Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 138 of 185

BellFlower **Type II 24-hr 50-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=5.21"** Type II 24-hr 50-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=5.21" Prepared by ITS **Prepared by ITS** Printed 10/14/2020

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 02245 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 55

#### Summary for Subcatchment B3:

Runoff =  $208.67$  cfs  $@$  13.11 hrs, Volume= 48.504 af, Depth= 4.08"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 50-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=5.21"



#### Subcatchment B3:





Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 139 of 185



### Summary for Subcatchment B4:

Runoff = 101.53 cfs @ 12.45 hrs, Volume= 13.341 af, Depth= 3.66"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 50-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=5.21"



#### Subcatchment B4:





### Summary for Subcatchment B5:

Runoff = 639.51 cfs @ 13.82 hrs, Volume= 201.560 af, Depth= 3.66"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 50-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=5.21"



151.8 8,006 Total

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 141 of 185



# Subcatchment B5:



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 142 of 185



### Summary for Subcatchment B6:

Runoff = 121.90 cfs @ 12.27 hrs, Volume= 12.199 af, Depth= 2.89"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 50-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=5.21"



#### Subcatchment B6:



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 143 of 185



Time span=0.00-96.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 1921 points Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN Reach routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method - Pond routing by Stor-Ind method



100.00% Pervious = 1,374.730 ac 0.00% Impervious = 0.000 ac



### Summary for Subcatchment B1:

Runoff = 376.15 cfs @ 12.65 hrs, Volume= 62.138 af, Depth= 4.66"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



### Subcatchment B1:





### Summary for Subcatchment B2:

Runoff = 337.04 cfs @ 14.26 hrs, Volume= 126.361 af, Depth= 4.77"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



188.4 5,853 Total

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 146 of 185

BellFlower Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04" Prepared by ITS<br>
HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 02245 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC<br>
Page 63 HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 02245 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

## Subcatchment B2:





### Summary for Subcatchment B3:

Runoff = 248.44 cfs @ 13.11 hrs, Volume= 58.085 af, Depth= 4.88"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



#### Subcatchment B3:





### Summary for Subcatchment B4:

Runoff = 122.68 cfs @ 12.44 hrs, Volume= 16.196 af, Depth= 4.45"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



### Subcatchment B4:





### Summary for Subcatchment B5:

Runoff = 774.29 cfs @ 13.81 hrs, Volume= 244.695 af, Depth= 4.45"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



151.8 8,006 Total

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 150 of 185



### Subcatchment B5:





### Summary for Subcatchment B6:

Runoff = 152.63 cfs @ 12.26 hrs, Volume= 15.252 af, Depth= 3.61"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



#### Subcatchment B6:



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 152 of 185



# **APPENDIX I PRE-DEVELOPMENT MANNINGS MAP**

\_

2211557.001A | RAL20R117556 A-9 A-9 October 15, 2020<br>
◎ 2020 Kleinfelder.com A-9 <u>www.kleinfelder.com</u>

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 153 of 185



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 154 of 185



# **APPENDIX J OFFSITE DRAINAGE MAP**

\_

2211557.001A | RAL20R117556 A-10 A-10 October 15, 2020<br>
◎ 2020 Kleinfelder.com © 2020 Kleinfelder.com

Document Path: C:\Kristin\\_Working\Bellflower\GIS\Report\_Figures\FigJ.mxd



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 156 of 185



# **APPENDIX K OFFSITE LANDUSE MAP**

\_

2211557.001A | RAL20R117556 A-11 A-11 October 15, 2020<br>
◎ 2020 Kleinfelder.com © 2020 Kleinfelder.com



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 158 of 185



### **APPENDIX L OFFSITE CURVE NUMBERS**

\_

2211557.001A | RAL20R117556 A-12 A-12 October 15, 2020<br>
◎ 2020 Kleinfelder.com © 2020





















Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 165 of 185



# **APPENDIX M OFFSITE HYDROCAD REPORT**

\_

2211557.001A | RAL20R117556 A-13 October 15, 2020



Printed 9/3/2020 Page 2

# Area Listing (selected nodes)



# Soil Listing (selected nodes)



Prepared by ITS **Prepared by ITS Printed 9/3/2020** HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 02245 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 4

### Ground Covers (selected nodes)



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 170 of 185



Time span=0.00-96.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 1921 points Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN Reach routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method - Pond routing by Stor-Ind method



100.00% Pervious = 3,026.710 ac 0.00% Impervious = 0.000 ac



### Summary for Subcatchment OB1:

Runoff = 140.62 cfs @ 15.50 hrs, Volume= 70.001 af, Depth= 4.66"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



274.2 4,768 Total

#### Subcatchment OB1:





### Summary for Subcatchment OB2:

Runoff = 277.70 cfs @ 18.63 hrs, Volume= 225.095 af, Depth= 4.77"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



508.6 9,111 Total

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 173 of 185

BellFlower Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"<br>Prepared by ITS Finted 9/3/2020 Prepared by ITS<br>
HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 02245 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC<br>
Page 8 HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 02245 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC



# Subcatchment OB2:


# **Summary for Subcatchment OB3:**

Runoff 224 99 cfs @ 13.34 hrs, Volume= 58.986 af, Depth= 4.56"  $=$ 

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



#### **Subcatchment OB3:**



**Bellflower Solar 1** Attachment VTG-1 Page 175 of 185



# **Summary for Subcatchment OB4:**

Runoff 39.27 cfs @ 12.12 hrs, Volume= 2.998 af, Depth= 4.34"  $\quad =$ 

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



#### **Subcatchment OB4:**



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 176 of 185



# Summary for Subcatchment OB5:

Runoff = 33.18 cfs @ 12.26 hrs, Volume= 3.355 af, Depth= 4.23"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



#### Subcatchment 0B5:



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 177 of 185



# Summary for Subcatchment OB6:

Runoff = 54.88 cfs @ 12.29 hrs, Volume= 5.874 af, Depth= 4.45"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



#### Subcatchment 0B6:



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 178 of 185



# Summary for Subcatchment OB7:

Runoff = 83.64 cfs @ 12.40 hrs, Volume= 10.301 af, Depth= 4.13"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



#### Subcatchment 0B7:





# Summary for Subcatchment OB8:

Runoff = 451.61 cfs @ 17.50 hrs, Volume= 334.248 af, Depth= 4.56"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



449.9 14,103 Total

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 180 of 185

Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04" **BellFlower** Prepared by ITS Printed 9/3/2020 HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 02245 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 15

#### Hydrograph  $500 \Box$  Runoff 480 451 61 cfs 460 Type II 24-hr  $440 -$ 420 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"  $400<sub>1</sub>$  $380<sub>3</sub>$ Runoff Area=880.470 ac  $360 -$ Runoff Volume=334,248 af  $340 320 -$ Runoff Depth=4.56"  $\frac{300}{280}$ Flow (cfs) Flow Length=14,103'  $260$ <br> $240$ <br> $220$ Tc=449.9 min **CN=87**  $200 180 -$ 160  $140 120 100<sup>3</sup>$  $80^{-1}$  $60\frac{3}{2}$  $40 20 0<sup>3</sup>$  $20$  $25$  $40$  $\overline{5}$  $10$  $15$  $30$  $35$  $45$  $50$  $55$  $70$  $75$  $95$  $\ddot{\mathbf{0}}$ 60 65 80 85 90 Time (hours)

# **Subcatchment OB8:**



# Summary for Subcatchment OB9:

Runoff = 456.18 cfs @ 20.61 hrs, Volume= 459.210 af, Depth= 4.66"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-96.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04"



662.0 17,015 Total

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 182 of 185

Type II 24-hr 100-Year 24-Hr Rainfall=6.04" **BellFlower** Printed 9/3/2020 Prepared by ITS HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 02245 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC Page 17



# **Subcatchment OB9:**

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-1 Page 183 of 185



# **APPENDIX N PRE-DEVELOPMENT FLOOD MAPS**

\_

2211557.001A | RAL20R117556 A-14 October 15, 2020





Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 1 of 151



October 8, 2020 Project No. 20211557.001A

Mr. Joshua Larimer Lightsource BP 400 Montgomery St, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94104

#### Subject: Geotechnical Investigation Report Bellflower Solar Project Henry and Rush Counties, Indiana

Dear Mr. Larimer,

Kleinfelder is pleased to present this report summarizing the geotechnical investigation findings for the Bellflower Solar project. The purpose of the geotechnical investigation is to characterize the subsurface conditions and provide geotechnical recommendations for design and construction of the Bellflower Solar project. The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are subject to the limitations presented herein. In addition, the brief by the Geotechnical Business Association (GBA, Appendix H) provides additional information regarding data interpretation and industry-standard limitations of a geotechnical investigation.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide geotechnical engineering services on this project. Should you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Carey at 303.237.6601.

Respectfully submitted,

#### KLEINFELDER, INC.

Derek E. Pagel, PE (PA) Jennifer Carey, PE Geotechnical Engineer **Project Professional** 

 $P_{\text{t}}$   $P_{\text{t}}$ 

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 2 of 151



GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT BELLFLOWER SOLAR PROJECT HENRY AND RUSH COUNTIES, INDIANA KLEINFELDER PROJECT NO. 20211557.001A

October 8, 2020

Copyright 2020 Kleinfelder All Rights Reserved

ONLY THE CLIENT OR ITS DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVES MAY USE THIS DOCUMENT AND ONLY FOR THE SPECIFIC PROJECT FOR WHICH THIS REPORT WAS PREPARED.

20211557.001A/DEN20R117320 Page i of iv October 8, 2020 © 2020 Kleinfelder www.kleinfelder.com

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 3 of 151

Report Prepared for:

Mr. Joshua Larimer Lightsource BP 400 Montgomery St, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94104

GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT BELLFLOWER SOLAR PROJECT HENRY AND RUSH COUNTIES, INDIANA

KLEINFELDER PROJECT NO. 20211557.001A

Prepared by:

 $P_{u}A$   $P_{u}$ 

Derek E. Pagel, PE\* Geotechnical Engineer \*Not Licensed in Indiana

Reviewed by:



#### KLEINFELDER

707 17th Street, Suite 3000 Denver, Colorado 80202 303.237.6601

October 8, 2020

Kleinfelder Project No. 20211557.001A

.

10 - 03-2.o20

*лининни* 

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 4 of 151



#### TABLE OF CONTENTS



#### **FIGURES**

- 1. Exploration Location Plan and Vicinity Map
- 2. Surficial Geology Map
- 3. Bedrock Geology Map
- 4. Pile Location Test Map

#### APPENDICES

- A. Soil Boring and Test Pit Logs
- B. Field Testing: Resistivity Testing Results
- C. Laboratory Test Results: Index Testing

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 5 of 151



- D. Laboratory Test Results: Thermal Resistivity Testing
- E. Laboratory Test Results: Corrosivity
- F. Pile Load Test Results
- G. Corrosion Assessment
- H. GBA Document

#### GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT BELLFLOWER SOLAR PROJECT HENRY AND RUSH COUNTIES, INDIANA

## 1 INTRODUCTION

\_

This report presents the results of Kleinfelder's geotechnical investigation of the proposed Bellflower photovoltaic (PV) solar electric generation facility planned in Henry and Rush Counties, Indiana. The location of the project is shown on the Exploration Location Plan and Vicinity Map, Figure 1. Kleinfelder's services were performed in general accordance with our August 5, 2020, proposal.

The scope of Kleinfelder's geotechnical investigation consists of a subsurface exploration, laboratory testing, engineering analysis, pile load testing, and preparation of this report. The purpose of Kleinfelder's geotechnical engineering investigation is to provide design and construction recommendations for the PV array foundations, equipment pads, access roads, site preparation, and general earthwork.

In summary, the site appears to be suitable for the intended development provided the recommendations outlined in this report are properly incorporated in the design and construction phases of the project.

The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are based on subsurface information encountered in our explorations, our site observations, and our experience with similar developments. The recommendations contained in this report are subject to the provisions and requirements outlined in the Limitations section of this report.

#### 1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

We understand the project will include the installation of ground-mounted solar PV arrays and construction of support infrastructure including gravel or soil access roads, perimeter fence, and ancillary electrical equipment.

Kleinfelder anticipates the PV panels to be attached to a single-axis tracker (SAT) system supported on driven steel piles, typically fabricated from wide-flange beams. Maximum axial and lateral loads are expected to be on the order of two to three kips each. Other components will include overhead and underground electrical conductors, inverters, transformers, and other electrical components, to be supported on piles, slabs-on-grade, or combinations of slabs and piles. Additional site development will likely include access roadways for construction and maintenance purposes.

The finished site grades had not been provided at the time this report was prepared. Kleinfelder anticipates grading within the solar array field will be limited. Earthwork cuts and fills of no more than approximately two feet are expected for equipment pads. Utility trenches are not anticipated to exceed four feet in depth.

# 2 FIELD EXPLORATION & LABORATORY TESTING

 $\_$  ,  $\_$  ,

#### 2.1 FIELD EXPLORATION

Subsurface conditions at the site were explored with 12 soil test borings, 4 test pits, and 4 in-situ soil electrical resistivity tests between August 24 and September 1, 2020. The approximate test locations are presented on the Exploration Location Plan and Vicinity Map, Figure 1.

Prior to Kleinfelder's field exploration, the exploration locations were cleared for underground utilities through the Indiana 811 system. Kleinfelder staked the boring locations in the field using a handheld GPS unit. Kleinfelder geotechnical staff observed drilling and test pit operations, collected soil samples, and reviewed the subsurface conditions logged in each boring and test pit. Kleinfelder visually classified the observed soils in general accordance with ASTM D2488 and the Unified Soil Classification System. Keys to the soil descriptions and symbols used to describe the subsurface conditions encountered are presented in Appendix A.

#### 2.1.1 Exploratory Borings

Twelve borings were advanced with a Diedrich D25 track mounted drill rig using hollow stem auger drilling techniques to depths ranging from 20 to 50 feet below the ground surface (bgs). Soil samples were obtained with a standard 1.4-inch I.D., 2-inch O.D., split-tube sampler. The sampler was first seated six inches, then driven an additional 18-inches with blows of a 140-pound auto-hammer falling 30 inches. Standard Penetration Tests (SPTs) were performed at two-foot intervals for the first 10 feet and at five-foot intervals thereafter, in general accordance with ASTM D1586. Standard Penetration Test data (SPT N-values) were used to estimate the in-situ soil strength and density. Soil samples were obtained at each test interval. Groundwater observations were recorded in each boring during drilling and the borings were subsequently backfilled with site soils after completion of drilling. Logs of the borings are presented in Appendix A.

#### 2.1.2 Test Pits

Four test pits were excavated to depths of approximately nine feet bgs. Kleinfelder field personnel observed, manually classified, and logged the soil encountered in each test pit. Kleinfelder also obtained bulk samples from each test pit for laboratory testing. Groundwater observations were

recorded in each test pit during excavation and the test pits were subsequently backfilled with the site soils. Logs of test pits are presented in Appendix A.

# 2.1.3 Field Resistivity Testing

Soil resistivity was measured by Kleinfelder personnel using the Wenner four-electrode method with an AEMC 6471 Soil Resistivity Meter in accordance with ASTM G57 and IEEE Standard 81 at four locations as shown in Figure 1, Exploration Location Plan and Vicinity Map. Resistance measurements were conducted within the array areas using electrode spacings of 2, 4, 6, 10, 20, 30, 50, 100, and 200 feet. The results of the field resistivity testing are presented in Appendix B.

#### 2.2 PILE LOAD TESTING

Kleinfelder completed load testing of 30 piles installed by J&B Solar. The piles were installed in groups of 3 at 10 separate locations at the approximate locations shown in Figure 4. Each pile testing location consisted of a W6x8.5 wide flange beam that was driven to a depth of 6 feet, a W6x8.5 wide flange beam that was driven to a depth of 10, and a W6x15 wide flange beam that was driven to a depth of 8 feet. A summary of the pile installations is presented in Table 4-4 in Section 4.5.

The piles were tested under lateral and axial tension (pullout) loading. Each pile was first tested laterally by loading the pile in incremental loads up to approximately 3,000 and 4,000 pounds, W6x8.5 and W6x15 respectively, at 48 inches above grade and measuring the deflections at 4 and 48 inches above grade. After completion of lateral testing, piles were subject to axial tension testing to failure or up to approximately 12,500 pounds. Results of testing are presented in Appendix F.

#### 2.3 LABORATORY TESTING

Laboratory testing was performed on selected samples to evaluate physical and engineering properties of the soils. The laboratory testing included the following tests performed in general accordance with the referenced standards:

- Moisture Content (ASTM D2216);
- Grain Size Distribution (ASTM D422);
- Atterberg Limits (ASTM D4318);
- Standard Proctor (ASTM D698);
- Thermal Resistivity (ASTM D5334); and
- Corrosion Suite:
	- o pH of Soils (AASTHO T289),
	- o Electrical Resistivity (AASHTO T288),
	- o Sulfate Content (AASHTO T290),
	- o Chloride Content (AASHTO T291),
	- o Sulfide Content (SM 4500-S2-D), and
	- o Oxidation-Reduction Potential (SM 2580 B Mod.).

Laboratory testing results are shown on the boring logs presented in Appendix A. A summary table and laboratory test results are also included in Appendix C (geotechnical testing results) and Appendix E (corrosivity analysis).

# 3 SITE DESCRIPTION AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING

 $\_$  ,  $\_$  ,

## 3.1 SITE DESCRIPTION

The project site consists of approximately 878 acres of predominantly undeveloped farmland. The topography of the site is relatively flat and level with low hills and shallow valleys. The Little Blue River traverses the southwestern portion of the site. Irrigation ditches for crops are present throughout the site. Topographic relief is approximately 30 feet across the site. Ground cover at the time of our investigation consisted of predominantly of corn and soy fields. Reviews of aerial and satellite photography from 1992 through the present indicates the project site has remained mostly undeveloped, with the exception of several residential structures, rural roads, and culverts.

# 3.2 GEOLOGIC SETTING AND SURFACE SOILS

Based on the "Map of Surficial Deposits and Materials in the Eastern and Central United States" (Fullerton et al, 2003), the overburden deposits at the site are mapped as ground moraine and end moraine deposits (loamy till) of Holocene and late Wisconsin age. Kames, end moraines, mounds and hummocky regions may be located throughout the glaciated areas of Indiana. Boulders maybe present below the ground surface in some areas. Figure 2 shows the surficial geology of the site.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soil surveys indicate that most of the project site is loam, silt loam, and silty clay loam. Loess generally persists to a depth of 18 inches and then loamy till lies directly underneath to the maximum depth recorded by the NRCS (80 inches).

"Bedrock Geologic Map of Indiana" (Gray et al, 1987) $^{\rm l}$  reports the site is underlain by the Louisville Limestone through Brassfield Limestone bedrock geologic unit as well as the Whitewater Formation unit. The Louisville Limestone through Brassfield Limestone unit consists of Silurian

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Gray, H. H., Ault, C. H., and Keller, S. J., 1987, Bedrock geologic map of Indiana: Indiana Geological Survey Miscellaneous Map 48, scale 1:500,000.

age Sexton Creek limestone at base. The Whitewater Formation consists of skeletal limestone and calcareous shale, with dolomitic mudstone at the base.

Based upon our review of the readily available geologic information of the project site, karst features such as sinkholes, pinnacled bedrock, and other dissolution features are not anticipated to influence the site development. While the underlying bedrock consists of limestone and carbonate rich material, the surface conditions are dominated by glacial deposits greater than 50 feet thick. The presence of thick overburden material greatly reduces the risk that karst features could translate to the ground surface. PV development adds little, if any, increase load to the ground. The overall risk associated with karst features at the site is low.

#### 3.3 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

The following description provides a general summary of the subsurface conditions encountered during the field exploration and further identified by the laboratory testing program. A more detailed description can be found on the Boring and Test Pit Logs presented in Appendix A.

The surface soil conditions encountered at the site generally consist of medium stiff to very stiff lean clay (CL) with various amounts of sand and gravel, overlying very stiff to hard silt (ML) and medium dense to very dense silty sand (SM) and poorly-graded sand with silt (SP-SM). These soils extended to the termination depth of each boring, ranging from approximately 20 to 50 feet bgs. Bedrock was not encountered in any of the borings.

The subsurface conditions in the test pits were generally similar to those observed in the borings. Excavation refusal was not encountered in our test pits, which extended to a depth of approximately 9 feet bgs. Groundwater was not encountered in the test pits.

Engineering properties of the soils were evaluated using field and laboratory testing and are included in Appendix C. Atterberg limits tests performed on selected samples of the soils indicated liquid limit (LL) values ranging from 35 to 38 and plasticity index (PI) values ranging from 5 to 18.

#### 3.3.1 Groundwater

Groundwater was observed in Borings BF-B-01 through BF-B-04, BF-B-07, and BF-B-12 at depths ranging from approximately 11 to 28 feet bgs. Some fluctuation in groundwater levels can occur with climatic and seasonal variations. Fluctuations of the groundwater level, localized zones

of perched water, and increased soil moisture content should be anticipated during and following rain events. Therefore, subsurface water conditions at other times may be different from those described in this report.

# 3.4 CORROSIVITY TEST RESULTS

SoilCor completed laboratory testing of six samples to provide data regarding corrosivity of onsite soils. These analytical laboratory tests were performed on discrete samples and do not provide a complete representation of all soil types at the site. The soil corrosion laboratory test results are general and should be considered only a random survey. The results of the chemical testing are summarized in Table 3-1 and provided in Appendix E.

<b>Boring</b> No.	Depth (f <sup>t</sup> )	pH	Sulfide (mg/kg)	Chloride (mg/kg)	Sulfate (mg/kg)	Minimum Resistivity (ohm-cm)	Redox Potential $Eh$ (mV)
<b>BF-B-03</b>	$6 - 10$	7.3	<b>ND</b>	10	ND.	4,300	246
<b>BF-B-04</b>	$6 - 10$	7.6	<b>ND</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>ND</b>	5,200	278
<b>BF-B-05</b>	$6 - 10$	7.6	0.56	<b>ND</b>	<b>ND</b>	5,600	275
<b>BF-B-08</b>	$2 - 6$	7.5	<b>ND</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>ND</b>	3,900	266
$BF-B-10$	$6 - 10$	7.2	0.38	<b>ND</b>	10	4,800	251
<b>BF-B-12</b>	$4 - 8$	7.1	0.25	<b>ND</b>	<b>ND</b>	6,100	285

Table 3-1. Summary of Laboratory Soil Corrosivity Testing

\*ND- No Detection

These laboratory results were compared to the "Building Code Requirements for Reinforced Concrete", ACI 318, to evaluate the potential of corrosion and attack to concrete. Based upon the tested sulfate concentrations, the soils have a Class S0 exposure rating for sulfate attack. ACI has no special requirements for cement type or concrete formulation for concrete in contact with soil based on the measured sulfate concentrations.

The results of the laboratory resistivity testing, as shown in Appendix E, generally indicate that there is the potential for corrosion to steel articles in contact with soils. Galvanization is typically used for protection of PV racking support piles, but additional measures such as coatings or active corrosion protection systems may be necessary depending on the design life of the system. A Corrosion Evaluation Report, which includes recommendations for corrosion design for steel piles for the project site, is provided in Appendix G.

#### 3.5 THERMAL RESISTIVITY

Four thermal resistivity tests were performed in the laboratory on samples obtained from the test pits. The thermal resistivity tests were performed in general accordance with IEEE Standard 442- 2017-Guide for Soil Thermal Resistivity Measurements and ASTM standards. The results of the thermal resistivity testing are shown in Table 3-2 below. Graphical results of the individual thermal dry-out curves and more detailed information regarding the sample preparation are presented in Appendix D.

<b>Test</b> Location	<b>Tested Initial</b> <b>Moisture Content</b> (% dry weight)	<b>Tested Dry</b> Density $(lb/ft^3)$	<b>Thermal</b> Resistivity, wet $(^{\circ}C$ -cm/W)	Thermal Resistivity, dry $(^{\circ}$ C-cm/W)
$TP-1$	12	111	64	153
$TP-2$	16	98	83	215
$TP-3$	11	112	60	147
$TP-4$	9	117	56	127

Table 3-2. Thermal Resistivity of Native Soil Samples

# 4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

 $\_$  ,  $\_$  ,

#### 4.1 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions and recommendations presented below are based on the subsurface conditions observed in the explorations, laboratory test results, pile load testing, engineering analyses, and our experience with similar utility-scale solar projects. Based on the results of our field exploration and laboratory testing, the site appears to be geotechnically suitable for PV solar development.

#### 4.2 EARTHWORK

# 4.2.1 Subgrade Preparation

Initial site work should consist of grubbing and stripping of vegetation, demolition, and removal of existing structures and other deleterious materials. Deleterious material should be removed for offsite disposal in accordance with local laws and regulations.

Subgrades below roadways, equipment pads, and areas planned for structural fill placement should be evaluated by an experienced geotechnical engineer or their representative prior to construction. Areas should be proof rolled with a loaded dump truck (minimum 18-kip axel load). Areas that express excessive rutting or pumping should be undercut and backfilled with structural fill per the following paragraphs. The excavations should extend horizontally beyond the construction limits, extending outward one foot for every one foot of excavation.

We recommend native soils below structural fill, equipment pads, spread foundations, and access roadways be scarified, moisture conditioned to zero to three percent above optimum moisture content, and recompacted at least eight inches below the engineered fill, access road subgrade, or base of concrete.

In the area where PV array piles will be installed, stripping of the organic materials is not required, unless there will be areas of fill in excess of 12 inches in depth. Preparation of the tilled or disturbed soils should be completed as required to facilitate array installation equipment access and will likely include minor levelling and compaction.

#### 4.2.2 Excavation and Trenching

We anticipate the site soils can be excavated using conventional heavy-duty construction equipment. Our borings and test pits did not encounter bedrock, boulders, or other layers anticipated to present difficult excavation conditions.

All excavations must comply with applicable local, state, and federal safety regulations including the current OSHA Excavation and Trench Safety Standards. OSHA soil type and allowable sloping must be made in the field by the contractor's OSHA-qualified "competent person" whenever personnel exposure is anticipated. Construction site safety is the responsibility of the contractor, who shall also be solely responsible for the means, methods, and sequencing of construction operations.

#### 4.2.3 Structural Fill

Structural fill is defined as any fill that will support structural elements. Structural fill will be required for backfill of utilities and for site-grading fill. All structural fill must be free of sod, rubbish, topsoil, frozen soil, and other deleterious materials. Structural fill materials should consist of a non-expansive, mainly granular material as specified below. On-site soils may be suitable for reuse as structural fill if they meet the criteria present in Table 4-1. Import materials can also be used, if desired.



#### Table 4-1. Structural Fill Criteria

A sample of any imported fill material should be submitted to the geotechnical engineer for approval and testing at least one week prior to stockpiling at the site. Structural fill should be placed according to the recommendations in Section 4.2.4.

# 4.2.4 Fill Placement and Compaction

Structural fill should be placed in loose lifts and in thicknesses appropriate for the compaction equipment being used. However, in no case should loose-lift thickness exceed eight inches. Structural fill should be compacted to the specifications presented in Table 4-2.



# Table 4-2. Compaction Specifications

#### 4.2.5 Construction in Wet or Cold Weather

During construction, grade the site such that surface water can drain readily away from the excavations. Promptly pump out or otherwise remove any water that may accumulate in excavations or on subgrade surfaces and allow these areas to dry before resuming construction. The use of berms, ditches, and similar means may be used to prevent stormwater from entering the work area and to convey any water off-site efficiently.

If earthwork is performed during the winter months when freezing may occur, no grading fill, structural fill, or other fill should be placed on frosted or frozen ground, nor should frozen material be placed as fill. Frozen ground should be allowed to thaw or be completely removed prior to placement of fill. A good practice is to cover the compacted fill with a "blanket" of loose fill to help prevent the compacted fill from freezing.

# 4.2.6 Construction Testing and Observation

Field testing and construction observation should take place under the direction of a qualified geotechnical engineer. Furthermore, the opinions and recommendations expressed in a geotechnical report are based on interpretation of limited information obtained from the field exploration. Therefore, it is common to find that actual site conditions differ from those indicated in the report. The geotechnical engineer should remain involved throughout the project to evaluate such differing conditions as they appear, and to modify or add to the geotechnical recommendations, as necessary.

# 4.23 Surface Drainage and Final Site Grading

Positive drainage away from structures is essential to the performance of foundations and roads and should be provided during the life of the facility. Consideration should be given to improving the slope and surface drainage of areas that have ponding of surface water and/or poor surface drainage near slab foundations or roads.

#### 4.3 SEISMIC SITE CLASS

Based on the soil conditions encountered in the borings and our knowledge of geologic conditions in the area of the site, a Site Class of 'D' is considered appropriate. The seismic design parameters as determined in ASCE 7-10 are summarized in Table 4-3.



### Table 4-3. Seismic Design Parameters

The typical soil profile encountered in our borings was predominately stiff to very stiff clay and silt and dense sand. It is our opinion that this soil profile presents negligible risk of liquefaction due to the stiff/dense soils.

#### 4.4 FROST HEAVE CONSIDERATIONS

Frost depth at the project site is approximately thirty inches. Due to the groundwater depth at the project site, we anticipate the risk of frost action is low.

#### 4.5 PV ARRAY FOUNDATIONS

Typical foundations used for PV arrays, such as driven steel piles, drilled piers, helical piers, ballasts, or footings will likely be feasible for use for this project. We have assumed driven steel piles are preferred. A summary of the pile installations and axial pullout load is presented in Table 4-4. Driving refusal was not encountered at any of the ten (10) test locations.



## Table 4-4. Pullout Test Summary

The following design values for evaluation of axial and lateral pile capacity are based on the findings of our field investigation, laboratory testing, pile load testing, and our experience in the area. We recommend all PV support piles have a minimum driven depth of at least seven feet. Greater depths may be required to achieve structural requirements.

# 4.51 Axial Capacity

Axial capacity of driven piles may be estimated based on the perimeter of the pile and embedment depth. The perimeter of a wide-flange beam should be taken as twice the sum of the flange width and web depth. We recommend the upper one foot of soil be neglected from skin friction component of axial capacity. Based on the results of the Atterberg limits testing and the moisture contents of the samples, expansive soil risk to properly designed and installed pile foundations is judged to be negligible.

Kleinfelder evaluated the skin friction of pile based on the results of the axial pullout testing. The ultimate skin friction of driven pile foundations can be taken as 400 psf. Thus, the nominal axial load capacity of the driven piles for PV racking can be calculated using the following formula:

> $Q_{ult} = 400 \text{psf} * P * (L-1 \text{ft})$ Where:  $Q_{ult}$  = ultimate (nominal) axial capacity (pounds)  $P =$  perimeter equal to twice the section depth plus twice the flange width (ft)  $L =$  embedment depth (ft), neglecting the upper 1ft

For design of piles, we recommend a factor of safety of at least 1.5 for evaluation of allowable skin friction, or a resistance factor of 0.7 for design using load and resistance factored design (LRFD).

For piles in compression, end bearing can be considered additive to the skin friction. Ultimate end bearing pressure can be taken as 10,000 psf, calculated based on the box end area of the pile. For evaluation of allowable end pressure, we recommend a factor of safety of 2.5. For LRFD, we recommend a maximum a resistance factor of 0.5. The above values can be used to estimate the capacity of piles for both refusal and non-refusal installations.

# 4.5.2 Lateral Capacity

Lateral load response of pile foundations can be calculated with the computer program L-Pile, created by Ensoft, Inc. The stiffness of the pile and the stress-strain properties of the surrounding soils determine the lateral resistance of the foundation. Recommended LPile input parameters for the sand and clay soils encountered are included in Table 4-5.



# Table 4-5. LPile Input Parameters

Kleinfelder developed these parameters from the results of the field and laboratory testing and pile load testing. These parameters can be used for the full depth of pile embedment. If piles will be wider than seven inches, Kleinfelder should be given the opportunity to reconsider these parameters.

# 4.5.3 Refusal Considerations

We recommend all PV support piles have a minimum driven depth of at least seven feet. Greater depths may be required to achieve structural requirements. Refusal is defined as no advancement after driving with full power (minimum 830 Joules) for at least 30 seconds. Piles that refuse and require additional embedment depth should be withdrawn and the pile location predrilled. Predrilled pile holes should be backfilled with compacted granular material. Compaction should be completed by tamping with a heavy tamping bar with at least three lifts.

#### 4.6 EQUIPMENT FOUNDATIONS

We understand that some proposed structures may be supported on shallow/mat foundations. We evaluated several foundation sizes to provide allowable bearing pressures for various sizes based on the limiting factors of soil bearing capacity and estimates for 1-inch of settlement (whichever is lower). Our recommendations are based on a composite soil profile from the borings





We recommend mat foundations be designed in accordance with the following criteria:

- The recommended allowable bearing pressures is 2,000 psf and includes a factor of safety of 3 with regards to bearing capacity. Any unsuitable subgrade conditions encountered in the area of mat foundations should be improved as discussed in Section 4.2.1.
- A modulus of subgrade reaction (k1) of 350 pounds per square inch per inch (pci) of deflection for a 1 ft by 1 ft plate may be used for the design of the mat foundations bearing on approved materials. This modulus value may be adjusted for the design mat width by using the equation below with B equal to the width of the mat in feet.

Modulus of subgrade reaction adjusted for size of mat in  $pci = -$ 

- To provide frost protection, mat foundations should have a minimum embedment depth of 36 inches based on the frost depth in the area of the site or as required by more stringent codes. Minimum embedment may be achieved by turned down or thickened edges at least 36-inches below surrounding grades to provide perimeter confinement to reduce water infiltration. The soils included inside the turned down edges within the entire footprint of the mat should consist of gravel (AASHTO No. 57 or equivalent). Drainage provisions should be provided to ensure surface water does not become trapped beneath the mat.
- Mat foundations should be designed to distribute the loads uniformly over the mat area.
- Minimum foundation size should be 2-feet by 2-feet.
- Post-construction total settlements of the mat foundations are estimated to be up to about 1 inch (at the sizes and allowable bearing pressures provided in Table 4-6), with postconstruction differential settlements of up to about ½ inch.
- Underground utilities running parallel to the mat and lying 3 feet or shallower, generally should be located no closer than 2 feet outside of the perimeter edges of the mat slab. Deeper utilities should be located above a 1:1 (horizontal to vertical) slope projected downward from the bottom edges of the mat.
- For resistance to lateral loading, we recommend an ultimate coefficient of friction of 0.35 be utilized for calculation of friction resistance along the bottom of foundations constructed on approved subgrade soils. The vertical dead loads acting on the mat can be utilized to calculate the ultimate friction resistance. We recommend a minimum factor of safety of 1.5 when using sliding friction alone. A passive pressure coefficient of 1.7 may be used to calculate ultimate passive pressure resistance on the side of mats for resistance to sliding in Structural Fill and site soils. A moist unit weight of 115 pcf may be used to calculate passive pressures. The passive pressure can be assumed to act starting at a depth of 1-foot below

grade in level unpaved areas. A larger magnitude of movement is required to engage the full passive resistance than sliding friction. Therefore, a minimum factor of safety of 2.0 is recommended when using passive pressure in conjunction with base friction to resist lateral loads. It should be noted that the lateral load resistance values discussed above are only applicable where the concrete for foundations are either placed directly against undisturbed soils or that the voids created from the use of forming are backfilled with properly compacted soil.

During construction, foundation excavations should be observed by a representative of the Geotechnical Engineer to evaluate the supporting capabilities of the bearing materials. If unsuitable bearing conditions are encountered, the area should be over-excavated and backfilled with compacted Structural Fill at the recommendation of a representative of the Geotechnical Engineer.

The Contractor should not allow surface and/or ground water to accumulate in foundation excavations. Foundations should be placed in excavations immediately after foundation subgrades are approved by the on-site geotechnical representative. Water entering foundation excavations should be removed and the subgrade scarified, moisture conditioned, and recompacted in accordance with Section 4.2.1 of this report, prior to foundation placement. The use of a "mud mat", an unreinforced concrete slab (approximately 3 inches thick), may be considered for foundation subgrades to protect the subgrade from damage resulting from precipitation.

#### 4.7 DIRECT EMBEDMENT POLES

Overhead interconnection lines are assumed to be supported on direct embedment poles. Based on the "Design Manual for High Voltage Transmission Lines" RUS Bulletin 1724E-200, the standard for installation of direct embedment poles in "good soil" is "10 percent plus 2 feet". The subsurface conditions encountered, however, are probably less than "good soils". Longer embedment depths may be required, and the pole designer should review the logs to evaluate an appropriate depth for poles.

#### 4.8 ACCESS ROADS

At typical solar sites, access roads are heavily used during construction, but see very low traffic volumes during the life of the installation. Vehicle types are anticipated to vary significantly, from lightly to heavily loaded trucks and construction equipment. Access road sections are typically designed based on post-construction traffic volumes, with the assumption that localized
improvements and/or frequent maintenance of the roads will occur during construction. Gravel-surfaced or soil access roads are typical for these facilities.

Near surface soils encountered in the explorations were predominately lean clay with various amounts of sand with low to medium plasticity. These soils are considered fair to poor subgrade for roads, and the strength of the subgrade will be highly influenced by moisture content. We estimate these soils to have an R-value of 5 for road section design.

Performance of gravel-surface roads is greatly influenced by moisture in the subgrade soils. High subgrade moisture contents will increase the frequency and depth of rutting and ponding on the wearing surface. The use of subgrade stabilization (e.g., lime or fly-ash) or a geotextile separation fabric can improve support qualities and may be appropriate for high-traffic areas. A geotextile can also reduce rutting and maintain strength of a gravel surface course.

Based on AASHTO design criteria, we recommend a minimum wearing surface of eleven inches of aggregate pavement for a traffic load of six trucks per weekday for a year during construction. Traffic after construction is anticipated to be very limited and we recommend a wearing surface of a minimum of six inches of aggregate pavement. Wearing course should consist of imported granular material that meets the requirements of Indiana Department of Transportation Standard Specifications (2020) Section 303, Aggregate Pavements. These thicknesses assume no stabilization of the subgrade; subgrade stabilization should reduce these thickness estimates. An increased thickness of granular material may be required in isolated areas to achieve stability.

We recommend the roads be designed with cross-slope to promote drainage, and, where possible, with ditches to help drain water from the pavement subgrade and convey off-site.

Road alignments should be properly prepared by stripping all vegetation, organic soil, and deleterious materials and scarified and recompacted to a depth 12 inches below final subgrade elevation. The road alignment should be proof rolled with a fully loaded dump truck or similar vehicle. Areas that deflect, rut, or pump should be further excavated and recompacted, or stabilized.

Regular maintenance including grading and the addition of gravel should be anticipated during the facility construction because truck and heavy equipment traffic will be frequent. After construction, traffic volumes are anticipated to be very low, and mainly related to facility maintenance operations.

#### 5 LIMITATIONS

\_

This work was performed in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by other members of Kleinfelder's profession practicing in the same locality, under similar conditions and at the date the services are provided. Our conclusions, opinions, and recommendations are based on a limited number of observations and data. It is possible that conditions could vary between or beyond the data evaluated. Kleinfelder makes no other representation, guarantee, or warranty, express or implied, regarding the services, communication (oral or written), report, opinion, or instrument of service provided.

This report may be used only by Lightsource BP and the registered design professional in responsible charge and only for the purposes stated for this specific engagement within a reasonable time from its issuance, but in no event later than two (2) years from the date of the report.

The work performed was based on project information provided by Lightsource BP. If Lightsource BP does not retain Kleinfelder to review any plans and specifications, including any revisions or modifications to the plans and specifications, Kleinfelder assumes no responsibility for the interpretation or implementation of our recommendations. In addition, if there are any changes in the field to the plans and specifications, Lightsource BP must obtain written approval from Kleinfelder's engineer that such changes do not affect our recommendations. Failure to do so will vitiate Kleinfelder's recommendations.

Kleinfelder offers various levels of investigative and engineering services to suit the varying needs of different clients. Although risk can never be eliminated, more detailed and extensive studies yield more information, which may help understand and manage the level of risk. Since detailed study and analysis involves greater expense, our clients participate in determining levels of service, which provide information for their purposes at acceptable levels of risk. Lightsource BP and key members of the design team should discuss the issues covered in this report with Kleinfelder, so that the issues are understood and applied in a manner consistent with the owner's budget, tolerance of risk and expectations for future performance and maintenance.

The scope of services for this subsurface exploration and geotechnical report did not include environmental assessments or evaluations regarding the presence or absence of wetlands or hazardous substances in the soil, surface water, or groundwater at this site.

This report, and any future addenda or reports regarding this site, may be made available to bidders to supply them with only the data contained in the report regarding subsurface conditions and laboratory test results at the point and time noted. Bidders may not rely on interpretations, opinions, recommendations, or conclusions contained in the report. Because of the limited nature of any subsurface study, the contractor may encounter conditions during construction which differ from those presented in this report. In such event, the contractor should promptly notify the owner so that Kleinfelder's Geotechnical Engineer can be contacted to confirm those conditions. We recommend the contractor describe the nature and extent of the differing conditions in writing and that the construction contract include provisions for dealing with differing conditions. Contingency funds should be reserved for potential problems during foundation construction.

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 28 of 151

FIGURES \_ PLOTTED: 9/22/2020



<u>NEEL Alexandrijk van die Stad v</u>

 $\ket{\mathsf{N}}$ 

Hei

The use or misuse of the information contained on this graphic representation is at the sole risk of the party using or misusing the information.









bxm.ypoloe5 *A*oobed - & anngi-l/agniwsnb/toejor1 nalo2 newofilled At00.7aat1f.so3/aboef/dawingshamed - Bedrock Geology.nxal





Henr

09-22-2020

CHECKED BY: B. Baum

D AT E :

GIS FILE PATH: \\azrgisstorp01\Working\\_clients\\_Automated\_Exploration Plans Plans PLOTTED: 10/8/2020 9:15:06 AM BY: ALEONARDISD: PLOTTED: 10/8/2020 9:15:06 AM BY: ALEONARDISD: 10/8/2020 9:15:06 AM BY: ALEONARDISD: ALEONAR on Plan FILE PATH  $\frac{10}{10}$ 

The information included on this graphic representation has been compiled from a variety of sources and is usubstrated to the state as the presentations of warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, time using or misusing the information.

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 33 of 151

#### APPENDIX A SOIL BORING AND TEST PIT LOGS

\_

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 34 of 151



**REACTION WITH** 





#### SECONDARY CONSTITUENT MOISTURE CONTENT CEMENTATION



#### MOISTURE CONTENT



#### CONSISTENCY - FINE-GRAINED SOIL



#### APPARENT / IRELATIVE IDENSITY FICOARSE-GRAINED SOIL



#### **PLASTICITY**



LL is from Casagrande, 1948. Plis from Holtz , 1959.

FROM TERZAGHI AND PECK, 1948

#### **STRUCTURE**





#### EINFELDER Bright People. Right Solutions. KEY-2 SOIL IDESCRIPTION KEY **APPENDIX Bellflower Solar Project** Henry and Rush Counties, Indiana DATE: 9/22/2020 CHECKED BY: DEP DRAWN BY: MGG 20211557.001A

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 36 of 151



PLOTTED: 10/06/2020 02:31 PM BY: DPagel PLOTTED:

OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER gINT FILE: IKKf\_gint\_master\_2021 IIIIII]<br>DINT FILE: IKKf\_gint\_master\_2021 IIIII] **IPITISOL** gINT TEMPLATE: E:KLF\_STANDARD\_GINT\_LIBRARY\_2021.GLB [\_\_KLF\_BORING/TEST PIT SOIL LOG] gINTIFILE:IIXIf\_gint\_masier\_2021IIIIIIII<br>aINTITEMPLATE:IE:KLF STANDARD GINT LIBRARY 2021.GLB.IIIII KLF BORING/TEST

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 37 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 38 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER gINT FILE: Klf\_gint\_master\_2021 PROJECT NUMBER: 20211557.001A OFFICE FILTER: DENVER gINT TEMPLATE: E:KLF\_STANDARD\_GINT\_LIBRARY\_2021.GLB [\_\_KLF\_BORING/TEST PIT SOIL LOG] PROJECTINUMBER:II20211557.001A<br>Albenev 2021.cl e.iii... Ki E. BOBING/FEST g|NTŒILE:ונוֹאוֹר gint\_master\_2021<br>הואודרדפואוסו אידב-ייפי גיו ב-פידאאומאסים יכואוד ו

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 39 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: IIDENVER gINT FILE: Klf\_gint\_master\_2021 PROJECT NUMBER: 20211557.001A OFFICE FILTER: DENVER gINT TEMPLATE: E:KLF\_STANDARD\_GINT\_LIBRARY\_2021.GLB [\_\_KLF\_BORING/TEST PIT SOIL LOG] PROJECTINUMBER:iI20211557.001A<br>Approvation on the Formulation  $\overline{C}$ gINT:FILE::EKIf\_gint\_master\_2021<br>- المنتصوص المعروف الم

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 40 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER gINT FILE: Klf\_gint\_master\_2021 PROJECT NUMBER: 20211557.001A OFFICE FILTER: DENVER gINT TEMPLATE: E:KLF\_STANDARD\_GINT\_LIBRARY\_2021.GLB [\_\_KLF\_BORING/TEST PIT SOIL LOG] PROJECTINUMBER:i⊡20211557.001A<br>HBRARY 2021 GLRim KLE BORING/TEST g|NTŒ|LE:ונוֹאוֹר ֵgint\_master\_2021<br>הואודרדפואוסו אידב-יופי גור ב פידאאוס אסיס ביואוד ו

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 41 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 42 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 43 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 44 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 45 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER gINT FILE: Klf\_gint\_master\_2021 PROJECT NUMBER: 20211557.001A OFFICE FILTER: DENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

# Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 46 of 151



## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 47 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER gINT FILE: Klf\_gint\_master\_2021 PROJECT NUMBER: 20211557.001A OFFICE FILTER: DENVER gINT TEMPLATE: E:KLF\_STANDARD\_GINT\_LIBRARY\_2021.GLB [\_\_KLF\_BORING/TEST PIT SOIL LOG] PROJECTINUMBER:i⊡20211557.001A<br>HBRARY 2021 GLRim KLE BORING/TEST g|NTŒ|LE:ונוֹאוֹר ֵgint\_master\_2021<br>הואודרדפואוסו אידב-יופי גור ב פידאאוס אסיס ביואוד ו

# Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 48 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER gINT FILE: Klf\_gint\_master\_2021 PROJECT NUMBER: 20211557.001A OFFICE FILTER: DENVER PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A gINTIFILE: IIKIf\_gint\_master\_2021

## Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 49 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

#### Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 50 of 151



gINT FILE: IKKf\_gint\_master\_2021 IIIIII]<br>DINT FILE: IKKf\_gint\_master\_2021 IIIII] LOG<sub>1</sub> gINT TEMPLATE: E:KLF\_STANDARD\_GINT\_LIBRARY\_2021.GLB [\_\_KLF\_BORING/TEST PIT SOIL LOG] **BORING/TESTIPIT SOIL** PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A  $2021$ . GLB  $\Box$ KLF IE:KLF\_STANDARD\_GINT\_LIBRARY gINT:FILE: LIKIf\_gint\_master\_2021 **QINTITEMPLATE:** 

OFFICE IFILTER: IIDENVER

# Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 51 of 151



# Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 52 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: ILDENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

#### Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 53 of 151



OFFICE IFILTER: IIDENVER

PROJECTINUMBER: 02211557.001A

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 54 of 151

## APPENDIX B FIELD TESTING: RESISTIVITY TESTING RESULTS

\_



Revision 7

Date: 9/25/2020





Date: 9/25/2020



Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 59 of 151

#### APPENDIX C LABORATORY TEST RESULTS: INDEX TESTING

\_






OFFICE FILTER: DENVER

[KLF\_ATTERBERG (ASTM)] PROJECT NUMBER: 20211557.001A gINT FILE: KIf\_gint\_master\_2021<br>gINT TEMPLATE: E:KLF\_STANDARD\_GINT\_LIBRARY\_2021.GLB











#### **Laboratory Compaction Characteristics of Soil** Project Name: LSBP Bellflower Project Project Number: 20211557.001A **Client** Light Source BP Report Date: September 16, 2020 Sample: TP-1/S-1 and S-2/2-9 ft. Soil Description: Sandy Lean Clay Maximum Dry Density / Optimum Water Content 123.5 pcf / 11.6 % 125.0 124.0 123.0 122.0 121.0 Unit Weight, pcf 120.0 119.0 118.0 117.0 116.0 115.0 114.0 113.0 112.0 70  $8.0$ 90  $10.0$  $11.0$  $12.0$ 13.0  $14.0$ 15.0 16.0  $17.0$ **Water Content %**

Type of Rammer manual



**Remarks:** 

ASTM Test Method: ASTM D 698-12e

Limitations: Pursuant to applicable building codes, the results presented in this report are for the exclusive use of the client and the registered design professional in responsible charge. The results apply only to the samples tested. This report may not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of Kleinfelder.

ASTM Method D 698: B

 $Drv$ 

 $12.5$ 

 $0.5$ 

 $N/A$ 

**Preparation Method** 

As-received Water Content %

**Oversize Correction BSG** 





Type of Rammer manual



**Remarks:** 

ASTM Test Method: ASTM D 698-12e

Limitations: Pursuant to applicable building codes, the results presented in this report are for the exclusive use of the client and the registered design professional in responsible charge. The results apply only to the samples tested. This report may not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of Kleinfelder.

 $Drv$ 

 $19.6$ 

 $\overline{3.1}$ 

 $N/A$ 

**Preparation Method** 

As-received Water Content %

**Oversize Correction BSG** 





Type of Rammer manual



**Remarks:** 

ASTM Test Method: ASTM D 698-12e

Limitations: Pursuant to applicable building codes, the results presented in this report are for the exclusive use of the client and the registered design professional in responsible charge. The results apply only to the samples tested. This report may not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of Kleinfelder.

 $Drv$ 

 $10.9$ 

 $\overline{1.8}$ 

 $N/A$ 

**Preparation Method** 

As-received Water Content %

**Oversize Correction BSG** 





Type of Rammer manual



**Remarks:** 

ASTM Test Method: ASTM D 698-12e

Limitations: Pursuant to applicable building codes, the results presented in this report are for the exclusive use of the client and the registered design professional in responsible charge. The results apply only to the samples tested. This report may not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of Kleinfelder.

 $Drv$ 

 $12.8$ 

 $0.9$ 

 $N/A$ 

**Preparation Method** 

As-received Water Content %

**Oversize Correction BSG** 

#### APPENDIX D

#### LABORATORY TEST RESULTS: THERMAL RESISTIVITY TESTING \_

20211557.001A/DEN20R117320<br>© 2020 Kleinfelder



**21239 FM529 Rd., Bldg. F Cypress, TX 77433 Tel: 281-985-9344 Fax: 832-427-1752 info@geothermusa.com** Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 69 of 151

**September 30, 2020** 

**Kleinfelder**  707 17th Street, Ste 3000 Denver, CO 80202 **Attn: Bradley M. Baum, MS, PMP**

#### **Re: Thermal Analysis of Native Soil Samples Bellflower Solar Project - Project No. 20211557**

The following is the report of thermal dryout characterization tests conducted on four (4) native soil samples from the referenced project sent to our laboratory.

**Thermal Dryout Tests:** The samples were tested at their "optimum" moisture content and 90% of the maximum dry density *provided by Kleinfelder.* The tests were conducted in accordance with the IEEE standard 442-2017. The results are tabulated below and the thermal dry out curves are presented in **Figures 1 to 4.** 

#### **Sample ID, Description, Thermal Resistivity, Moisture Content and Density**



Please contact us if you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance.

*Geotherm USA*

and

Nimesh Patel

COOL SOLUTIONS FOR UNDERGROUND POWER CABLES THERMAL SURVEYS, CORRECTIVE BACKFILLS & INSTRUMENTATION

**Serving the electric power industry since 1978**





Thermal Analysis of Native Soils Bellflower Solar Project





Thermal Analysis of Native Soils Bellflower Solar Project





Thermal Analysis of Native Soils Bellflower Solar Project





September 2020

Figure 4

Bellflower Solar Project

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 74 of 151

#### APPENDIX E LABORATORY TEST RESULTS: CORROSIVITY

\_



Work Order No.: 2011268 Client: Kleinfelder, Inc. Project No.: 20211557.001A Project Name: LSBP - Bellflower Solar Project, IN Report Date: September 11, 2020

#### Laboratory Test(s) Results Summary

The subject soil samples were processed with the U.S. Standard No. 10 Sieve and tested for pH per AASHTO T 289-91 (2018), Minimum Electrical Resistivity per AASHTO T 288-12 (2016), Sulfate Ion Content per AASHTO T 290-95 (2016) Method B, Water-Soluble Chloride Ion Content per AASHTO T 291-94 (2018) Method A and in general accordance with Standard Methods procedures for Sulfide Content (SM 4500-S2- D) and Oxidation-Reduction Potential (SM 2580 B Mod.). Redox Potential value(s) reflect temperature correction based on Light's standard solution measurements applied to the calculation in section 6 of the procedure. The results follow:



\*ND=No Detection

We appreciate the opportunity to serve you. Please do not hesitate.to contact us with any questions or clarifications regarding these results or procedures.

 $extK.K-$ 

Ahmet K. Kaya, Laboratory Manager



Form No. 200-PR www.soilcor.com Rev. 09/2019

Bellflower Solar 1 Attachment VTG-2 Page 76 of 151

#### APPENDIX F PILE LOAD TEST RESULTS

\_





Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height: 45 in 47.5 in 4 in









Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height: 48 in 47.75 in 4 in









Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height: 48 in 47.75 in 4 in

Load (Ib) Top Gauge Deflection (in) Lower Gauge **Deflection** (in) Load<br>(lb) Top Gauge **Deflection** (in) Lower Gauge **Deflection** (in) 250 0.052 0.013 0 0.047 0.022 500 0.111 0.030 1030 0.300 0.095 1000 0.231 0.067 2020 0.527 0.165 0 0.021 0.009 3070 0.804 0.262 1030 0.244 0.071 0 0.092 0.035 1510 0.364 0.110 2050 0.565 0.190 0 0.033 0.016 3030 0.867 0.267 1020 0.268 0.081 4030 1.102 0.373 2070 0.515 0.161 1990 0.715 0.261 0 0.047 0.022 0 0.095 0.045























48 in 48 in 4 in

Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Pile Reveal:

Embedment Depth:

Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height:

PLT-2C W6x15 8.00 ft 61 in



















48 in 48 in 4 in

Embedment Depth:

Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height:

10.00 ft 59 in

Pile Reveal:





48 in 48 in 4 in

Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Pile Reveal:

Embedment Depth:

Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height:

PLT-3C W6x15 8.00 ft 62 in







**Deflection** (in)  $0.014$ 

### Lateral Pile Test Results





PLT-4

PLT-4A W6x8.5 6.00 ft

Test Location:

Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Embedment Depth:



770 0.314 0.003 3040 1.401 0.423 1500 0.593 0.159 1510 0.946 0.312 90 0.056 0.014 40 0.159 0.067





Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height: 48 in 48 in 4 in









Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height: 48 in 48 in 4 in





48 in 48 in 4 in

Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Pile Reveal:

Embedment Depth:

Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height:

PLT-5A W6x8.5 6.00 ft 60 in

















48 in 48 in

Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Embedment Depth: Pile Reveal:

Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height:

PLT-5C W6x15 8.00 ft 60 in







48 in 48 in 4 in

Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Pile Reveal:

Embedment Depth:

Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height:

PLT-6A W6x8.5 6.00 ft 60 in

















Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Pile Reveal:

Embedment Depth:

Load Application Height:

PLT-6C W6x15 8.00 ft 60 in





48 in







Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height: 48 in 48 in 4 in














## Lateral Pile Test Results

48 in 48 in

Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Pile Reveal:

Embedment Depth:

Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height:

PLT-7C W6x15 8.00 ft 60 in







## Lateral Pile Test Results

48 in 48 in 4 in

Pile Indentifier: Pile Type:

Pile Reveal:

Embedment Depth:

Load Application Height: Upper Measurement Height: Lower Measurement Height:

PLT-8A W6x8.5 6.00 ft 60 in





