standard Penetration Test results (blow counts) close to the surface varied considerably; in the upper five feet of the soil profile, most of the SPT results indicated medium-dense to dense conditions, but about a third of the results indicated loose or soft soils, associated with the topsoil, subsoil and frost-affected zones. At depths greater than five feet all but one of the SPT tests had blow counts of fifteen or greater, indicating soils that were at least medium-dense/stiff (blow counts of ten to thirty,) with the majority of the tests indicating dense/very stiff (N=30 to 50) or very dense/hard soils (N=50 or greater.) The one lower test result was at six feet depth in boring B21, the proposed Warehouse 2 area, with N=9 in wet, stiff, clayey till. At depths greater than twenty feet, the minimum recorded blow count value was thirty-six, and the majority of the SPT values were greater than fifty. Boring B2 was the only location that did not follow the general trend. This boring was drilled close to a wetland area, outside the final proposed limits of the facility, and encountered wet medium-dense sandy soils from five feet depth to the end of the boring at fourteen feet.

Moisture content tests were performed on samples from a representative group of the soil borings, to determine the typical soil moisture profile. Most of the test results were normal for densely-consolidated (overconsolidated) inorganic soils. Test results were somewhat low (about four percent moisture) for the samples from boring B18 at depths of three to six feet; this material was weathered shale with minor veins of soil. The samples from boring B8 at 46 and 51 feet depth had higher moisture contents (24% and 23%) than the soils above and below (10% to 11%,) which corresponds to a change in soil type; dense gray glaciolacustrine clay was present at approximately 44 to 51 feet, with dense to very dense gray clay till above it and below it. At boring B23, in the proposed northwest parking area, the sample from six feet depth had a moisture content of 32.3%; this was in wet silty clay which had a blow count value (N=21) indicating very stiff soil, but the recovered sample was soft, indicating a normally-consolidated clay with a very stiff in-situ condition, sensitive to disturbance.

The particle size analyses and Atterberg Limits tests were performed on representative soil samples of the glacial till and related soil types from the borings, primarily those most likely to be used as fill, or that will support foundations, and/or that may be retained or sloped for a deep cut in the northwest hill. Note that the split-spoon sampling method which was used to collect the samples excludes particles that are medium gravel-size or larger. The gravel fraction may be under-represented; cobbles and boulders are also present in some of the soils but are not represented by the tests. The samples were predominately fine-grained; while sample B8-S3 was classified as coarse-grained, 'SM, Silty Sand with Gravel,' it had 49 percent passing the #200 sieve, and if that number had been fifty percent it would have been 'ML, Sandy Silt.' The six

samples had silt and clay contents (minus-#200) of 49 to 88 percent, averaging 66 percent, and had gravel contents of zero to eighteen percent, averaging eight percent. The Atterberg Limits tests indicated that the fine fraction of the more clayey soils consists of silty clay and low-plasticity lean clay; these soils typically have a narrow range of moisture contents at which they can be efficiently compacted, and tend to be resistant to detrimental shrink-swell behavior.

The unconfined compressive strength test gave results with the typical characteristics of the local overconsolidated glacial till; its moist and dry density values are very high for natural soils, its moisture content was low for a predominately clayey soil, and its peak strength was high. The test modulus value is similar to the subgrade modulus of the in-situ soil, and is also very high, indicating that very little deflection will occur under load. The properties of this soil change significantly when it is disturbed or when it is compacted as fill, and it can become very soft if subjected to vehicle traffic while in a wet or very moist condition.

2.2. Subsurface Profile and Summary of Soil Conditions

Subsurface conditions encountered in the borings are described in the boring logs, are summarized in the drawings attached to this report, and are discussed below. The soils encountered in the investigation have a low potential for expansion due to shrinking and swelling resulting from moisture changes. This behavior is typically associated with high-plasticity silt and clay soils. Physical testing and qualitative examination indicate that the soil properties do not meet the criteria for potentially expansive soils as defined in section 1803.5.3 of the Code. The on-site soils are moderately to highly susceptible to frost heave. Frost heave can be minimized by providing good drainage and by thoroughly compacting the soil. Well-graded granular fill should be used in areas where frost heave could result in damage. The local bedrock is a non-expansive type, making it suitable for use as general fill, after processing. Some shales exhibit expansive behavior, but it is not known to occur with the local bedrock type. The weathered samples recovered from the borings did not have a composition that is associated with this problem.

EAST PART OF PROPOSED FACILITY

The top of weathered shale bedrock was encountered at depths of two feet to ten feet in this area. The shallowest location was at boring B13, where the auger was advanced through weathered rock from two feet to fifteen feet depth before meeting refusal on harder rock. Boring B14 was drilled on the knob near the corner of the site, and encountered probable bedrock at five feet depth, roughly elevation 418. The top of weathered rock was at elevation 405 or lower in the other borings. Boring B2 stopped at fourteen feet depth without encountering bedrock. During development of the adjacent FedEx Ground site to the north, shallow bedrock was encountered only near Neelytown Road.

The soils in this area consisted of mostly of layered silty sand, sand, silty clayey sand and silty gravelly sand, with sandy silt and sandy silty clay near the surface. The upper 1.5 to 3.5 feet of the soils was generally loose, changing to medium-dense, then to dense or very dense conditions in the underlying weathered shale bedrock. Very moist to wet conditions were encountered below depths of four to five feet in most of these borings. In boring B12, very moist conditions began at the surface, changing to wet soils at seven feet depth.

WAREHOUSE 1 AREA

The borings in and near the low part of the proposed building area (borings B3, B4, B10, B11, B19 and B20) encountered about two feet of loose sandy silt, or sand and silt, over medium-dense to very dense silty sand and gravel, gravelly silty sand, gravelly sand, sandy silty clayey gravel, and similar soils. In boring B19 the loose soils extended to about three feet depth. In borings B3, B4 and B10, the top of weathered shale bedrock was encountered at about five to seven feet depth, at elevations of approximately 405, 399 and 401 feet, respectively. A greater depth to rock was indicated in the other borings.

Five borings were drilled on the hill in the northwest part of the site. The first two, B5 and B6, were drilled during the first phase of the investigation, and were drilled about 190 feet northeast and 195 feet northwest from the proposed northwest building corner, near the crest of the existing hill and near the top of its steep western face. These borings met refusal at relatively high elevations in the hill, with B5 stopping at 23 feet depth and B6 at nineteen feet, elevations of approximately 454 and 434 feet. Borings B7, B8 and B9 were drilled on the hill, with B7 and B8 located high on the hill, and B9 toward the bottom of the hill. Boring B9 encountered medium-dense to very dense silt to about seven feet depth, elevation 420, then a two-foot layer of medium-dense/very stiff clay, over very dense silty to clayey till, with weathered shale encountered at forty feet depth, elevation 387. Borings B7 and B8 encountered variable (USCS classes ML, CL-ML, SM,) medium-dense to very dense layered till in the upper eight to sixteen feet, then dense to very dense clay till, USCS class CL, extending from approximately elevation 421 to 398 feet (end-of-hole) in boring B7 and from about 449 feet to EOH at 397 feet in B8. There was a layer of dense glacial lake clay in boring B8 between elevations of approximately 414 and 407. No sand layers were encountered, but it is typical for this type of deposit to have occasional veins or lenses of sand or silt in the dense till; these are usually a source of water seepage, sometimes drying up after they have drained, and sometimes developing into springs or seeps on the face of the cut.

PROPOSED WAREHOUSE 2

Borings B21, B22 and B23 were drilled in the proposed Warehouse 2 area, and borings B5 and B6, discussed above, were drilled about 265 feet southeast and 310 feet south-southwest from the southeast corner of the proposed building. Boring B23, near the proposed southeast building corner, encountered about seven feet of loose to medium-dense clay and silty clay over very dense till, mostly sandy clay and clayey sand, with some sandy silty clay and sandy silt. Boring B21, southeast from the proposed building center, encountered about nine feet of loose to medium-dense sandy silty clay and silty clayey sand, over very dense till similar to boring B23, but with silty sand included and sandy silt more abundant. Boring B22, in the middle of the north part of the proposed warehouse, encountered about four feet of loose to medium-dense silty clay and sandy clay, over medium-dense to very dense till, consisting of sandy clay and gravelly clayey sand. The upper zone of looser soils was generally wet, with the underlying very dense till in a moist condition. In boring B22 the wet zone extended to about 21 feet depth, and in boring B23 a deeper wet zone was encountered below 36 feet depth.

Supplemental data from the test pits indicated the presence of shale bedrock at approximately ten feet depth on the west side of proposed Warehouse 2. Weathered shale was present at approximately 425 feet elevation in test pit P43, just north from center on the west building line, and at approximately elevation 410 in test pit P41, halfway to the proposed southwest building corner. These elevations are fairly consistent with those on the other side of the hill, where the top of weathered bedrock was encountered at elevations of 388 to 413 feet.

SOUTH PART OF PROPOSED FACILITY

In the middle to north portions of this area, which begins on the south side of proposed Warehouse 1 and includes the main stormwater control area, there was typically about two feet of loose sandy silt at the surface, sometimes over medium-dense sand and silty sand, with the top of weathered shale bedrock at depths of two to four feet (elevations of ±402 to 413 feet.) In the south part of this area, boring B16 encountered two feet of loose silt over six feet of dense silt and sandy silt, with the top of rock indicated at about eight feet depth, elevation 405. The soils were mostly in a moist condition, with very moist soil at the surface in boring B15. The soils were wet at borings B3 and B4, near the south side of proposed Warehouse 1, and at boring B15, near the south end, and were moist at the other locations.

2.3. Infiltration Testing and Test Pits

EAST PART OF PROPOSED FACILITY

Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation

The typical seasonal shallowest groundwater depth in this area is estimated at 12 to 30 inches below existing grade, with a range of 9 to 40 inches measured in the field. The groundwater measurements throughout the project area were made during the wet season; the Soil Survey indicates that groundwater is typically shallowest in the local soils during the December through April period, and all of the measurements were taken in February, March and early April. The measurements during the initial investigation were taken after allowing thirteen days for the groundwater level to stabilize, and

during the later phases of the investigation long times were allowed for water level stabilization, and repeat measurements were taken several days or weeks apart, with the shallowest level reported. These values are believed to be at or close to the seasonal high groundwater level at the test locations.

CENTER, WEST AND NORTHWEST PARTS OF SITE

Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation

In the center to west parts of the site, the measured seasonal high groundwater level ranged from 20 inches to 78 inches below existing grade. In the rest of this area the groundwater depths were similar to those encountered in the east part of the proposed facility; the typical seasonal shallowest groundwater depth in this area is also estimated at 12 to 30 inches below existing grade, and the field measurements of depth to groundwater ranged from 9 inches to 39 inches.

NORTHWEST PART OF SITE

Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation

Wet and very moist soils were encountered at and near the surface in the borings in this area, but the depth to groundwater was determined only in test pits P41 and P43, where it was approximately four to ten feet below existing grade. This is a steeply-sloping area and the typical seasonal shallowest groundwater depth is estimated at four feet below existing grade.

SOUTH PART OF PROPOSED FACILITY

Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation

In the south part of the site, the measured seasonal high groundwater level ranged from 8 inches to 85+ inches below existing grade. In most of this area the groundwater depths were again similar to those encountered in the east part of the proposed facility, with the typical seasonal shallowest groundwater depth estimated at 12 to 30 inches below existing grade. The depth increases to six feet or more near the south end and southwest end of the area investigated.

3. EVALUATION

3.1. Subgrade Preparation

The conditions encountered in the investigation were evaluated for their impacts on construction methods, structural-geotechnical design, and long-term performance. The evaluation indicates that the subgrade conditions throughout the proposed building areas are suitable for the use of shallow spread footing foundations and slabs-on-grade, subject to performing the required subgrade preparation operations, as described below. Site conditions are generally expected to be favorable for retaining wall construction, however the loads on the retaining walls will be very high where the walls retain high cuts in the native, predominately clayey soils. In regards to stormwater control, significant portions of the site do not appear to be well-suited for the use of infiltration practices; in many areas the soils are excessively fine-grained, and where granular soils are present groundwater tends to be shallow. Some of the proposed stormwater control areas have not yet been investigated. Additional borings and/or test pits, and appropriate field tests, are required to assess both the proposed stormwater control areas and the proposed retaining wall locations.

ALL AREAS

Remove all existing pavement, topsoil, soft subsoil, stumps and large roots from the subgrade surface, in all building and wall foundation areas*.* In stormwater control areas, soft soils may be left in place, provided they are compatible with subsequent construction. Remove existing slabs and foundations in their entirety from below new foundation areas, and to at least twenty-four inches below bottom-of-slab in slab-on-grade areas, and as needed to prevent interference with the new construction. Remove uncontrolled fill in its entirety from below new foundation areas and from below slab-on-grade areas unless otherwise approved by the Engineer.

Excavate to the design subgrade elevation, or deeper if required to reach suitable subgrade soils, which shall be undisturbed native soils, free from topsoil, fine organics and root masses. The subgrade shall have a stiff/ medium-dense or harder consistency (except in stormwater infiltration areas); some surface drainage improvement and dewatering or draining of the excavations may be required to develop and maintain acceptable subgrade conditions and to minimize over-excavation.

Trim to the required subgrade elevation using excavation methods that minimize disturbance of the final soil surface. The subgrade shall not be compacted below stormwater infiltration practices; in other areas, compact the surface as needed to consolidate any soil that was loosened during excavation. Remove any pockets or small zones of unsuitable materials that are encountered, and replace them with controlled compacted fill. Contact the Engineer prior to performing any significant extra excavation. Where old foundations, stumps or boulders are removed, or where other over-excavation work is performed to prepare subgrade areas, the sides of the excavation shall be trimmed back to stable soil as each lift is placed; as the backfill is compacted, extra care shall be taken to ensure thorough compaction where the edges of each lift meet the sides of the excavation. Where deficient soil is removed from below footing locations, the remediated area shall extend at least one foot out from the footing per foot of depth (1 to 1 splay.)

Where bedrock is present and excavation is performed by ripping, hammering and/or blasting, remove the rock to an approximately level and uniform elevation, with a slope of ten percent or less in areas below footings. If the rock subgrade surface has open fractures, level and seat the surface by tracking back-andforth over it with a bulldozer or excavator, or spade it with the excavator bucket in tight areas, then compact the surface with several passes of a vibratory trench roller or a single-drum soil roller. A layer up to four inches thick of Structural Fill or ¾-inch to 1-inch crushed stone may be placed over the rock surface to facilitate compaction. Remove loose rock from vertical steps in the foundation.

Footings may bear directly on the prepared soil or rock subgrade, or on controlled compacted fill placed over the subgrade. For typical bearing conditions on rock, a layer of compacted granular site-borrow soil or Structural Fill six to twelve inches thick is recommended between the bottoms of the footings and the top of bedrock, to reduce the effects of the varying bearing conditions between bedrock and soil, and to facilitate the setting of forms. Highly weathered and decomposed shale is equivalent to very dense soil, and this cushion layer may be omitted. Where fine-grained native soil is present at the bearing elevation, a layer up to four inches thick of Structural Fill or equivalent site-borrow soil may be placed in the footing bottom to protect the soil surface, after properly preparing the surface to a level and stable condition. This layer shall be thoroughly compacted with a vibratory plate tamper or roller, and its surface shall not extend above the design bearing elevation. Footing bearing surfaces shall be free from frost, mud and loose soil or standing water, when concrete is placed. Rock surfaces should be thoroughly moistened prior to placing concrete.

WAREHOUSE 1

The northwest quarter of this building will be in a cut, with a maximum depth of approximately 45 feet near the northwest corner, from the existing elevation of 465 feet to the proposed finished grade at 420 feet; the excavations for the exterior footings will be approximately four feet deeper. This hill into which this cut is to be made levels out at about 404 feet elevation near the proposed southwest building corner, and at about 412 feet near the northeast corner, and most of the south and east part of the proposed building area is at elevations of approximately 404 to 410 feet, about fourteen to twenty feet lower than the proposed slab elevation of 424.4 feet. The borings indicate that the cut will be made into dense glacial till; the soils were mostly in a drained condition when the borings were drilled, with some zones of perched groundwater. The fill area will require normal preparation to remove topsoil, stumps and the shallow upper zone of soft loamy soil.

WAREHOUSE 2

A cut-and-fill is also proposed for this warehouse, with more cut than fill. The highest fill will be at the southwest building corner, with a nominal height of about 22 feet, from existing grade to the proposed elevation of 444.5 feet of the floor slab, which will be at walk-out elevation on the west side of the building. The cut will have a maximum nominal height of 57 feet, along the north two-thirds of the east side of the building, from the existing elevation of about 497 feet to the exterior pavement at 440 feet elevation. The cut will be approximately 36 feet deep at the southeast building corner and about four feet deep at the northwest corner. The borings in this area indicate that the cut will be made in very dense glacial till, with some medium-dense to slightly loose till, mostly in the upper ten feet of the cut. Bedrock was encountered at approximately ten feet in test pits P41 and P43, along the west side of the proposed building, in the fill area. The investigation indicates that bedrock will probably not be encountered in the excavations for Warehouse 2, but some rock excavation could be required. The fill area will be built against an existing slope, beginning from a generally level area at the bottom. The fill will need to be keyed into the slope as discussed above.

3.2. Excavation

The borings indicate that the existing native soils may be excavated using conventional heavy equipment, such as tracked excavators and bulldozers. For mass excavations in the glacial till, extra-heavy equipment should be used if it is available; large excavators such as the CAT 330 and bulldozers such as the D8 are somewhat undersized for large-volume excavation of this soil. Scraper pans may be used for mass cuts in the glacial till; the pans will likely need a bulldozer pusher when cutting into the borrow area surface, and moderate interference from boulders should be expected.

While the native glacial till is hard to excavate, it softens easily when subjected to construction traffic. Rollers, wheel loaders and other heavy equipment should be sized appropriately for the subgrade conditions. Traffic from dump trucks, concrete mixers, semi-trailers and similar heavy vehicles should be minimized on the exposed surface of the subgrade and on compacted fine-grained fills.

The investigation indicates that the shallow soils which will be encountered in the building excavations are likely to be a mix of OSHA Type A, requiring a minimum slope of 0.75-to-1 in shallow excavations, with benching permitted, OSHA Type B, requiring a minimum slope of 1-to-1 in shallow excavations, also with benching permitted, and OSHA Type C, requiring a minimum slope of 1.5 horizontal to one vertical in shallow excavations, with benching not permitted. The deeper soils are expected to be OSHA Type A. An engineered excavation design is required for cuts of twenty feet depth or greater. Soil types and excavation requirements must be confirmed by a qualified representative of the Contractor during construction.

Minor rock excavation is expected to be required in the north end of the east building area. The local bedrock is shale which was highly weathered in most locations, but may be harder where this knob formed. A large bulldozer with a ripper tooth should be able to excavate the shallow rock. A large excavator with a hydraulic hoe-ram may be required to excavate into the deeper bedrock.

Shoring of the building excavations and most other excavations should not be required, as in most cases there is sufficient distance from the property line to the estimated limits of the work area to allow the use of conventional excavation slopes. The exception is the proposed retaining wall system parallel to the north side of the northwest building; the proposed two-tiered wall will be close to the property line, likely requiring excavation over the line for construction of a cantilever wall, or requiring tie-backs extending onto the adjacent property for temporary shoring or for permanent installation of a soil-nail or soldier pile wall. Past experience has shown that high vertical faces with extensive stand-up time may be safely excavated in the dense glacial till types at the site, when performed in conformance with an engineered design. The design of any necessary shoring or other support-of-excavation is the responsibility of the Contractor and is not included in this report.

Groundwater seepage rates in the building excavations are expected to be slow, but will likely be persistent, at least during wet seasons. Occasional zones of concentrated seepage may be encountered, including some initial short-term drainage of greater volume from zones of perched water. Persistent springs or seeps that develop in cuts may warrant the installation of special drainage, and should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Groundwater seepage and stormwater should be removed promptly from the excavations, and the groundwater elevation should be maintained at least one foot below the soil surface in foundation and slab construction areas. When dewatering open excavations, the water level should be drawn down at a

controlled rate to minimize sloughing, allowing the water to drain from the soil in the sides of the excavation.

3.3. Fill Materials and CLSM

All fill placed below foundations and slabs shall consist of Structural Fill or suitable site-borrow soil, as described below, or shall be other imported fill of a quality at least equal to that of the site-borrow fill. All fill materials shall be composed of sound, durable particles, shall be free from frost or snow, garbage, construction debris or other deleterious material, and shall be substantially free from organic matter and roots. Imported fill materials shall be obtained only from licensed or otherwise approved sources. Recycled crushed concrete and masonry may be acceptable for some applications above the water table, subject to approval by the Designer of Record.

In warehouse slab-on-grade areas, Structural Fill or select site-borrow fill with a high gravel content should be used for the final one to two lifts of fill, for support of construction vehicle traffic and to protect against slab movement under heavy forklift traffic.

Soils excavated from the site are expected to be of fair quality for re-use as fill and backfill for foundations, slabs and pavement areas. Most of the potential borrow soil is clayey to silty glacial till, containing little to some sand, trace to little gravel and few cobbles and boulders. The native soils can be used as fill, and when properly compacted will provide acceptable support, but they are moisture-sensitive and are typically difficult to work with, especially when the weather is other than warm and dry. Boulders and large cobbles must be removed from the borrow fill. Large clumps of clayey soil must be broken up; this typically requires spreading the fill in a thin lift and tracking back-and-forth over it repeatedly with a heavy bulldozer, while the soil is in a relatively dry condition. Disking is not typically effective as a method of breaking up this clayey soil, due mainly to the hardness of the soil clods, with boulders also interfering with disking.

Structural Fill, if imported for use below foundations and slabs, shall be good-quality bank-run sand and gravel or crushed stone, and should be a locally-available well-graded product complying with or substantially similar to the specifications provided above. Structural Fill may also be used as foundation backfill. Structure Fill HD (Heavy Duty) should be used in areas to be protected from heavy construction traffic and where subgrade stabilization is needed. Structure Fill HD and Structure Fill NFS (non-frost susceptible) provide enhanced drainage; they are suitable for use as fill for frost-protected shallow foundations and for placement during winter conditions. Fill produced from natural sand and gravel is usually easier to compact than crushed fill, making it advantageous for winter work and for compaction

with manual equipment. Crushed fill products are typically more suitable for use during wet weather and provide better stability over poor soils or under heavy construction traffic

Pipe bedding in utility trenches should consist of well-graded sand or sand and gravel. If open-graded stone is used as pipe bedding, a layer of geotextile or a filter zone of well-graded fill may be required between the pipe bedding and the soils, particularly if erodible soils such as fine sand or cohesionless silt are present. Pipe bedding may act as a drainage path for groundwater seepage; slab and wall penetrations should be sealed, and seepage relief may be required in long, sloping trenches.

CLSM (Controlled Low-Strength Material, or 'flowable fill,') may be used under footings and foundations when specifically approved by the Engineer, and may also be used to backfill trenches or other excavations, typically where rapid fill placement is required, fill areas are narrow, or the use of conventional compaction methods is not practical. For support of footings, a CLSM mix consisting of sand, cement and water, with a 56-day compressive strength of 75 to 200 psi, is appropriate. CLSM may produce high fluid pressures during placement, and caution must be used for placements against foundation walls, near unbraced cuts, etc. Pipes or tanks can also float if not properly restrained during placement. CLSM should not be placed against unprotected aluminum; CLSM containing flyash should not be used in contact with cast iron or ductile iron. Hardened CLSM masses may also adversely affect groundwater flow, possibly causing erosion under or along the CLSM, particularly in sloping trenches.

Other Fill Materials:

- Crushed stone base course for slabs-on-grade should consist of ASTM C33 #56 or #57 stone (⅜- to $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch size,) or as required by the slab system design.
- Crushed stone or gravel for footing drains should consist of ASTM C33 #5, #56 or #57 stone (¾ inch or ⅜-¾-inch size.)
- Well-graded granular subbase material (Structure Fill NFS, NYSDOT Item 733-04 'Item 4', or similar types,) should be used under sidewalks and exterior slabs.

3.4. Fill Placement and Compaction

Soil surfaces, including the surface of the subgrade and of previously-placed fill materials, shall be prepared to a stiff and essentially unyielding condition prior to placing each new lift of fill. Bedrock surfaces to receive fill shall be free from voids or loose areas and the rock surface shall be free from large loose pieces of stone. Use mid-size equipment to compact the site-borrow fill or similar materials. Vibratory trench rollers, and single-drum soil rollers with a nominal size of three to seven tons, should be appropriate for the observed site conditions. Larger rollers may be used when compacting well-graded granular fill over essentially unyielding surfaces, and may be suitable for use on the site-borrow fill when conditions are optimal.

Fill shall be placed in controlled lifts, with each lift compacted to the required density at a moisture content close to optimum moisture, as determined by ASTM D1557. When the moisture content of fill which will support footings or slabs is within two percent of optimum, fill may be placed in lifts with compacted thicknesses of up to twelve inches. If the moisture content is two to 2.5 percent from optimum, reduce the maximum thickness to eight inches, and if it is more than 2.5 percent from optimum, discontinue compaction. Do not place or compact fill when the air temperature is less than 25°F. Use a reduced lift thickness if required to obtain the specified percent compaction and when using small compaction equipment.

Where fill will be placed against slopes, bench the fill into the slope to create a stair-step interface, for improved stability and groundwater control. Lightly scarify the surface of the existing soil prior to placing the fill, and key the fill into the subgrade at the toe of the slope. When the fill is more than five feet high against a slope of twenty percent or more, the key should be at least two feet deep and ten feet wide.

For cut slopes or fill slopes with a height of thirty feet or more, and a slope of one in three or greater, terraces should be provided at vertical intervals of thirty feet or less, to control drainage and debris. The terraces should be at least six feet wide, but where more than one is required, the terrace nearest mid-height of the slope should have a width of at least twelve feet, for maintenance access. Drainage swales shall be provided on terraces. Refer to the optional Appendix J of the Building Code for additional details.

Backfill placed against foundation walls should be compacted with trench rollers or with similar equipment which will not produce damaging stresses on the wall. Place backfill equally on opposite sides of the foundation unless otherwise indicated by the specifications or drawings. Foundation walls acting as retaining walls should be braced (i.e. by installation of the floor framing) before placing backfill, unless otherwise indicated on the drawings or approved by the Engineer.

Open-graded stone base course material for slabs-on-grade should be graded level and seated with one or more compaction passes, to help resist displacement during slab area preparation and concrete placement.

Where the native clay soil is used for fill, careful preparation, placement and compaction methods must be employed, and the fill section must be properly designed.

- Prepare the fill by drying it to a somewhat crumbly consistency, then thoroughly break up the soil clods so that they are no larger than two-thirds of the lift thickness (e.g. smaller than eight inches for a twelve-inch thick lift.)
- Mix and spread the fill so that the larger clods are well-mixed with finer pulverized soil; remove boulders during preparation and placement. Condition the fill if needed to the reach the proper compaction moisture content, mixing the fill so that the moisture is uniform throughout the lift thickness.
- Re-work any 'clod clusters,' where the fill is lacking in fines, to a well-graded condition, by pulverizing, mixing and/or adding fine fill material.
- Compact the clay fill with a mid-size single-drum vibratory roller, or with a dual-drum trench roller where access is limited; a heavy roller will tend to produce rutting, and a light roller will not adequately compact the soil. A roller with a sheep's-foot or tamping foot drum is preferred, both because it tends to knead and compact the soil clods, and because the irregular compacted surface promotes the dispersed vertical drainage of water infiltration, versus the surface produced by a smooth-drum roller, which promotes lateral seepage movement, potentially causing local saturation and the creation of soft spots.
- Drainage must be provided at the bottom of any significant fill sections, to minimize water accumulation in the base of the clay, which can cause softening and settlement. A layer of granular fill, such as 'Structural Fill,' at least one foot thick, is typically sufficient, provided the granular

layer is free to drain laterally and/or vertically. Where the vertical drainage into a clay subgrade is to be provided, trim the clay subgrade carefully to a suitable surface without disturbance, and do not compact the clay prior to placing the granular fill; this will promote infiltration, but the rate may still be slow.

- The top of the fill must also be provided with proper drainage, particularly below parking lots, lawns, and in other areas of surface water infiltration. The final lift of clay fill should be at least two feet below the proposed top-of-pavement elevation in paved areas, to provide sufficient depth for drainage and for protection of the clay subgrade during construction and paving. In landscaped areas, the top of the clay fill should also be at least two feet deep, to allow for a sufficient thickness of fill with a suitable moisture capacity to support vegetation.
- The top of the clay fill must be carefully graded to avoid low spots, where surface water infiltration can accumulate; it should be pitched gently toward underdrains or other outlets, and not made perfectly level.
- Installation of a layer of geotextile between the top of the clay fill and the pavement subbase and landscaping fill is recommended. The geotextile will promote the retention of water from surface infiltration in the pavement base and drainage layers and in the landscaping, and will reduce concentrated infiltration into the clay fill.
- Surface water infiltration in the shallow fill materials and in the clay fill will tend to seek curbs, utility trenches and similar discontinuities, and subsurface drainage should be provided from these features; where water concentration along utilities needs to be minimized, use well-graded bedding material.
- Embankment slopes constructed with clay fill should be built slightly wide, then trimmed back, to allow thorough compaction near the edge. The fill placed in the outer zone (six feet wide, or one third of the fill height above, whichever is greater) should be compacted at a moisture content no more than one percent above optimum, leaving the soil clods slightly crumbly and creating some initial lateral permeability.
- The surfaces of embankment slopes should be scarified prior to placing topsoil, and small benches or one- to two-foot wide steps should be provided at frequent intervals to protect against sliding of the topsoil. The topsoil should be well-graded and relatively free-draining for erosion resistance, and should be placed at the minimum required thickness when the slope is steeper than three-onone.

3.5. Compaction Requirements

Compact each lift of fill supporting slabs or foundations with at least six one-way compaction passes, even if the required compaction percentage is obtained with fewer passes. Each compaction pass shall be made at a slow walking speed (less than four feet per second,) with the equipment passing completely over all areas of the fill. Where the fill material consists of clayey site-borrow soil, the compacted fill shall be essentially free from open and interconnected voids between the clods. Fill materials shall be compacted to at least the percentage of the ASTM D1557 maximum dry density given in the table below. For coarsegraded fill materials with more than thirty percent retained on the ¾-inch sieve, the ASTM D4253 Maximum Index Density test may be substituted for the D1557 test.

3.6. Testing

The prepared subgrade shall be inspected to verify that it has been prepared in conformance with the requirements of this report, prior to placing fill or foundations. Recommended test procedures and frequencies are provided below.

PROOF-ROLLING: Proof-rolling of the prepared subgrade soil is not required, but may be performed to determine the limits of a soft area. Use an appropriately–sized vehicle, to avoid damaging wet and/or finegrained, but otherwise acceptable soils. Observe the effects of the moving vehicle; if the soil exhibits excessive deflection, rutting or cracking, additional excavation or drying of the subgrade may be required.

BEARING CAPACITY: The prepared subgrade surface throughout the foundation and slab areas area shall be probed thoroughly to check for soft spots. The foundation subgrade shall be in a dense and unyielding condition, substantially free from soft areas and/or loose material. If these conditions are not encountered at the bearing elevation, testing shall be performed with a Static Cone Penetrometer or equivalent device in foundation bearing areas. If the design bearing capacity is not indicated within three inches of the bearing surface, the soil conditions shall be corrected and/or, if approved by the Engineer, the footing depth may be increased to reach acceptable soil. The slab subgrade areas shall be densely consolidated and sufficiently stiff to prevent rutting or displacement during slab base course and concrete placement operations. Where fractured rock or bedrock is present at the bearing elevation, it shall be visually inspected to verify that it is generally level and free from accumulations of loose material, and that in areas where it is fractured, the fractured mass is in a dense and stable condition, free from large open voids.

COMPACTION TESTING: Compaction testing shall be performed for each lift of fill supporting foundations, with testing performed while the work is in progress. Testing is also recommended for the fill supporting slabs or pavement, exterior backfill and for fill placed in embankments. Compaction tests of fill and backfill supporting foundations and slabs should be performed in at least one location per 1000 square feet of fill surface, per lift. In mass fill areas, this frequency may be reduced to one test per 2500 square feet, when the surface of the fill is at least three feet below the proposed bottom-of-footing elevation. Compaction tests should be performed with a nuclear moisture-density gauge, per ASTM Test Method D6938, unless otherwise approved. Required percent compaction values are provided above.

CLSM: When flowable fill is used to support footings or foundations, at least one set of three 6x12-inch test cylinders shall be cast from each day's placement, per ASTM D4832. Test the cylinders for unit weight and for compliance with the specified strength requirements. Cast additional cylinders if early tests are needed.

3.7. Geosynthetic Materials

Geosynthetic materials are expected to be used for reinforcement and drainage applications at the site on an as-needed basis, or where required by Code, such as for footing drains. Geosynthetic materials shall be installed against smooth and evenly shaped surfaces, to avoid 'tenting' of the material over voids or high points. The geosynthetics shall be installed substantially free from wrinkles, and fill materials shall be placed and spread in a manner which pushes out the wrinkles toward the free end, but which does not otherwise displace the geosynthetic material. Avoid placing coarse-graded angular fill directly over the geosynthetic materials, unless specifically directed. Vehicles shall not drive on the exposed geosynthetics.

Woven Reinforcement Geotextiles: These fabrics should typically be used only between the subgrade soil and the granular base course of an asphalt or concrete pavement, in relatively level areas. In this application the geotextile protects against rutting during paving operations, can reduce long-term pothole development, and, because of its tight weave, retains water seepage from the pavement within the granular base layer, where it can drain toward the curbs, rather than softening the subgrade.

Woven Drainage Geotextiles: Similar to woven reinforcement geotextiles, but with an open weave that allows water to flow through them, these geotextiles are available with high strengths and should be used instead of reinforcement geotextiles for subgrade reinforcement where groundwater movement is to be allowed. They are also the most suitable geotextile for installation between the native soils and the drainage medium (stone or sand) in footing drains and underdrains, as discussed below.

Geogrids: Biaxial or multi-axial geogrid should be used for road base stabilization on steep grades, as sliding or erosion of fill placed on top of a woven geotextile layer may occur during construction. They can also be used for base stabilization in level areas, but typically are more costly than geotextiles.

Non-Woven Geotextiles: These fabrics are suitable to keep fine-graded soils from mixing into open-graded soils, such as in stone-filled trenches passing through silt or fine sand. They can also be used in footing drain and underdrain construction, but are susceptible to clogging if used incorrectly, as discussed below.

Footing Drains and Underdrains: For these applications, the drainage trench should be carefully graded to the pipe invert elevation, the geotextile should be draped into the trench, the pipe installed, the trench backfilled with the drainage medium, and the geotextile wrapped over the top and capped with soil backfill. The drainage medium may be clean gravel or stone, or coarse sand, of a size compatible with the slots or perforations in the pipe. For most applications, Woven Drainage Geotextile may be installed directly against the native soils. However, if the native soils consist of cohesionless silt or fine sand, which may erode through the drainage geotextile, a layer of clean well-graded sand at least four inches thick should be installed between the geotextile and the soil; this may not be practical for underdrains, and if erodible fine soils are abundant, sand-filled trenches (clean concrete sand) without a geotextile wrap, equipped with a drain pipe wrapped with a layer of drainage or non-woven geotextile may be more suitable. Non-woven geotextiles may be used for footing drains, when they are covered on the top and outside by at least six inches of concrete sand, to act as a filter to prevent clogging.

4. DESIGN VALUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Soil engineering properties and recommendations for design are provided in this section; additional important design considerations are also discussed in the other sections of this report. The design values assume that the buildings will be supported by conventional spread footing foundations with slab-ongrade floors, as described in the previous sections, on fill and/or on undisturbed native soil or rock, and will be provided with proper drainage.

4.1. Bearing Capacity and Soil Pressure for Buildings

Footings subject to frost shall bear at least 42 inches below finished grade, or shall be otherwise protected from frost. Bearing elevations of footings shall be established such that a line drawn between the bottoms of two adjacent footings is not steeper than 30 degrees between the closest points on the footings. (Slope of 1 vertical to 1.75 horizontal.)

Up to one inch of settlement and ¼-inch of local differential settlement should be anticipated for new foundations bearing on compacted controlled fill. Footings bearing on undisturbed native soil in deep cuts are expected to exhibit less than one quarter inch of settlement.

4.2. Control of Groundwater and Soil Gases

Some groundwater seepage should be expected in excavations and below-grade areas during and after construction. The subgrade soils in the low part of the site in particular are expected to be wet at a shallow depth, and some groundwater control may be needed during stripping and initial fill placement operations. Proper drainage should be provided during construction, so that stormwater does not pool on top of the subgrade or around footings, causing softening which will be difficult to correct. Conventional dampproofing of slabs-on-grade, with installation over a vapor barrier and an open-graded stone base course, is appropriate. Footing drains are not required for the proposed construction, however persistent groundwater movement should be expected through the northwest building area, moving north-to-south from the remaining hill, under the building and toward the wetlands; this seepage should be intercepted at the adjacent building walls, using conventional footing drains, and/or near the base of the cut. Stormwater infiltration from the parking and landscaped area should be diverted away from the building.

Construction dewatering is discussed elsewhere in this report. For the completed construction, the elevations shown on the plans indicate that foundation drains should be able to discharge by gravity from the proposed building areas.

Soil gases that could normally be expected to impact the structure are water vapor and radon. Thorough foundation damp-proofing, as noted above, placement of dense concrete in slabs-on-grade, (low water-tocementitious ratio, thoroughly consolidated,) and sealing of all wall-to-slab joints, concrete cracks, pipe penetrations, drainage sumps, etc. are usually effective in controlling transmission of these gases to interior spaces. If an open-graded base course is used under the slab, a passive vapor mitigation system can be included, using small-diameter PVC pipes. The potential for these gases to adversely impact the use of the building is estimated to be low, if the above recommended practices are used, and normal interior ventilation is provided.

4.3. Seismic Evaluation

The Seismic Site Class and Seismic Design Category for the proposed construction were determined per section 1613 of the New York State Building Code and ASCE 7-16. Seismic values for the site were obtained from the current database maintained by the Applied Technology Council, Redwood City, Cal., and are consistent with the published maps in the Building Code. The design values are provided in the table below.

The Seismic Site Class was determined based on the conditions in the upper 100 feet of the subsurface. Borings were drilled as deep as 53 feet, where the average SPT N value was greater than fifty, and from this depth to one hundred feet is very dense till and bedrock, thus the average N value to 100 feet depth is greater than fifty, resulting in a Site Class C designation. The seismic design values are based on the "risk adjusted maximum probable earthquake." These are not the maximum values that *could* occur, they are values that are not likely to be exceeded during the service life of a typical structure.

The soils encountered in the investigation have very low liquefaction susceptibility. Liquefaction is typically associated with thick deposits of loose poorly-graded sand situated below the water table, and may also occur in loose, poorly-graded cohesionless silt. A similar phenomenon, cyclic softening, can occur in saturated soft clays. Those soils are also prone to shifting or spreading during seismic events when they are situated near a slope, even if the slope is gentle. The soils encountered in the borings have textures, drainage conditions, locations and/or sufficient consolidation (density) to resist liquefaction or unusual movement during the design seismic event. No special mitigation measures are required.

4.4. Retaining Walls

The drilling of additional borings is recommended along the proposed extents of the major retaining walls. Test pits could be substituted for borings for the low walls which will retain building-area fills, to confirm acceptable bearing conditions.

For soil conditions substantially similar to those encountered in the borings, the allowable soil bearing capacity for conventional segmental block retaining walls for the building pad fills is 4000 psf, and for reinforced concrete retaining walls in cut areas, the allowable bearing capacity is 6000 psf. These values use a safety factor of two.

For segmental retaining wall construction in the fill areas, the silty to clayey site-borrow is not recommended for use in the geogrid-reinforced zone behind the wall; select granular fill material should be used for that application, and the properties of the retained site-borrow fill or undisturbed native soil beyond the reinforced zone may be taken from the table for foundation design in section 4.1 of this report.

Retaining walls for the proposed deep cuts are expected to consist of reinforced concrete cantilever walls, and/or soldier pile-and-lagging walls, and/or soil-nail walls. Soil nails or tie-backs will be required for practical construction of any walls higher than about eighteen feet, other than cantilever walls. For these walls, with a relatively narrow backfill zone behind the wall, the forces acting on the walls will be governed by the long-term stability of the native soils. The recommended design values are provided in the table above These design values should be applied to the retained native soils behind the wall and to the soils in the foundation zone to a depth of one foot below finished grade. Design values for the soils in the deeper portions of the foundation zone and for base friction may be taken from the table for building foundations in Section 4.1 of this report.

5. NOTES AND LIMITATIONS

Please see the attached pages for additional information. Subsurface conditions encountered during construction shall be compared to the soil boring logs and this report; any significant variations from anticipated conditions must be evaluated for their effect on the design. This report summarizes the results of a limited investigation and does not purport to predict every variation in subsurface conditions. Elevations, slopes, contours, project layout and similar or related data provided in this report were interpreted from the drawings, from field data or from other information which was provided, unless otherwise noted.

This geotechnical investigation was conducted to evaluate the engineering properties of the soils at the site, to aid in the design and construction of the proposed work. The investigation did not include evaluation of the potential effects of the proposed construction on other properties, nor did it include inspection of, or sampling for, items of environmental concern such as the presence of soil contaminants or of regulated wetlands, and did not include review of local zoning regulations, codes, floodplain boundaries or similar matters, unless specifically referenced in the report. This investigation was conducted solely for the use of the Client, the Client's Project Designers and Agents and the Authorities Having Jurisdiction; this report should not be used by others, nor for any use other than its stated purpose, without contacting the Engineer. Any such use is solely at the user's risk.

KEVIN L. PATTON, P.E. 36 PATTON ROAD NEWBURGH, N.Y. 12550 845 275-7732 PATTONGEOTECH.COM

Soil Technical Notes:

Soil Classifications, Descriptions and Properties

The USCS (Unified Soil Classification System) was used to classify the soils in this report. The USCS is described in ASTM D2487 (laboratory test method) and D2488 (visual-manual method.) The USCS classification gives a 'Group Symbol' and 'Group Name' based on particle size distribution (gradation,) clay properties (Atterberg Limits) and basic composition (mineral or organic.)

USCS Soil Classes

Soils with less than 5% passing the #200 sieve:

GW, GP, SW, SP – Well-graded gravel, Poorly-graded gravel, Well-graded sand, Poorly-graded sand. Soils with 12% to 50% passing the #200 sieve:

GC, GM, GC-GM, SC, SM, SC-SM – Clayey gravel, Silty gravel, Silty clayey gravel, Clayey sand, Silty sand, Silty clayey sand.

Soils with 5% to 12% passing the #200 sieve use a dual symbol, such as SW-SC (Clayey well-graded sand.) Soils with more than 50% passing the #200 sieve:

CL-ML, ML, CL, MH, CH, OL, OH – Silty clay, Silt, Lean clay, Elastic silt, Fat clay, Organic silt, Organic clay. Highly organic soils:

PT – Peat.

The soil group name is modified with the term 'with sand' or 'with gravel' added if the soil contains more than 15% of these materials; clays and silts with 30% or more plus-#200 material are described as 'sandy' or 'gravelly' (whichever is predominate.) Examples – GM, Silty gravel with sand; CL, Gravelly lean clay.

SECTION 1 - EAST SIDE OF PROPOSED FACILITY

GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE

IN GENERAL, RED PATTERNS INDICATE RELATIVELY CLEAN SANDY OR GRAVELLY SOILS, PURPLE PATTERNS INDICATE SOILS WITH SIGNIFICANT CLAY CONTENT AND ORANGE PATTERNS INDICATE SOILS WITH A SIGNIFICANT SILT CONTENT.

A THIN LAYER OF TOPSOIL WAS PRESENT AT MOST LOCATIONS.
COBBLES AND BOULDERS ARE PRESENT.

THESE SECTIONS ARE BASED ON THE SUBSURFACE RELEVANT INFORMAT INTERPRETED IN CONJ GEOTECHNICAL INVEST ENCOUNTERED AT THE

NO HORIZONTAL SCALE. USCS SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS ARE IN BRACKETS.

SECTION 2 - SOUTH PART OF PROPOSED FACILITY

GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE

IN GENERAL, RED PATTERNS INDICATE RELATIVELY CLEAN SANDY OR GRAVELLY SOILS, PURPLE PATTERNS INDICATE SOILS WITH SIGNIFICANT CLAY CONTENT AND ORANGE PATTERNS INDICATE SOILS WITH A SIGNIFICANT SILT CONTENT.

A THIN LAYER OF TOPSOIL WAS PRESENT AT MOST LOCATIONS.
COBBLES AND BOULDERS ARE PRESENT.

NO HORIZONTAL SCALE. USCS SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS ARE IN BRACKETS.

THESE SECTIONS ARE GENERALIZED REPRESENTATIONS OF THE SUBSURFACE PROFILE, BASED ON THE SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION DATA, OBSERVATIONS, RESEARCH, AND OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION. THE SOILS INFORMATION PRESENTED HEREIN SHOULD BE INTERPRETED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE INFORMATION FROM THE BORING LOGS AND THE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT. SITE CONDITIONS MAY DIFFER FROM THOSE ENCOUNTERED AT THE BORING LOCATIONS.

DRILLING METHOD: HSA - Hollow-Stem Auger MR - Mud-Rotary MEASUREMENTS IN FEET AND INCHES SAMPLE/TEST TYPESS - SPLIT SPOON C - CORE T - UNDISTURBED TUBE AUG - AUGER CUTTINGS PEN - HAND PENETROMETER TOR - TORVANE V - VANE SHEAR

MOISTURE CONTENT OF SOIL

TEST METHOD: ASTM D2216

Moisture content is expressed as a percent of the dry mass of the soil.

Reviewed by: *Kevin Patton*

Form NMC

MOISTURE CONTENT OF SOIL

TEST METHOD: ASTM D2216

Moisture content is expressed as a percent of the dry mass of the soil.

Reviewed by: *Kevin Patton*

Form NMC

MOISTURE CONTENT OF SOIL

TEST METHOD: ASTM D2216

Moisture content is expressed as a percent of the dry mass of the soil.

Reviewed by: *Kevin Patton*

Form NMC

KEVIN L. PATTON, P.E. 36 PATTON ROAD NEWBURGH, NY 12550

845 275-7732 PATTONGEOTECH.COM

MOISTURE CONTENT OF SOIL

TEST METHOD: ASTM D2216

Moisture content is expressed as a percent of the dry mass of the soil.

KEVIN L. PATTON, P.E. 36 PATTON ROAD NEWBURGH, NY 12550
845 275-7732 **PATTONGEOTECH 845 275-7732 PATTONGEOTECH.COM**

SIEVE-AND-HYDROMETER ANALYSIS TEST REPORT

TEST METHOD(s): ASTM D422, AASHTO T88

Reviewed by: *Kevin Patton* Form HYD

SIEVE-AND-HYDROMETER ANALYSIS TEST REPORT TEST METHOD(s): ASTM D422, AASHTO T88

SIEVE-AND-HYDROMETER ANALYSIS TEST REPORT TEST METHOD(s): ASTM D422, AASHTO T88

SIEVE-AND-HYDROMETER ANALYSIS TEST REPORT TEST METHOD(s): ASTM D422, AASHTO T88

SIEVE-AND-HYDROMETER ANALYSIS TEST REPORT

TEST METHOD(s): ASTM D422, AASHTO T88

ATTERBERG LIMITS TEST

TEST METHODS: ASTM D4318/ AASHTO T89, T90

LL, PL and PI values are percent moisture of the soil by dry mass.

Test is performed on the 'matrix' fraction of the soil, finer than the #40 (0.425mm) sieve.

The Liquid Limit is the moisture content at which the matrix fraction of the soil changes from a stiff to a flowing consistency. The plastic limit is the moisture content at which it changes from cohesive to crumbly. The Plasticity Index is the Liquid Limit minus the Plastic Limit.

ATTERBERG LIMITS TEST

TEST METHODS: ASTM D4318/ AASHTO T89, T90

LL, PL and PI values are percent moisture of the soil by dry mass.

Test is performed on the 'matrix' fraction of the soil, finer than the #40 (0.425mm) sieve.

The Liquid Limit is the moisture content at which the matrix fraction of the soil changes from a stiff to a flowing consistency. The plastic limit is the moisture content at which it changes from cohesive to crumbly. The Plasticity Index is the Liquid Limit minus the Plastic Limit.

ATTERBERG LIMITS TEST

TEST METHODS: ASTM D4318/ AASHTO T89, T90

LL, PL and PI values are percent moisture of the soil by dry mass.

Test is performed on the 'matrix' fraction of the soil, finer than the #40 (0.425mm) sieve.

The Liquid Limit is the moisture content at which the matrix fraction of the soil changes from a stiff to a flowing consistency. The plastic limit is the moisture content at which it changes from cohesive to crumbly. The Plasticity Index is the Liquid Limit minus the Plastic Limit.

ATTERBERG LIMITS TEST

TEST METHODS: ASTM D4318/ AASHTO T89, T90

LL, PL and PI values are percent moisture of the soil by dry mass.

Test is performed on the 'matrix' fraction of the soil, finer than the #40 (0.425mm) sieve.

The Liquid Limit is the moisture content at which the matrix fraction of the soil changes from a stiff to a flowing consistency. The plastic limit is the moisture content at which it changes from cohesive to crumbly. The Plasticity Index is the Liquid Limit minus the Plastic Limit.

Unconfined Compressive Strength of Soil

APPARATUS: Rimac Press, Manually Operated

BEDROCK GEOLOGIC MAP KEY (PARTIAL)

MID-HUDSON INDUSTRIAL PARK MONTGOMERY, N.Y.

Approximate location of the project site, shown on a partial copy of the Surficial Geologic Map of New York (N.Y. State Museum, 1989.) The map indicates that the site is in an area of lacustrine silt and clay deposits (brown symbol 'lsc') associated with a recessional glacial moraine crossing the Wallkill Valley. Nearby soils include till (pink,) outwash sand and gravel (yellow) and kames (orange.) Kames form where sand and gravel are deposited on or against stagnant, melting ice. Shallow bedrock is indicated with a red stipple pattern and exposed rock is shown in red with the symbol 'r.'

KEVIN L. PATTON, P.E.

MAP KEY NEW YORK STATE SURFICIAL GEOLOGIC MAP

KEVIN L. PATTON, P.E.

Natural Resources Conservation Service

USDA

Web Soil Survey National Cooperative Soil Survey

12/22/2022 Page 1 of 4

Natural Resources USDA Conservation Service

Web Soil Survey National Cooperative Soil Survey

Map Unit Legend

Engineering Properties

This table gives the engineering classifications and the range of engineering properties for the layers of each soil in the survey area.

Hydrologic soil group is a group of soils having similar runoff potential under similar storm and cover conditions. The criteria for determining Hydrologic soil group is found in the National Engineering Handbook, Chapter 7 issued May 2007(http://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/OpenNonWebContent.aspx? content=17757.wba). Listing HSGs by soil map unit component and not by soil series is a new concept for the engineers. Past engineering references contained lists of HSGs by soil series. Soil series are continually being defined and redefined, and the list of soil series names changes so frequently as to make the task of maintaining a single national list virtually impossible. Therefore, the criteria is now used to calculate the HSG using the component soil properties and no such national series lists will be maintained. All such references are obsolete and their use should be discontinued. Soil properties that influence runoff potential are those that influence the minimum rate of infiltration for a bare soil after prolonged wetting and when not frozen. These properties are depth to a seasonal high water table, saturated hydraulic conductivity after prolonged wetting, and depth to a layer with a very slow water transmission rate. Changes in soil properties caused by land management or climate changes also cause the hydrologic soil group to change. The influence of ground cover is treated independently. There are four hydrologic soil groups, A, B, C, and D, and three dual groups, A/D, B/D, and C/D. In the dual groups, the first letter is for drained areas and the second letter is for undrained areas.

The four hydrologic soil groups are described in the following paragraphs:

Group A. Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission.

Group D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink-swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission.

Depth to the upper and lower boundaries of each layer is indicated.

Texture is given in the standard terms used by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These terms are defined according to percentages of sand, silt, and clay in the fraction of the soil that is less than 2 millimeters in diameter. "Loam," for example, is soil that is 7 to 27 percent clay, 28 to 50 percent silt, and less than 52 percent sand. If the content of particles coarser than sand is 15 percent or more, an appropriate modifier is added, for example, "gravelly."

Classification of the soils is determined according to the Unified soil classification system (ASTM, 2005) and the system adopted by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO, 2004).

The Unified system classifies soils according to properties that affect their use as construction material. Soils are classified according to particle-size distribution of the fraction less than 3 inches in diameter and according to plasticity index, liquid limit, and organic matter content. Sandy and gravelly soils are identified as GW, GP, GM, GC, SW, SP, SM, and SC; silty and clayey soils as ML, CL, OL, MH, CH, and OH; and highly organic soils as PT. Soils exhibiting engineering properties of two groups can have a dual classification, for example, CL-ML.

The AASHTO system classifies soils according to those properties that affect roadway construction and maintenance. In this system, the fraction of a mineral soil that is less than 3 inches in diameter is classified in one of seven groups from A-1 through A-7 on the basis of particle-size distribution, liquid limit, and plasticity index. Soils in group A-1 are coarse grained and low in content of fines (silt and clay). At the other extreme, soils in group A-7 are fine grained. Highly organic soils are classified in group A-8 on the basis of visual inspection.

If laboratory data are available, the A-1, A-2, and A-7 groups are further classified as A-1-a, A-1-b, A-2-4, A-2-5, A-2-6, A-2-7, A-7-5, or A-7-6. As an additional refinement, the suitability of a soil as subgrade material can be indicated by a group index number. Group index numbers range from 0 for the best subgrade material to 20 or higher for the poorest.

Percentage of rock fragments larger than 10 inches in diameter and 3 to 10 inches in diameter are indicated as a percentage of the total soil on a dry-weight basis. The percentages are estimates determined mainly by converting volume percentage in the field to weight percentage. Three values are provided to identify the expected Low (L), Representative Value (R), and High (H).

Percentage (of soil particles) passing designated sieves is the percentage of the soil fraction less than 3 inches in diameter based on an ovendry weight. The sieves, numbers 4, 10, 40, and 200 (USA Standard Series), have openings of 4.76, 2.00, 0.420, and 0.074 millimeters, respectively. Estimates are based on laboratory tests of soils sampled in the survey area and in nearby areas and on estimates made in the field. Three values are provided to identify the expected Low (L), Representative Value (R), and High (H).

Liquid limit and *plasticity index* (Atterberg limits) indicate the plasticity characteristics of a soil. The estimates are based on test data from the survey area or from nearby areas and on field examination. Three values are provided to identify the expected Low (L), Representative Value (R), and High (H).

References:

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.

Report—Engineering Properties

Absence of an entry indicates that the data were not estimated. The asterisk '*' denotes the representative texture; other possible textures follow the dash. The criteria for determining the hydrologic soil group for individual soil components is found in the National Engineering Handbook, Chapter 7 issued May 2007(http://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/ OpenNonWebContent.aspx?content=17757.wba). Three values are provided to identify the expected Low (L), Representative Value (R), and High (H).

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Orange County, New York Survey Area Data: Version 23, Sep 10, 2022

