Northeast C&D Landfill Permit No. 3555050

Tier III Permit Modification Application for a Horizontal and Vertical Expansion of Existing C & D Landfill

Volume 1 of 2

N.E. Land Fill, LLC (A subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, A GFL Environmental Company) 2601 North Midwest Blvd Spencer, OK 73084

SCS ENGINEERS

16219107.00 | August 2023

1901 Central Drive, Suite 550 Bedford, TX 76021 817-571-2288

SCS ENGINEERS

TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME 1 OF 2

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

APPLICATION FORM

PERMIT NARRATIVE

- APPENDIX A NOTIFICATION TO ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS, LOCATION RESTRICTION CORRESPONDENCE LETTERS, LEGAL DESCRIPTION, PROOF OF PROPERTY OWNERSHIP, AND COPY OF AGREEMENT WITH CITY OF SPENCER
- APPENDIX B HYDROGEOLOGICAL AND GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT

SCS ENGINEERS

August 23, 2023 File No. 16219107.00

Ms. Kaylee Daneshmand, E.I. Land Protection Division Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality 707 N. Robinson Avenue Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677

Subject: Tier III Permit Modification Application Northeast C&D Landfill DEQ Permit No.: 3555050

Dear Ms. Daneshmand:

On behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this Tier III permit modification application for your review to permit a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill (DEQ Permit No. 3555050). The proposed expansion will be located on GFL-owned property, north of the existing C&D landfill footprint.

The expansion property occupies 73.2 acres, out of which 53.5 acres will be utilized for waste disposal operations. The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma County.

This Tier III permit modification application has been prepared in accordance with Oklahoma Administrative Code (OAC) 252:515-3-33 and includes the following information:

Volume 1 of 2, which includes:

- 1. Permit Application Form #515-020, and
- 2. Permit Modification Application, which address the following requirements of Title 252, Chapter 515:
 - a. Subchapter 3 Permit Provisions and Applications,
 - b. Subchapter 5 Location Restrictions,
 - c. Subchapter 7 Subsurface Investigation,

Volume 2 of 2, which includes:

- d. Subchapter 9 Groundwater Monitoring/Correction Action, and
- e. Subchapter 11 Liner Design
- f. Subchapter 15 Methane Gas Monitoring and Control,
- g. Subchapter 17 Stormwater Management,
- h. Subchapter 19 Operational Requirements,
- i. Subchapter 25 Closure and Post-Closure Care,
- j. Subchapter 27 Cost Estimates and Financial Assurance, and
- k. Subchapter 29 Exclusion of Prohibited Wastes.



As discussed during pre-application meeting on 05/08/2023, this application is being submitted as a stand-alone document and is intended to replace previously submitted application documents, as follows:

- Permit Application Narrative,
- Appendix A Notification to Adjacent Property Owners, Location Restriction Correspondence Letters, Legal Description, and Proof of Property Ownership,
- Appendix B Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Investigation,
- Appendix C Slope Stability and Final Cover Veneer Slope Analysis,
- Appendix D Explosive Gas Monitoring Plan,
- Appendix E Surface Water Management System Design Plan,
- Appendix G Operations Plan, and
- Appendix I Closure and Post-Closure Care (C-PC) Plan.

Related to this submittal, the following documents are included as reference and <u>not proposed to be</u> revised with this permit modification application:

- Appendix I, Attachment A Closure Cost Estimates, approved by DEQ on 3/9/2023.
- Appendix I, Attachment B Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan for Final Cover System Installation, approved by DEQ on 10/13/2022.
- Appendix F Construction Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan,
- Appendix H Waste Exclusion Plan.

Information related to Permit Drawings and Maps, Subsurface Investigation, and Liner Design that support the proposed expansion are provided within various appendices of this permit application package. Included is one hard copy of the application for your review. Additionally, a PDF copy of the application is also separately provided for your use.

A draft "Notice of Application Filed" (Notice) was emailed to DEQ for approval on 08/22/2023 and a copy of this Notice is included in Attachment A of this letter for reference. In accordance with OAC 252:4-7-13, this Notice will be published in *The Oklahoman* within 2 weeks of receiving approval from DEQ.

Additionally, notification letter of permit application being filed with DEQ to be mailed to adjacent property and mineral right owners was emailed to DEQ for approval on 08/22/2023 and is included in Appendix A of the permit application for reference. This notification letter will be mailed to adjacent property and mineral rights owners upon receiving approval from DEQ. Proof of acknowledgement of this notification letter will be forwarded to DEQ for inclusion into Appendix A of the attached application.

We trust that you will find this permit application to be satisfactory. Please contact Sandeep Saraf, P.E. at (407) 923-7013 should you have questions related to this application.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Attachment A: Draft Notice of Application Filed Attachment B: Permit Application Form

Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President / Satellite Unit Director SCS Engineers

cc: Robert Starke – GFL (e-copy and hard copy) Marcos Elizondo – GFL (e-copy) Lana Alderdice – GFL (e-copy) Eduardo Choquis – GFL (e-copy)

ATTACHMENT A

DRAFT NOTICE OF APPLICATION

OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY NOTICE OF APPLICATION FILED

Application filed. A solid waste Tier III application has been filed with Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Interested persons now have the opportunity to meet with DEQ and learn how and where they may participate in the permitting process.

Applicant: Applicant is N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] Company), which owns and operates Northeast C&D Landfill.

Type of final permit or permit action being sought: Applicant seeks to modify an existing permit.

Facility location: Northeast C&D Landfill is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard, Spencer, Oklahoma. See property legal description below*.

Activities to be regulated if the application is approved: Applicant seeks to modify the existing permit to expand the currently permitted boundary to the north. Facility operations will continue in the same manner as currently being conducted for the existing facility. The average volume of construction and demolition (C&D) waste received daily at the facility is not anticipated to increase as a result of this permit modification.

Statutes and Rules: DEQ will review the application for compliance with the Environmental Quality Code, including the Solid Waste Management Act, Title 27A of Oklahoma Statutes, Section 2-10-101, *et seq.*, and DEQ rules, Oklahoma Administrative Code, Title 252, Chapters 4 and 515.

Permitting procedures explained: Upon request, a DEQ representative will chair a meeting to explain DEQ's permitting process to interested persons. At that meeting, there will be discussions explaining when oral and written public comments can be made on the proposal. Administrative hearing opportunities will also be discussed. To request this process meeting, send a written request to DEQ representative named below within 30 days after the date this notice is published. Please note this is not a meeting for protests. Its purpose is to advise interested persons on participation opportunities during the permitting process. For more information about this process meeting, please contact the DEQ representative named below.

Locations where application may be reviewed:

- 1. Locally at Midwest City Library, 8143 E Reno Avenue, Midwest City, OK 73110
- DEQ Central Records Division, located at 707 N. Robinson Avenue, Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677
- 3. DEQ webpage: https://www.deq.ok.gov/permits-for-public-review/

For more information, contact:

- 1. For Applicant: Mr. Robert Starke, 2601 N. Midwest Blvd., Spencer, OK 73084; Ph: (405) 317-3912
- 2. For DEQ: Ms. Kaylee Daneshmand, E.I., Land Protection Division, 707 N. Robinson Avenue, Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677; Ph: (405) 702-5196; Fax: (405) 702-5101

*Legal description of currently permitted area:

The NW/4 of the NE/4, SW/4 of the NE/4, and the SE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 24, Township 4 South, Range 2 East, Carter County, Oklahoma.

*Legal description of proposed expansion area:

The West Half (W/2) of the Northeast Quarter(NE/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) of the Northeast Quarter(NE/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the Northwest Quarter (NW/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the Northwest Quarter (NW/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the West Half (W/2) of the East Half (E/2) of the Southwest Quarter (SW/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) of Section 22, Township 12 North, Range 2 West of the Indian Meridian, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma.

AND

A part of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4) of Section 22, Township 12 North, Range 2 West of the Indian Meridian, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northeast (NE) corner of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4), S 00°33'24" E of distance of 1420.60 feet to the Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said East Line of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4), S 00°33'24" E a distance of 1122.47 feet to a point which is 100 feet N 00°33'24" W from the Southeast (SE) corner of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence S 89°39'49" W a distance of 330.00 feet; thence S 00°33'24" E a distance of 100.00 feet to a point on the South Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along said South Line of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4), S 89°34'49" W a distance of 2308.74 feet to the Southwest (SW) corner of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4), N 00°28'20" W a distance of the 1219.31 feet, thence N 89°35'43" E a distance of 2636.93 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Described property being subject to easements and rights-of-way and to any and all easements and rights-of-way of record or fact.

ATTACHMENT B

APPLICATION FORM

APPLICATION FOR	A C&D LANDFILL PERMIT
Date: August 18, 2023	County: Oklahoma County
Send to:	
Solid Waste Permitting Unit	FOR DEQ USE
Dept. of Environmental Quality 707 N. Robinson (PO Box 1677) Oklahoma City, OK 73101-167) DEQ Log No 7 No. Copies
	Date Received:
N.E. Land Fill, LLC	proposes to establish, construct, operate, and maintain,
(Applicant's Name) the Northeast C&D Landfill 1	ocated at Legal description attached after verification

metes & bounds, platted lot, or land survey. Append extra sheets if necessary)

in <u>Oklahoma</u> County, Oklahoma, and hereby makes application for a permit to establish, construct, operate, and maintain a <u>C&D</u> landfill as required by **Oklahoma Solid** Waste Management Act and Rules pursuant thereto.

(Exact legal description:

Brief description of application:

(Facility Name)

Tier III permit modification application for a horizontal and vertical expansion of the Northeast C&D landfill (DEQ Permit No. 3555050) located on 2601 Midwest Blvd, Spencer in Oklahoma County.

Applicant or Authorized A	gent:	Preparing Engineer:	
Marcost	lizon la	Sandypas	rf
Marcos Elizor	do	Sandeen Saraf DE	V
Typed Na	ame	Typed Name	
Address: 2050 W. Sam Hous	ton Pkwy S, Suite 1950	Address: 1901 Central D	Drive, Suite 550
City: Houston	State: TX	City: Bedford	State: TX
Date signed: Augu	ust 28, 2023	Date signed: 8-2	8-2023
Phone: 713-292	-2417	Phone: 407-923-7013	
Facility Address (if any): 2 Spencer, OK 73084	2601 N. Midwest Blvc	DEQ USE	ONLY

July 2016 DEQ Form #515-010

VERIFICATION¹

STATE OF OKLAHOMA)	
COUNTY OF	Oklahoma)	SS

Marcos Elizondo _, of lawful age, being first duly sworn, upon oath state that I have read the foregoing APPLICATION FOR A C & D LANDFILL PERMIT, that I am familiar with the matters set forth therein, and that the same are true to the best of my information and belief.

Applicant

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ______ day of______ 2023 E arcos

1170nde (Applicant or legal representative).

ANDREA ALLEN BARNES Notary Public, State of Texas Comm. Expires 12-05-2023 Notary ID 13227462-5

bv

Indrea Notary Public

My commission expires:

2-05-23

¹ This Verification is required for a Tier III application.

APPLICATION TO MODIFY A SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITY PERMIT LEGAL DESCRIPTION

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The West Half (W/2) of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the Northwest Quarter (NW/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the Northwest Quarter (SW/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the Northwest Quarter (SW/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) and the West Half (W/2) of the East Half (E/2) of the Southwest Quarter (SW/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) of Section 22, Township 12 North, Range 2 West of the Indian Meridian, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma.

AND

A part of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4) of Section 22, Township 12 North, Range 2 West of the Indian Meridian, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the Northeast (NE) corner of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4), S 00°33'24" E of distance of 1420.60 feet to the Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said East Line of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4), S 00°33'24" E a distance of 1122.47 feet to a point which is 100 feet N 00°33'24" W from the Southeast (SE) corner of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence S 89°39'49" W a distance of 330.00 feet; thence S 00°33'24" E a distance of 100.00 feet to a point on the South Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along said South Line of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4), S 89°34'49" W a distance of 2308.74 feet to the Southwest (SW) corner of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence along the West Line of said Northeast Quarter (NE/4); thence N 89°35'43" E a distance of 2636.93 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Described property being subject to easements and rights-of-way and to any and all easements and rights-of-way of record or fact.

Permit Application Narrative

Northeast C&D Landfill Tier III Permit Modification Application

N.E. Land Fill, LLC (A subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental Company) 2601 North Midwest Blvd Spencer, OK 73084

SCS ENGINEERS

16219107.00 | August 2023

1901 Central Drive, Suite 550 Bedford, TX 76021 817-571-2288

Table of Contents

Sect	Section Page		
1.0	INTR	ODUCTION	1
2.0	GENERAL INFORMATION		
	2.1	Verification	2
	2.2	Legal Description	2
	2.3	Legal Right to Property	2
	2.4	Adjacent Property Owner Notification	2
	2.5	Aesthetic Enhancement	2
	2.6	Air Quality	3
3.0	LOCA	TION RESTRICTIONS	4
	3.1	Scenic Rivers	4
	3.2	Recreation and Preservation Areas	4
	3.3	Endangered or Threatened Species	4
	3.4	100-Year Floodplain	4
	3.5	Public Water Supply	5
	3.6	Wellhead Protection Area	5
	3.7	Wetlands	5
	3.8	Terrace Deposits	6
	3.9	Karst Terrain	6
	3.10	Earthquake Epicenter Area	6
	3.11	Asbestos Monofill	7
	3.12	Utility/Transmission Lines	7
	3.13	Fault Areas	7
	3.14	Seismic Impact Zones	8
	3.15	Unstable Areas	8
	3.16	Airports	8
	3.17	Buffer Zones	8
	3.18	LOCAL ZONING	9
4.0	SUBS	SURFACE INVESTIGATION	10
5.0	0 LANDFILL DEVELOPMENT		
	5.1	Design Criteria	11
	5.2	Landfill Development	11
	5.3	Landfill Capacity	11
		5.3.1 Sequence of Development	12
6.0	GRO	JNDWATER MONITORING	13
7.0	EXPL	OSIVE GAS MONITORING	14
8.0	STOF	RM WATER MANAGEMENT	15
	8.1	OKR05 Permit Requirements	15
	8.2	Run-on Control Systems	15
	8.3	Run-off Control Systems	15
		8.3.1 Drainage Swales	16

	8.3.2	Downchute Structures	16
	8.3.3	Perimeter Drainage Channels	16
	8.3.4	Stormwater Detention Ponds	17
9.0	LINER CONS	TRUCTION	18
10.0	SITE OPERAT	۲IONS	19
11.0	COVER AND	SOIL BORROW REQUIREMENTS	20
	11.1 Weekly	/ and Intermediate Cover	20
	11.2 Final C	over System	20
	11.3 Borrow	/ Sources	20
12.0	CLOSURE AN	ID POST-CLOSURE PLAN	21

Tables

Table 1.	Landfill Capacity	12
----------	-------------------	----

Figures

Figure 1	General Location Map
----------	----------------------

- Figure 2 Floodplain Map
- Figure 3 Aerial Photograph
- Figure 4 Public Water Supply (PWS) Surface Water Intakes Map
- Figure 5 Wellhead Protection Areas Map
- Figure 6 General Topographic Map
- Figure 7 FAA Airport Vicinity Map

Permit Drawings

- Drawing 1 Coversheet
- Drawing 2 Existing Topographic Map
- Drawing 3 Site Map
- Drawing 4 Highest Groundwater Contour Map
- Drawing 5 Top of Subgrade Grading Plan
- Drawing 6 Top of Protective Cover Grading Plan
- Drawing 7 Top of Final Cover Grading Plan
- Drawing 8 Cross Section A-A'
- Drawing 9 Cross Section B-B'
- Drawing 10 Phase 11 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 11 Phase 11 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 12 Phase 12 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 13 Phase 12 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 14 Phase 13 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 15 Phase 13 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 16 Phase 14 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 17 Phase 14 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 18 Phase 15 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 19 Phase 15 Conceptual Cross-section

- Drawing 20 Liner and Final Cover System Details
- Drawing 21 Landfill Perimeter Berm Details
- Drawing 22 Storm Water Management Plan
- Drawing 23 Storm Water Details 1
- Drawing 24 Storm Water Details 2

Appendices

- Appendix A Notification to Adjacent Property Owners, Location Restriction Correspondence Letters, Legal Description, Proof of Property Ownership, and Copy of Agreement with City of Spencer
- Appendix B Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Investigation
- Appendix C Slope Stability and Final Cover Veneer Slope Analysis
- Appendix D Explosive Gas Monitoring Plan
- Appendix E Surface Water Management System Design Plan
- Appendix F Construction Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan
- Appendix G Operations Plan
- Appendix H Waste Exclusion Plan
- Appendix I Closure and Post-Closure Care Plan

Certification

This Tier III Permit Modification Application has been prepared in accordance with sound engineering practices, including consideration of industry standards, and the requirements of the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), as defined in Oklahoma Administrative Code (OAC), Title 252, Chapters 4 and 515.

Prepared by:



Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

1.0 INTRODUCTION

SCS Engineers, on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company) is submitting the necessary documents for a Tier III permit modification application to horizontally and vertically expand the existing construction and demolition (C&D) landfill. The existing C&D landfill (referred in this application as landfill) permit boundary contains approximately 90.1 acres, of which approximately 67.7 acres has been developed for C&D waste disposal under Permit No. 3555050. The proposed expansion will have a permit boundary of 73.2 acres, of which approximately 53.5 acres will be developed for disposal of C&D waste. The combined total property boundary area (existing and expansion) is approximately 163.3 acres, out of which approximately 121.2 acres will be available for C&D waste disposal upon obtaining approval of the permit application.

This Tier III permit application has been prepared consistent with the applicable sections of Title 252, Chapters 4 and 515, and establishes excavation, final grades, liner design, explosive gas monitoring, surface water drainage, and operations for the landfill. The proposed landfill expansion is located in Section 22, Township 12 North, Range 2 West of the Indian Meridian in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma (see Figures 1, 3, and 6).

2.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

The following is general information for the facility:

Facility Name:	Northeast C&D Landfill
Mailing Address:	2050 W. Sam Houston Parkway S, Suite 1950, Houston, TX 77042
Physical Location:	2601 N Midwest Blvd, Spencer, OK 73084
Facility Owner/Operator:	N.E. Land Fill, LLC (A subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company)
Facility Phone Number:	(405) 796-8081
Hours of Operation:	Monday-Friday 7:00 am-5:00pm, Saturday 7:00am-1:00pm
Primary Contact:	Marcos Elizondo

2.1 VERIFICATION

OAC 252:515-3-33 requires the applicant to sign the permit application under oath on forms provided by DEQ. The signed verification is attached to the application form.

2.2 LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Legal description and boundary survey of the existing and proposed landfill expansion is included in Appendix A.

2.3 LEGAL RIGHT TO PROPERTY

OAC 252:515-3-34(a)(1) requires that the owner of the landfill have a true and correct copy of a legal document filed in Oklahoma County, demonstrating that the applicant possesses a legal right to access and use the property in the manner outlined in this application. fDocumentation, showing that N.E. Land Fill, LLC owns the property containing both the existing and proposed landfill expansion, is included within Appendix A of this application.

2.4 ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER NOTIFICATION

Notification of the proposed landfill expansion was provided to adjacent properties owners and copies of the notification letters and delivery confirmations are included in Appendix A.

2.5 AESTHETIC ENHANCEMENT

The proposed landfill expansion will be located directly north of the existing landfill, east of Midwest City Wastewater Treatment Plant, south of Arlington Memorial Park Cemetery, and west of Midwest Boulevard. To comply with the requirements of OAC 252:515-3-37, visual harmony of the proposed landfill expansion will be enhanced by (1) creating buffer zones greater than the required minimum of 100 feet, as discussed in Section 3.17 and shown on Drawing 3, and (2) by maintaining existing vegetation at the north and west property boundaries. Noise will be controlled by the established buffer

zones and guidelines outlined in the facility's Operations Plan, included in Appendix G. Dust will be controlled as discussed in the facility's Operations Plan.

2.6 AIR QUALITY

Odors will be controlled at the site through proper operations and, more specifically, through proper application of weekly, intermediate, and final cover. Cover requirements are further discussed in Section 12. Dust control is discussed in the Operations Plan included in Appendix G.

3.0 LOCATION RESTRICTIONS

All solid waste disposal facilities are subject to the location restrictions set forth by DEQ in OAC 252:515-5. The following subsections show compliance with the location restrictions for solid waste disposal facilities.

3.1 SCENIC RIVERS

No area within the permit boundary of new solid waste disposal facility, or expansion of the permit boundary of an existing solid waste disposal facility, shall be located within the drainage basin of any river designated by the Oklahoma Scenic Rivers Commission Act in accordance with OAC 252:515-5-31(a).

Appendix A contains correspondence submitted to Oklahoma Scenic Rivers Commission (OSRC), dated August 23, 2023 requesting confirmation that the proposed landfill expansion will have no adverse impact on any of Oklahoma's Scenic River Areas. A copy of response received from OSRC will be provided to DEQ upon receipt.

3.2 RECREATION AND PRESERVATION AREAS

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-31(b), no area within the permit boundary of a new solid waste disposal facility, or expansion of the permit boundary of an existing solid waste disposal facility, shall be located within one-half mile of any area formally dedicated and managed for public recreation or natural preservation by a federal, state, or local government agency.

Appendix A contains correspondences submitted to Oklahoma Archeological Survey (OAS), dated August 23, 2023, the US Department of the Interior – Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), dated August 23, 2023, and the Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department (OTRD), dated August 23, 2023, requesting confirmation that the landfill expansion is not within one-half mile of any area formally dedicated and managed for public recreation or national preservation. A copy of response received from OAS, BOR, and OTRD will be provided to DEQ upon receipt.

3.3 ENDANGERED OR THREATENED SPECIES

For a new solid waste disposal facility, or expansion of the permit boundary of an existing solid waste disposal facility, a statement from the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation (ODWC) and the Oklahoma Biological Survey (OBS) shall be submitted regarding current information about endangered or threatened wildlife or plant species listed in state and federal laws that exist within one mile of the permit boundary, in accordance with OAC 252:515-5-31(c).

Correspondence letters, dated August 23, 2023, submitted to ODWC and OBS, respectively, requesting confirmation that endangered species or threatened wildlife or plant species listed in State and Federal laws will not be adversely affected due to the proposed landfill expansion are provided in Appendix A. A copy of response received from the ODWC and OBS will be provided to DEQ upon receipt.

3.4 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN

OAC 252:515-5-32(a) prohibits, with exception, the location of waste management or disposal areas within the 100-year floodplain.

No portion of the landfill waste management or disposal areas is located within the 100-year floodplain, as shown in Figure 2. This figure was created using Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Maps of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma and Incorporated Areas (Flood Insurance Rate Maps Panel 0310H, Community Number 40109C0310H, Effective Date: December 18, 2009).

3.5 PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-32(b), no new waste management or disposal areas of a solid waste disposal facility shall be located within one mile up-gradient of an existing public water supply (PWS) surface intake, including those permitted for construction, or within a one-year time of travel of a PWS well.

The online geographic information system (GIS) Oklahoma DEQ database indicated that there are two PWS surface water intakes within one mile of the proposed landfill expansion (http://gis.deq.ok.gov/maps/); however, both wells are located up-gradient of the proposed landfill expansion. The locations of the recorded PWS wells and surface water intake are shown on Figure 4 of Appendix A.

Appendix A contains correspondence submitted to DEQ, dated August 23, 2023, requesting confirmation that the proposed landfill expansion is located **down-gradient** of existing PWS surface water intakes. A copy of response received from DEQ will be provided upon receipt.

3.6 WELLHEAD PROTECTION AREA

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-32(c), if any new waste management or disposal area is located within two miles of a PWS well, a wellhead protection area shall be identified and submitted to DEQ, as specified by the State Wellhead Protection Plan.

Based on a search of DEQ's database, there are 23 PWS wells within two miles of the proposed landfill expansion, as shown on Figure 5. Of the 23 PWS wells, 12 have associated wellhead protection areas. Of the remaining 11, the closest PWS well is approximately 4,000 feet **down-gradient** of the proposed landfill expansion, and is not expected to be impacted by the landfill.

Appendix A contains correspondence submitted to DEQ, dated August 23, 2023, requesting confirmation that the nearest PWS without associated wellhead protection areas will not be impacted by the proposed landfill expansion. A copy of response received from DEQ will be provided upon receipt.

3.7 WETLANDS

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-32(d), no new waste management or disposal areas of a solid waste disposal facility shall be located within wetland areas as designated by the Oklahoma Conservation Commission (OCC) or other appropriate agency, with exception.

Based on the conclusions of the jurisdictional determination letter, dated December 11, 2020, by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) Tulsa District Office, the proposed landfill expansion poses an impact to the Waters of the United States (WOTUS) in the amount of 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub wetland impacts, 0.76 acres of open water impacts, 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of intermittent stream impacts, and 1,359 linear feet (0.14 acres) of ephemeral stream impact. Therefore, GFL proposes to

purchase stream and wetland credits from the Deep Fork Mitigation Bank (DFMB) to offset unavoidable, permanent impacts from the proposed landfill expansion.

Additionally, an application for individual permit was submitted to USACOE on May 28, 2021. Subsequently a mitigation plan was also submitted to USACOE on August 17, 2021. Appendix A contains a copy of the individual permit application and the mitigation plan, developed by Hydrex Environmental, and a copy of the Water Quality Certification Letter issued by DEQ on May 9, 2023. GFL acknowledges that no waste disposal operations will begin for the proposal landfill until the individual permit has been received from USACOE.

3.8 TERRACE DEPOSITS

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-51(a), no area within the permit boundary of a new land disposal facility, or expansion of the boundary of an existing land disposal facility, shall be located within an area designated as alluvium or terrace deposits and their recharge areas, as shown on the *Map of Aquifers and Recharge Areas in Oklahoma*, compiled by Kenneth S. Johnson of the Oklahoma Geologic Survey (OGS) dated 1991.

According to the "Geologic Map of the Midwest City 7.5' Quadrangle, Cleveland and Oklahoma Counties, Oklahoma" compiled by Thomas M. Stanley and Neil H. Suneson, 2000 and the "Geologic Map of the Spencer 7.5' Quadrangle, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma" complied by Thomas M. Stanley and Neil H. Suneson, 1999; the proposed landfill expansion is not located in alluvium or terrace deposits. Further confirmation that the expansion area is not located within areas designated as alluvium or terrace deposits was obtained through hydrogeologic and geotechnical investigations performed for the proposed landfill expansion. Based on boring logs obtained during these investigations, the lithology underlying the landfill is consistent with weathered Garber sandstones. Please refer to Appendix B for the hydrogeological and geotechnical investigation report.

3.9 KARST TERRAIN

OAC 252:515-5-51(b) prohibits locating any area within the permit boundary of a new MSWLF in an area that is both within locally fractured or cavernous limestone or cherty limestone and within five miles of any water well owned by a rural water district that is used or has the potential to be used to provide water to customers of the district.

This location restriction does not apply to this facility because the Northeast C&D landfill expansion will not be an MSWLF.

3.10 EARTHQUAKE EPICENTER AREA

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-5I(c), no area within the permit boundary of a new land disposal facility that accepts non-hazardous industrial waste (NHIW) shall be located within five miles of a known epicenter of an earthquake of more than 4.0 on the Richter Scale, or a number V on the modified Mercalli (MM) scale, as recorded by the Oklahoma Geological Survey.

This location restriction does not apply to this facility because the Northeast C&D landfill does not accept NHIW.

3.11 ASBESTOS MONOFILL

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-5I(d), no area within the permit boundary of a new asbestos monofill shall be located within five hundred (500) yards of an occupied residence or within three (3) miles of the corporate boundaries of any city or town.

This location restriction does not apply to this facility because the Northeast C&D landfill is not an asbestos monofill.

3.12 UTILITY/TRANSMISSION LINES

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-52(a), a minimum horizontal separation of 25 feet shall be maintained between disposal areas of land disposal facilities and any aboveground or underground pipeline or transmission line.

Several utilities are present within the proposed expansion area, as discussed below:

- Natural gas line owned by Plains Pipeline, LP will be relocated as shown on Drawing 3. Following pipeline relocation, a minimum horizontal separation distance of 25 feet will be maintained between disposal areas and this pipeline before the landfill is developed.
- Two (2) 30-foot electrical transmission line easements owned by Diamond A Inc., are currently located within the proposed landfill expansion, as shown on the boundary survey in Appendix A. These electrical transmission line easements will be released and assigned to GFL prior to landfill development.
- 20-foot pipeline easement owned by Midstates Natural Gas Company will be released and reassigned to GFL prior to landfill development.
- Magellan pipeline will be abandoned prior to landfill development.
- Additionally, existing Northport Production Co. Wells #1 and #3 shown on the boundary survey will be abandoned prior to landfill development.

3.13 FAULT AREAS

In accordance with OAC 252:5I5-5-52(b), no new waste management or disposal areas of a land disposal facility shall be located within 200 feet of a fault that has had displacement in Holocene time.

The landfill and the surrounding area were examined for the presence of Holocene (last 11,000 years) fault displacements. This included a physical inspection of the landfill and surrounding area, review of previous fault investigations, available literature and maps, and review of historical aerial photographs. No unusual Holocene scarps, topographic breaks, vegetation changes, or lineaments were interpreted within 200 feet of the landfill area. No apparent Holocene structural influence of stream courses were observed. Additionally, no unusual relief or topographic features, such as sag ponds, truncated alluvial spurs, or offset tributary alignments, were observed. The Tectonic Map of Oklahoma (Arbenz, 1956) indicates no mapped faults within Oklahoma County.

In summary, there is no evidence of Holocene faulting within 200 feet of the site. Therefore, the proposed expansion complies with the fault area location restriction.

3.14 SEISMIC IMPACT ZONES

In accordance with OAC 252:515-5-52(c)(1), no new waste management or disposal areas of a land disposal facility shall be located in a seismic impact zone, except as provided in OAC 252:515-5-52(c)(2).

The proposed landfill expansion is located within a seismic impact zone with a peak ground acceleration (PGA) of 0.17g from U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Unified Hazard Tool and USGS Hazard Map 2014. Appendix C, related to Slope Stability and Final Cover Veneer Slope Analysis, addresses seismic issues in conjunction with the slope stability analyses for the landfill.

3.15 UNSTABLE AREAS

OAC 252:515-5-52(d) prohibits, with exception, locating new waste management or disposal areas of a land disposal facility over a subsurface mining area or any other unstable area.

The proposed landfill expansion is not located over a subsurface mining area or any other unstable area. Appendix A contains correspondence submitted to Oklahoma Department of Mines (ODM), dated August 23, 2023, requesting confirmation that the proposed landfill expansion meets this location restriction. A copy of response received from ODM will be provided to DEQ upon receipt

3.16 AIRPORTS

In accordance with OAC 252-515-52(e), if any waste management or disposal area of a new land disposal facility, or expansion of waste management or disposal areas of an existing land disposal facility, is to be located within 10,000 feet of any airport runway end used by turbojet aircraft or within 5,000 feet of any airport runway end used by only piston-type aircraft, a demonstration that the facility will not pose a bird hazard to aircraft shall be provided to DEQ.

The proposed landfill expansion is not located within 10,000 feet of any airport runway end used by turbojet aircraft or within 5,000 feet of any airport runway end used by only piston-type aircraft, as depicted in the airport location map (see Figure 6). Correspondence submitted to U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), dated August 23, 2023, requesting confirming that the proposed landfill expansion meets this location restriction and has no objection to the landfill expansion from the standpoint of potential bird hazards is provided in Appendix A. Tinker Air Force Base (TAFB) is located about 23,000 feet (4.4 miles) south of the proposed landfill expansion, as shown in Figure 7. Correspondence submitted to TAFB, dated August 23, 2023, requesting confirmation that there will be no negative impact from the proposed landfill expansion, is also provided in Appendix A. A copy of response received from the FAA and TAFB will be provided to DEQ upon receipt.

3.17 BUFFER ZONES

In accordance with OAC 252:515-19-38(b), all disposal facilities shall be designed and maintained with a waste-free buffer zone of at least 50 feet in width between all waste disposal and/or handling areas and adjacent property.

The proposed landfill expansion will be maintained with a waste-free buffer zone of at least 50 feet in width between all waste disposal and/or handling areas and adjacent property as depicted on Drawing 3.

3.18 LOCAL ZONING

The proposed landfill expansion will be located in the City of Spencer limits, and as such, is subject to local zoning ordinance requirements. An agreement between GFL and City of Spencer, dated March 30, 2023, authorizing GFL to expand the existing C&D landfill to accept C&D waste for disposal is provided in Appendix A.

4.0 SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

A geotechnical and hydrogeological investigation has been conducted within the proposed expansion of the landfill permit boundary. The field investigation for determining subsurface soil and groundwater characteristics consisted of drilling 16 exploratory borings, nine (9) of which were completed as piezometers. The results of the investigation are detailed in the report *Hydrogeologic and Geotechnical Investigation* prepared by SCS Engineers and included in Appendix B. Results of the subsurface investigation were considered while designing the proposed landfill expansion.

5.0 LANDFILL DEVELOPMENT

This section, in conjunction with the accompanying drawings and appendices, addresses the various design and operational elements of the proposed landfill expansion.

5.1 DESIGN CRITERIA

The development of the proposed landfill expansion was based on the following design criteria:

- Compliance with landfill requirements, including liner and final cover requirements, as described in Sections 9 and 12, respectively.
- Final sideslopes will be created at a maximum 4H:1V. The slope of the top of the landfill (crown) will be no less than 4 percent.
- The following surface water drainage management practices will be implemented at the landfill:
 - > Drainage swales and downchutes will be constructed to improve surface water drainage.
 - Surface water diversionary structures and the perimeter stormwater management system will be capable of handling at a minimum a 25-year 24-hour storm event (see Appendix E).
- Seismic and stability design criteria established in the Slope Stability and Final Cover Veneer Slope Analysis (see Appendix C) have been incorporated into the design.
- Applicable sections of the regulations listed below are followed:
 - ➢ OAC 252:515
 - ➢ 40 CFR Part 257 and 258 (Subtitle D)

5.2 LANDFILL DEVELOPMENT

As described in Section 1, The existing C&D landfill (referred in this application as landfill) permit boundary contains approximately 90.1 acres, of which approximately 67.7 acres has been developed for C&D waste disposal under Permit No. 3555050. The proposed expansion will have a permit boundary of 73.2 acres, out of which 53.5 acres will be developed for disposal of C&D waste. The combined total area (existing and expansion) available for C&D waste disposal upon obtaining approval of the permit application will be 121.2 acres. The following subsections described the landfill waste capacity and general sequence of development of the proposed landfill expansion.

5.3 LANDFILL CAPACITY

The waste airspace for the landfill expansion is estimated by using AutoCAD Civil 3D to be **10,558,969 cubic yards** (10,277,350 cubic yards expansion plus 281,619 cubic yards within currently permitted boundary) by comparing the proposed top of waste grades to the top of protective cover grades.

Also, conservatively assuming an in-place waste density for C&D as 1,000 lb/cy, the available landfill capacity was estimated to be **5,279,485 tons**, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1.	Waste Disposal Capacity Calculation

Description Item	Volume
1. Waste airspace volume =	10,558,969 cubic yards
2. In-place waste density ¹ =	1,000 lb/cy
3. Total waste disposal tonnage =	5,279,485 tons

Note 1. In-place waste density is assumed to be 1,000 lb/cy based on OAC 252:515-27-8.

5.3.1 Sequence of Development

The proposed landfill expansion will be developed in seven (7) primary phases with Phases 11 through 17. Phases may be constructed incrementally (e.g., Phase 11 constructed in two or more individual cells or sub-phases, such as Phase 11A, Phase 11B, etc.). Temporary drainage swales and channels may be constructed, as needed, on intermediate contours to control surface water.

Plans and cross-sections depicting the conceptual sequence of development are shown on Drawings 10 through 19.

6.0 GROUNDWATER MONITORING

The current groundwater monitoring system for the existing landfill consists of six monitoring wells designated as MW-1, MW-2, MW-3R, MW-4R, MW-5, and MW-6 as shown on Drawings 2 and 3. All six of the existing monitoring wells are completed within the Garber Sandstone. The proposed groundwater monitoring system to be utilized for the entire landfill will consist of a series of existing and new groundwater monitoring wells. Existing piezometer PZ-1 was installed to monitoring well specifications for the purpose of being utilized within the groundwater monitoring network. As such, PZ-1 will be converted to groundwater monitoring well MW-7 following approval of this permit application.

Additionally, three new monitoring wells (MW-8, MW-9, and MW-10) will be installed and two existing monitoring wells (MW-3R and MW-4R) will be decommissioned, in accordance with the "EPA Handbook of Suggested Practices for Design and Installation of Groundwater Monitoring Wells" and OAC 785:35-11-2, prior to waste disposal within the proposed landfill expansion. As such, monitoring system for existing and proposed landfill expansion will consist of eight monitoring wells, existing MW-1, MW-2, MW-5, and MW-6, and new MW-7, MW-8, MW-9, and MW-10.

It should be noted that MW-1 and MW-7 are located south and southeast of the disposal unit, respectively, and are considered up-gradient monitoring wells. MW-2, MW-5, MW-6, MW-8, MW-9, and MW-10 are considered down-gradient monitoring wells. The down-gradient wells will be screened within the uppermost saturated zone, similar to existing wells.

Groundwater monitoring wells will be subject to the sampling, testing, and reporting requirements of OAC 252:515-9 and the final permit. Four rounds of background data will be collected from new wells for groundwater quality constituents listed in OAC 252:515-9-31 (d)(1)(A) as well as Appendix A parameters in accordance with OAC 252:515-9-31(d)(1)(B). Additional sampling events may be required prior to the first statistical evaluation. The Ground Water Sampling and Analysis Plan (GWSAP) will include the requirements for detection monitoring and any required reporting for verified Statistically Significant Increases (SSIs) and subsequent testing programs. The monitoring program will include semi-annual sampling of Appendix A parameters.

Additional information related to the proposed groundwater monitoring network is provided in Section 6.0 of the hydrogeologic and geotechnical investigation (see Appendix B). The existing C&D landfill already has an existing Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Plan (GWSAP) that will be updated once the final permit is issued. The GWSAP is intended to be used as a standalone document, a copy of which will be maintained within the facility's operating record.

7.0 EXPLOSIVE GAS MONITORING

The decomposition of solid waste within a landfill is known to produce landfill gas, typically consisting of approximately 50% methane (CH₄) and 50% carbon dioxide (CO₂). Trace amounts of non-methane organic compounds (NMOCs), oxygen, hydrogen sulfide, and reactive organic gases are also present (*Engineering and Design Landfill Off-Gas Collection and Treatment Systems*, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1995).

OAC 252:515-15-2 requires that the concentration of methane gas generated by the facility shall not exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the lower explosive limit (LEL) for methane in all structures within the permit boundary and shall not exceed the LEL for methane at the permit boundary. The LEL is defined as the lowest percent by volume of a mixture of explosive gases in air that will propagate a flame at 25°C and atmospheric pressure. The LEL for methane is 5% by volume in air.

Additionally, OAC 252:515-15-3(a) requires an Explosive Gas Monitoring Plan to be submitted and approved by DEQ to demonstrate how compliance with the LEL mentioned in OAC 252:515-15-2 will be achieved. A copy of the Explosive Gas Monitoring Plan is included with this application as Appendix D. The Explosive Gas Monitoring Plan is intended to be used as a standalone document, a copy of which will be maintained within the facility's operating record.

Currently there are 17 existing gas monitoring probes (GP-1 through GP-4, GP-6A through GP-8A, and GP-9 through GP-18) around the perimeter of the existing C&D landfill.

Following approval of this permit application and prior to developing of adjacent cells within 1,000 feet of the gas monitoring probe locations, three existing gas probes will be decommissioned (GP-9, GP-10, and GP-11), and 10 additional gas probes (GP-9A, GP-10A, GP-11A, GP-19, GP-20, GP-21, GP-22, GP-23, GP-24, and GP-25) will be installed in accordance with OAC 252:515-15-4, as shown on Drawing 2 in Appendix D. As such, a combined total of 24 gas monitoring probes will be required around the perimeter of the expanded C&D landfill. The new gas probes will be registered online or by mail with the Oklahoma Water Resources Board (OWRB) by a licensed driller within 60 days after installation.

8.0 STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

8.1 OKR05 PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

State law requires an Oklahoma Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (OPDES) Permit be obtained to allow storm water to discharge from this facility. Under state regulations, the existing C&D landfill is subject to requirements of the Oklahoma DEQ Water Quality Division, Sector L, Industrial General Permit OKR05 (OKR05). Under the requirements of OKR05, the facility is to prepare and maintain a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The existing C&D landfill has an SWPPP for the permitted C&D disposal area and disturbed areas within the currently owned GFL properties.

As such, following permit issuance the existing authorization under the general permit will be updated (i.e., filing a Notice of Change) to reflect the new total property acreage (i.e., including the proposed expansion area of C&D landfill). Additionally, the existing SWPPP will be updated to describe the expanded C&D landfill and its operations, identify potential sources of storm water pollution at the facility, recommend appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) or pollution control measures to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff, and provide procedures for regular inspections, storm water monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting, and periodic review of the SWPPP.

8.2 RUN-ON CONTROL SYSTEMS

In accordance with OAC 252:515-17-2(1), the expanded C&D landfill has been designed to have a runon control system to prevent flow onto active portions of the facility during the peak discharge from a 24-hour, 25-year storm event. Temporary separation berms will be constructed, as needed, between phases as the landfill is expanded. Additional run-on control features such as diversion berms will be constructed up-gradient of the construction areas and active portions of the landfill.

8.3 RUN-OFF CONTROL SYSTEMS

In accordance with OAC 252:515-17-2(2), a run-off control system will be installed to collect and control contaminated stormwater run-off from active portions of the landfill resulting from a 24-hour, 25-year storm event.

Additionally, the expanded C&D landfill has been designed with a single comprehensive surface water drainage system to collect and control uncontaminated stormwater runoff from the landfill permit boundary resulting from a 24-hour, 25-year storm event. Stormwater runoff will be conveyed from the landfill sideslopes and topslopes within in-place final cover through a series of drainage swales discharging to downchutes (letdown channels), which will convey the stormwater to either perimeter drainage channels or detention ponds. Drainage channels will also convey stormwater to two future detention ponds located on the north side of the landfill (North and Northwest Detention Ponds), which will discharge stormwater from the facility through controlled outlet structures and two detention ponds located on the south side of the landfill (South Pond, which discharges into the Southeast Pond, which is a zero discharge pond). The ponds have been designed to discharge stormwater to the north or south such that previously existing drainage patterns are not adversely altered.

The peak volume and flows from the final grades of the landfill were calculated using the hydrologic modeling program HEC-HMS (Version 4.0). Hydraulic calculations were performed using Hydraflow Extension for AutoCAD Civil 3D 2020 for sizing the various surface water drainage controls and structures to convey a 24-hour, 25-year storm event. Hydrology model input parameters and output;

and the results of the hydraulic design calculations are included in the Surface Water Drainage System Design Plan in Appendix E.

The following surface water management structures will be constructed to control and route surface water runoff from the landfill:

- Drainage swales,
- Downchutes,
- Perimeter drainage channels, and
- Stormwater detention ponds.

Details of the surface water management structures are described in the following subsections, and detailed hydraulic calculations for sizing these structures are included in Appendix E.

8.3.1 Drainage Swales

The drainage swales are tack-on berms constructed on the landfill sideslopes and topslopes to convey surface water to installed downchutes. Drainage swales were designed as grass-lined V-shaped channels, with a 2:1 exterior sideslope (berm side) and 4:1 interior sideslope (landfill side). A majority of the drainage swales will have a minimum height of 2.5 feet, with exception to the lower drainage swales on the south side of the existing landfill will have a minimum height of 3.5 feet, and minimum slope of two-percent towards the downchutes, as shown on Drawings 7 and 13. Design calculations for drainage swales can be found in Appendix E, Attachment E-4.

8.3.2 Downchute Structures

The downchutes shall be geomembrane-lined or HydroTurf-lined trapezoidal shaped channels with 3:1 sideslopes, a minimum bottom width of 15 feet, and depth of 2.0 feet, as shown on Drawing 14. The downchute structures will be installed on the landfill sideslopes (maximum 25 percent (4:1) slope), and have been sized for the largest contributing drainage area discharging to the downchute. Design calculations for the downchutes are provided in Appendix E, Attachment E-4.

8.3.3 Perimeter Drainage Channels

The future perimeter channels will vary in dimension but generally will be either vegetated or armored channels (turf reinforcement mat or riprap) depending on calculated flow velocity, 2 to 4.5 feet deep with a bottom width of 2 to 10 feet and 2:1 or 3:1 side slopes. The channels will be sloped toward a discharge point at an approximate average slope of 0.25 to 1 percent. Design calculations for perimeter channels can be found in Appendix E, Attachment E-4.

Design and sizing calculations for existing perimeter channels are included in approved Tier I permit modification, dated September 2012, for Permit No. 3555050. The peak flows from drainage areas contributing stormwater runoff to the existing perimeter channels were evaluated to confirm that these channels are still adequately sized to convey the 24-hour, 25-year storm event.

8.3.4 Stormwater Detention Ponds

Two stormwater detention ponds (North and Northwest Ponds) have been designed to manage and detain stormwater runoff from the landfill for a 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event and discharge to an existing offsite discharge location to the north. Additionally, existing stormwater detention pond (South Pond) located south of the existing C&D landfill disposal area has been redesigned and analyzed for management of stormwater runoff from the proposed expanded landfill. Based on the peak flows from drainage areas contributing stormwater runoff to the existing South Pond, the pond was resized and discharges to the new Southeast Pond, which is a zero discharge pond. Both the South and Southeast Ponds have been sized for the 24-hour, 25-year storm event.

Design calculations for detention ponds can be found in Appendix E-1.

9.0 LINER CONSTRUCTION

The permitted liner system at the landfill comprises of the following, from top to bottom:

- 1-foot-thick soil protective cover,
- 36-inch-thick compacted clay liner (CCL, $k \le 1x10^{-5}$ cm/sec), and
- Prepared subgrade (excavation grade).

No changes to the approved liner system are being proposed with this permit modification application.

Specific information pertaining to quality assurance and quality control testing during installation and construction of the liner system components is included in the QA/QC Plan, provided in Appendix F. No changes to the QA/QC plan are proposed with this permit modification application.

Additionally, Appendix C includes a slope stability and final cover veneer slope analysis of the liner and final cover systems, respectively. Based on these analyses, it can be concluded that the slope stability of the proposed landfill excavation slopes, interim fill sideslopes, and final grade sideslopes are acceptable as designed.
10.0 SITE OPERATIONS

In accordance with OAC 252:515-19, the landfill has an approved Operations Plan, which is included in Appendix G. The Operations Plan provides pertinent operational methods and procedures for public access control, controlling windblown litter, controlling odors, controlling disease vectors, acceptance, unloading and placement of waste, and placement of soil cover, including weekly, intermediate, and final cover. The Operations Plan outlines acceptable waste streams as well as limitations on incoming waste streams, as well as recordkeeping and reporting requirements for the landfill.

Acceptable and prohibited wastes for the landfill are outlined in the Waste Exclusion Plan, included with this application in Appendix H. The Waste Exclusion Plan is intended to be used as a standalone document, a copy of which is maintained within the facility's operating record. The Waste Exclusion Plan also provides information on restrictions for the disposal of bulk liquids, restrictions on the disposal of municipal sewages, as well as recordkeeping and reporting requirements for incoming waste streams.

No changes to the waste exclusion plan are being proposed with this permit modification application.

11.0 COVER AND SOIL BORROW REQUIREMENTS

Cover will be applied to reduce fire hazards, stormwater infiltration, odors, and windblown litter; to control vectors; to discourage scavenging; and to provide aesthetically pleasing appearance.

11.1 WEEKLY AND INTERMEDIATE COVER

Weekly soil cover will be applied at the end of each operating week, regardless of weather, as required by DEQ, to deter disease vectors, fires, odors, and windblown litter. The weekly soil cover material should consist of nominally compacted earthen material free of garbage, trash, or other unsuitable material. The minimum thickness of the weekly soil cover will be six (6) inches.

Intermediate cover will consist of at least one foot of nominally compacted soil over refuse. Proper surface grades and sideslopes will be maintained to promote stormwater runoff and minimize infiltration without excessive erosion. Internal sideslopes will not exceed a slope of 3H:1V and external side slopes will not exceed a slope of 4H:1V (25 percent) with the final top slope graded to a minimum of 4 percent.

11.2 FINAL COVER SYSTEM

The final cover system will be constructed once the landfill reaches final grade. The approved final cover system conforms to DEQ specifications and includes the following components from top to bottom:

- 12-inch-thick erosion layer of earthen material capable of sustaining plant growth;
- 24—inch-thick barrier layer ($k \le 1x10^{-5}$ cm/sec hydraulic conductivity).

Once the final cover system and surface water control structures are constructed, the erosion layer will be seeded to establish vegetation. Final cover will be installed in accordance with the approved Closure and Post Closure (C-PC) Plan (Appendix I), Attachment B – Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan for Final Cover System Installation.

11.3 BORROW SOURCES

The active borrow area for the site will be located in the future disposal areas of the proposed landfill expansion. The areas will be excavated in a manner to provide positive drainage to onsite stormwater control features (channels, ponds, etc.). BMPs will be installed in accordance with the OPDES General Permit OKR05 to minimize erosion and offsite sedimentation. Disturbance of vegetation will be limited to the extent possible. Since the borrow source will be located within future disposal areas, reclamation of the area consistent with 252:515-19-55 will not be required.

12.0 CLOSURE AND POST-CLOSURE PLAN

A C-PC Plan is included in Appendix I. The C-PC Plan is in general accordance with OAC 252:515-25. The C-PC Plan includes the necessary actions to be completed at the site before the facility can be certified closed and sets forth the maintenance and monitoring requirements during the post-closure period. The post-closure period will be 8 years following closure to verify that the closed landfill will continue to retain its integrity and will not pose a threat to human health or the environment.

The cost estimates and financial assurance requirements for closure and post-closure care for the landfill are included in Appendix I, Attachment A.

Figures

- Figure 1 General Location Map
- Figure 2 Floodplain Map
- Figure 3 Aerial Photograph
- Figure 4 Public Water Supply (PSW) Surface Water Intakes Map
- Figure 5 Wellhead Protection Areas Map
- Figure 6 General Topographic Map
- Figure 7 FAA Airport Vicinity Map









LEGEND

EXISTING LANDFILL BOUNDARY PROPOSED LANDFILL EXPANSION BOUNDARY CURRENT LIMIT OF WASTE PROPOSED LIMIT OF WASTE

PERMIT BOUNDARY						
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE				
100	N35 30' 13.47"	W97 23 51.04"				
101	N35 30' 13.49"	W97 23' 19.15"				
102	N35 30' 02.39"	W97 23' 19.11"				
103	N35 30' 01.40"	W97 23 27.08"				
104	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23 27.06"				
105	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23' 19.08"				
106	N35 29' 48.32"	W97 23 19.05"				
107	N35 29' 48.33"	W97 23 39.01"				
108	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 38.97"				
109	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 42.96"				
110	N35 29' 41.80"	W97 23 42.98"				
111	N35 29' 41.81"	W97 23 50.97"				

	LIMITS OF WASTE							
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE						
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23 49.46"						
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"						
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"						
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"						
204	N35' 30' 02.01"	W97 23 28.29"						
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97* 23' 27.76"						
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23 20.68"						
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"						
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23 39.61"						
209	N35 29' 43.77"	W97 23 42.53						
210	N35' 29' 43.95"	W97 23 50.20"						



В	
DESCRIPTION	
DATE	
S S	
LLC DRAWING TITLE AERIAL PHOTO	DFILL PROJECT TILE NORTHEAST LANDFILL ST BLVD. TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION 084 APPLICATION
CLIENT N.E. LAND FILL, L	NORTHEAST LANDF 2601 NORTH MIDWEST SPENCER, OK 730
SCS ENGINEERS STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT	CONSULTING ENGINEERS 1901 CENTRAL DRIVE, SUITE 550, BEDPORD, TX 76021 PH60.101 571-2288 FAX.00. (817) 571-2188 PH80.400 DWH. BF. 0,70 FWW BF. 5 162719107.00 DWH. BF. 0,70 FWW BF. 5 PNM. BF. 5S DWH. BF. 5D APP. BF. FRK
CADD F 03 AERIAL PH DATF:	ILE: łoto
SCALE:	08/2023 AS SHOWN
	G NO.
DRAWIN	





FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY

CALE

IGURE NO.

AS SHOWN

4











Permit Drawings

- Drawing 1 Cover Sheet
- Drawing 2 Existing Topographic Map
- Drawing 3 Site Map
- Drawing 4 Highest Groundwater Contour Map
- Drawing 5 Top of Subgrade Grading Plan
- Drawing 6 Top of Protective Cover Grading Plan
- Drawing 7 Final Cover Grading Plan
- Drawing 8 Cross Section A-A'
- Drawing 9 Cross Section B-B'
- Drawing 10 Phase 11 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 11 Phase 11 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 12 Phase 12 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 13 Phase 12 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 14 Phase 13 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 15 Phase 13 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 16 Phase 14 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 17 Phase 14 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 18 Phase 15 Conceptual Phasing Plan
- Drawing 19 Phase 15 Conceptual Cross-section
- Drawing 20 Liner and Final Cover System Details
- Drawing 21 Perimeter Road Details
- Drawing 22 Stormwater Management Plan
- Drawing 23 Stormwater Details 1
- Drawing 24 Stormwater Details 2

NORTHEAST LANDFILL TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION **APPLICATION DRAWINGS AUGUST 2023**

PREPARED FOR:

N.E. LAND FILL, LLC 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD. **SPENCER, OK 73084**

10 11 **PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL** 12 **EXPANSION BOUNDARY** 13 14 SPENCER 15 23RD 16 17 Ы 18 **EXISTING C&D LANDFILL** 19 MIDWE PERMIT BOUNDARY 20 PREPARED BY: 21 22 SCS ENGINEERS 23 STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT LOCATION MAP CONSULTING ENGINEERS 24 1901 CENTRAL DRIVE, SUITE 550, BEDFORD, TX, 76021 4000 PH (817) 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2188 SCALE IN FEET

SCS PROJECT # 16219107.00

	BΥ							
	DESCRIPTION							
	DATE							
	REV	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	
	DRAWING TITLE	COVER SHEET		PROJECT TITLE	NOKIHEASI LANDFILL	TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION		ALLICATION
	CLIENT			NORTHEAST LANDFILL	2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD.	SPENCER OK 73084		
		OCO ENGINEERO	STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT	CONSULTING ENGINEERS	PH (817) 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2188	PROJ. NO. DWN. BY: Q/A RVW BY:	16219107.00 DS SS	DSN. BT: SS UHK. BT: SDS APP. BT: RRK
	C/ 01 -	ADD cov	FI er s	LE: Heet				
	D/	ATE:	C)8/	′2C	23		
,	DF	RAW	 /	λS β Ν	S⊢ 0.	101	٧N	
2	ĺ			1	I			

DRAWING TITLE

COVER SHEET

SITE MAP

DRAWING NO.

2

3

EXISTING TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

HIGHEST GROUNDWATER CONTOUR MAP TOP OF SUBGRADE GRADING PLAN TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER PLAN

- FINAL COVER GRADING PLAN
- **CROSS SECTION A-A**
- **CROSS SECTION B-B**
- PHASE 11 CONCEPTUAL PHASING PLAN
- PHASE 11 CONCEPTUAL CROSS-SECTION
- PHASE 12 CONCEPTUAL PHASING PLAN
- PHASE 12 CONCEPTUAL CROSS-SECTION
- PHASE 13 CONCEPTUAL PHASING PLAN
- PHASE 13 CONCEPTUAL CROSS-SECTION
- PHASE 14 CONCEPTUAL PHASING PLAN
- PHASE 14 CONCEPTUAL CROSS-SECTION
- PHASE 15 CONCEPTUAL PHASING PLAN
- PHASE 15 CONCEPTUAL CROSS-SECTION
- LINER & FINAL COVER SYSTEM DETAILS
- PERIMETER ROAD DETAILS
- STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
- **STORM WATER DETAILS 1**
- **STORM WATER DETAILS 2**

FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY

SANDEEPE

SARAF







	LEGEND	BY	
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1)		
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE		
·· — · —	PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL EXPANSION PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1)		
	PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 2)	RIPTION	
	PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION DISPOSAL AREA PHASE BOUNDARY	DESCI	
	PROPOSED PERIMETER ROAD		
	PROPOSED FENCE		
● ^{MW-10}	PROPOSED MONITORING WELL		
— x ——	EXISTING FENCE	DATE	
	EXISTING 10' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	>	
-1182	HIGHEST GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOURS	٩	
	EXISTING ROADS	MA	NO
GAS	EXISTING EASEMENT (APPROX., SEE NOTE 4) EXISTING GAS LINE (APPROX., SEE NOTE 4)	OUR	FILL ICATI
● ^{MW-1}	EXISTING MONITORING WELL (TO REMAIN)	L	
PZ-1 MW-7	EXISTING PIEZOMETER TO BE CONVERTED INTO MONITORING WELL	tes1 CO	MOI
	EXISTING PIEZOMETER (TO BE ABANDONED/DECOMMISSIONED)	HGH	EAS ⁻ RMIT
● ^{MW-4R}	EXISTING MONITORING WELL (TO BE ABANDONED/DECOMMISSIONED)		AF AF
—— A	LANDFILL CROSS-SECTION LOCATION		ILER II
		iz ma	

EXISTING AND PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA:

 EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA = 90.1 AC.
 PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA = 73.2 AC.
 TOTAL C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 163.3 AC.

 EXISTING AND PROPOSED C&D WASTE DISPOSAL BOUNDARY AREA:

 EXISTING C&D LANDFILL DISPOSAL AREA = 67.7 AC.
 PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION LANDFILL WASTE DISPOSAL AREA = 53.5 AC.
 TOTAL C&D LANDFILL DISPOSAL AREA (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 121.2 AC.

 EXISTING CONTOURS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER AERIAL SURVEYS CO. ON 01/23/2023.

HIGHEST GROUNDWATER RECORDED							
PIEZOMETER NAME	ELEVATION	DATE RECORDED					
MW-1	1180.67	APRIL 2020					
MW-2	1177.81	MAY 2020					
MW-3R	1174.99	MAY 2020					
MW-4R	1172.10	APRIL 2020					
MW-5	1168.31	MAY 2020					
MW-6	1174.85	SEPTEMBER 2020					
PZ-1	1185.20	MARCH 2020					
PZ-2	1184.89	DECEMBER 2020					
PZ-3	1174.50	MAY 2020					
PZ-4	1171.31	MARCH 2020					
PZ-5	1166.77	MARCH 2020					
PZ-6	1178.17	MAY 2020					
PZ-7	1159.66	MAY 2020					
PZ-8	1183.70	MARCH 2020					
PZ-9	1163.39	JUNE 2020					







				, .	
0 150 SCALE IN	0 300 N FEET	DESCRIPTION BY			
LEC	GEND				
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1) EXISTING C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL EXPANSION PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1) PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 2) PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION DISPOSAL AREA PHASE BOUNDARY				
	PROPOSED 10' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES	Į	$\hat{\mathbf{S}}$		
1186	PROPOSED 2' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES		 >		
	PROPOSED PERIMETER ROAD		ןנ		
	PROPOSED FENCE		5	THE	APi
x	EXISTING FENCE		<u>ר</u>	<u> </u>	Ξ
	EXISTING 10' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)		<u>כ</u>		
	EXISTING 2 CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	DRAW	2	PROJE	
 Λ Λ'					
OSED C&D LANDFILL F FILL PERMIT BOUNDAR NDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY OSED C&D WASTE DIS FILL DISPOSAL AREA = PANSION LANDFILL WAS L DISPOSAL AREA (EX ARE FROM AERIAL PH D. ON 01/23/2023.	PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA: Y AREA = 90.1 AC. ARY AREA = 73.2 AC. (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 163.3 AC. <u>POSAL BOUNDARY AREA:</u> = 67.7 AC. STE DISPOSAL AREA = 53.5 AC. ISTING AND EXPANSION) = 121.2 AC. HOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER	CLIENT	N.E. LAND FILL, LLC	2601 NORTH MIDWEST BL	SPENCER, OK 73084
	PROFESSION AL			Provide the statistic solution of the solution	3 PROJ. MG. DWN. BY: Q/A RVM BY: 16219107.00 DS SS DSN. BY: SC OHK. BY: SDS APP. BY: RRK
	SANDEEP D. SARAF 32896 SANDEEP D. 32896 SANDEEP D. 328 SANDEEP D. 328 SANDEEP D. 328 SANDEEP D. 328 SANDEEP D. 328 SANDEEP D. 328 SANDEEP D. 338 SANDEEP D. 338 S SANDEEP D. 338 S SANDE	DATI SCA	E: 0 LE: 0 WING	8/202 S SHC NO.	23 DWN
	FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY	1			





			_
	B		
	DESCRIPTION		
	REV DATE	1994	
	DRAWING TITLE CROSS SECTION A-A'		TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION
SEE NOTE 1) D GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR F WASTE GRADE F PROTECTIVE COVER GRADE GRADE F WASTE GRADE 'POND GRADE ARERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED ON 01/23/2023	CLIENT N.E. LAND FILL, LLC	NORTHEAST LANDFILL 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD.	SPENCER, OK 73084
	INEERS ND SCHMIDT	EERS ITE 550, BEDFORD, TX 76021 0. (817) 571-2188	DS q/arwwen: DS app.ev: RRK SDS App.ev: RRK
PROFESSIONAL IN	SCS ENG STEARNS, CONRAD A	CONSULTING ENGINI 1901 CENTRAL DRIVE, SU PH (817) 571-2288 FAX NC	PROJ. NO. 16219107.00 DSN. BY: SSN. BY: SSN. BY:
SANDEEP D. SARAF	DATE: SCALE:	OS SECTIONS	3(5-5-23) 23 WNI
	DRAWIN	G NO.	
FUR PERMIT TING PURPUSES UNLY			

LEGEND:

– — EXISTING GRADE (SEE NOTE 1)	
HIGHEST RECORDED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR	
PERMITTED TOP OF WASTE GRADE	
PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADE	
PROPOSED FINAL GRADE	
PROPOSED TOP OF WASTE GRADE	
PROPOSED DITCH/POND GRADE	
	Ŀ
ING CONTOURS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED	CLIEN
OUFER MERIAL SURVEIS CO. ON UT/23/2023.	F



NOTE:

	_	_			_			_
	NC BY							
	DESCRIPTIO							
	REV DATE	4		\triangleleft	\bigtriangledown	\bigtriangledown	\triangleleft	
			7	PROJECT TITLE		TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION		
	CLIENT	N.E. LAND FILL, LLC		NOR I HEASI LANDFILL	2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD.	SPENCER OK 73084		
			SIEAHNS, CONHAD AND SCHMIDI	CONSULTING ENGINEERS	PH (817) 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2188	PROJ. NO. DWN. BY: Q/A RVW BY:	16219107.00 DS SS	USNL BT: SS CHAK BT: SDS AFP. BT: RRK
10000	СА 08-0 DA	DD 9 - 1 TE:	FII cros	LE: ss se 08/	сто 20	NS(5-	-5-2	3)
3	SC DR	ALE AWI	NG	, S N	SH o.	IOV	٧N	
				Ś)			

LEGEND:

- EXISTING GRADE (SEE NOTE 1)
- PERMITTED TOP OF WASTE GRADE
- PROPOSED FINAL GRADE
- PROPOSED TOP OF WASTE GRADE

1. EXISTING CONTOURS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER AERIAL SURVEYS CO. ON 01/23/2023.





		•		-	
0 150 SCALE IN) 300 FEET	DESCRIPTION BY			
LEG	GEND				
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1) EXISTING C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 1) PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 2) PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION DISPOSAL AREA PHASE BOUNDARY PROPOSED 10' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES PROPOSED 2' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES PROPOSED PERIMETER ROAD PROPOSED FENCE EXISTING FENCE EXISTING FENCE EXISTING 10' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3) EXISTING 2' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	PHASE 11 CONCEPTUAL			
	EXISTING ROADS	DR	РК		_
A A'	LANDFILL CROSS-SECTION LOCATION PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA <u>L PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA:</u> DARY AREA = 90.1 AC. NDARY AREA = 73.2 AC. RY (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 163.3 AC. <u>DISPOSAL BOUNDARY AREA:</u>	CLIENT N.E. LAND FILL, LLC	NORTHEAST LANDFILL 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD.	SPENCER, OK 73084	
ANDFILL DISPOSAL ARE EXPANSION LANDFILL DFILL DISPOSAL AREA JRS ARE FROM AERIAL CO. ON 01/23/2023	A = 67.7 AC. WASTE DISPOSAL AREA = 53.5 AC. (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 121.2 AC. PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER	SCS ENGINEERS SCS ENGINEERS SCATE : SCATE: S	CONSULTING ENGINEERS 1901 CENTRAL DRIVE, SUITE 550, EEDFORD, TX 76021 1901 CENTRAL DRIVE, SUITE 550, EEDFORD, TX 76021 2007 S 20 2007 S 20	C 00 PROJ NO. 00 DWL BY: 0/A RW BY: 34 16/219107.00 DWL DS 0/A RW BY: SS	DSN. BY: SS CHK. BY: SDS APP. BY: RRK
	FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY				



	REV DATE DESCRIPTION BY A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
I EGEND:	PRANNG TITLE PROJECT TITLE PROJECT TITLE TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATIC APPLICATION
LEGEND: EXISTING GRADE (SEE NOTE 1) HIGHEST RECORDED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR PERMITTED TOP OF WASTE GRADE PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADE PROPOSED FINAL GRADE PROPOSED TOP OF WASTE GRADE PROPOSED DITCH/POND GRADE PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE LIMITS CONTOURS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED	CLENT N.E. LAND FILL, LLC NORTHEAST LANDFILL 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD. SPENCER, OK 73084
SANDEEP D. SARAF 32896 SANDEEP D. SARAF 32896 SANDEEP D. SARAF 32896 SANDEEP D. SARAF	BACK CONRAD CONRAD Constant SCS ENGINEERS SECRECONAD Note SECRES CONDUCTION CONDUCTION SCARE SCARE CONDUCTION CONDUCTION SCARE PHORITY CONDUCTION Note SCARE SCARE SCARE SCARE SCARE DATE: 08 DATE: OB SCARE SCARE SS SCARE SCARE SCARE DATE: SS SCARE SCARE SCARE TAL DATE: SS SCARE SCARE TATION SS SCARE SCARE SCARE



						_
1		β			-	
Ý						
Î		z				
A 150	300	RIPTIO				
SCALE IN	FEET	DESCF				
LEC	SEND					
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY					
	(SEE NOTE 1)	DATE				
	PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE	ц С	10		1<	1
	BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1)	α II.				J
	OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 2)			Ę	z	
<u> </u>	PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION DISPOSAL AREA PHASE BOUNDARY	A	!	, E		
1210	PROPOSED 10' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES	EPTL	AN	NDFI		N
1186	PROPOSED 2' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES		IG PI			CALL
	PROPOSED PERIMETER ROAD	S S	ASIN	EAS		μĽ
<u>D</u>	PROPOSED FENCE	ц	FI/	Ξ	<u>г</u> ,	AP
x	EXISTING FENCE	ΗĂ		Щ Ы Ы Ы		
	EXISTING 10' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	Ĕœ				
	EXISTING 2' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	RAWING		SOUEC		
	EXISTING ROADS	đ		ď.		
A —— A'	LANDFILL CROSS-SECTION LOCATION			Ģ		
C 2 3	PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA		с Г		84	
000	PROPOSED PHASE 12 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA		<u>ו</u> ב, ר		K 730	
				AST L H MID'	ER, O	
			י ב שׁוּ	CHE CHE	ENCI	
			z g	E N N	SPI	
ANDFILL PERMIT BOUND	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$		•	2 <u>60</u>		
DFILL PERMIT BOUNDAR	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$	LIENT				
ROPOSED C&D WASTE ANDFILL DISPOSAL ARE	DISPOSAL BOUNDARY AREA: A = 67.7 AC.	0				×
EXPANSION LANDFILL DFILL DISPOSAL AREA	WASTE DISPOSAL AREA = 53.5 AC. (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 121.2 AC.			76021	BY: SS	RRI
URS ARE FROM AERIAL CO. ON 01/23/2023	PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER	S a l) []	0FORD, TX 2188	Q/A RVW	APP. BY:
		ļĻ	SCHM	S 50, BEC 17) 571-		
		0		NEER SUITE (NO. (8	BY: DS	BY: SDS
		Ž	ONRA	G ENG DRIVE, 288 FA)	DWN.	CHK.
		S S	NS, C	ULTIN ENTRAL) 571-2:	00.70	
	ROFESSION	S S S	STEAF	CONS 1901 CE PH (817	ы. ND. 1621910	N. BY: SS
		CAD	D FI	LE:	æ T	S
	SANDEEP D. AR	06 – 1 plan(5 DAT	OP OF -5-23) E:	PROTECTIVE	COVER	2
	8 32806 /18	SCA	C LE:	08/202	23	
	California and		WINC	AS SHO	OWN	
	218-23			10		
				12		
	FUR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY					



	EXISTING GRADE (SEE NOTE 1)
	HIGHEST RECORDED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR
	PERMITTED TOP OF WASTE GRADE
	PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADE
	PROPOSED FINAL GRADE
	PROPOSED TOP OF WASTE GRADE
	PROPOSED DITCH/POND GRADE
	PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE LIMITS
_	PROPOSED PHASE 12 WASTE LIMITS

CT TITLE NORTHEAST LANDFILL TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION

N.E. LAND FILL, LLC NORTHEAST LANDFILL 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD. SPENCER, OK 73084

CADD FILE: 8-09 - CROSS SECTIONS(5-5-23)

08/2023

AS SHOWN

13

DATE

SCALE:

RAWING NO.

PHASE 12 CONCEPTUAL CROSS-SECTION

1. EXISTING CONTOURS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER AERIAL SURVEYS CO. ON 01/23/2023.





		_		
0 150 SCALE IN	0 300 L FFFT	CRIPTION BY		
		DES		
LEC	GEND			
 	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1) EXISTING C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL EXPANSION PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1) PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS	REV DATE		
	OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 2) PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION DISPOSAL AREA PHASE BOUNDARY			Z D
1210	PROPOSED 10' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES	PTUAI		
1186	PROPOSED 2' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES			
	PROPOSED PERIMETER ROAD			
D	PROPOSED FENCE	Ш	THE	АРР
x		- AS	J ⊡ E	1
1210	EXISTING 10' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	וב		Ľ
	EXISTING ROADS	AWING	OJECT	=
A —— A'	LANDFILL CROSS-SECTION LOCATION	DR	PR	
C 2 0	PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA		Ū.	
000	PROPOSED PHASE 12 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA		DFIL	3084
000	PROPOSED PHASE 13 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA		IEAST LAN TH MIDWE	CER, OK 7
ROPOSED C&D LANDFII ANDFILL PERMIT BOUN LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDAI DFILL PERMIT BOUNDAI ROPOSED C&D WASTE	LL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA: DARY AREA = 90.1 AC. INDARY AREA = 73.2 AC. RY (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 163.3 AC. DISPOSAL BOUNDARY AREA:	CLIENT N F	NORTH 2601 NOR	SPEN
EXPANSION LANDFILL	WASTE DISPOSAL AREA = 53.5 AC. (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 121.2 AC.		21	ŝS RRK
URS ARE FROM AERIAL CO. ON 01/23/2023	PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER	NGINEERS	RAD AND SCHMIDT :NGINEERS IVE, SUITE 550, BEDFORD, TX 760; FAX NO. (817) 571-2188	NWL BY: DS Q/A RVW BY: SHKL BY: SDS APP. BY: F
	SANDEEP D. SARAF	CADD CADD 06 - TOP PLAN(5-5 DATE:	ECONSULTING E STEARNS, CON STEARNS, CON STEARNS, CON STEARNS, CON STRAIDE PH (817) 571-2288 PH (817) 571-2288	CU 88 PROL NO. JAN 16219107.00 P
	San 22896 50000 San 22896 50000 San 22896 50000 12-23	SCALE DRAW	AS SHO	DWN
	FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY		14	



LEGEND:

LEGEND: — EXISTING GRADE (SEE NOTE 1) HIGHEST RECORDED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR	PRAWING THE PROJECT THE CROSS-SECTION PROJECT THE NORTHEAST LANDFILL TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION
PERMITTED TOP OF WASTE GRADE PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADE PROPOSED FINAL GRADE PROPOSED TOP OF WASTE GRADE PROPOSED DITCH/POND GRADE PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE LIMITS PROPOSED PHASE 12 WASTE LIMITS PROPOSED PHASE 13 WASTE LIMITS PROPOSED PHASE 13 WASTE LIMITS	CLENT N.E. LAND FILL, LLC NORTHEAST LANDFILL 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD. SPENCER, OK 73084
	SCS ENGINEERS STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT SONSULTING ENGINEERS SONSULTING ENGINEERS SONSULTING ENGINEERS MARCHAR M



CADD FILE: 8-09 - CROSS SECTIONS(5-5-23)

08/2023

AS SHOWN

15

DΔTE

SCALE:

RAWING NO.



		BY		
# 2				
t				
N 150		PTION		
0 150 SCALE IN	300 FEET	DESCRI		
LEG	END			
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY			
	(SEE NOTE 1)	DATE		
<u> </u>	PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL EXPANSION PERMIT			<u>dd</u>
	BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1) PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS		T	
	OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 2)			Z
	PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION DISPUSAL AREA PHASE BOUNDARY	ΑL	 _]	ATIC
	PROPOSED 10' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES	EPTU	NDFIL	DIFIC
1186	PROPOSED 2' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADES			
	PROPOSED PERIMETER ROAD	4 V 0		PLIC
o	PROPOSED FENCE	Щ Ц Ц		API
x	EXISTING FENCE	HAS	ן פֿו	
	EXISTING 10' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	∎∎		EB
	EXISTING 2' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	AWING	DJECT	F
	EXISTING ROADS	DRV	PR(
A —— A'	LANDFILL CROSS-SECTION LOCATION		é	
C 2 3	PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA	C I) 84
000	PROPOSED PHASE 12 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA		AND	K 730
	PROPOSED PHASE 13 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA		AST I H MID	ER, O
	PROPOSED PHASE 14 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA	Е. L/	ATHE ORTH	ENCI
ROPOSED <u>C&D LANDFIL</u>	l permit bounda <u>ry area:</u>	z	NOF	SP
ANDFILL PERMIT BOUNE LANDFILL PERMIT BOU	NARY AREA = 90.1 AC. NDARY AREA = 73.2 AC.	⊢	260	
DFILL PERMIT BOUNDAR	(EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 163.3 AC.	CLIEN		
ROPOSED C&D WASTE	DISPOSAL BOUNDARY AREA: A = 67.7 AC.		=	N XX
DFILL DISPOSAL AREA	(EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 121.2 AC.	ر م	TX 7602	.м. вх ж м. н.
URS ARE FROM AERIAL CO. ON 01/23/2023	PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER		DFORD, -2188	Q/A F APP.
			7 SCRIV 35 550, BE 817) 571	<u>ي</u>
		D	SINEEF SINEEF SUITE	BY: BY: SC
		И	JONHA JG EN L DRIVI 2288 FJ	DWN
		လွန်	SULTIN SULTIN SULTIN SULTIN SULTIN SULTIN SULTIN	07.00 S
	ROFESSION	S	CON: 1901 C PH (81	ou. no. 162191 ^{SN. BY:} S ^r
		CADD	FILE:	COVER
	SANDEEP D. TR	DATE:	-23)	03
	32896	SCALE	06/20.	
	Samerication	DRAWI	AS SH NG NO.	UWN
	-18-23		16	





LEGEND:

	EXISTING GRADE (SEE NOTE 1)	Ę۵
	HIGHEST RECORDED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR	MING
	PERMITTED TOP OF WASTE GRADE	DRA
	PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADE	
	PROPOSED FINAL GRADE	
	PROPOSED TOP OF WASTE GRADE	
	PROPOSED DITCH/POND GRADE	
	PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE LIMITS	
-	PROPOSED PHASE 12 WASTE LIMITS	
	PROPOSED PHASE 13 WASTE LIMITS	
-	PROPOSED PHASE 14 WASTE LIMITS	

1. EXISTING CONTOURS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER AERIAL SURVEYS CO. ON 01/23/2023.

FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY

m

FSS

SANDEEP D.

SARAF



8/17/003 11:12 M C.Nkothonet CMN 16219107 00 - Ter III Dumit Und Andronicol, Dumit DIRC DEDUT DIRC 2023/ Evolvetion Court Direction Court

		≻□ □ □ □ □ □
1		<u> </u>
0 150 300 SCALE IN FEET		DESCRIPTION
LEGEND		
EXISTING ((SEE NOTE EXISTING (PROPOSED BOUNDARY PROPOSED OF WASTE PROPOSED PHASE BO	C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY 1) C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE C&D LANDFILL EXPANSION PERMIT (SEE NOTE 1) C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS (SEE NOTE 2) C&D EXPANSION DISPOSAL AREA UNDARY 10' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER	TUAL REV DATE
1210 GRADES 1186 PROPOSED	2' TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER	NCEP1 PLAN LANDI MODIFI
GRADES		
		E 15 HAS HE/ ERM
X EXISTING F	ENCE	
	O' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3) .' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3) ROADS	PROJECT TITLE
	ROSS-SECTION OCATION	
PROPOSED	PHASE 11 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA	C ILL BLVD.
PROPOSED	PHASE 12 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA	LL, LI ANDF VEST VEST (7308
PROPOSED	PHASE 13 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA	ND FI \ST L/ MIDV R, OK
PROPOSED	PHASE 14 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA	E. LA THEA ORTH
PROPOSED	PHASE 15 WASTE DISPOSAL AREA	N. NOR SPI
ROPOSED C&D LANDFILL PERMIT ANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA	BOUNDARY AREA: = 90.1 AC.	CLIENT 260
LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY ARE DFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (EXISTIN	A = 73.2 AC. G AND EXPANSION) = 163.3 AC.	X 76021 ** 85 ** RRK
ROPOSED C&D WASTE DISPOSAL I ANDFILL DISPOSAL AREA = 67.7 EXPANSION LANDFILL WASTE DISP	$\frac{\text{BOUNDARY AREA:}}{\text{AC.}}$	HMIDT BEDFORD, T 71-2188 APP. B
URS ARE FROM AFRIAL PHOTOGRA	ND EXPANSION) = 121.2 AC.	ND SCH RESSO, B (817) 51 DS
S CO. ON 01/23/2023.		
		S, CON TING E 71-2288
	ROFESSION	SCS STEARN STEARN CONSUL 1901 CENT 1901 CENT 1901 CENT 1901 CENT 1 817) 5 22 19107.
	SANDEEP D.	PLAN(5-5-23) DATE:
	132896	SCALE:
	San San Adamand	DRAWING NO.
	DEPMITTING DUPPOSED ONLY	18
FOR	PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY	





LEGEND:

	EXISTING GRADE (SEE NOTE 1)	Ľ
	HIGHEST RECORDED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOUR	Ē
	PERMITTED TOP OF WASTE GRADE	AWINC
	PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER GRADE	DR
	PROPOSED FINAL GRADE	
	PROPOSED TOP OF WASTE GRADE	
	PROPOSED DITCH/POND GRADE	
	PROPOSED PHASE 11 WASTE LIMITS	
-	PROPOSED PHASE 12 WASTE LIMITS	
-	PROPOSED PHASE 13 WASTE LIMITS	
-	PROPOSED PHASE 14 WASTE LIMITS	
	PROPOSED PHASE 15 WASTE LIMITS	

1. EXISTING CONTOURS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER AERIAL SURVEYS CO. ON 01/23/2023.









		ВΥ			
	LEGEND				
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY				
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE				
<u> </u>	PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL EXPANSION PERMIT	TION			
	PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS	SCRIP			
	OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 2)	DE			
— GAS ———	PROPOSED GAS LINE				
	PROPOSED PERIMETER ROAD				
	PROPOSED DOWNCHUTES	DATE			
··- 	PROPOSED DRAINAGE SWALE (TYPE A)	EV		100	
	PROPOSED DRAINAGE SWALE (TYPE B)	α			~ ~
]	PROPOSED FENCE				7
- x ——	EXISTING FENCE				<u>l</u>
1740	10' FINAL GRADES IN PERMITTED		AN		CAT
1340	C&D DISPOSAL AREA		TPL		PLIC
	Z FINAL GRADES IN PERMITTED C&D DISPOSAL AREA		MEN	רא ד	ΤAΡ
-1210	PROPOSED 10' FINAL GRADES (C&D DISPOSAL AREA)			EAS	.IW
	PROPOSED 2' FINAL GRADES (C&D DISPOSAL AREA)	ľ	MAN	RTH	Ш Ц
	EXISTING ROADS	щ		j N	E E E
1210	EXISTING 10' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	C TIT		TI TI	Ξ
	EXISTING 2' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	NIMAF		ROJEC	
<u> </u>	EXISTING EASEMENT (APPROX., SEE NOTE 4)	ä		ā	
-GAS	EXISTING GAS LINE (APPROX., SEE NOTE 4)			ē	
	EXISTING DRAINAGE CHANNEL AND FLOW DIRECTION		υ	Ъ Г С	4
◄	PROPOSED DRAINAGE CHANNEL AND FLOW DIRECTION (SEE NOTE 5)		Ļ		7308
S:			Ë	N A	X
EXISTING AND PR XISTING C&D LA PROPOSED C&D I TOTAL C&D LAND = 163.3 AC.	OPOSED C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA: NDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA = 90.1 AC. LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA = 73.2 AC. FILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (EXISTING AND EXPANSION)		N.E. LANDI	NRTHEAST	PENCER, (
EXISTING AND PR EXISTING C&D LA PROPOSED C&D I 53.5 AC. FOTAL C&D LAND	<u>OPOSED C&D WASTE DISPOSAL BOUNDARY AREA:</u> NDFILL DISPOSAL AREA = 67.7 AC. EXPANSION LANDFILL WASTE DISPOSAL AREA = FILL DISPOSAL AREA (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) =	CLIENT		2601 I	S
21.2 AC.	、 ···				ž
XISTING CONTOU BY COOPER AERIA	RS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED AL SURVEYS CO. ON 01/23/2023.	6	n	TX 76021	W BY: S 37: P.F.
EXISTING EASEMENT THE PLAT OF SUI CONSULTING INC.,	NT AND UTILITY LINES INFORMATION ARE FROM RVEY, DEVELOPED BY MASON SURVEYING & DATED 02/17/2022.			; 0, BEDFORD, 1) 571-2188	Q/A F APP. E
REFER TO DRAWIN FABLE.	NG 23 FOR PROPOSED STORMWATER CHANNEL			INGINEERS IVE, SUITE 55 FAX NO. (817	NWN. BY: NR HK. BY: RRK
		ן נ	L S	FING E RAL DRI 1-2288	a ö
	and the second s		LEARNS	ONSUL 01 CENT 1 (817) 57	No. 19107.0 ۴ حد
	DOD PROFESSION 4	Ľ	າ ເ	O≌⊊	PROJ. 1 162 DSN. BY
	SANDEEP D.	CA 22 -	DD F	ILE: NAGEMENT PL	AN (IA)
	SARAF 历日	DA	TE:	07/202	23
	132896 3010	SC	ALE:	AS SHO	NWC
	San Bringhom 2	DR	AWN	g no.	
				ງງ	
	FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY			22	

CHANNEL TABLE



1. CHANNELS MAY ALTERNATIVELY BE INSTALLED WITH AN ECB, TRM, OR RIP RAP.

2. DESIGNED DEPTH WILL INCLUDE MINIMUM 1-FOOT FREEBOARD ABOVE D25 (DEPTH AT 25-YEAR, 24 HOUR STORM EVENT).



CHANNEL NAME	OUTER SIDESLOPE (FT/FT)	INNER SIDESLOPE (FT/FT)	BOTTOM WIDTH (MIN., FT)	MIN. DEPTH (FT)	SLOPE (%)
PC-1	2	3	10	5.3	0.35
PC-2	2	3	10	5.0	0.25
PC-3A ¹	2	3	5	4.5	0.25
PC-3B ¹	2	3	5	3.0	1.50
PC-3C1	2	3	5	4.5	0.25
PC-4A ¹	2	3	5	4.0	0.25
PC-4B ¹	2	3	5	3.5	1.00
PC-71	2	3	5	3.0	0.50
PC-8 ¹	2	3	2	2.0	1.00
PC-9	2	3	6	3.3	1.00
NC-1	2	2	6	3.1	2.50
NC-2	2	2	6	4.3	0.30
NC-3	2	2	6	3.3	2.00
NC-4	2	2	6	3.0	4.00

NOTES:

1. IN PERIMETER CHANNELS WHERE THE CHANNEL VELOCITY EXCEEDS 5 FT/S, THE CHANNEL SHALL BE LINED WITH ECB, RIP-RAP, OR TRM, AS DISCUSSED IN APPENDIX E.





1. THIS DETAIL IS APPLICABLE TO THE SIDESLOPE SWALE WITH A 2% SLOPE











2. DESIGN OF DOWNCHUTES ARE PRESENTED IN APPENDIX E, ATTACHMENT E-4, DOWNCHUTES WILL BE CONSTRUCTED WITH A MINIMUM BOTTOM WIDTH, Bw, OF 15'.



15' 12" RIP RAP <u>0.5%</u>



POND LOCATION	POND BOTTOM ELEVATION (FT)	CULVERT SIZE (INCH)	NO. CULVERTS	LENGTH (FT)	A (FT)	MATERIAL
NORTH POND	1190	36	3	250	2.0	RCP
NORTHWEST POND	1165	30	7	100	2.0	RCP
SOUTH POND	1194	24	2	80	2.0	CMP

NOTES:

- 1. TYPICAL DOWNCHUTE DEPTH IS 2 FEET FOR INDIVIDUAL DOWNCHUTES. FINAL DEPTHS TO BE DETERMINED DURING CLOSURE DESIGN.
- 2. HYDROTURF OR GEOMEMBRANE SHALL BE INSTALLED CONSISTENT WITH MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATION.
- DESIGN OF DOWNCHUTES ARE PRESENTED IN APPENDIX E, ATTACHMENT E-4, DOWNCHUTES WILL BE CONSTRUCTED WITH A MINIMUM BOTTOM WIDTH, Bw, OF 15'.

	BY		
	DESCRIPTION		
	REV DATE		
	DRAWING INTE STORM WATER DETAILS - 2	PROJECT TITLE NORTHEAST LANDFILL TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION	
RIP RAP F	CLIENT N.E. LAND FILL, LLC NORTHEAST LANDFILL 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD. SPENCER, OK 73084		
T) A (FT) MATERIAL 2.0 RCP 2.0 RCP 2.0 CMP	SCS ENGINEERS STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT	CONSULTING ENGINEERS 1901 CENTRAL DRIVE, SUITE 580, BEDFORD, TX 76021 1913 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2188 1817 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2188 No. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.	
A STORE PROFESSIONAL TRANSPORT	CADD F 23-24 - STO	ILE: DRMWATER DETAILS	
SANDEEP D.	DATE: SCALE:	08/2023	
Sand and a stand	DRAWIN	G NO.	
FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY	24		

CULVERTS



Н 24
Appendix A

Notification to Adjacent Property Owners, Location Restriction Correspondence Letters, Legal Description, and Proof of Property Ownership Appendix A-1

Notification to Adjacent Property Owners

August 22, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Application Notification DEQ Permit No. 3555050

To whom it may concern:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a Tier III permit modification application for an expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) waste landfill located at 2601 N. Midwest Blvd in Spencer, Oklahoma.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Sandeep Saraf at (817) 571-2288.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President / Satellite Office Manager SCS Engineers

Appendix A-2

Location Restriction Correspondence Letters

Scenic Rivers

August 23, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Mr. Darrell Townsend, Vice President Ecosystems & Watershed Management GRDA Scenic Rivers Commission 15971 OK-10 Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74465-0292

Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Application Notification Request for Scenic Rivers Evaluation

Dear Mr. Townsend:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma.

Three general site location maps (Figures 1, 3, and 6) are enclosed. Latitude/longitude of the corners of the permit boundaries are provided in Figure 3.

DEQ regulation states the following: no area within the permit boundary of a new solid waste disposal facility, or expansion of the permit boundary of an existing solid waste disposal facility, shall be located within the drainage basin of any river designated under the Oklahoma Scenic Rivers Commission Act, unless the Scenic Rivers Commission that manages the affected river provides a statement that the proposed facility is not expected to adversely affect the river or any of the public purposes for which it was designated.

On behalf of GFL, we request you to review the enclosed maps at your earliest convenience and confirm that the proposed landfill is in compliance with 252:515-5-31(a). If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Sandeep Saraf at (407) 923-7013. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Enclosures: Figures 1, 3, and 6

Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President / Satellite Office Manager SCS Engineers







PERMIT BOUNDARY						
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE				
100	N35 30' 13.47"	W97 23 51.04"				
101	N35 30' 13.49"	W97 23' 19.15"				
102	N35 30' 02.39"	W97 23 19.11"				
103	N35' 30' 01.40"	W97 23 27.08"				
104	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23 27.06"				
105	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23' 19.08"				
106	N35 29' 48.32"	W97 23 19.05"				
107	N35 29' 48.33"	W97 23 39.01"				
108	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 38.97"				
109	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 42.96"				
110	N35 29' 41.80"	W97 23 42.98"				
111	N35 29' 41.81"	W97 23 50.97"				

LIMITS OF WASTE						
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE				
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23 49.46"				
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"				
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"				
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"				
204	N35' 30' 02.01"	W97 23 28.29"				
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97* 23' 27.76"				
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23 20.68"				
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"				
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23 39.61"				
209	N35 29' 43.77"	W97 23 42.53				
210	N35' 29' 43.95"	W97* 23' 50.20"				





E DESCRIPTION BY							-
REV DATE	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	<	Ī
DRAWING TITLE	AERIAL PHOTO		PROJECT TITLE	NORTHEAST LANDFILL	TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION		AFFLICATION
CLIENT			NORTHEAST LANDFILL	2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD.	SPENCER OK 73084		
	OCO ENGINEERO	STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT	CONSULTING ENGINEERS	PH (817) 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2188	PROJ. NO. DWN. BY: Q/A RVW BY:	16219107.00 DS SS	DSN. BY: SS CHK. BY: SDS APP. BY: RRK
CA 03 A	ADD Verial	FI PH	LE: DTO		1		-
sc	CAL	C E: 4)8/ \S	′20 S⊢)23 101	, VN	
DF	RAW	INC	S N	0.			
			3	3			





Recreation and Preservation Areas

August 18, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Ms. Shelley Zumwalt Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department 123 Robert S Kerr Avenue, Suite 1000 Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Application Notification Request for Recreation/Preservation Areas Evaluation

Dear Ms. Zumwalt:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma.

Three general site location maps (Figures 1, 3, and 6) are enclosed. Latitude/longitude of the corners of the permit boundaries are provided in Figure 3.

DEQ regulation states the following: No area within the permit boundary of a new solid waste disposal facility, or expansion of the permit boundary of an existing solid waste disposal facility, shall be located within one-half mile of any area formally dedicated and managed for public recreation or natural preservation by a federal, state, or local government agency, unless the appropriate management agency provides a statement that the proposed facility is not expected to adversely affect the existing recreation or natural preservation area.

On behalf of GFL, we request you to review the enclosed maps and provide the above evaluation as required by DEQ, at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Sandeep Saraf at (407) 923-7013. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Enclosures: Figures 1, 3, and 6

Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President / Satellite Office Manager SCS Engineers







PERMIT BOUNDARY						
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE				
100	N35 30' 13.47"	W97 23 51.04"				
101	N35 30' 13.49"	W97 23' 19.15"				
102	N35 30' 02.39"	W97 23 19.11"				
103	N35' 30' 01.40"	W97 23' 27.08"				
104	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23 27.06"				
105	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23' 19.08"				
106	N35 29' 48.32"	W97 23 19.05"				
107	N35 29' 48.33"	W97 23 39.01"				
108	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23' 38.97"				
109	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 42.96"				
110	N35 29' 41.80"	W97 23 42.98"				
111	N35 29' 41.81"	W97 23 50.97"				

LIMITS OF WASTE						
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE				
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23 49.46"				
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"				
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"				
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"				
204	N35' 30' 02.01"	W97 23 28.29"				
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97* 23' 27.76"				
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23 20.68"				
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"				
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23 39.61"				
209	N35 29' 43.77"	W97 23 42.53				
210	N35' 29' 43.95"	W97* 23' 50.20"				









August 18, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Mr. Mark Trevino, Area Manager Bureau of Reclamation Oklahoma-Texas Area Office 5316 Highway 290 West, Suite 110 Austin, TX 78735

Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Application Notification Request for Recreation/Preservation Areas Evaluation

Dear Mr. Trevino:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma.

Three general site location maps (Figures 1, 3, and 6) are enclosed. Latitude/longitude of the corners of the permit boundaries are provided in Figure 3.

DEQ regulation states the following: No area within the permit boundary of a new solid waste disposal facility, or expansion of the permit boundary of an existing solid waste disposal facility, shall be located within one-half mile of any area formally dedicated and managed for public recreation or natural preservation by a federal, state, or local government agency, unless the appropriate management agency provides a statement that the proposed facility is not expected to adversely affect the existing recreation or natural preservation area.

On behalf of GFL, we request you to review the enclosed maps and provide the above evaluation as required by DEQ, at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Sandeep Saraf at (407) 923-7013. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Enclosures: Figures 1, 3, and 6

Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President / Satellite Office Manager SCS Engineers







PERMIT BOUNDARY						
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE				
100	N35 30' 13.47"	W97 23 51.04"				
101	N35 30' 13.49"	W97 23' 19.15"				
102	N35 30' 02.39"	W97 23 19.11"				
103	N35' 30' 01.40"	W97 23 27.08"				
104	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23 27.06"				
105	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23' 19.08"				
106	N35 29' 48.32"	W97 23 19.05"				
107	N35 29' 48.33"	W97 23 39.01"				
108	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 38.97"				
109	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 42.96"				
110	N35 29' 41.80"	W97 23 42.98"				
111	N35 29' 41.81"	W97 23 50.97"				

LIMITS OF WASTE						
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE				
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23 49.46"				
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"				
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"				
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"				
204	N35' 30' 02.01"	W97 23 28.29"				
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97* 23' 27.76"				
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23 20.68"				
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"				
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23 39.61"				
209	N35 29' 43.77"	W97 23 42.53				
210	N35' 29' 43.95"	W97* 23' 50.20"				





E DESCRIPTION BY							-
REV DATE	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	<	Ī
DRAWING TITLE	AERIAL PHOTO		PROJECT TITLE	NORIHEASI LANDFILL	TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION		AFFLICATION
CLIENT			NORTHEAST LANDFILL	2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD.	SPENCER OK 73084		
	OCO ENGINEERO	STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT	CONSULTING ENGINEERS	PH (817) 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2188	PROJ. NO. DWN. BY: Q/A RVW BY:	16219107.00 DS SS	DSN. BY: SS CHK. BY: SDS APP. BY: RRK
CA 03 A	ADD Verial	FI PH	LE: DTO		1		-
sc	CAL	C E: 4)8/ \S	′20 S⊢)23 101	, VN	
DF	RAW	INC	S N	0.			
			3	3			





Endangered or Threatened Species

Daniel Morgan

From:	Fullerton, Matthew <matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov></matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov>
Sent:	Thursday, April 23, 2020 4:10 PM
То:	Daniel Morgan
Subject:	Re: Northeast Landfill - Threatened and Endangered Species Statement

Hi Daniel,

Apologies for my lateness in getting back to you. I would blame it on COVID, but that really hasn't changed my day-to-day workload!

We don't have any concerns over this location and the site is outside of the range of any state-listed threatened or endangered species.

Please let me know if you need anything else from us.

Thanks,

Matt Fullerton Wildlife Biologist - Threatened & Endangered Species Wildlife Diversity Program Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation Cell: 580-571-5820 Email: <u>matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov</u>

On Mon, Apr 13, 2020 at 3:34 PM Daniel Morgan <<u>dmorgan@hydrex-inc.com</u>> wrote:

Good afternoon Matt,

Just following up on this letter. Given the craziness of the last few weeks and focusing on other parts of this project, I had let the T&E statements sit on the backburner, so I wanted to see if I needed to provide any more info on this.

Thanks again for your help,

Daniel Morgan

Environmental Scientist

Hydrex Environmental

1120 NW Stallings Dr.

Nacogdoches, TX 75964

Office: 936-568-9451

Cell: 936-553-8598

From: Fullerton, Matthew [mailto:matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2020 9:08 AM
To: Daniel Morgan dmorgan@hydrex-inc.com
Subject: Re: Northeast Landfill - Threatened and Endangered Species Statement

Hi Daniel,

Apologies for the delayed response. Your email was somehow sent to my spam filter and I just now found it.

I should be able to complete this for you by the end of the day. Thank you for your patience!

Regards,

Matt Fullerton

Wildlife Biologist - Threatened & Endangered Species

Wildlife Diversity Program

Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation

Cell: 580-571-5820

Email: matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov

On Thu, Mar 5, 2020 at 5:10 PM Daniel Morgan <<u>dmorgan@hydrex-inc.com</u>> wrote:

Good Afternoon Matt,

This is Daniel Morgan with Hydrex Environmental, we spoke earlier regarding a threatened and endangered species statement for a project in Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma. I have attached a zipped shapefile of the project area, as well as a vicinity map showing the project area. The project area encompasses 163.3 acres, which includes an existing 90.3-acre landfill property and an approximate 73-acre expansion area to the north of the existing landfill. The existing landfill is currently operating as a construction and demolition (C&D) landfill, while the proposed expansion area is partially utilized for soil stockpile and borrow.

As part of complying with ODEQ regulations, I am requesting a statement regarding the existence of federal and state listed species within the vicinity of the permit area. Please let me know if I can provide any more information, I appreciate your help.

Thanks,

Daniel Morgan

Environmental Scientist

Hydrex Environmental

1120 NW Stallings Dr.

Nacogdoches, TX 75964

Office: 936-568-9451

Cell: 936-553-8598

Public Water Supply Surface Intake

August 18, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Ms. Ginger Sharkness Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality Public Water Supply 707 North Robinson Oklahoma City, OK 73101

Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Application Notification Request for Public Water Supply Evaluation

Dear Ms. Sharkness:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The proposed expansion will be located on GFL-owned property, north of the existing C&D landfill footprint.

The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma as shown on general site location maps (Figures 1, 3, and 6). Figure 4 depicts the locations of the public water supply (PWS) surface water intakes and public water supply wells relative to the site location.

DEQ regulation states the following: Except for solid waste processing facilities where no waste is stored or placed on permeable surfaces, no new waste management or disposal areas of a solid waste disposal facility shall be located within: (1) one mile upgradient of an existing public water supply surface water intake, or one that is permitted for construction when a complete application has been filed with the DEQ; or (2) a one year time of travel of a public water supply well.

Based on our review of Figure 4, there are two PWS surface water intakes within one mile of the proposed landfill expansion (http://gis.deq.ok.gov/maps/); however, both wells are located **up-gradient** of the proposed landfill expansion.

On behalf of GFL, we request you to review the enclosed maps at your earliest convenience and confirm that the proposed landfill is in compliance with OAC 252:515-5-32(b). If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Sandeep Saraf at (407) 923-7013. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Enclosures: Figures 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6

Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President / Satellite Office Manager SCS Engineers







PERMIT BOUNDARY					
POINT #	LATITUDE LONG	SITUDE			
100	N35 30' 13.47" W97 23	3'51.04"			
101	N35 30' 13.49" W97 23	3'19.15"			
102	N35 30' 02.39" W97 23	3'19.11"			
103	N35 30' 01.40" W97 23	3'27.08"			
104	N35 29' 54.86" W97 23	3'27.06"			
105	N35 29' 54.86" W97 23	3'19.08"			
106	N35 29' 48.32" W97 23	3'19.05"			
107	N35 29' 48.33" W97 23	3'39.01"			
108	N35 29' 35.26" W97 23	3'38.97"			
109	N35 29' 35.26" W97 23	3'42.96"			
110	N35 29' 41.80" W97 23	3' 42.98"			
111	N35 29' 41.81" W97 23	3'50.97"			

LIMITS OF WASTE						
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE				
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23' 49.46"				
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"				
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"				
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"				
204	N35 30' 02.01"	W97 23' 28.29"				
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97 23' 27.76"				
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23' 20.68"				
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"				
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 39.61"				
209	N35 29' 43.77"	W97 23' 42.53"				
210	N35 29' 43.95"	W97 23' 50.20"				







1. CONTOURS SHOWN ARE FROM THE 7.5K QUAD MAP FOR SPENCER, OKLAHOMA (2022); JONES, OKLAHOMA (2022); CHOCTAW, OKLAHOMA (2022); AND MIDWEST CITY, OKLAHOMA (2018); PRODUCED BY THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

2. LOCATION OF PWS SURFACE WATER INTAKES WAS OBTAINED FROM OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.

00 3000 IN FEET	DATE DESCRIPTION		
L BOUNDARY FILL EXPANSION BOUNDARY FILL EXPANSION AREA RAPHIC CONTOURS (SEE NOTE 1) FUPPLY (PWS) SURFACE (SEE NOTE 2)	AWNS TITLE PWS SURFACE WATER INTAKES MAP		
QUAD MAP FOR SPENCER, OKLAHOMA AW, OKLAHOMA (2022); AND MIDWEST E UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY. AKES WAS OBTAINED FROM OKLAHOMA		NORTHEAST LANDFILL	SPENCER, OK 73084
	SCALE SCHRIDT	CONSULTING FAIGURAS BUTTING FAIGURAS 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 10	C 14 162.19107.00 DWL BT: 4/A RW BT: 5DS 162.19107.00 DWL BT: 5DS DBA BT: 5DS CAK BT: 5DS APP: 97 RRK
FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY		4	







Wellhead Protection Areas

August 18, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Mr. George Russell Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality Wellhead Protection 707 North Robinson Avenue Oklahoma City, OK 73101

Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Application Notification Request for Wellhead Protection Area Evaluation

Dear Mr. Russell:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma.

Three general site location maps (Figures 1, 3, and 6) are enclosed. Latitude/longitude of the corners of the permit boundaries are provided in Figure 3. Figure 4, showing the location of the site on DEQ Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Map downloaded from DEQ's GIS Maps and Data website, is also enclosed. Figure 4 also depicts the locations of the public water supply wells within two miles of the site.

DEQ regulation states the following: If any new waste management or disposal areas will be located within two miles of a public water supply well, a wellhead protection area shall be identified, as specified by the State Wellhead Protection Plan, and information submitted to DEQ.

On behalf of GFL, we request you to review the enclosed maps and provide this evaluation as required by DEQ, at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Sandeep Saraf at (407) 923-7013. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Enclosures: Figures 1, 3, 4, and 6

Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President / Satellite Office Manager **SCS Engineers**







PERMIT BOUNDARY		
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
100	N35 30' 13.47"	W97 23 51.04"
101	N35 30' 13.49"	W97 23' 19.15"
102	N35 30' 02.39"	W97 23 19.11
103	N35' 30' 01.40"	W97 23 27.08"
104	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23 27.06"
105	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23' 19.08"
106	N35 29' 48.32"	W97 23 19.05"
107	N35 29' 48.33"	W97 23 39.01"
108	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 38.97"
109	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 42.96"
110	N35 29' 41.80"	W97 23 42.98"
111	N35 29' 41.81"	W97 23' 50.97"

LIMITS OF WASTE		
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23 49.46"
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"
204	N35' 30' 02.01"	W97 23 28.29"
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97* 23' 27.76"
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23 20.68"
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23 39.61"
209	N35 29' 43.77"	W97 23 42.53
210	N35 29' 43.95"	W97* 23' 50.20"









FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY

CALE

IGURE NO.

AS SHOWN

4





Wetlands
Individual Permit

U.S. A	Army Corps	of Engineers	(USACE)
--------	------------	--------------	---------

APPLICATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERMIT

33 CFR 325. The proponent agency is CECW-CO-R.

Form Approved -OMB No. 0710-0003 Expires: 02-28-2022

The public reporting burden for this collection of information. OMB Control Number 0710-0003, is estimated to average 11 hours per response, including the time
for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of
information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or burden reduction suggestions to the Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services
at whs.mc-alex.eso.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person sha
be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT
RETURN YOUR APPLICATION TO THE ABOVE EMAIL.

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

Authorities: Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10, 33 USC 403; Clean Water Act, Section 404, 33 USC 1344; Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, Section 103, 33 USC 1413; Regulatory Programs of the Corps of Engineers; Final Rule 33 CFR 320-332. Principal Purpose: Information provided on this form will be used in evaluating the application for a permit. Routine Uses: This information may be shared with the Department of Justice and other federal, state, and local government agencies, and the public and may be made available as part of a public notice as required by Federal law. Submission of requested information is voluntary, however, if information is not provided the permit application cannot be evaluated nor can a permit be issued. One set of original drawings or good reproducible copies which show the location and character of the proposed activity must be attached to this application (see sample drawings and/or instructions) and be submitted to the District Engineer having jurisdiction over the location of the proposed activity. An application that is not completed in full will be returned. System of Record Notice (SORN). The information received is entered into our permit tracking database and a SORN has been completed (SORN #A1145b) and may be accessed at the following website: http://dpcld.defense.gov/Privacy/SORNsIndex/DOD-wide-SORN-Article-View/Article/570115/a1145b-ce.aspx

A TUDU A TO DE EN LED DU TUE OO

	(ITEWS TTHRO 4 TO B	SE FILLED BY IN	E CORPS)	
1. APPLICATION NO.	2. FIELD OFFICE CODE	_	3. DATE RECEIVED	4. DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE
	(ITEMS BELOW TO B	E FILLED BY API	PLICANT)	
5. APPLICANT'S NAME		8. AUTHORIZ	ED AGENT'S NAME A	ND TITLE (agent is not required)
First - David Middle -	First - Clavton Middle - A. Last - Collier			
Company - N.E. Land Fill, LLC	Company - Hydrex Environmental LLC			
E mail Address, dhabranburg@aflanu		E mail Address	aren En Hondona	
E-mail Address - dbanrenburg@grienv.	com	E-mail Address	s-ccollier@hydrex-	inc.com
6. APPLICANT'S ADDRESS:	9. AGENT'S A	DDRESS:		
Address- 1001 S Rockwell	Address- 1120 NW Stallings Drive			
City - Oklahoma City State - OK	Zip - 73128 Country - USA	City - Nacogo	loches State - 7	Cexas Zip - 75964 Country - USA
7. APPLICANT'S PHONE NOS. W/AREA CODE		10. AGENTS PHONE NOs. w/AREA CODE		
a. Residence b. Business (405) 492-83	с. Fax 05	a. Residence	b. Busines 936-568-	ss c. Fax 9451
11. I hereby authorize, <u>Clayton A.</u> supplemental information in support of	Collier to act in my behalf as f this permit application.	F AUTHORIZATIOns my agent in the processing of t	DN processing of this appli DATE	cation and to furnish, upon request,
	NAME, LOCATION, AND DESCR	RIPTION OF PRO	JECT OR ACTIVITY	
12. PROJECT NAME OR TITLE (see inst Northeast Landfill, 163.3-Acre Prope	ructions) rty, Including 73.2-Acre Landfil	ll Expansion Are	ea	
13. NAME OF WATERBODY, IF KNOWN	14. PROJECT	STREET ADDRESS (i	f applicable)	
Unnamed Tributary to Crutcho Creek		Address 2601 North Midwest Boulevard		
15. LOCATION OF PROJECT				
1 stitutes N 35 406025	City - Spence	r s	State- Oklahoma Zip- 73084	

16. OTHER LOCATION DESCRIPTIONS, IF KNOWN (see instructions)

Township -

Longitude: •W 97.388838

T12N

Municipality

State Tax Parcel ID See Attachment,

Section - 22

Latitude: •N 35.496925

ENG FORM 4345, FEB 2019

PREVIOUS EDITIONS ARE OBSOLETE.

Range - R2W

17. DIRECTIONS TO THE SITE

The Project Area is located immediately northwest of the intersection of North Midwest Boulevard and Northeast 23rd Street, at 2601 North Midwest Boulevard, within the city limits of Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma.

To access the site from the Oklahoma State Capitol building in Oklahoma City, travel east on Northwest 23rd Street for approximately 6.8 miles, then turn left onto North Midwest Boulevard. Continue for 0.3 miles and the site entrance will be on the left, marked by the Northeast Landfill sign.

18. Nature of Activity (Description of project, include all features)

The 163.3-acre Northeast Landfill property includes a 90.1-acre existing construction and demolition (C&D) landfill permitted under ODEQ Permit No. 3555050 and a proposed 73.2-acre lateral expansion area. N.E. Land Fill, LLC (NELF) is planning to expand the existing landfill vertically and horizontally into the 73.2-acre expansion area and provide disposal of C&D waste as well as municipal solid waste (MSW). The landfill expansion components include seven (7) proposed waste disposal cells, one (1) stormwater pond in the northwestern portion of the expansion area, one (1) stormwater pond in the eastern portion of the expansion area, one (1) run-on control channel spanning the northern property boundary, one (1) 15-foot screening berm along the eastern property boundary, three (3) perimeter drainage channels spanning the northern, eastern, and western property boundaries, and one (1) relocated natural gas pipeline extending north and then east along the perimeter of the expansion area.

See Attachment for further discussion.

19. Project Purpose (Describe the reason or purpose of the project, see instructions)

The proposed landfill expansion will be constructed in order to meet the rising demand of waste storage capacity in the areas surrounding Oklahoma City. Based on county population growth projections performed in 2012, Oklahoma County is expected to experience an annual average growth rate of 0.69 percent until 2075 (Oklahoma Department of Commerce). With this increase in population, it will be necessary to increase the waste storage capacity of Oklahoma County.

The Northeast Landfill is approaching the maximum waste disposal capacity of its current designs, therefore presenting a need to increase waste disposal capacity. The purpose of this project is to provide additional waste disposal capacity for the Oklahoma City and the surrounding areas. The expansion of Northeast Landfill is not a water dependent activity.

USE BLOCKS 20-23 IF DREDGED AND/OR FILL MATERIAL IS TO BE DISCHARGED

Type

Amount in Cubic Yards

20. Reason(s) for Discharge

In order to utilize the area north of the existing landfill, approximately 0.66 acres of scrub-shrub wetlands, 0.68 acres of open water, and approximately 0.05 acres (746 LF) of intermittent stream will need to be disturbed for the construction of the proposed landfill cells and stormwater pond.

21. Type(s) of Material Being Discharged and the Amount of Each Type in Cubic Yards:

Type Amount in Cubic Yards Type Amount in Cubic Yards

See Attachment.

22. Surface Area in Acres of Wetlands or Other Waters Filled (see instructions)

Acres 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub wetlands; 0.68 acres of open water

or

Linear Feet 746 LF of intermittent stream

23. Description of Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation (see instructions)

Due to the location of the existing landfill, the only available area for expansion of the Northeast Landfill is north of the currently permited landfill. Existing development, both residential and commercial, is located to the east, south, and west. Therefore, impacts to aquatic resources could not be avoided.

See Attachment for further discussion.

24. Is Any Portion of the Work Already Complete?	Yes No IF YES, DESC	RIBE THE COMPLETE	D WORK	
25. Addresses of Adjoining Property Owners, Lessees,	Etc., Whose Property Adjoins	the Waterbody (if more th	an can be entered here, please attac	ch a supplemental list).
		•		,
a. Address- 3400 N Midwest Blvd				
City - Spencer	State - OK		7in - 73084	
ony - Spencer			Zip - 75084	
b. Address- PO Box 50189				
City - Midwest City	State - OK		Zip - 73140	
c. Address- 5600 NW 83rd Street				
City Oldahama City	State OV		7:- 70100	
City - Oklanoma City	State - OK		Zip - /3132	
d. Address-				
City -	State -		Zip -	
e. Address-				
City -	State -		Zip -	
26. List of Other Certificates or Approvals/Denials receiv	/ed from other Federal, State,	or Local Agencies for V	ork Described in This Appl	ication.
AGENCY TYPE APPROVAL*		DATE APPLIED	DATE APPROVED	DATE DENIED
	NUMBER			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	t.	
* Would include but is not restricted to zoning, building, a	and flood plain permits			
27. Application is hereby made for permit or permits to a	authorize the work described in	n this application. I cert	fy that this information in th	is application is
complete and accurate. I further certify that I possess th	e authority to undertake the w	ork described herein or	am acting as the duly author	prized agent of the
applicant.				
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT		SIGNATUR		
The Application must be signed by the person who	desires to undertake the	pronosed activity (ap	licant) or it may be sign	ed by a duly
authorized agent if the statement in block 11 has b	been filled out and signed.		Sicard of it may be sign	eu by a uury
_	0			
18 U.S.C. Section 1001 provides that: Whoever, in	any manner within the jur	isdiction of any depar	tment or agency of the U	Jnited States
statements or representations or makes or uses ar	s up any mck, scheme, or ny false writing or docume	uisguises a material i nt knowing same to c	act or makes any faise, ontain any faise_fictitiou	s or fraudulent
statements or entry, shall be fined not more than \$	10,000 or imprisoned not i	more than five years	or both.	

USACE Tulsa District ENG 4345 Form Attachment Request for Individual Permit Northeast Landfill

Box 16. State Tax Parcel ID

The Oklahoma County Assessor Account Numbers associated with the site are as follows:

R168553475 R191490500 R191497440 R191497430 R191497420 R191497400 R191497450 R191497460 R191497470 R191497490 R191497480 R191493900 R191495000

Box 18. Nature of Activity

Furnished information indicates waste filling for the expansion area will piggyback onto the north slope of the existing C&D landfill to the south of the expansion area and extend northward into the 73.2-acre expansion area. The landfill liner and leachate collection system to be constructed for the expansion area will consist of the following components from bottom to top: a 2-foot thick layer of recompacted soil with a maximum permeability of 1.0×10^{-7} cm/sec; a 60-mil thick HDPE geomembrane (smooth on the bottom, textured on the side slopes); a leachate collection layer drainage geocomposite (single-sided on bottom, double-sided on side slopes); and a 2-foot thick layer of protective cover soil.

The initial cell construction will occur in the southwest portion of the lateral expansion area in the area designated as Phase 11 on the expansion layout plan. Subsequent landfill construction will advance to the north and then to the east in sequence with the designated Phases 12 through 17.

Designs for the project area, provided by SCS Engineers, are included in Attachment C.

Box 21. Type(s) of Material Being Discharged and the Amount of Each Type in Cubic Yards

Proposed Landfill Expansion Waste Cells:

Wetland A:	Fill, 118,000 cubic yards				
Wetland B:	Fill, 22,700 cubic yards				
Open Water 5:	Fill, 147,000 cubic yards				
Stream 2:	Fill, 3,000 cubic yards				
Proposed Stormwater Pond:					
Stream 2:	Fill, 400 cubic yards				
Total discharge volume: 291.100 cubic vards					

USACE Tulsa District ENG 4345 Form Attachment Request for Individual Permit Northeast Landfill

Box 23. Description of Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation

In order to determine if reasonably practicable alternatives that avoided or minimized impacts were available, an alternatives analysis was conducted for the Northeast Landfill Expansion. In addition to the proposed designs outlined in the Project Details section of this report, several potential alternatives were considered.

Alternative #1: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative, which would not involve any additional construction activities beyond the continued use of the landfill, would result in the facility closing and ceasing to provide waste disposal services to business and communities that are currently under contract with the Northeast Landfill. Therefore, alternative plans for construction were considered.

Alternative #2: Off-Site Permitting of New Facility

Off-site permitting of a new facility was considered, but was deemed unreasonable due to several factors. Environmental impacts from construction of a new landfill site are substantially greater than an expansion of an existing facility. Other factors include high costs associated with property acquisitions, additional time for siting studies, and greater permitting timelines. Therefore, off-site permitting was deemed unreasonable or not viable for the Northeast Landfill.

Alternative #3: On-Site Configurations

On-site configurations that would reduce the potential impacts to WOTUS from the expansion were considered, but were deemed unreasonable due to several factors. The primary factor for this is a higher development cost per cubic yard of airspace and minimal increase in site operating life for cost spent. Therefore, alternative on-site configurations were deemed unreasonable or not viable for the Northeast Landfill.

Alternative #4: Currently Proposed Landfill Expansion

According to NELF, several alterations to the proposed waste cell configuration were considered. The proposed landfill expansion configuration is optimal for NELF's future capacity and operating life needs, and alterations to avoid WOTUS would greatly reduce the available disposal capacity and increase cost per cubic yard of airspace to a point that the expansion would not be viable. In addition, keeping the expansion area in such close proximity will allow for the soil excavated for construction of the proposed waste cells to be hauled to the existing landfill to be used for daily cover and constructions needs. The proposed design maximizes the amount of airspace produced by expanding the existing waste disposal cells (Phases 5 and 6) as well as constructing the cells deeper and higher to reduce lateral impacts. Therefore, there are no alternative designs that minimize impacts to WOTUS without drastically reducing cost effectiveness.

Based on the conclusions of the *Jurisdictional Determination* letter dated December 11, 2020 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District, proposed permanent impacts to waters of the U.S. amount to amount to 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub wetland impacts, 0.68 acres of open water impacts, and 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of intermittent stream impacts. Therefore, NELF proposes to purchase stream and wetland credits from the Deep Fork Mitigation Bank (DFMB) in order to offset unavoidable, permanent impacts from the proposed landfill expansion.

The DFMB does not utilize any particular functional assessment method, therefore the *Texas Rapid Assessment Method* (TXRAM) 2.0, was conducted by Hydrex to evaluate wetland and stream quality. Utilizing TXRAM, Hydrex determined potential mitigation requirements for permanent impacts to the 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub Wetlands A and B and 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of Stream 2 within the project site.

According to the TXRAM wetland functional assessment, Wetland A (0.40 acres) scored 49.2 out of a possible 115, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality wetlands, therefore Wetland A will require the purchase of 1.6 wetland credits. Wetland B (0.16 acres) scored 49.3 out of a possible 115, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality wetlands, therefore Wetland B will require the purchase of 0.64 wetland credits. Open Water 5 did not require a functional assessment, as DFMB utilizes the 3:1 ratio for low quality wetlands, Open Water 5 will require the purchase of 2.04 wetland credits. Based on these scores, NELF will be required to purchase 4.28 wetland credits for impacts at the Northeast Landfill Expansion.

According to the TXRAM stream functional assessment, Stream 2 (746 linear feet) scored 39.5 out of a possible 105, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 2:1 for medium quality intermittent streams, therefore Stream 2 will require the purchase of 1,492 intermittent stream credits. However, at this time DFMB does not have sufficient intermittent stream credits to fulfill this compensatory mitigation requirement. Therefore, Hydrex is requesting approval for the purchase of perennial stream credits as needed to supplement the purchase of intermittent stream credits and satisfy mitigation requirements. At this time, DFMB has 366 intermittent stream credits available for purchase. Hydrex respectfully requests a 0.5:1 mitigation ratio for the purchase of perennial stream credits to satisfy the remainder of mitigation requirements. In the event that more intermittent stream credits become available during the permitting process, those will be purchased prior to any perennial stream credits.

In conclusion, the total required credits will be 4.28 wetland credits and 1,492 intermittent stream credits for the proposed landfill expansion. As of May 2021, RIBITS indicates that the DFMB only has 336 intermittent stream credits available, which will be purchased to satisfy mitigation requirements for Stream 2. Due to insufficient available intermittent stream credits, perennial stream credits will be purchased at a 0.5:1 ratio to satisfy the remainder of the compensatory mitigation needs for this project. The TXRAM functional assessment datasheets and final scoring sheets are attached.

REQUEST FOR INDIVIDUAL PERMIT

NORTHEAST LANDFILL 163.3-ACRE PROPERTY, INCLUDING 73.2-ACRE LANDFILL EXPANSION

2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD. SPENCER, OKLAHOMA COUNTY

Hydrex Project No. A-12-1361

Report Date: May 28, 2021

Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District CEWST-RO 2488 81st Street Tulsa, OK 74137-4290

Prepared by: Hydrex Environmental 1120 NW Stallings Drive Nacogdoches, Texas 75964 (936) 568-9451 FAX (936) 568-9527



May 28, 2021



Mr. Robert Hoffman U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District CESWT-RO 2488 R. 81st Street Tulsa, Oklahoma 74137-4290

RE: REQUEST FOR INDIVIDUAL PERMIT Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Property, Including 73.2-Acre Landfill Expansion 2601 North Midwest Blvd. Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma Hydrex Project No. A-12-1361

Mr. Robert Hoffman,

The enclosed application package is a request for authorization under an Individual Permit for unavoidable impacts to waters of the U.S. (WOTUS) associated with the expansion of the Northeast Landfill ("Project Area"). This 163.3-acre Project Area consists of an existing 90.1-acre construction and demolition (C&D) landfill permitted under ODEQ Permit No. 3555050 and a proposed 73.2-acre lateral expansion area. The proposed plans involve a horizontal and vertical expansion of the landfill, which will be used for solid waste disposal. This request is being submitted by Hydrex Environmental (Hydrex) on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (NELF).

The Project Area is a 163.3-acre property currently owned by NELF, which consists of the 90.1acre existing C&D landfill, and a proposed 73.2-acre lateral expansion area. The Project Area is located immediately northwest of the intersection of North Midwest Boulevard and Northeast 23rd Street, at 2601 North Midwest Boulevard, within the city limits of Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma, as depicted on Figure 1 in Attachment A. The approximate NAD 83 geographic coordinates for the site entrance are: N 35.496925, W 97.388838.

Oklahoma City and the surrounding Oklahoma County are expected to continue seeing growth in population, and as such will require an increase in waste storage capacity. The Northeast Landfill Expansion is proposed in order to meet the increase in demand. Due to the location of the existing landfill, the only available area for expansion of the Northeast Landfill is north of the current permit boundary. Existing development, both residential and commercial, is to the east, south, and west. Therefore, impacts to aquatic resources could not be avoided. The proposed Northeast Landfill Expansion components include seven (7) proposed waste disposal cells, one (1) stormwater pond in the northwestern portion of the expansion area, one (1) stormwater pond in the northern portion of the expansion area, one (1) stormwater pond in the northern property boundary, one (1) 15-foot screening berm along the eastern property boundary, three (3) perimeter drainage channels spanning the northern, eastern, and western property boundaries, and one (1) relocated natural gas pipeline extending north and then east along the perimeter of the expansion area. The location of project components are depicted on Figures 2 and 3 in Attachment A.

Based on the conclusions of the *Jurisdictional Determination* letter dated December 11, 2020 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Tulsa District, the following WOTUS were identified within the Project Area: two (2) scrub-shrub wetlands (Wetlands A and B), one (1) open water (Open Water 5),and one (1) intermittent stream (Stream 2). Scrub-shrub Wetland A (0.40 acres) is located within the proposed location of Phase 12 of the lateral expansion area. Scrub-shrub Wetland B (0.16 acres) is located within the proposed location of Phase 13 of the lateral expansion area. Open Water 5 (0.68 acres) is located within the proposed locations of Phase 12 and 13 of the lateral expansion area. Intermittent Stream 2 (746 linear feet, 0.05 acres) flows through proposed Phase 13 as well as the proposed stormwater pond in the lateral expansion area. Therefore, total impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands, amount to 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub wetland impacts, 0.68 acres of open water impacts, and 746 linear feet of intermittent stream impacts. To minimize impacts to any downgradient WOTUS, sediment and erosion controls will be implemented in accordance with the site's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWP3).

Based on proposed impacts to WOTUS (approximately 1.29 acres), this project does not fall within the guidelines of any Nationwide Permits, and therefore requires the submission of a Request for an Individual Permit to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Tulsa District. Therefore, on behalf of NELF, we respectfully request authorization under an Individual Permit for unavoidable impacts to WOTUS associated with the Northeast Landfill Expansion.

DELINEATION OF WATERS OF THE U.S.

AND APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION

The area reviewed for this investigation was delineated March 16 to 18, 2020 by Hydrex to evaluate site conditions and identify potential WOTUS. The area reviewed includes the 163.3-acre Project Area, consisting of the 90.1-acre existing C&D landfill, and a proposed 73.2-acre lateral expansion area. The results of this delineation were submitted to the USACE Tulsa District as part of a July 8, 2020 *Approved Jurisdictional Determination Request*, which was resolved in the December 11, 2020 *Jurisdictional Determination*.

Based on the findings of the *Jurisdictional Determination* letter provided by the USACE Tulsa District, the following waters of the U.S. were identified within the 163.3-acre Project Area.

- Wetland A (Scrub-Shrub, 0.40 acres)
- Wetland B (Scrub-Shrub, 0.16 ac)
- Stream 2 (Intermittent, 746 LF, 0.05 ac)
- Open Water 5 (Excavation; 0.68 acres)

PROJECT DETAILS

The 163.3-acre Northeast Landfill property includes a 90.1-acre existing construction and demolition (C&D) landfill permitted under ODEQ Permit No. 3555050 and a proposed 73.2-acre lateral expansion area. N.E. Land Fill, LLC (NELF) is planning to expand the existing landfill horizontally and vertically and horizontally into the 73.2-acre expansion area and provide disposal of C&D waste as well as municipal solid waste (MSW). The landfill expansion components include seven (7) proposed waste disposal cells, one (1) stormwater pond in the northwestern portion of the expansion area, one (1) stormwater pond in the northern portion of the expansion area, one (1) run-on control channel spanning the northern property boundary, one (1) 15-foot screening berm along the eastern property boundary, three (3) perimeter drainage channels spanning the northern, eastern, and western property boundaries, and one (1) relocated natural gas pipeline extending north and then east along the perimeter of the expansion area.

Furnished information from SCS Engineers indicates waste filling for the expansion area will piggyback onto the north slope of the existing C&D landfill and extend northward into the 73.2-acre expansion area. The landfill liner and leachate collection system to be constructed for the expansion area will consist of the following components from bottom to top: a 2-foot thick layer of recompacted soil with a maximum permeability of 1.0×10^{-7} cm/sec; a 60-mil thick HDPE geomembrane (smooth on the bottom, textured on the side slopes); a leachate collection layer drainage geocomposite (single-sided on bottom, double-sided on side slopes); and a 2-foot thick layer of protective cover soil.

The initial cell construction will occur in the southwest portion of the lateral expansion area in the area designated as Phase 11 on the expansion layout plan. Subsequent landfill construction will advance to the north and then to the east in sequence with the designated Phases 12 through 17.

In order to minimize impacts to the environment, appropriate soil erosion and sediment controls (sediment fence, hay bales, rock riprap, vegetation mats, etc) will be used and maintained in effective operating conditions during the construction and during operation of all project elements. All development within this project will be designed to drain towards the stormwater management ditches and ponds. Stormwater will be routed through perimeter ditches towards the on-site detention ponds, where it will then be discharged into Stream 2. Construction is expected to be initiated following the approval of the ODEQ expansion permit in 2022. Designs for the project area, provided by SCS Engineers, are included in Attachment C.

The construction activities described above will require permanent fill within Wetlands A and B, Open Water 5, and Stream 2. Table 1 describes the volume of proposed fill to be placed in waters of the U.S., including wetlands.

Table 1. Volume of Proposed Fill to be Placed in WOTUS.

Project Element	Feature ID	Material Fill (cubic yards)		Total Fill in WOTUS (cubic yards)
Landfill Expansion Waste Cells	Wetland A	118,000		118,000
Landfill Expansion Waste Cells	Wetland B	22,700		22,700
Landfill Expansion Waste Cells	Open Water 5	147,000		147,000
Landfill Expansion Waste Cells	Stream 2	3,000		3,000
Stormwater Pond	Stream 2	400		400
		Тт (сц	otal Fill in WOTUS ubic yards)	291,100

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

In order to determine if reasonably practicable alternatives were available, an alternatives analysis was conducted for the Northeast Landfill Expansion. The Northeast Landfill is approaching the maximum waste disposal capacity of its current designs, therefore presenting a need to increase waste disposal capacity. The purpose of this project is to provide additional waste disposal capacity for the Oklahoma City Metro area. In addition to the proposed designs outlined in the Project Details section of this report, several potential alternatives were considered.

Alternative #1: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative, which would not involve any additional construction activities beyond the continued use of the landfill, would result in the facility closing and ceasing to provide waste disposal services to business and communities that are currently under contract with the Northeast Landfill. Therefore, alternative plans for construction were considered.

REQUEST FOR INDIVIDUAL PERMIT Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Property, Including 73.2-Acre Expansion 2601 North Midwest Blvd. Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma Hydrex Project No. A-12-1361

.

Alternative #2: Off-Site Permitting of New Facility

Off-site permitting of a new facility was considered, but was deemed unreasonable due to several factors. Environmental impacts from construction of a new landfill site are substantially greater than an expansion of an existing facility. Other factors include high costs associated with property acquisitions, additional time for siting studies, and greater permitting timelines. Therefore, off-site permitting was deemed unreasonable or not viable for the Northeast Landfill.

Alternative #3: On-Site Configurations

On-site configurations that would reduce the potential impacts to WOTUS from the expansion were considered, but were deemed unreasonable due to several factors. The primary factor for this is a higher development cost per cubic yard of airspace and minimal increase in site operating life for cost spent. Therefore, alternative on-site configurations were deemed unreasonable or not viable for the Northeast Landfill.

Alternative #4: Currently Proposed Landfill Expansion

According to NELF, several alterations to the proposed waste cell configuration were considered. The proposed landfill expansion configuration is optimal for NELF's future capacity and operating life needs, and alterations to avoid WOTUS would greatly reduce the available disposal capacity and increase cost per cubic yard of airspace to a point that the expansion would not be viable. In addition, keeping the expansion area in such close proximity will allow for the soil excavated for construction of the proposed waste cells to be hauled to the existing landfill to be used for daily cover and constructions needs. The proposed design maximizes the amount of airspace produced by expanding the existing waste disposal cells (Phases 5 and 6) as well as constructing the cells deeper and higher to reduce lateral impacts. Therefore, there are no alternative designs that minimize impacts to WOTUS without drastically reducing cost effectiveness..

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES HABITAT SURVEY

In accordance with the requirements put forth by the USACE regarding impacts to federally-listed threatened and endangered species and their habitats, a threatened and endangered species habitat survey was performed by Hydrex concurrently with the delineation of WOTUS March 16 to 18, 2020 as part of this investigation. This habitat survey was based upon the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service threatened and endangered species list and habitat descriptions provided by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Oklahoma Ecological Services Field Office. The list indicates four (4) federally threatened and/or endangered species occur within Oklahoma County: Arkansas River shiner (*Notropis girardi*), piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), and whooping crane (*Grus americana*).

In the best professional opinion of Hydrex, construction activities associated with the proposed project will have "no effect" on federally listed threatened or endangered species, species proposed for such designation, or critical habitat of such species for Oklahoma County, Oklahoma. Supporting documentation for the threatened and endangered species habitat survey is included in Attachment D.

REQUEST FOR INDIVIDUAL PERMIT Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Property, Including 73.2-Acre Expansion 2601 North Midwest Blvd. Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma Hydrex Project No. A-12-1361

.

As required by the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) Administrative Code 252:515-5-31(c), the Oklahoma Biological Survey (OBS) and Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Consultation (ODWC) were consulted regarding threatened and endangered species determinations for species located near or within the Project Area of the Northeast Landfill. Coordination with OBS determined that no federally or state listed threatened, endangered, candidate, or non-regulatory rare species had habitat within the Project Area. It was noted that an occurrence of bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) had been observed within the vicinity of the Project Area (Section 2 - Township T12N - Range R2W). It is likely that this specimen was observed near the Canadian River, which flows approximately 1.2 miles north of the Project Area, and that the site is located outside of the range of any state-listed threatened or endangered species. Correspondence with OBS and ODWC representatives can be found in Attachment D.

CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY

A Phase I Cultural Resource Survey (CRS) was conducted by Stone Point Services, LLC (Stone Point) for this project. Background research was conducted on February 13, 2020, during which no previously recorded cultural resources were identified in the Area of Potential Effects (APE). Background research also indicated no listed, eligible, or potentially eligible sites for the National Registry of Historic Places (NRHP) within one mile of the survey area. Stone Point performed field investigations March 16 to March 25, 2021, which included both pedestrian archaeological surveys and shovel tests, with surface inspections being conducted in the areas of significant disturbance. During field investigations, one historic storm shelter structure (circa 1950s) was identified within the southern portion of the survey area. Upon coordination with the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey (OAS), due to a lack of associated artifacts and disturbed integrity, this site was not given an Oklahoma site trinomial. As this structure does not fit the criteria for consideration as a histroic site, Stone Point recommends this structure as ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP. According to Stone Point, this project will not impact NRHP listed, eligible, or potentially eligible structures or sites. Therefore, Stone Point recommends that this project can proceed with no additional consideration of cultural resources. The results of Stone Point's review are included in Attachment E.

In the event of an inadvertent discovery of human remains and/or archaeological cultural deposits, all project activity near the location should cease immediately until proper notification of consulting parties has occurred and mitigative measures have been determined and implemented.

COMPENSATORY MITIGATION PLAN

Based on the conclusions of the *Jurisdictional Determination* letter dated December 11, 2020 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District, proposed permanent impacts to waters of the U.S. amount to 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub wetland impacts, 0.68 acres of open water impacts, and 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of intermittent stream impacts. Based on proposed impacts to WOTUS (>0.5 acres), this project does not fall within the guidelines of any Nationwide Permits, and as such will require compensatory mitigation. Therefore, N.E. Landfill, LLC proposes to purchase stream and wetland credits from the Deep Fork Mitigation Bank (DFMB) in order to offset unavoidable, permanent impacts from the proposed landfill expansion. The Northeast Landfill Expansion is located within the primary service area of the DFMB.

The DFMB does not utilize any particular functional assessment method, therefore the *Texas Rapid Assessment Method* (TXRAM) 2.0, was conducted by Hydrex to evaluate wetland and stream quality. Utilizing TXRAM, Hydrex determined potential mitigation requirements for permanent impacts to the 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub Wetlands A and B, 0.68 acres of Open Water 5, and 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of Stream 2 within the project site.

According to the TXRAM wetland functional assessment, Wetland A (0.40 acres) scored 49.2 out of a possible 115, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality wetlands, therefore Wetland A will require the purchase of 1.6 wetland credits. Wetland B (0.16 acres) scored 49.3 out of a possible 115, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality wetlands, therefore Wetland B will require the purchase of 0.64 wetland credits. Open Water 5 did not require a functional assessment, as DFMB utilizes the 3:1 ratio for low quality wetlands, for open water features. Applying the 3:1 ratio for low quality wetlands, Open Water 5 will require the purchase of 2.04 wetland credits. Based on these scores, NELF will be required to purchase 4.28 wetland credits for impacts at the Northeast Landfill Expansion.

According to the TXRAM stream functional assessment, Stream (746 linear feet) scored 39.5 out of a possible 105, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 2:1 for medium quality intermittent streams, therefore Stream 2 will require the purchase of 1,492 intermittent stream credits. However, at this time DFMB does not have sufficient intermittent stream credits to fulfill this compensatory mitigation requirement. Therefore, Hydrex is requesting approval for the purchase of perennial stream credits as needed to supplement the purchase of intermittent stream credits and satisfy mitigation requirements. At this time, DFMB has 366 intermittent stream credits available for purchase. Hydrex respectfully requests a 0.5:1 mitigation ratio for the purchase of perennial stream credits to satisfy the remainder of mitigation requirements. In the event that more intermittent stream credits become available during the permitting process, those will be purchased prior to any perennial stream credits.

In conclusion, the total required credits will be 4.28 wetland credits and 1,492 intermittent stream credits for the proposed landfill expansion. As of May 2021, RIBITS indicates that the DFMB only has 336 intermittent stream credits available, which will be purchased to satisfy mitigation requirements for Stream 2. Due to insufficient available intermittent stream credits, perennial stream credits are proposed to be purchased at a 0.5:1 ratio to satisfy the remainder of the compensatory mitigation needs for this project. The TXRAM functional assessment datasheets and final scoring sheets are included in Attachment F.

WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

In order to minimize adverse effects to water quality, precautionary measures will be put in place. These include controls for minimizing sediment load as well as preventing the release of construction debris, fuels, lubricants, or other deleterious materials into impacted waterbodies.

In order to minimize erosion and sedimentation, best management practices (BMPs) will be used during the construction of landfill waste cells in accordance with Oklahoma Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (OPDES), General Permit No. OKR 10. During operation, the facility will mitigate significant erosion and sedimentation through the use of a perimeter storm water management system that will comply with Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) regulations. This storm water management system will include both structural controls (division berms, drainage conveyance swales, letdown structures, ditches, energy dissipation, detention/retention basins, etc) as well as non-structural controls (vegetation establishment on slopes, vegetative buffers near property boundaries, inspections and maintenance of in-place BMPs, etc.) that will be utilized during facility operation to reduce erosion/sedimentation and other potential pollutant sources from discharging offsite. This system will also be designed for compliance with OPDES, General Permit No. OKR05, including implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWP3).

In addition to minimizing deleterious impacts from sediment runoff, controls will be put in place to prevent construction debris from impacting water quality. Operational soil cover (daily and/or intermediate cover) will be in place during facility development and operation, and final cover will be placed at facility closure consistent with applicable ODEQ regulations. Additionally, as indicated above, the facility will comply with OPDES, General Permit No. OKR05 during facility development/operation to protect surface water.

Additional controls will be put in place to prevent fuels and lubricants from impacting water quality. As outlined above, the facility will implement a SWP3 in compliance with OPDES, General Permit No. OKR05, and will implement a Spill Prevention, Containment, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan in compliance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 112 to manage and mitigate spills during landfill operations. There are no other obvious risks to water quality from the landfill expansion.

On behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC, we respectfully request authorization under an Individual Permit for the impacts described herein. Should you have any questions or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at <u>ccollier@hydrex-inc.com</u> or (936) 568-9451.

Sincerely,

Hydrex Environmental

Clayton A. Collier, REM, PWS Senior Environmental Scientist

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A	SITE MAPS
Figure 1	Vicinity Map
Figure 2	Site Map
Figure 3	Site Map (2020 Aerial Photograph)
ATTACHMENT B	JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION LETTER (DECEMBER 11, 2020)
ATTACHMENT C	SURVEY PLATS AND DESIGN DETAILS
ATTACHMENT D	THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES DOCUMENTATION AND CONCURRENCE
ATTACHMENT E	CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY
ATTACHMENT F	MITIGATION PLAN
ATTACHMENT G	LIMITATIONS
ATTACHMENT H	QUALIFICATIONS

REQUEST FOR INDIVIDUAL PERMIT Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Property, Including 73.2-Acre Expansion 2601 North Midwest Blvd. Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma Hydrex Project No. A-12-1361

DISTRIBUTION

Mr. Robert Hoffman U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District CESWT-RO 2488 R. 81st Street Tulsa, Oklahoma 74137-4290

Mr. Clayton A. Collier, REM, PWS Senior Environmental Scientist Hydrex Environmental 1120 NW Stallings Drive Nacogdoches, Texas 75964

Mr. David Bahrenburg Senior District Manager N.E. Land Fill, LLC 1001 S. Rockwell Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73128

Mr. Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President/Project Director SCS Engineers 1901 Central Drive, Suite 550 Bedford, Texas 76021

ATTACHMENT A

SITE MAPS







ATTACHMENT B

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION LETTER (DECEMBER 11, 2020)



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT 2488 EAST 81ST STREET TULSA, OK 74137-4290

December 11, 2020

Regulatory Office

Mr. Clayton Collier Hydrex Environmental 1120 NW Stallings Drive Nacogdoches, TX 75964-3428

Dear Mr. Collier:

This is in reference to your request for a jurisdictional determination (JD) on the Northeast Landfill property located in Section 22, Township 12 North, Range 2 West, in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma. The area marked in red on the enclosed map denotes the limits of the property examined under this request. We have reviewed the submitted data relative to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

We have examined the approximately 163-acre review area and concluded that Wetland A (0.40 acre), Wetland B (0.16 acre), Open Water 5 (0.68 acre), and Stream 2 (746 linear feet) are jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the United States subject to Section 404 of the CWA.

We believe this determination to be an accurate assessment of the presence of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters on the site which are subject to Section 404 of the CWA. This is a final determination of federal jurisdiction on the property pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA. This determination is valid for 5 years from the date of this letter unless new information warrants revision of the determination before the expiration date.

This determination has been conducted to identify the limits of the Corps CWA jurisdiction for the particular site identified in this request. This determination may not be valid for the wetland conservation provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended. If you or your tenant are USDA program participants, or anticipate participation in USDA programs, you should request a certified wetland determination from the local office of the Natural Resources Conservation Service prior to starting work.

This final determination constitutes an approved JD subject to the optional Corps Administrative Appeal Process. If you object to this determination, you may request an administrative appeal under Corps regulations at 33 CFR Part 331. Enclosed is a copy of the Notification of Administrative Appeal Options and Process (NAP) and Request for Appeal (RFA) form. If you request to appeal this determination you must submit a completed RFA form to the Southwestern Division Office at the following address:

Mr. Elliott Carman Administrative Appeals Review Officer (CESWD-PD-O) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1100 Commerce Street, Suite 831 Dallas, TX 75242-1317 Tel: 469-487-7061

In order for a RFA form to be accepted by the Corps, the Corps must determine that it is complete, that it meets the criteria for appeal under 33 CFR Part 331.5, and that it has been received by the Division Office within 60 days of the date of the NAP. Should you decide to submit a RFA form, it must be received at the above address by February 9, 2021. It is not necessary to submit a RFA form to the Division Office if you do not object to the determination in this letter.

If you desire to complete a "Customer Service Survey" on your experience with the Corps Regulatory Program, visit <u>http://corpsmapu.usace.army.mil/cm_apex/f?p=regulatory_survey</u> on the internet at your convenience and submit your comments.

This case has been assigned Identification No. SWT-2020-00344. Please refer to this number during future correspondence. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Rob Hoffmann at 918-669-7481.

Sincerely,

for

Date: 2020.12.11 09:58:54 -06'00'

Andrew R. Commer Chief, Regulatory Office

Enclosures



ATTACHMENT C

SURVEY PLATS AND DESIGN DETAILS







ATTACHMENT D

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES DOCUMENTATION AND CONCURRENCE

Oklahoma County, Oklahoma Federally Listed Threatened & Endangered Species Habitat Descriptions and Evaluation

NORTHEAST LANDFILL 163.3-ACRE PROJECT AREA, INCLUDING 73.2-ACRE LANDFILL EXPANSION

Hydrex Project No. A-12-1361

In accordance with the requirements put forth by the USACE regarding impacts to federally-listed threatened and endangered species and their habitats, a Threatened & Endangered Species Habitat Survey has been conducted. The following species were listed by the United States Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS):

Arkansas River shiner (Notropis girardi): THREATENED

Habitat: Arkansas River shiners historically occurred in large rivers throughout the Arkansas River basin, including the Arkansas, Cimarron, and Canadian rivers in Oklahoma. The Arkansas River shiner only inhabits wide and shallow prairie rivers with sandy bottoms, though it seems to use various microhabitats within these systems throughout its life cycle. These shiners often congregate in schools on the side of sandbars and ridges and rarely occur in the open water of the main river channel.. (Source: USFWS).

Evaluation: It is the opinion of **Hydrex Environmental** that there will be "no effect" to the Arkansas River shiner or its habitat by this project. The following reasons for a "no effect" determination are listed below:

- The project area does not contain any large rivers.
- The project area does not contain any wide and shallow prairie rivers with sandy bottoms.
- No specimens were observed during the investigation.

Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*): **THREATENED**

<u>Habitat</u>: Many reservoirs throughout the state have harbored piping plovers for brief periods and single birds are usually documented at stopover sites. As with other plovers, piping plovers often select mudflats and sandbars to forage for invertebrates. The birds seen in Oklahoma are all part of the Northern Great Plains population and typically occur in the state from March to May, and July to September. (Source: USWFS)

Evaluation: It is the opinion of Hydrex Environmental that there will be "no effect" to the piping plover or its habitat by this project. The following reasons for a "no effect" determination are listed below:

- The project area does not contain mudflats or sandbars.
- No nests made of sandy substrate with pebble or shell lining were present.
- No specimens were observed during the investigation.

Red Knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*): **THREATENED**

<u>Habitat</u>: Red knots prefer to forage on mudflats and use their bills to probe the substrate for mollusks, invertebrates, and seeds. Ideal foraging habitat for this species is limited within the state; Oklahoma is not a critical breeding or staging area for the species. Fewer than five birds are reported in Oklahoma annually. Of those, 85 percent have been reported during fall migration. Inexperienced or malnourished birds likely comprise the majority of sightings, however inclement weather events can also ground long-distance migrants like these birds for periods of time. (Source: USFWS)

Evaluation: It is the opinion of Hydrex Environmental that there will be "no effect" to the red knot or its habitat by this project. The following reasons for a "no effect" determination are listed below:

- The project area did not contain medflats or coastlines.
- Oklahoma is not a critical breeding or staging area for the species.
- No specimens were observed during the investigation.

Whooping Crane (Grus americana): ENDANGERED

Habitat: Whooping cranes most commonly migrate through the western half of the state, typically east of Guymon, OK and west of Interstate 35. Although rare, cranes have been known to land on sites in central Oklahoma, including reservoirs in the Oklahoma City metropolitan area. While moving through Oklahoma, whooping cranes typically use shallow wetlands, marshes, the margins of ponds and lakes, sandbars, shorelines of shallow rivers, wet prairies and crop fields near water. The Salt Plains National Wildlife Refuge, near Jet, OK is a very important migration stopover area and has been designated as critical habitat for the species. (Source: USFWS)

Evaluation: It is the opinion of **Hydrex Environmental** that there will be "no effect" to the Whooping Crane or its habitat by this project. The following reasons for a "no effect" determination are listed below:

- The project site is not located near the Salt Plains National Wildlife Refuge.
- The project site does not contain any lakes, marshes, sandbars, rivers, wet prairies or crop fields near water.
- No specimens were observed during the investigation.

Sources

(USWFS - OESFO) - United States Fish & Wildlife Service - Oklahoma Ecological Services Field Office, Species Fact Sheets https://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/Oklahoma/Species_Fact_Sheets.htm

(USFWS) - United States Fish & Wildlife Service, <u>Environmental Conservation Online</u> System, <u>http://ecos.fws.gov/ecos/indexPublic.do</u>

United States Fish and Wildlife Service Threatened and Endangered Species for Oklahoma County, Oklahoma

Group	Common Name	Scientific Name	Population	Status	
			[Atlantic Coast and Northern Great		
Birds	Piping Plover	Charadrius melodus	Plains populations] - Wherever found,	Threatened	
			except those areas where listed as		
			endangered.		
Birds	Red knot	Calidris canutus rufa	Wherever found	Threatened	
			Wherever found, except where listed as		
Birds	Whooping crane	Grus americana	an experimental population	Endangered	
			Arkansas River Basin (AR, KS, NM, OK,		
Fishes	Arkansas River shiner	Notropis girardi	TX)	Threatened	
Daniel Morgan

From:	Fagin, Todd D. <tfagin@ou.edu></tfagin@ou.edu>
Sent:	Thursday, March 05, 2020 11:35 AM
То:	Daniel Morgan
Subject:	RE: Northeast Landfill Threatened and Endangered Species Statement
Attachments:	2020-133-BUS-HYD.pdf

The results are attached.

Thank you,

Todd Fagin

Oklahoma Natural Heritage Inventory/ Oklahoma Biological Survey

From: Daniel Morgan [mailto:dmorgan@hydrex-inc.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 11:16 AM
To: Fagin, Todd D.
Subject: Northeast Landfill Threatened and Endangered Species Statement

Todd,

This is Daniel Morgan with Hydrex Environmental. I have attached a zipped shapefile displaying the location of the Northeast Landfill and the proposed northern expansion. As part of complying with ODEQ regulations, we are requesting a statement from the Oklahoma Biological Survey regarding threatened and endangered species for the project area. Please let me know if I can provide any more information or documents.

Thank you,

Daniel Morgan

Environmental Scientist Hydrex Environmental 1120 NW Stallings Dr. Nacogdoches, TX 75964 Office: 936-568-9451 Cell: 936-553-8598

OBS Ref. 2020-133-BUS-HYD

Dear Mr. Morgan,

We have reviewed occurrence information on federal and state threatened, endangered or candidate species, as well as non-regulatory rare species and ecological systems of importance currently in the Oklahoma Natural Heritage Inventory database for the following location you provided:

Sec. 22-T12N-R2W, Oklahoma County

We found 1 occurrence(s) of relevant species within the vicinity of the project location as described.

Species Name	Common Name	Federal Status
Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Bald Eagle	Protected
County	TRS	Count
Oklahome	Sec. 2-T12N-R2W	1

Additionally, absence from our database does not preclude such species from occurring in the area.

If you have any questions about this response, please send me an email, or call us at the number given below.

Although not specific to your project, you may find the following links helpful.

ONHI, guide to ranking codes for endangered and threatened species: http://vmpincel.ou.edu/heritage/ranking_guide.html

Information regarding the Oklahoma Natural Areas Registry: http://www.oknaturalheritage.ou.edu/registry_faq.htm

Todd Fagin Oklahoma Natural Heritage Inventory (405) 325-4700 <u>tfagin@ou.edu</u>

Daniel Morgan

From:	Fullerton, Matthew <matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov></matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov>
Sent:	Thursday, April 23, 2020 4:10 PM
То:	Daniel Morgan
Subject:	Re: Northeast Landfill - Threatened and Endangered Species Statement

Hi Daniel,

Apologies for my lateness in getting back to you. I would blame it on COVID, but that really hasn't changed my day-to-day workload!

We don't have any concerns over this location and the site is outside of the range of any state-listed threatened or endangered species.

Please let me know if you need anything else from us.

Thanks,

Matt Fullerton Wildlife Biologist - Threatened & Endangered Species Wildlife Diversity Program Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation Cell: 580-571-5820 Email: <u>matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov</u>

On Mon, Apr 13, 2020 at 3:34 PM Daniel Morgan <<u>dmorgan@hydrex-inc.com</u>> wrote:

Good afternoon Matt,

Just following up on this letter. Given the craziness of the last few weeks and focusing on other parts of this project, I had let the T&E statements sit on the backburner, so I wanted to see if I needed to provide any more info on this.

Thanks again for your help,

Daniel Morgan

Environmental Scientist

Hydrex Environmental

1120 NW Stallings Dr.

Nacogdoches, TX 75964

Office: 936-568-9451

Cell: 936-553-8598

From: Fullerton, Matthew [mailto:matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2020 9:08 AM
To: Daniel Morgan dmorgan@hydrex-inc.com
Subject: Re: Northeast Landfill - Threatened and Endangered Species Statement

Hi Daniel,

Apologies for the delayed response. Your email was somehow sent to my spam filter and I just now found it.

I should be able to complete this for you by the end of the day. Thank you for your patience!

Regards,

Matt Fullerton

Wildlife Biologist - Threatened & Endangered Species

Wildlife Diversity Program

Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation

Cell: 580-571-5820

Email: matthew.fullerton@odwc.ok.gov

On Thu, Mar 5, 2020 at 5:10 PM Daniel Morgan <<u>dmorgan@hydrex-inc.com</u>> wrote:

Good Afternoon Matt,

This is Daniel Morgan with Hydrex Environmental, we spoke earlier regarding a threatened and endangered species statement for a project in Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma. I have attached a zipped shapefile of the project area, as well as a vicinity map showing the project area. The project area encompasses 163.3 acres, which includes an existing 90.3-acre landfill property and an approximate 73-acre expansion area to the north of the existing landfill. The existing landfill is currently operating as a construction and demolition (C&D) landfill, while the proposed expansion area is partially utilized for soil stockpile and borrow.

As part of complying with ODEQ regulations, I am requesting a statement regarding the existence of federal and state listed species within the vicinity of the permit area. Please let me know if I can provide any more information, I appreciate your help.

Thanks,

Daniel Morgan

Environmental Scientist

Hydrex Environmental

1120 NW Stallings Dr.

Nacogdoches, TX 75964

Office: 936-568-9451

Cell: 936-553-8598

ATTACHMENT E

CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY

Cultural Resources Survey of the 163.3-Acre Northeast C&D Landfill Project Oklahoma County, Oklahoma



Authored by: Danny Welch Jenny Simpson Emma Richburg

Stone Point Services, LLC 11827 County Road 41 Tyler, TX 75706

Submitted to: Hydrex Environmental, Inc. 1120 NW Stallings Dr. Nacogdoches, TX 75964

Stone Point Services, SPS19C1201

USACE Project Number: SWT-2020-344

Danny Welch Principal Investigator

May 5, 2021

Cultural Resources Survey of the 163.3-Acre Northeast C&D Landfill Project Oklahoma County, Oklahoma

Submitted by Todd McMakin, Owner/Senior Archaeologist Stone Point Services, LLC 11827 County Road 41 Tyler, TX 75706 903-881-3103

Submitted to:

Hydrex Environmental, Inc. 1120 NW Stallings Dr. Nacogdoches, TX 75964

Survey Dates: March 16 – March 25, 2021 Total Area Surveyed: 163.3-acres (66.09-hectares) Map: USGS Spencer, Midwest City 7.5' quadrangles

Stone Point Services, SPS19C1201

USACE Project Number: SWT-2020-344

May 5, 2021

Abstract

In March of 2021 Stone Point Services, LLC conducted a cultural resource survey of the proposed 163.3-acre Northeast C&D Landfill Project in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma for Hydrex Environmental, Inc. The total area included in this archaeological survey consists of 163.3-acres (66-hectares), including an area designated as the North Area (73.2-acres/30-hectares) and an area designated as the South Area/existing landfill (90.1-acres/36.46-hectares). Survey methods included pedestrian archaeological survey and shovel testing at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals along the higher potential areas adjacent to the unnamed tributary of Crutcho Creek, 30-meter (100-foot) intervals across adjacent areas with intact soils, and pedestrian survey with selective shovel testing within areas of significant soil disturbances. Survey included surface investigations with limited shovel testing in the South Area, and surface investigations with intensive systematic shovel testing in the North Area. In total, 27 shovel tests were excavated within the heavily disturbed soils of the existing landfill in the South Area, representing approximately 0.3 shovel tests per acre (0.74 shovel tests per hectare). A total of 181 shovel tests were excavated in the North area, representing approximately 2.47 shovel tests per acre (6 shovel tests per hectare). Survey methods meet or exceed the minimum survey standards of the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey (OAS), the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office (OSHPO) and the and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Corps Regulatory Office (SWT) as outlined in the Guidelines for Cultural Resources Investigations (Sept 2019). This cultural resources survey was conducted as part of USACE Project Number: SWT-2020-344. No shovel tests were positive for archaeological materials.

Background research was conducted on February 13, 2020, which indicated no National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed, eligible, or potentially eligible archeological sites within one mile of the survey area.

The archaeological survey encountered one historic storm shelter (Field ID # 1201-HS1), which does not qualify for OAS trinomial allocation. Shovel tests were systematically placed surrounding this feature and encountered no associated subsurface artifacts. As this storm shelter does not fit the criteria for consideration as a historic site, we recommend this structure as ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP. We therefore find that this project will not impact NRHP listed, eligible, or potentially eligible structures or sites. All records produced as a result of this project will be prepared to Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office standards and submitted to the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey at the University of Oklahoma for curation.

Executive Summary

Stone Point Services, LLC completed a cultural resource survey of the proposed Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Project Area located in Spencer, Oklahoma for Hydrex Environmental. The project area includes the "North Area," which covers an approximately 73.2-acre (30-hectare) area and the "South Area" of the existing landfill, which consists of 90.1-acres (36.36-hectares). The total area surveyed for this project is approximately 163.3-acres (66-hectares). As the North Area, which contains a tributary of Crutcho Creek, may be used in the future for borrow material, landfill construction, and other landfill activities, it is anticipated disturbance in this area may be extensive. As a Federal nexus has been identified for this project, oversight by the U.S. Corps of Engineers is required and likewise the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) will apply. The purpose of this cultural resources survey is to identify cultural resources (archaeological and historic) that may be impacted by the proposed borrowing, landfill construction and other associated landfill activities. This cultural resources survey was conducted as part of USACE Project Number: SWT-2020-344.

Background research was conducted on February 13, 2020, during which no previously recorded cultural resources were identified in the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for direct effects. Field investigations were conducted from March 16 through March 25, 2021, led by Danny Welch, Ph.D. of Stone Point Services. Survey methods included pedestrian archaeological survey and shovel testing at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals along the unnamed tributary of Crutcho Creek, 30meter (100-foot) intervals across adjacent areas with intact soils, and pedestrian survey with selective shovel testing within areas of significant soil disturbances. Survey included surface investigations with limited shovel testing in the South Area, and surface investigations with intensive systematic shovel testing in the North Area. In total, 27 shovel tests were excavated within the heavily disturbed soils of the existing landfill in the South Area, representing approximately 0.3 shovel tests per acre (0.74 shovel tests per hectare). A total of 181 shovel tests were excavated in the North area, representing approximately 2.47 shovel tests per acre (6 shovel tests per hectare). Surface inspection at 10-meter (32-foot) transect intervals was employed in areas of heavy disturbance deemed not to contain in situ soils. A total of 208 shovel tests were completed as part of this cultural resources survey. No shovel tests returned positive results for subsurface artifacts.

Background research indicated no listed, eligible, or potentially eligible sites for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within one mile of the survey area. Background research of historic aerial imagery indicated the presence of historic structures in the South Area and these areas were subjected to near-surface intensive survey. Archaeological survey encountered one historic storm shelter structure in one location identified in aerial imagery (Field ID # 1201-HS1). After coordination with the OAS, due to the lack of associated artifacts and disturbed integrity, this site was not given an Oklahoma site trinomial. Shovel tests were systematically placed surrounding this feature and encountered no associated subsurface artifacts. As this storm shelter



does not fit the criteria for consideration as a historic site, we recommend this structure as ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP. We therefore find that this project will not impact NRHP listed, eligible, or potentially eligible structures or sites. All records produced as a result of this project will be prepared to OAS, OSHPO and USACE standards and submitted to the OAS at the University of Oklahoma for curation. Survey methods meet or exceed the minimum survey standards of the SWT Corps Regulatory Office outlined in the Guidelines for Cultural Resources Investigations (Sept 2019).

The survey included an assessment of direct effects. We find that this project will not impact NRHP listed, eligible, or potentially eligible structures or sites. All records produced as a result of this project will be prepared to Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office standards and submitted to the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey at the University of Oklahoma for curation.

Inadvertent Discovery Protocol

In the event of an inadvertent discovery of human remains and/or archeological cultural deposits, all project activity near the location will cease immediately until proper notification of consulting parties has occurred and mitigative measures have been determined and implemented.



Northeast C&D Landfill Survey Project Summary			
Client: Hydrex Environmental, I	nc.		
Device 4 Level from		T	
Project Location:		Townsnip: 12N	
Spancer OK 73084		Kange: 2w	
County: Oklahoma		Meridian: Indian	
Proposed Tract:	Area Surveyed:	Withium: Indian	Date(s) of Background
73.2- acres (30-hectares)	163.3- acres (66-h	nectares)	Research:
``````````````````````````````````````	North area: 73.2	-acres (30-hectares)	February 13, 2020
	South area: 90.1-	-acres (36.36 hectares)	•
Field methods:	Field Director:		Date(s) of Field Visit:
North Area: 181 shovel tests	Danny Welch		March 16 – March 25, 2021
= 2.47  ST/ac (6  ST/ha)			
	Crew Chief:		
South Area 27 shovel tests	Nicholas Smith		
=0.3  S1/ac (0.74  S1/na)	Field Crow		
10 meter (32 foot) pedestrian	Jenny M. Simpson	n	
surface inspection transects in	Emma Richburg	11	
areas of significant disturbance	Blair Armstrong		
or 20% slope	2 mil 1 million ong		
Staggered 15-meter (50-foot)			
and 30-meter (100-foot) shovel			
testing intervals with 30-meter			
transect spacing.			
Discont Effects Determined	December 1.4		Durch of Defenses of
Direct Effects Determination:	This project is rec	ns: commanded to proceed	SDS #: SDS10C1201
NRHP.	with no additional	l consideration of	SFS#. SFS19C1201
	cultural resources		USACE Project Number [.]
Storm Shelter 1201-HS1			SWT-2020-344



## Acknowledgements

Stone Point Services would like to thank Hydrex Environmental, Inc. for providing us with necessary data to complete this survey. Danny Welch served as Principal Investigator and Field Director. Nicholas Smith served as Crew Chief. Danny Welch, Jenny M. Simpson, Emma Richburg, Nicholas Smith, and Blair Armstrong completed all fieldwork. Sally Victor served as Architectural Historian. Appreciation is also extended to Katherine McMakin, Jill Jodie and Danny Lewis, GIS Specialists for Stone Point Services.



## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction       1         Previous Investigations       23         Chapter 3: Project Methodology       25         Background Research       25         Land Use History       25         Historic Records and Deed History       27         Field Methods       42         Laboratory Methods       42         Laboratory Methods       44         NRHP Eligibility Assessments       45         Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations       47         Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances       47         Near-Surface Intensive Survey       59         1201-HS1       72         Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations       80         References Cited       81         Appendix A: Shovel Test Log       85         Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form       100		
Previous Investigations23Chapter 3: Project Methodology25Background Research25Land Use History25Historic Records and Deed History27Field Methods42Laboratory Methods44NRHP Eligibility Assessments45Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations47Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances47Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 3: Project Methodology25Background Research25Land Use History25Historic Records and Deed History27Field Methods42Laboratory Methods44NRHP Eligibility Assessments45Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations47Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances47Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Previous Investigations	
Background Research25Land Use History25Historic Records and Deed History27Field Methods42Laboratory Methods44NRHP Eligibility Assessments45Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations47Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances47Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Chapter 3: Project Methodology	
Land Use History25Historic Records and Deed History27Field Methods42Laboratory Methods44NRHP Eligibility Assessments45Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations47Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances47Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Background Research	
Historic Records and Deed History27Field Methods42Laboratory Methods44NRHP Eligibility Assessments45Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations47Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances47Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Land Use History	
Field Methods42Laboratory Methods44NRHP Eligibility Assessments45Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations47Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances47Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Historic Records and Deed History	
Laboratory Methods44NRHP Eligibility Assessments45Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations47Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances47Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Field Methods	
NRHP Eligibility Assessments       45         Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations       47         Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances       47         Near-Surface Intensive Survey       59         1201-HS1       72         Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations       80         References Cited       81         Appendix A: Shovel Test Log       85         Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form       100	Laboratory Methods	
Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations       47         Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances       47         Near-Surface Intensive Survey       59         1201-HS1       72         Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations       80         References Cited       81         Appendix A: Shovel Test Log       85         Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form       100	NRHP Eligibility Assessments	
Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances.47Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations	
Near-Surface Intensive Survey591201-HS172Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations80References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances	
1201-HS1       72         Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations       80         References Cited       81         Appendix A: Shovel Test Log       85         Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form       100	Near-Surface Intensive Survey	59
Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations	1201-HS1	
References Cited81Appendix A: Shovel Test Log85Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form100	Summary of Findings and Management Recommendations	
Appendix A: Shovel Test Log	References Cited	
Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form	Appendix A: Shovel Test Log	
11	Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form	100



# List of Figures

Figure 1: General location overview map	3
Figure 2: USGS Spencer, Midwest City 7.5-min quad map showing the project area	4
Figure 3: Aerial map showing the project area	5
Figure 4: Project map showing general areas for surface survey and systematic shovel testing	6
Figure 5: View west along unnamed tributary of Crutcho Creek	8
Figure 6: Typical density of vegetation within stream zone of North Area	8
Figure 7: View north toward old quarry in North Area	9
Figure 8: View south of level terrain and mulch pile in South Area	9
Figure 9: View north in North Area of parking lot and dumpsters	10
Figure 10: View southwest from North Area dumpsters toward South Area landfill	10
Figure 11: Exposed profile of Harrah soil series in residuum formed from Garber sandstone	12
Figure 12: Shovel test profile within Teller fine sandy loam soil series in the South Area	13
Figure 13: Shovel test profile with disturbed Teller fine sandy loam in North Area	13
Figure 14: Shovel test profile to 85-cmbs within the Harrah fine sandy loam soil unit	14
Figure 15: Shovel test profile within disturbed Vanoss silt loam in North Area	14
Figure 16: Underlying geologic unit within the survey area	18
Figure 17: Soil types within the survey area	19
Figure 18: Historic 1954 aerial imagery map showing the project area	29
Figure 19: Historic 1969 aerial imagery map showing the project area	30
Figure 20: Historic 1975 aerial imagery map showing the project area	31
Figure 21: 1984 Historic aerial imagery map showing the project area	32
Figure 22: 1995 Historic aerial imagery map showing the project area	33
Figure 23: 2008 Historic aerial imagery map showing the project area	34
Figure 24: 2017 Historic aerial imagery map showing the project area	35
Figure 25: 1956 USGS Spencer, Midwest City topographic map showing the project area	36
Figure 26: 1986 USGS Spencer, Midwest City topographic map showing the project area	37
Figure 27: 2018 USGS Spencer, Midwest City, Jones, Choctaw topographic map showing	the
project area	38
Figure 28: 1873 General Land Office map showing the project area	39
Figure 29: 1889 GLO Crutcho Township map	40
Figure 30: 1907 GLO Crutcho Township map with the Subject Property in Section 22	41
Figure 31: overview map of obstructions and disturbances with photo locations marked	49
Figure 32: Photo location 1, view north from storm shelter to pond, mulch pile, and landfill	50
Figure 33: Photo location 2, view north along mulch pile, bar ditch and fenceline	50
Figure 34: Photo location 3, view SW toward redeposited sand, equipment, and mulch pile	51
Figure 35: Photo location 4, view south of disturbed soil and dumpster area 3	51
Figure 36: Photo location 5, view north of disturbed soil and dumpster area 2	52
Figure 37: Photo location 6, view NW of excavated pond	52



Figure 38: Photo location 7, view SE of clay pit and active landfill (right)	53
Figure 39: Photo location 8, view west of quarry edge and refuse dump	53
Figure 40: Photo location 9, view west of stream near quarry edge	54
Figure 41: Photo location 10, view NW of marshy areas in quarry basin	54
Figure 42: Photo location 11, view north indicating depth of cut on east side of quarry	55
Figure 43: Photo location 12, view west of northern boundary and quarry cross section	55
Figure 44: Photo location 13, view south of breached quarry dam and NW stream section	56
Figure 45: Photo location 14, view south towards NW shovel test area and sand stockpile	56
Figure 46: Photo location 15, view west of pipelines, sediment cuts, mulch, and stockpile	area 57
Figure 47: Photo location 16, view north of exposed mulch (left) and buried mulch (right)	) 57
Figure 48: Photo location 17, view north of pipeline ROW and stockpile area	58
Figure 49: Photo location 18, view west of pipeline ROW south of clay pit	58
Figure 50: Aerial project overview map indicating disturbance areas and shovel tests	60
Figure 51: USGS Spencer/Midwest City 7.5 min topo quad project overview map	61
Figure 52: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 1 of	f 5) 62
Figure 53: Topographic quad project map (topo map 1 of 5)	63
Figure 54: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 2 of	f 5) 64
Figure 55: Topographic quad project map (topo map 2 of 5)	65
Figure 56: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 3 of	f 5) 66
Figure 57: Topographic quad project map (topo map 3 of 5)	67
Figure 58: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 4 of	f 5) 68
Figure 59: Topographic quad project map (topo map 4 of 5)	69
Figure 60: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 5 of	f 5)70
Figure 61: Topographic quad project map (topo map 5 of 5)	
Figure 62: USGS Spencer, Midwest City 7.5 min quad with location of site 1201-HS1	
Figure 63: Site sketch map of 1201-HS1	
Figure 64: View south toward the storm shelter and cinder block addition	77
Figure 65: View west toward the storm shelter opening	
Figure 66: view west into the spiral stairway	
Figure 67: View northeast of the concrete pad with metal fasteners	
Figure 68: Closeup of concrete texture (scale = 1cm)	
Figure 69: Representative soil profile from shovel test HS1-ST8 at site 1201-HS1	



### List of Tables

Table 1: Project area soil series and soil horizon data	. 12
Table 2: Archaeological Periods in Southern Oklahoma	. 20
Table 3: Archaeological sites within the one-mile review area	. 23
Table 4: Archaeological surveys within the one-mile review area	. 24
Table 5: Shovel test data from 1201-HS1	. 73



# Chapter 1: Introduction

Stone Point Services, LLC completed a cultural resource survey of the proposed Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Project Area located in Spencer, Oklahoma for Hydrex Environmental. The project area includes the "North Area," which covers an approximately 73.2-acre (30-hectare) area and the "South Area" of the existing landfill, which consists of 90.1-acres (36.36-hectares). The total area surveyed for this project is approximately 163.3-acres (66-hectares). As the North Area, which contains a tributary of Crutcho Creek, may be used in the future for borrow material, landfill construction, and other landfill activities, it is anticipated disturbance in this area may be extensive. As a Federal nexus has been identified for this project, oversight by the U.S. Corps of Engineers is required and likewise the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) will apply. The purpose of this cultural resources survey is to identify cultural resources (archaeological and historic) that may be impacted by the proposed borrowing, landfill construction and other associated landfill activities. This cultural resources survey was conducted as part of USACE Project Number: SWT-2020-344.

The proposed project includes two main survey blocks, the North Area and the South Area consisting of the existing landfill (Figure 4). The existing landfill (South Area) is significantly disturbed with little in situ soils. The North Area also includes soil disturbance areas and will be used for future borrowing, landfill construction, and other associated landfill activity (Figure 4). The total proposed project area is approximately 163.3-acres (66-hectares). The maximum depth of proposed ground disturbance for the eastern portion of the North Area is 4.5 to 6-meters (15 to 20-feet). The maximum depth of ground disturbance on the western portion of The North Area will be 9 to 12-meters (30 to 40-feet).

Background research was conducted on February 13, 2020. Background research indicated no listed, eligible, or potentially eligible sites for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within one mile of the survey area. Background research of historic aerial imagery indicated the presence of historic structures in the South Area and these areas were subjected to near-surface intensive survey.

Survey methods conducted at the proposed tract meet or exceed methods recommended by the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey (OAS) and the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the US Army Corps of Engineers SWT Corps Regulatory Office. Field investigations were conducted from March 16th through March 25th, 2021 led by Danny Welch, Ph.D. of Stone Point Services. Survey methods included surface investigations with limited shovel testing in the South Area, and surface investigations with intensive systematic shovel testing in the North Area. In total, 27 shovel tests were excavated within the heavily disturbed soils of the existing landfill in the South Area, representing approximately 0.3 shovel tests per acre (0.74 shovel tests per hectare). A total of 181 shovel tests were excavated in the North area, representing approximately 2.47 shovel tests per acre (6 shovel tests per hectare). Surface inspection at 10-meter transect intervals

tone Point Services

was employed in areas of heavy disturbance deemed not to contain in situ soils. A total of 208 shovel tests were completed as part of this cultural resources survey. No shovel tests returned positive results for subsurface artifacts.

Archaeological survey encountered one historic storm shelter structure in one location identified in aerial imagery (Field ID # 1201-HS1). After coordination with the OAS, due to the lack of associated artifacts and disturbed integrity, this site was not given an Oklahoma site trinomial. Shovel tests were systematically placed surrounding this feature and encountered no associated subsurface artifacts. As this storm shelter does not fit the criteria for consideration as a historic site, we recommend this structure as ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP. We therefore find that this project will not impact NRHP listed, eligible, or potentially eligible structures or sites. All records produced as a result of this project will be prepared to OAS, OSHPO and United States USACE standards and submitted to the OAS at the University of Oklahoma for curation. Survey methods meet or exceed the minimum survey standards of the SWT Corps Regulatory Office outlined in the Guidelines for Cultural Resources Investigations (Sept 2019).

The survey included an assessment of direct effects. We find that this project will not impact NRHP listed, eligible, or potentially eligible structures or sites. All records produced as a result of this project will be prepared to Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office standards and submitted to the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey at the University of Oklahoma for curation.





Figure 1: General location overview map





Figure 2: USGS Spencer, Midwest City 7.5-min quad map showing the project area





Figure 3: Aerial map showing the project area





Figure 4: Project map showing general areas for surface survey and systematic shovel testing



# Chapter 2: Natural and Cultural Setting

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The survey area is located in Oklahoma County, within the town of Spencer, OK. Oklahoma County lies within the Central Great Plains ecological region (Oklahoma Forestry Service 2021). This area consists of scattered low trees and shrubs with the majority of vegetation being crops. The present survey lies partially within an existing landfill to the south, and includes hilly areas, level fields and a narrow steam within the norther survey area (Figures 5-10).

#### Flora and Fauna

Animals that historically may have been used for food, shelter, and clothing (or perhaps for tools) in Oklahoma County include: white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), pronghorn (*Antilocapra americana*), bison (*Bison bison*), elk (*Cervus canadensis*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), beaver (*Castor canadensis*), rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*), opossum (*Didelphis marsupialis*), shrew (*Cryptotis parva*), moles (*Scalopus aquaticus*), armadillo (*Dasypodidae novemcinctus*), and rodents (Oklahoma Historical Society 2021b).

The Central Great Plains region consists of low trees and shrubs with the majority of the vegetation being crops. The main crops include small grains, grain sorghum, alfalfa, and soybeans. Trees noted in this region include blackjack oak (*Q. marilandica*), post oak (*Q. stellate*), and hickory (*Carya tomentosa; Carya cordiformis*). Common prairie grasses include little bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*), side-oats grama (*Bouteloua curtipendula*), blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*), Indiangrass (*Sorghastrum nutans*), big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*), and switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum*) (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2021; Oklahoma State University Extension Services 2021).

The climate of this part of Oklahoma is characterized by generally cool winters (34° F) and hot summers (82° F). Precipitation averages 34 inches (86-cm) per year (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2021; Oklahoma Climatological Survey 1997). This portion of Oklahoma experiences roughly between 210-217 frost free days a year (Oklahoma Climatological Survey 1997).





Figure 5: View west along unnamed tributary of Crutcho Creek



Figure 6: Typical density of vegetation within stream zone of North Area





Figure 7: View north toward old quarry in North Area



Figure 8: View south of level terrain and mulch pile in South Area





Figure 9: View north in North Area of parking lot and dumpsters



Figure 10: View southwest from North Area dumpsters toward South Area landfill

Stone Point Services

#### **Geology and Soils**

The survey area is located in Oklahoma County, within the town of Spencer, OK within the Central Great Plains physiographic region of the Gulf Coastal Plains. This region is characterized by low rolling terrain underlain by siltstone, sandstone, and mudstone. The underlying geologic formations in the project consist of alluvium (Map Unit: Oal) and Garber sandstone (Map Unit: Pg) (Bureau of Economic Geology 2021). Much of the alluvial deposits consist of paleoterraces of Pleistocene age, with portions of alluvium dating within the Holocene. the Garber Sandstone unit (Pg), formed during the Permian Period. Weathered alluvial terraces in the survey area consist of deposits of gravel, sand, silt, and clay that ranges from light tan to gray in color. Thickness along streams ranges between 12 to 30-meters (40 to 100-feet) thick. Garber Sandstone is a mostly orange-brown fine-grained sandstone, irregularly bedded with red-brown shale, chert, and mudstone. Ancient alluvial terrace sediments and the Garber sandstone formation have weathered to produce soil profiles imprinted on residuum (Figure 11). Consolidated sandstone yielding to weathered sandy residuum is observable in cutbanks and mechanically-excavated portions across the survey area, as are ancient river terrace deposits with gravel and clay. Alluvium and sandstone appear to be intermingled in the survey area such that there is no well-defined lateral distinction between geologic units.

The US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) *Soil Survey of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma* (NRCS 2021) was used in determining soils within the project area (Table 1; Figures 15-23). Soils within the project area include the following map units:

Urban Land (Map Unit: URB)

Teller fine sandy loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes (Map Unit: TlrD) Teller fine sandy loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes (Map Unit: TlrC) Teller fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes (Map Unit: TlrB) Harrah fine sandy loam, 3 to 45 percent slopes (Map Unit: HarG) Vanoss silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes (Map Unit: VanB) Vanoss silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes (Map Unit: VanA)

The Teller series consists of very deep, well drained, moderately permeable soils that formed in loamy sediments of Pleistocene age. These soils are found on treads and risers of stream terraces with slopes ranging from 0 to 8 percent. Harrah soils are characterized by very deep soils atop sandstone that formed from sandy and loamy colluvium weathered from sandstone of Permian age. They can be found on backslopes and foot slopes of low hills with slopes that range from 3 to 45 percent. The Vanoss series contain very deep, well drained soils formed in loamy alluvium of Pleistocene age. Vanoss soils can be found on treads of stream terraces with slopes from 0 to 8 percent. Soils within the survey area typically exhibit the following horizonation (Table 1; Figures 11-15). Alluvial deposits are generally located within the east of the Subject Property, while Permian-aged sandstone is present within the western portion of the Subject Property (Figures 17-18). The underlying geology is the primary reason for the variation in soil types encountered during survey.



Soil type	Horizon	Depth	Color	Texture
Teller	Ар	0-15 cm	brown (10YR 5/3)	Fine sandy loam
	А	15-38 cm	brown (10YR 4/3)	Fine sandy loam
	BA	38-51 cm	brown (7.5YR 4/4)	Fine sandy loam
	Bt1	51-81 cm	yellowish red (5YR 5/6)	Sandy clay loam
	Bt2	81-107 cm	yellowish red (5YR 5/6)	Sandy clay loam
	Bt3	107-152 cm	yellowish red (5YR 5/6)	Fine sandy loam
	С	152-203 cm	yellowish red (5YR 5/6)	Fine sandy loam
Harrah	Ар	0 to 23 cm	brown (7.5YR 5/2)	Fine sandy loam
	Е	23-48 cm	light brown (7.5YR 6/4)	Loamy fine sand
	Bt1	48-86 cm	red (2.5YR 5/6)	Sandy clay loam
	Bt2	86-132 cm	red (2.5YR 5/8)	Sandy clay loam
	Bt3b	132-193 cm	red (2.5YR 4/6)	Sandy clay loam
	Bt4b	193-218 cm	red (2.5YR 4/6)	Sandy clay loam
Vanoss	Ар	0 -18 cm	grayish brown (10YR 5/2)	Loam
	В	18-28 cm	grayish brown (10YR 5/2)	Loam
	BA	28-38 cm	brown (10YR 5/3)	Loam
	Bt1	38-69 cm	dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4)	Clay loam
	Bt2	69-94 cm	yellowish brown (10YR 5/4)	Clay loam
	Bt3	94-127 cm	yellowish brown (10YR 5/4)	Clay loam
	С	127-241 cm	pale brown (10YR 6/3)	Loam

Table 1: Project area soil series and soil horizon data



Figure 11: Exposed profile of Harrah soil series in residuum formed from Garber sandstone

tone Point Services



Figure 12: Shovel test profile within Teller fine sandy loam soil series in the South Area



Figure 13: Shovel test profile with disturbed Teller fine sandy loam in North Area

Stone Point Services



Figure 14: Shovel test profile to 85-cmbs within the Harrah fine sandy loam soil unit



Figure 15: Shovel test profile within disturbed Vanoss silt loam in North Area



#### **Understanding Soil Horizons**

The purpose of discussing soils within the context of an archaeological survey is to identify the types of deposition and subsequent soil transformations that have occurred on a site. Understanding the depositional environment provides a better understanding of how deep below the surface any archaeological materials may be anticipated and possible post-depositional processes that may affect archaeological interpretations. The following descriptions are noted from shallowest to deepest. These designations are intended to help the reader understand the master soil horizons and subordinate horizon designations noted in the above table. A brief description of master horizon types is provided below:

*O horizon*: This is generally a shallow litter or organic layer of soils on the ground surface, very recent in age.

*A horizon*: This is typically the layer exposed to the ground surface if no O horizon is present. As this horizon is the location of past and present human activity, archaeological artifacts are often present within this horizon.

*E horizon*: The E horizon consists of an intermediate horizon between the A horizon and the B (subsoil) horizon. The E horizon is a leached portion of a soil profile where silicate clays or minerals have been removed via soil forming processes and redeposited, typically within an underlying clay rich horizon.

**B** horizon: These are subsoil genetic horizons, meaning these horizons form in place through weathering processes. These portions of the soil column are often formed through illuviation (such as the vertical translocation of silicate clays by water).

*C horizon*: This is horizon describes unaltered parent material

*R horizon*: This is the bedrock layer.

Subordinate distinctions and numeric identifiers after a master horizon designation indicates that a master horizon has undergone specific soil forming processes and, in certain cases, exhibits vertical variation between related genetic horizons. As an example, a Btg1 horizon indicates a subsurface horizon where clays have been translocated from upper eluvial horizons and iron has been reduced or removed during soil formation, or that saturation with stagnant water has preserved a reduced state (gleying). This would be the first of at least two vertically subdivided horizons that exhibit general morphological attributes of silicate clay accumulation and gleying; yet are differentiated by depth on the basis of specific physical or chemical differences.

It must be noted that although archaeologists are experienced in determining soils types, we are not soil scientists, nor are we all geomorphologists. A field description of a soil type may vary/differ from the soils designated by the NRCS for a specific area. The degree of sunlight, soil moisture, and personal observations can lead to variation during soil profile descriptions. Additionally, topography, erosion, deposition, and/or artificial impacts may lead to differences in soil horizon thickness between NRCS data collected in advance of an archaeological survey and

one Point Services

actual project area soil thicknesses observed during fieldwork. For an expanded description of soil forming factors, processes, and interpretive strategies, see Schoeneberger and colleagues (2012) and Goldberg and Macphail (2006).

#### **Project Soil Discussion**

Shovel testing and surface observations within the survey area noted soils generally consistent with the above soils during shovel testing (Figures 11-15; Table 1). As noted above, the soils contained within the APE are variable, however, they were dominated by the Teller fine sandy loam series, the Vanoss silt loam series and the Harrah fine sandy loam series. Soil profiles associated with the Teller soil series were typically moderately deep and contained fine sandy loam with lenses of alluvial gravels and weathered laminated parent material where exposed in cross section near excavated borrow pits. Topsoil horizons within the Teller series generally consisted of reddish brown and dark grayish brown fine sandy loam. Topsoil horizons generally measured no thicker than 20-centimeters (8-inches). Teller series subsoil horizons generally exhibited yellowish red sandy clay. The subsoil horizon was noted during shovel testing by the shift in color towards a more vibrant red soil color and an obvious change in texture from soft fine sandy loam to moderately hard sandy clay.

Soil profiles associated with the Vanoss silt loam soil series were typically disturbed across the survey area due to their position within active parking areas and roads, however, less-disturbed soils of the Vanoss series were observed to the south of the unnamed tributary within the former agricultural field. Topsoil horizons within the Vanoss series generally consisted of brown and reddish-brown loam and clay loam. Topsoil horizons generally measured no thicker than 35-centimeters (14-inches) atop a reddish brown and red clay loam subsoil horizon. The subsoil horizon was noted during shovel testing by the shift in color towards a lighter reddish brown to weak red soil color and an obvious change in texture with an increase in clay content from soft loam to moderately hard clay loam.

The Harrah fine sandy loam soil series was present within the central portion of the North Area, specifically within the stream zone. This soil series differs from the surrounding Teller and Vanoss series in that it formed in sandy and loamy colluvium weathered from Garber Formation sandstone of Permian age. Exposed soil cuts illustrate weathered residuum imprinted with a topsoil horizon overlying a weak leeched zone (E horizon), atop a clay-rich subsoil horizon (Bt). Soil mixing by heavy root activity obscured the A and E horizon boundary across much of the stream bank shovel tests. Due to the potential for alluvial veneers (flood deposits) atop the Harrah series along the stream banks, shovel tests penetrated to a depth of 80-cm (31-inches) along transects nearest the north and south stream banks. No alluvial veneers were encountered, and the Harrah series conformed well with the noted soils data provided by NRCS soil map unit information (NRCS 2020). Topsoil horizons within the Harrah series generally consisted of very dark gray and dark grayish brown sandy loam and fine sandy loam. Topsoil horizons generally measured no thicker than 35-centimeters (14-inches). An underlying weak albic horizon (E horizon) was noted in less-

one Point Services

disturbed contexts and typically exhibited strong brown to dusky red sandy loam to sandy clay loam. The Harrah series subsoil was variable and contained brown, reddish brown and red sandy clay and sandy clay loam. Depth to sandstone parent material was variable and was shallow to subaerially-exposed within the eastern portion of the stream zone. The subsoil horizon was noted during shovel testing by the shift in color towards a lighter reddish brown to red soil color and an obvious change in texture with an increase in clay content from soft sandy loam to moderately hard clay loam and/or sandstone parent material.

Overall, the survey area exhibited extensive soil disturbances from prior agriculture, sediment mining (quarry), pond excavation, clay borrow pits, vehicle use, oil pad construction, gas pipeline trenching, and sand/mulch deposits from active landfill activity (see Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances section below). Shovel tests were excavated to sterile subsoil or 80 centimeters (31 inches) below ground surface, whichever was encountered first. The minimum shovel test depth was 14-centimeters (5.5-inches) atop construction fill, and the maximum shovel test depth was 87-centimeters (34-inches) within the stream bank of the unnamed tributary of Crutcho Creek. No shovel tests produced positive results for archaeological materials. Survey methods conducted during this cultural resources survey meet or exceed methods recommended by the OAS, OSHPO and USACE SWT office.





Figure 16: Underlying geologic unit within the survey area





Figure 17: Soil types within the survey area


# CULTURAL SETTING

For a detailed overview of the prehistory and history of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, the reader is referred to regional reports from larger surveys with positive results that focused on this general region. Because this survey resulted in the discovery of very limited cultural resources, the culture history section will be brief and will serve only as a very broad overview of regional prehistory and history (Table 2).

Dates	Period
30000 - 10000 BC	Pre-Clovis
10000 – 6000 BC	Paleoindian (Clovis and Folsom)
6000 BC – AD 1	Archaic
AD 1 - 800	Woodland
AD 800 – 1500	Late Prehistoric/Villagers
AD 1500 – 1800	Protohistoric
AD 1800 – present	Historic

 Table 2: Archaeological Periods in Southern Oklahoma

The following information is taken primarily from the Oklahoma Historical Society website (Oklahoma Historical Society 2021a, 2021c, 2021d, and 2021e), the University of Oklahoma's Prehistory Timeline (Oklahoma Prehistory Timeline 2019) and the American Indian Cultural Center and Museum website (Tribes-Brief History 2020).

## **Pre-Clovis Period** (30000 - 10000 BC)

There are two Pre-Clovis sites in Oklahoma that have played a role in answering some questions about Pre-Clovis peoples. The archaeological sites include the 18,000-year-old Cooperton mammoth remains in Kiowa County and the Burnham site in Woods County with relevant radiocarbon dates ranging from 28,000 to 32,000 years ago. Both locations hold material associated with extinct Ice Age animals. What the sites lack, however, is the clear continuity and unquestionable context found with Clovis culture sites. Because the context is uncertain and the comparable sites are absent in Oklahoma and the surrounding region, archaeologists have difficulty characterizing these peoples' ways of life. The Pre-Clovis people were explorers at the edge of new frontiers, and their motivations, the nature of their society, and the full implications of their actions may never be fully comprehended.

# Paleo-Indian Period (10000 - 6000 BC)

Much of the recorded evidence for the Paleo-Indian Period comes from kill/hunting sites. There are several Paleoindian sites in Oklahoma, including the Domebo mammoth kill site and the Cooper bison kill site. Other important Paleoindian sites in Oklahoma include the Perry Ranch site, the Roulston-Rogers site, the Jake Bluff Gully site, and the Packard site. These specialized hunters lived in small nomadic bands and adapted to their environment. The Paleoindian people hunted mammoth and giant bison, both of which are now extinct. Projectile points from this tradition include Clovis, Folsom, and Dalton.

stone Point Services

### Archaic Period (6000 BC - AD 1)

Archaic Period people were hunters who became less mobile than their Paleoindian ancestors. They hunted bison, deer, and small game. Subsistence activities focused on exploiting broader ecological resources, like wild plant foods. The climate was much warmer and dryer during this time period. Typical projectile points from this tradition include the Calf Creek points. Grinding stones also appear later in the Archaic period. Important Archaic period sites in Oklahoma include the Kiamichi Fish Weir site, the Certain site, the Lawrence site, the Primrose and Stillman Pit sites, and the Pumpkin Creek site.

### Woodland Period (AD 1 - 800)

Pottery production begins in the Woodland Period. Spears are replaced by the bow and arrow. The Woodland period people adapted a more sedentary lifestyle than their ancestors. They lived in camps and moved as resources were used up. The first evidence of plant domestication appears during this time period. Native plant and grass seed were harvested for use. The bulk of the diet came from deer, bison, fish, and nuts. Important Woodland period sites in Oklahoma include the McCutchan-McLaughlin site and the Roulston-Rogers site.

### Late Prehistoric/Villagers Period (AD 800 – 1500)

During the Late Prehistoric/Villagers period, permanent villages near stream valleys become common. The people of this period hunted deer and bison and grew corn, beans, and squash. Tobacco and other minor crops were also harvested. Fish and mussels were an important addition to their diet. In central and western Oklahoma, the Canadian and Washita Rivers and their tributaries had large populations of people living nearby. Villages of around 200 people were spaced every few miles along these river valleys. A trade network existed with turquoise and obsidian coming from New Mexico. Important sites in western Oklahoma include the Arthur site, the Brewer site, the Heerwald site, and the Zimms site. In eastern Oklahoma, all of the major stream valleys were farmed and ceremonial mound centers were common. A highly-ranked society developed in eastern Oklahoma during this time period. A large trade network also existed with copper coming from the Great Lakes, shells from the Gulf Coast, and obsidian from Central Mexico. Important sites in eastern Oklahoma site, the Tyler site, the Harlan Mound site, and the Norman Mound site.

### Protohistoric Period (AD 1500 – 1800)

The Protohistoric period is marked by the arrival of new immigrant groups, including Native American tribes and European Americans. This brought profound changes to the people living on the Southern Plains. Spanish horses become an important part of Plains culture. The Wichita people were successful farmers with large villages at the time of Spanish contact in the early 1500s. By the 1700s, French traders brought European goods up the Arkansas River from Louisiana to trade with the Wichita. Important Protohistoric sites in Oklahoma include the Longest site, the Duncan site, and the Deer Creek/Bryson Paddock sites. Tribes present during the Protohistoric Period include the Wichita, Apache, Quapaw, Osage, Pawnee, Kiowa, Comanche, Delaware, Shawnee, and Kickapoo.



### Historic Period (AD 1800 – present)

The United States negotiated the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. A region conceived as "the Indian country" was specified in 1825 as all the land lying west of the Mississippi. Eventually, Indian Territory would encompass the present states of Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and part of Iowa. The Indian Removal process had begun by treaties soon after 1800. Some of the Cherokee, for example, had begun moving west in the 1810s, with large migrations into west-central Arkansas in 1817 into a region they had exchanged for land in the Southeast. Shortly before the 1817 Cherokee treaty came "Lovely's Purchase" in 1816, and an 1818 Osage treaty theoretically cleared northeastern Oklahoma and added the land to the public domain. In 1820, the Choctaw agreed to accept land between the Arkansas and Canadian rivers and the Red River, in present Oklahoma.

During the 1820s and 1830s dozens of northeastern, midwestern, and southeastern tribes were removed by treaty and the 1830 Indian Removal Act (Carlson and Roberts 2006). An 1834 Trade Act further defined "the Indian country" as all that part of the United States west of the Mississippi and not within the states of Missouri, Louisiana, or Arkansas Territory, or any other organized territory. The Creek, Seminole, and Chickasaw also succumbed to forced migration. All of these southeastern tribes thereafter inhabited the southern part of "the Indian Territory."

The 1854 Kansas and Nebraska Act Congress formally organized those parts of northern Indian Territory into official territories that afterward became states. After the Civil War ended, Indians were moved further south into the part of the Indian Territory that is present Oklahoma. Plains tribes, including the Cheyenne, Arapaho, Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache, were concentrated on reservations in the western half of the territory (Chang 2010).

In March 1889, a law established a federal court system based at Muskogee, assuming judicial authority and jurisdiction that had been exercised since the 1834 Trade Act by the Western District of Arkansas. The 1889 measure for the first time specified enclosed boundaries for the Indian Territory, now officially reduced to an area bounded by Texas on the south, Arkansas and Missouri on the east, Kansas on the north, and New Mexico Territory on the west.

Soon this area was reduced again when Oklahoma Territory was created from part of it by the Organic Act in May 1890 (Burton 1997). A governor was appointed, and a two-house territorial assembly and a judicial system were set up. Oklahoma Territory would be eligible for statehood if its population grew large enough and if its leaders followed the process prescribed by federal law. The Oklahoma Territory Organic Act even more closely defined Indian Territory, reducing it to slightly more than the eastern half of the present state. In the 1905 Sequoyah Convention, Indian leaders sought to bypass the territorial process and bring about separate statehood for Indian Territory. However, with the 1907 union of the Indian nations and Oklahoma Territory as the State of Oklahoma, a separate, Indian-dominated territory or state was no longer viable. Oklahoma County was established with the passing of the Organic Act in 1890 with Oklahoma City the county seat.



An excerpt from Everett (2020f) from *The Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History and Culture*, provides the following information on the history of Spencer:

Spencer was one of the earliest towns in a region that was opened to settlement in the Land Run of 1889 into the Unassigned Lands. Spencer was developed in 1901 in Crutcho Township by Louis F. and Henry W. Kramer, early area settlers and businessmen of Oklahoma City. Crutcho Township was a fertile agricultural area within the flood plain of the North Canadian River. Local farmers grew wheat, some of which had been sent to Chicago for the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893 and won first place in the crop competition.

By 1909 Spencer had grown to approximately 300, with 1,111 in the surrounding township. Spencer grew after World War II, as nearby industries such as General Motors Assembly Plant and Tinker Air Force Base offered employment. In 1960, Spencer had approximately 1,189 residents. The population tripled to 3,713 in 1970. The population peaked at 4,604 in 1980. In 1990, the population was 3,972.

### **Previous Investigations**

Stone Point Services, LLC completed an Oklahoma archaeological site file review February 13, 2020 for the 1.6-kilometer (1.0-mile) review area, utilizing the files housed at the Oklahoma Archeological Survey in Norman, OK. Eight archaeological sites and six surveys have been recorded within the one-mile review area (Tables 3-4).

The majority of the archaeological sites in the area are prehistoric in nature with no known NRHP status. The sites are predominantly located on an upland slope or ridge from a water source, namely the Canadian River and associated tributaries, and present as lithic scatters and encampments in nature.

Site #	Date	Description	NRHP Status	Distance from
				Tower
OK11	1977	Prehistoric lithics	Unknown	0.18-miles southwest
OK15	1971	Ground surface lithic scatter	Unknown	0.46-miles south
OK32	1972	Prehistoric campsite	Unknown	0.83-miles southwest
OK69	1974	Prehistoric lithic workshop/camp	Unknown	0.83-miles north
OK95	1977	Prehistoric camp	Unknown	0.93-miles south
OK224	2012	Historic house (ruins)	Inventory Site	0.46-miles south
OK225	2012	Dairy Barn	Inventory Site	0.55-miles south
OK226	2012	Building slab	Inventory Site	0.60-miles southwest

Table 3. Archaeological	sites	within th	e one-mile	review area
Table 5. Alchaeological	51165	wiuiiii ui		leview alea

With regard to the archaeological surveys in the 1.0-mile review area, Dycus' survey was the closest to the expansion area. This survey appears to have bound the expansion area to the west. No new archaeological sites resulted from this survey.

one Point Services

Surveyor	Date	Description	Distance from Project Area
Dycus	2004	NE Landfill	0.04-miles southwest
O'Shea	2007	Bridge replacement	1.0-miles east northeast
Northcutt	2012	Industrial development	0.46-miles south
ECA	2014	Unknown	Unknown
Goodwin	2015	Pipeline	0.97-miles northwest
TRC	2018	Crutcho Creek Addition	0.27-miles southwest

Table 4: Archaeological surveys within the one-mile review area

Although neither an archaeological survey nor archaeological site, Arlington Memorial Gardens/Arlington Memorial Park cemetery adjoins the expansion area along the north border. Established in 1951, Arlington Memorial Gardens encompasses 86-acres (35-hectares) serving Oklahoma City, Midwest City, Spencer, and other surrounding communities as an interment facility. The cemetery is comprised of burial plots, cremation plots, a mausoleum, and dedicated military gardens.



# Chapter 3: Project Methodology

The methods for this project meet or exceed the minimum requirements for surveys in Oklahoma established by the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey (OAS) and the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the US Army Corps of Engineers. This project included three phases: 1) background research, 2) field investigations, and 3) laboratory analysis. Each phase of the investigations is described in detail below.

# **BACKGROUND RESEARCH**

The background literature and records search for the project area was conducted through the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey as well as through online map services, such as the historical aerial photography housed online at the US Department of Agriculture (USDA). The records examined at the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey included a review of their paper system containing information about previously recorded archeological resources in the vicinity of the present project. The literature review was used to determine if previously recorded cultural resources are in or near the project area and served to provide a historical context for the study area.

The background research also included information about standing historical structures and known cemeteries located near the survey area. As noted above, the purpose of the background research is to inform the Stone Point Services crew of potentially important cultural resources that have been previously identified near the survey area. Using data from the background research, our researchers can pinpoint those areas that are more likely to contain archeological sites.

# Land Use History

In addition to previous a study of previous archaeological investigations, historical aerial photography and topographic maps were searched for the presence of potential standing structures that may be present in the survey area, as well as location where former structures once stood. Historic aerial imagery from 1954 and 1969, as well as later imagery from 1975, 1984, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2003, 2005-2008, and 2010-2018 were reviewed in an effort to identify changes to the landscape, infrastructure, and the presence or absence of structures in the survey area (Figures 18-24). Additionally, topographic maps from 1892, 1934, 1935, 1938, 1940, 1957-1959, 1970, 1976, 1986-1987, 1999-200, 2012 and 2016 were reviewed in an effort to identify any existing structures, landscape changes, and infrastructure additions to the survey area (Figures 25-28) (USGS 2021). A General Land Office map (GLO) from 1873, 1889 and 1907 were also reviewed (Figures 28-30) (Barrett 1872). A combination of imagery and maps was used as a general background to guide field investigations and the resulting report. A review of historic aerial imagery of the project area indicated that potentially historical standing structures, buildings, or other features were not present within the survey area.

one Point Services

A review of topographic maps, historic aerial imagery, and satellite imagery indicated that there was a moderate potential for encountering prehistoric cultural resources across the survey area and a high-probability of encountering historic artifacts and/or structures in the survey area. The likelihood for archaeological sites is heightened near areas with flowing water and the natural resources that surround riparian zones (Verhagen and Whitley 2012, Hall 1988). In this case, Crutcho Creek is located approximately 300-meters (984-feet) west of the general Subject Property, and a small tributary of Crutcho Creek bisects the North Area.

The 1934 topographic map and 1954 historic aerial photograph (Figure 18) depicts two structures in the southern portion of the existing landfill extending down to Highway 62. These structures were razed between 2003 and 2008. By 1981, an additional three structures can be seen in the southwest portion of the existing landfill immediately west of the 1954 structures. The 1987 topographic map indicates that these structures were associated with an oil well. These three structures were razed by 1995. The location of these three structures appears to be located under mounds of landfill refuse at this time.

Historic imagery from 1954 and 1969 indicate that some land clearing had occurred in the central and western portion of the North Area, and a man-made pond is visible along the east end of the Crutcho Creek tributary. Mechanical excavations were underway within the quarry area by 1954. The 1957 topographic map indicates that this pond was created by the excavation of sandpits on the east side of the Crutcho Creek tributary. By 1981, two ponds were visible along the northeast boundary of the existing landfill in the South Area. The 1976 topographic map indicates that these two ponds were sandpits. By 2002, those two ponds were filled in. In the 1954 aerial, a pond is located at the northeast boundary of the North Area. A basin with intermittent ponding remains at that location to this day. Around 2010, an area was excavated in the existing landfill near Highway 62. The recently-excavated area south of the active landfill holds standing water at this time.

By 2002, much of the landscape was cleared except for small portions to the west and southwest in the existing landfill. By 2008, mounds of refuse appear in the southern portion of the existing landfill extending down to Highway 62 and the existing landfill appeared relatively similar to its appearance today. It is significant to note that the 2000 topographic map indicated that the north portion of the existing landfill was an oil field.

The North Area has witnessed landscape change in the form of quarrying, oil pad construction, two-track roads, excavated ponds, agricultural activity, landfill dumpster staging, and pipeline trench excavation. Some vegetation was cleared in the southwest corner of the North Area along the border with the existing landfill by 2013. The only area that appears somewhat undisturbed are the grassy fields within the North Area on the north and south side of the unnamed tributary.



### **Historic Records and Deed History**

According to the 1873 General Land Office (GLO) Map for the area, no person was patented the land in the survey area at that time (Figure 28). The Crutcho Township Plat for Range 12 North, Township 2 West in the Indian Meridian for 1889 indicated that the Southeast Quarter of Section 22 was owned by Marshall Crawford (Oklahoma Historical Society 2021) (Figure 29). Additionally, a 1907 Crutcho plat map indicates that two structures were present in the Southeast Quarter (Figure 30). The structures were located near the current intersection of NE 23rd St. and N. Midwest Blvd (Ancestry 20211). Marshall Crawford was born in 1846 and served in the military in 1865. He was Fourth Mounted Infantry, Ci-Da and carried the rank of Private in the Civil War (Ancestry 2021k). He lived in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma and passed away in 1933 (Ancestry 2021a). The 1910 census indicated that Marshall Crawford was a farmer in Crutcho, Oklahoma. He was married to Malva Crawford (Ancestry 2021b). It seems that following Crawford's death in 1933, the land was sectioned off and sold.

According to the Oklahoma Tax Assessor's Office (2021) the survey area became five separate tracts of land after 1933. Tracts one and two were owned by the Fuchs family. Tract three was owned by Earl Knighton Senior. Tract four was owned by the Dolese Company. Tract five was owned by Catherine R. Jones. Each individual tract was assessed for history of ownership and persons of historic significance. The findings of the historic records investigations are presented below.

Regarding tract one, the 1940 U.S. Census indicated that Arthur C. Fuchs resided in Crutcho Township in Oklahoma with his wife, Minnie, daughters Anna, Mildred and Florence and son, Charles. Arthur was a Superintendent at a bottling firm (Ancestry 2021m). Historic deed information indicates that upon Arthur's death in 1943, Florence Fuchs-English became owner of Tract one and her sister, Mildred Fuchs-Wright, became the owner of Tract 2. Florence Fuchs-English was born in 1938 and passed away in 2016 (Kueteman 2021). Florence worked in the oil industry and retired from National Oilwell. The address associated with tract one was 7621 North 23rd Street. In 1994, ownership of tract one moved into the Florence E. English Living Trust. In 2003, tract one was sold to Northeast Landfill, Inc. by the trust.

Tract two was owned by Mildred Fuchs-Wright. Mildred was born in 1929 and passed away in 2017. Little else is known about Mildred Fuchs-Wright. Robert and Jane Wright took ownership of tract two in 1976. Robert was born in 1946 (Ancestry 2021e). Little else is known about Robert Wright. Jane Wright was born in 1949. According to the US Public Records Index from 1950-1993, the address associated with tract two was 7701 NE 23rd (Ancestry 2021f, g). The structures observed in aerial images for tracts one and two are likely associated with the Fuchs, English, and Wright families. None of the individuals listed as deeded owners appear to have significance to the history of the town, county, or the State of Oklahoma.

Tract three was owned by Earl Knighton Senior. The 1940 US Census listed Earl as a Geologist in the Oil Industry (Ancestry 2021h). Earl was a Lieutenant Colonel in the Air Force in World War

tone Point Services

II. He received two Air Force Commendation medals and was inducted into the Kansas Oil Museum Hall of Fame (Ancestry 2021i). His residence was never listed as being on this tract of land. In 1987, Earl sold the tract to Midstates Natural Gas. In 1992, Midstates sold the land to Ted Dirickson. In 1997, Ted sold the land to Roy L Conley who sold the land to Northeast Landfill Inc. in 2000. None of the listed individuals appear to have significance to the history of the area or the State of Oklahoma.

Tract four was owned by the Dolese Company until 1997. In 1997, Dolese sold it to Northeast Landfill Inc. Dolese Company from its inception in the earliest days of Oklahoma Statehood, transformed the state's raw rock into buildings and foundations (Dolese 2021). They own more than 60 facilities and have more than 1,000 employees (Dolese 2021).

Tract five was owned by Catherine Leavitt Jones. Catherine married Walter Sloan Jones. According to the 1940 US Census, Walter was a port owner and realtor (ancestry 2021j). There is no indication that they ever lived on the property. Their son, Walter S. Jones, assumed ownership from Catherine. He lived in Dallas (Ancestry 2021j). In 1991, the land moved into a living trust for Walter S. Jones. In 1992, the trust sold the land to Terrance W. Mangan, nearly immediately sold the land to Billy J. Eisenhour. In 2005, Billy appears to have sold the land to his business, B.E. Land LLC. In 2009, B.E. Land sold the tract to Northeast Landfill Inc. No one appeared to have ever resided on the tract. None of the listed individuals appear to have significance to the history of the area or the State of Oklahoma.





Figure 18: Historic 1954 aerial imagery map showing the project area





Figure 19: Historic 1969 aerial imagery map showing the project area





Figure 20: Historic 1975 aerial imagery map showing the project area





Figure 21: 1984 Historic aerial imagery map showing the project area





Figure 22: 1995 Historic aerial imagery map showing the project area





Figure 23: 2008 Historic aerial imagery map showing the project area





Figure 24: 2017 Historic aerial imagery map showing the project area





Figure 25: 1956 USGS Spencer, Midwest City topographic map showing the project area





Figure 26: 1986 USGS Spencer, Midwest City topographic map showing the project area





Figure 27: 2018 USGS topographic map showing the project area





Figure 28: 1873 General Land Office map showing the project area



			Okl	ahom	a		LAF				
- Cr	utcho	Townshin	No. 12	North	<u> </u>	2 W/P	s+	a Ind	lian		
~					NC NC	ORTH			iian	Princip	<b>nd</b> Meridi:
Georget Wilson	3 Z I. Eugene Walker ©	Benjami Greer John M. Tucker	n Johan Fiedle	Charles r Hill	R Henry Willis	Madisor Bigham	WmW. Asher	Ambroses Leach	Trield	William L White	. Charlie Able
Attired Smith	Sam M. Fuhr	Albert	t Geo, M. Wright	Seymou Lowery	IrJohn Delehent	Josephi ySmith	RCharles I Langdon	MJohn A. Sechrist	Weeks	Peter Myers	John Dayton
John B. Forsythe	Granvill Vaughn D	e Geo.W. Rodger	Alison SJo <b>r</b> dan	R.R. Bigham	Wms, Wright	Georgen Myers	Lewis Thomas	Lyndes E Stone	Elmer L Russell	ARY WI Bar	illiam vett
Carter Bradley	J.H. Mitchell	Charles: Meyer	A Jacob F Knauss	F J.M Reynole	George	Jessie C, Young Ch W.	Ella E. Maxwell arles Stephens	William E Grosse	chas. Lavi	Ira B. Andersor	Martin
CharleyA Smith	Anthony Fuhr	Alexande Smith	r Samue Eylar	1 Sc	100	A CAR	Wadsack	Marcus Crawford	Alexander H.Howeil	Rheugene Ruse	Lea
Re 16't.C. Boyd	Lames H Lowery	Frank E Williams	. Margaret. Bates	1 13	nd	Jones N Arnold	Henry	GeorgeW Ashby	John W. M=Coy	Peter Rolese	Marks Warne
jzzle Smirth	CharlesW 5chroeder	John Shephard	WmH. Roby	Parke	James T Wallis	John H. M=Kinslq	Pleasan T.Gooing	t Arthur C Kincaid	Clarence Yates	Henry A. Sutton	Elizabet Thurster Samuel Z Thomas
JosephC Graeter	Fred M. Cabiness	Louisa	Thos J.	Bas.	James L. Simpsor	John H. Martin	Marshall Crawford	<u>Erastus</u> A Miller	Dallas Dean	Henry Dodd	William Gonty
telens. Partin	Andrew Michand	Samuel Conner North	Colomor Blevin:	J Uesses M.Cook	Charles H, Keller	Henry Shepior	Jeffie Wickline	HenryC, Renard	GeorgeW. Field	Wm H. McGee	Andrew Mickling
esse H. ohnston	Lee. Explor	THOUS THOUS	George W Berty	WilliamE Kelly	Rebecca H Sportsman	Ezra M. Robinson	August Koehler	John P.M. Crawford	Charlest. Pack	Samuelv Mosely	Henry7 Keys
Myers	SX15onr	Wm M. Carter	WilliamH Couch	Andrew	charles Francis	Emanuel Groth	WilliamT Miller	W.H., Clutter	StarlingP. Crawford	Sch	00
S	Alvin M. Sustin	MattieE. Boyd	James M. De Bolt	AlbertM DeBolt	Little B Morrison	Robert M. Hamilten	John Carpenter	Milton E Stolls	George Nelson	La	nd

Figure 29: 1889 GLO Crutcho Township map



(a)		1	PON		nr			
	AEC	CRU	ГCI	HC			-	
	·Tatt	TIW	NSHIP Bridge 2	inches to the	JI.	and the second		
	Town	ship 12 North Range 1	West and In	ndian Meri	diaa ,			
HARTZELL	1.45 HO ASPE 144 AA	Auge 14074   39 84   39 84	#407 BA 17	****	14.2. 14.2.	-	and and	TWP:
States Geater Ge	o W & Sealer	Roby Watis	B W Bruchman	Summe_	MartheoC		Withow	Daniel P Sweeney &
E A M	12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	12 m	3				101.74	indra . H
South Fulker	a the Weight	BREILIOE	· Smith	Liourgneo	Mayell	4	Cortmill	Dayton
Anna Street	Correctory	Constery R. 14 B. Dr. 6	A A	zehad .		G P		
Aidrer Vargen	A Stone	Bigham Weight	Styern see	7210mas \$	51000	1.75	Arrest Arrests	a financial and a
Carter Curtis 5 Ch	as A Jacob E	Kee R. George	John Delebeniy	Lee Thomas .*	1	X.	·/~ //	2 Rester A
Brucher Wolls M	ever Rauss	MINee Lock wood	In Cr.		OASS .	ANCI	And and	Davis
To Anthery	ELONA	Ker R.M.K.	AT AGAIN	Serest 1		da.	Mrs.Leo	John W.
Finetran Flater	Eylar -	in the state	free.		E Wigo	Howett	Gregory	Lea
No. 1. 1. 1.	S With	School Land	1	Hafry.	Edward L	state me	theme .	Marks
Barner Vie Viel	Detong	A	A STATE	Male	Sheldon cae Consteau	Me Coy	P.Benise	Warnac
Lagran C M.		···· ·	France	geo m.	Jahn H.	5. 5.	. Mary S	Elizabeth Thurston
Schronder Si	20	I. D. Vasper Kincaid Sint	5 pres	Geraian	Theretes 2	Malateum	Sutron	Plin R. see
Claude Le	W.Z. W.	mhen B I W MILLES Bailey		Markal	Geo. W. Moore	Dattas .	H. Dona	They K
1 -	niller m	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Martin	- <u>.</u>	7Z		School	ine .
He ALL	63	Contraction Bol Realter	EN.	Ransa A	DICKS	ON PO	Eliza B.	Maia 3:
	San Prover	28 main	Sum 2 ag	Annag	in protors	G W Maid	2	5 22
Howite PP Des	Tory D Blance for	Sawia S. Young	H.N. Campbell	Router	Chan P.M.	Chas H. Pack	Samt.W.	Daniela
	the fillingener	Port and		/***	<u></u> :	<u> </u>		·** . \
	Court	Shaley CW.Loy	E.M.	W T Miller	Cineman N.	S. F.	School	Land .
	82	83	/ 3	4	( a	5.	8	6

Figure 30: 1907 GLO Crutcho Township map with the Subject Property in Section 22



# FIELD METHODS

The archeological investigation of the project area included an intensive archeological survey using both pedestrian survey and shovel testing techniques. Pedestrian survey was used to locate quarries, cemeteries, chimneys, earthworks, and other above ground features, as well as artifacts lying on the ground surface. Shovel testing was used to identify potential subsurface artifacts and assess locations surrounding isolated surface artifacts. As the survey area exhibited widely-varying potential for the presence of archaeological sites, shovel testing strategies likewise shifted with the location to provide the appropriate horizontal and vertical coverage. The banks of the unnamed tributary of Crutcho Creek contained the area of highest potential for archaeological sites. Within the stream zone, systematic shovel testing was conducted along two transects on the north and south bank of the stream. Shovel tests in this area were spaced at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals along each survey transect. Shovel test survey transects along the banks of the unnamed tributary were spaced 15-meters (50-feet) apart. As two transects were placed on each bank of the tributary, shovel tests on adjacent transects in this high-probability area were offset (staggered) by 7.5meters (24-feet) to provide greater surface coverage. The transects nearest the stream edge contained shovel tests excavated to a minimum of 80-centimeters (31-inches) below surface (unless obstructed by bedrock or coarse roots) to fully characterize the nature of the soil profile and investigate the potential for deep archaeological materials. Extremely dense vegetation within the stream zone provided a challenge to navigation and uniform shovel test placement, however, shovel test spacing did not exceed 15-meters (50-feet) between shovel tests unless obstructed by deep ditches, modern refuse pits, and/or mechanically-excavated quarry/pond basins (see Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances section below).

The north and south agricultural fields constituted moderate-probability areas for potential archaeological sites due to increased distance from the water source. Shovel tests within the moderate-probability areas were conducted at 30-meter (100-foot) intervals along transects spaced 30-meters (100-feet) apart. Shovel tests along parallel transects in moderate probability areas were staggered at a distance of 15-meters (50-feet) between transects to provide increased horizontal coverage. Staggering shovel tests between adjacent transects creates the diamond shape shovel test pattern observable in project overview maps.

Areas with significant disturbance or modern landforms (e.g., dredged deposits) do not require systematic shovel testing unless the disturbance/intrusive deposits are shallow and shovel testing can reach in situ deposits. In disturbed soil contexts where shovel testing is feasible, shovel tests will be executed to evaluate the level of disturbance, which may or may not have impacted any potential archaeological sites. Likewise, areas within the active landfill with significant disturbance were surface inspected and discretionary shovel testing was implemented to determine if intact soils were present. Locations of significant soil disturbance in the North Area were surface inspected and shovel tests were placed to determine the level of disturbance and whether any Holocene-aged remained which may hold archaeological materials. In many cases the upper 4-meters (13-feet) of sediment had been removed my mechanical excavation. Photographs were



taken at all disturbance areas (see below). Shovel tests remained at a spacing of 30-meters (100feet) between tests in areas of significant disturbance. In this case, significant soil disturbances were present as the result of deep quarry pits, dumpster staging areas, excavated ponds, sand/mulch piles, and landfill deposits. In disturbed soil contexts where shovel testing was feasible, shovel tests were used to evaluate the level of disturbance, which may or may not have impacted any potential archaeological sites. At least one shovel test was excavated in each environmental zone (e.g., flood plain, first terrace, up-slope, ridge top, etc.) on each side of water crossings even in areas of high ground surface visibility, or soil disturbance.

Transects were terminated once hill slope angle measured greater than 20 percent. For consistency in slope assessment, slope angles were measured with a clinometer across the survey area by the Field Director. Areas with greater than 20 percent slopes, and/or exposed bedrock generally do not need systematic shovel testing, however discretionary shovel tests were implemented in specific cases. Areas with a slope angle of 20 percent or greater were visually-inspected via pedestrian survey along transect intervals spaced no wider than 10-meters (32-feet) apart.

Shovel tests measured a minimum of 30-centimeters (12-inches) in diameter and were excavated to culturally sterile soil, if possible. Shovel tests fully assessed the topsoil horizon(s) and penetrated a minimum of 10-centimeters (4-inches) into underlying subsoil to confirm the nature of the soil horizon. In specific cases, shovel testing depths continued well into subsoil horizons to evaluate the potential for buried soils near creek banks. Once stream bedload gravels or sandstone parent material were encountered and no indication of buried soils was noted, shovel testing was terminated, and aspects of the shovel test were noted. Field notes were made for each soil horizon or layer encountered within shovel tests. Shovel test notes documented, at a minimum, soil horizon depth range, Munsell color, soil texture, presence or absence of archaeological materials and reason for termination at that depth (e.g., subsoil, bedrock, water table). Each shovel test was excavated in no greater than 20-centimeter (8-inch) levels. All shovel test fill was screened through ¼-inch hardware mesh, or thoroughly processed within the screen by hand when soils would not pass through the mesh as the result of clay or water content.

If sites or isolated finds were encountered, they were delineated by the distribution of surface artifacts/features and shovel tests typically placed in a cruciform pattern extending along perpendicular axes in cardinal directions. Limitations on access posed by the natural and built environment required adjustments to shovel testing strategies in certain cases, for instance a shovel test grid, rather than cruciform pattern due to spatial constraints. Delineation shovel tests were excavated at 5-meter (16-feet) intervals from an initial positive shovel test until two successive negative shovel tests were excavated in each direction. Given the above strategy, a minimum of eight shovel tests would be placed along perpendicular axes extending from the center of the initial subsurface artifact discovery location for a minimum total of nine shovel tests (e.g., one positive test with eight negative delineation shovel tests). No positive tests were encountered during this assessment. For sites encountered on the surface, delineation shovel tests are encountered



in each cardinal direction. Shovel testing will not be conducted outside of the landfill or outside of the Northern Area boundary. Surface inspection at 10-meter (32-feet) transect spacing was employed coincident with shovel tests to delineate the horizontal and vertical extent of artifacts at each potential site. Depressions, possible middens, and other areas within sites that can be differentiated based on surface indications were shovel tested to the determine the potential nature of the anomaly. Artifacts were not collected as part of this survey. Artifacts were to be field analyzed (quantified and typed) and photographed (diagnostics and representative samples) and returned to the locations in which they were discovered. No artifacts were encountered during this survey.

All shovel test locations were recorded using a handheld GPS unit with an accuracy of 3-meters (10-feet) or less and plotted on project maps. Isolated find locations were plotted on USGS 7.5minute topographic maps. All shovel test locations were mapped using ArcGIS 10 with standard shape file formats. Sites were documented using an Oklahoma Archeological Site Survey Form. After consultation with the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey, if a recorded feature did not warrant the allocation of a trinomial, then an Oklahoma Historic Preservation Resource Identification Form (HPRI) was completed and attached to this assessment (See Appendix B). As the feature recorded during this survey did not qualify for allocation of a trinomial, an associated HPRIF form is attached. The Field Director maintained detailed notes on survey methods, disturbances, photographs, and relevant environmental factors. Danny Welch, Ph.D., of Stone Point Services served as Field Director and executed the Work Plan. Danny Welch meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48FR 22716 or 36 CFR Part 61).

Each archeological site was to be evaluated for NRHP eligibility following the four evaluation criteria as outlined within 36 CFR 60.4. Site delineation activities were restricted to the survey boundary and therefore eligibility assessments of sites may be tentative. Recommendations for avoidance or additional testing would be made for each site. Any standing building and or structure that is 45 years old or older would be recorded on the HPRIF as outlined in the SHPOs Review and Compliance Manual. An assessment of integrity and significance will be provided with an opinion on NRHP eligibility.

## LABORATORY METHODS

The following post-field activities meet SHPO guidelines. Upon completion of all field investigations, recovered artifacts were to be returned to the Stone Point Services Lab and washed, catalogued, and analyzed. Records for survey on private property will be submitted to the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey at the University of Oklahoma for curation. Laboratory methods for preparing artifacts, notes, and additional media will follow the guidelines set forth by the



Oklahoma Archaeological Survey and Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office. Since no artifacts were collected during this survey, no artifacts will be curated as part of this project.

### NRHP ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENTS

Archeological resources identified during this survey were evaluated to determine their NRHP eligibility. As per 36 CFR 60.4, four broad criteria should be used when making a NRHP eligibility determination. In order to be considered eligible for the NRHP, a resource must possess integrity (location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, association), and it must meet at least ONE of the following criteria:

- A. it is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of history;
- B. it is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past;
- C. it embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;
- D. it has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory.

Criteria A, B, and C are usually applied to historic structures, features, and non-archeological resources (i.e., battlegrounds, etc.). Criterion D is most often used to determine the NRHP eligibility of archeological resources. In most instances, an archeological site or historical resources must be at least 50 years old when it is assessed. In some instances, especially in regard to particularly important resources (e.g., the World Trade Center Site), a structure or location may be nominated for the NRHP even if it does not meet the 50-year rule. As a general rule, any property or site greater than 50 years of age may be considered for the NRHP.

Criterion D is the most commonly applied criterion in archeological surveying. The surveyor must try to determine if the site in question has adequate context for it to answer important questions about history or prehistory. The ultimate decision of eligibility is generally determined by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and/or the federal agency requesting the survey. The surveyor can make recommendations, but ultimately the SHPO or the federal agency will make the final determination of eligibility, either through concurring with a recommendation or not.

Archeological survey, and associated site delineation, is rarely sufficient to make a final ruling of a site's NRHP eligibility. In most cases, the archeologist will recommend a site as either "potentially eligible" for the NRHP or "not eligible" for the NRHP. If a recommendation of "potentially eligible" is given, and the SHPO or federal agency concurs, the site should be treated as if it is "eligible" for nomination to the NRHP. Additional testing of the site will generally be sufficient to make the final determination of NRHP eligibility. If a recommendation of "not



eligible" is made for the site, and if the SHPO and/or federal agency concur, the site is then considered to be unlikely to provide information important to our understanding of history or prehistory.

Archeologists generally look for a certain set of criteria to determine if a site possesses integrity. The most common keys in making this determination are location, setting, materials, and association. When archeologists speak of a site being "intact" or if they mention "context" they usually are referring to whether a site has sufficient deposits that appear to be undisturbed to answer the important questions about the prehistoric and historic past that will make it potentially eligible under Criterion D. The materials (artifacts) present can aid in dating the site and assigning cultural association. If a site is associated with a specific group or period, and that association can be determined through archeological research, then the site may retain sufficient integrity to be recommended potentially eligible for the NRHP. If a site is intact, this means that the site has retained its original location and setting and has not been disturbed. As an example, if an archeological site has buried deposits and ample time-diagnostic artifacts for dating the site, but there is evidence of disturbance, this would call into the question the reliability of any data recovered from the site. As such, a site may be recommended not eligible for the NRHP if it is highly disturbed. Another example would be a small prehistoric site with potentially intact deposits but no time-diagnostic artifacts or organic remains to help identify the age and association of the site. In this latter case, an eligibility determination of not eligible may be rendered. Small lithic (stone) scatters are often determined not eligible due to the lack of research potential.

Historic archeological sites pose a separate but similar set of issues. Although a prehistoric site may sometimes have evidence of a structure, they are far more common on historic sites. A historical structure on a site may be recommended not eligible for the NRHP due to it not meeting Criteria A, B, or C, and yet the archeological site that surrounds the structure may in fact be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D (information potential). Although the structure is in poor condition and possibly not eligible for the NRHP, the archeological site might contain information about the period in which the structure was used. In this case, the structure may be a contributing element to the site's NRHP eligibility under Criterion D.



# Chapter 4: Results and Recommendations

Stone Point Services, LLC conducted a cultural resource survey of the proposed Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Project Area located in Spencer, Oklahoma for Hydrex Environmental. The project area includes the "North Area," which covers an approximately 73.2-acre (30-hectare) area north of the existing landfill and the "South Area"/existing landfill, which consists of 90.1-acres (36.36-hectares). The total area surveyed for this project is approximately 163.3-acres (66-hectares). The purpose of this cultural resources survey is to identify cultural resources (archaeological and historic) that may be impacted by the proposed sediment removal, landfill construction, and other associated landfill activities. The findings of the near-surface intensive survey are presented below, preceded by a description of limiting factors which effected survey coverage and a discussion of derivations from standard survey methods.

# **Survey Obstructions and Soil Disturbances**

Survey transect spacing was maintained at 30-meters (100-feet) between transects. Shovel tests were generally offset between parallel transects to provide increased surface coverage and were spaced at 15-meter (50-foot) and 30-meter (100-foot) intervals where feasible. Investigations at potential sites included shovel tests at 5-meter (16-foot) intervals where feasible. The spacing between shovel tests along these transects was hindered in certain cases by aspects of the built environment and excavations by heavy machinery (Figures 31-49). In the cases where significant modern sediment or refuse piles were present, surface investigations were conducted to assess the area. In locations where soils had been removed for quarrying or pond excavation, surface survey was conducted and cutbanks at the quarry boundary were inspected for potential buried archaeological deposits. Major disturbance areas which precluded systematic shovel testing included modern sediment piles, mulch piles, modern refuse deposits, property lines, and active staging areas associated with landfill activities. Removal of sediments included deep pits from mechanical quarrying activity, which measured up to 4-meters (13-feet) deep and had subsequently removed any former soils which would have contained any potential for artifacts. Other obstructions during survey included tall sediment berms near the former quarry dam and steep slopes (above 20%). Any location where site delineation was hindered by modern activity were noted on site maps and photographed (see below). Site delineation was hindered at the historic storm shelter (Field ID# 1201-HS1) by property boundaries (fences) and a mechanically excavated pond. While some impediments existed during site delineation and transect shovel testing, these limitations appear to be relatively minor, and did not significantly detract from the collection of data or the understanding of the site encountered during survey. A description of the limiting factors and deviation from standard shovel testing protocol, along with photographs of the natural and artificial features is presented below.

A large rectangular mechanically excavated pit with ponded water was present in the southern portion of the South Area which inhibited systematic shovel testing of this portion of the South Area. This modern soil disturbance provided a limiting factor to the typical cardinal-direction

Stone Point Services

delineation method for the adjacent historic structure identified during background research (1201-HS1) (Figure 32, photo location 1). A deep bar ditch, mulch pile, and fence line was present along the eastern side of the southern mulch pile (Figure 33, photo location 2), which limited systematic shovel testing along this portion of the Subject Property. Landfill-related structures, machinery parts, fuel tanks, and redeposited sand covered the location of a second potential structure identified during background investigations (Figure 34, photo location 3). Investigative shovel tests were placed at 10-meter (32-foot) intervals in cardinal directions across this area in the case that artifacts remained. Shovel tests observed no artifacts, and shovel test profiles indicated a disturbed context with secondary sand deposits and mixed fill gravels. Soils across the southeast portion of the North Area were disturbed as the result of recent vehicle use and dumpster storage (Figure 35-36 photo location 4 and 5). Shovel tests placed within this area indicated an eroded topsoil with significant mixing of soil clasts between topsoil and subsoil horizons as the result of vehicle tires and dumpster movement. Systematic shovel testing was not undertaken in the basin of the excavated pond located in the northeast of the North Area (Figure 37, photo location 6). Surface survey was conducted across the dry portions and about the periphery of the basin. The clay borrow pit likewise posed limitations to systematic shovel testing (Figure 38, photo location 7). Shovel test were placed along the eastern edge of this obstruction, as the south and west held a gas pipeline, and deep quarry cuts were present to the north.

North of the clay borrow pit exhibited deep cuts from the sand quarry boundary and steep banks of the unnamed tributary (Figures 39-40, photo locations 8 and 9). These locations were surface surveyed, and systematic shovel testing terminated at contact with the quarry boundary. The depth of quarry-related sediment removal was well-expressed within the marshy quarry basin (Figure 41, photo location 10), and along the eastern edge where removal of sediment measured approximately 4-meters (13-feet) deep dependent on location (Figure 42, photo location 11). The width and depth of the quarry cut was illustrated well along the northern boundary (Figure 43, photo location 12). Shovel testing along the northern boundary encountered coarse, rounded, wellsorted sands associated with alluvial deposits of Pleistocene age. The sand exposed across the surface in this area would have been covered by ca. 4-meters (13-feet) of overlying sediment prior to quarrying activity. As such, this area contains no potential for archaeological materials. Shovel test transects along the northwest stream section were obstructed by a large earthen dam (Figure 44, photo location 13), which has been subsequently breached. The northwest corner of the North Area contained obstructions including sand piles, exposed and buried mulch, and gas pipelines (Figures 45-48, photo locations 14-17). The gas pipeline extended across the south portion of the North Area then diagonally towards the northeast (Figure 49, photo location 18)





Figure 31: Overview map of obstructions and disturbances with photo locations marked





Figure 32: Photo location 1, view north from storm shelter to pond, mulch pile, and landfill



Figure 33: Photo location 2, view north along mulch pile, bar ditch and fenceline





Figure 34: Photo location 3, view SW toward redeposited sand, equipment, and mulch pile



Figure 35: Photo location 4, view south of disturbed soil and dumpster area 3





Figure 36: Photo location 5, view north of disturbed soil and dumpster area 2



Figure 37: Photo location 6, view NW of excavated pond





Figure 38: Photo location 7, view SE of clay pit and active landfill (right)



Figure 39: Photo location 8, view west of quarry edge and refuse dump





Figure 40: Photo location 9, view west of stream near quarry edge



Figure 41: Photo location 10, view NW of marshy areas in quarry basin





Figure 42: Photo location 11, view north indicating depth of cut on east side of quarry



Figure 43: Photo location 12, view west of northern boundary and quarry cross section




Figure 44: Photo location 13, view south of breached quarry dam and NW stream section



Figure 45: Photo location 14, view south towards NW shovel test area and sand stockpile

tone Point Services



Figure 46: Photo location 15, view west of pipelines, sediment cuts, mulch, and stockpile area



Figure 47: Photo location 16, view north of exposed mulch (left) and buried mulch (right)





Figure 48: Photo location 17, view north of pipeline ROW and stockpile area



Figure 49: Photo location 18, view west of pipeline ROW south of clay pit



#### **Near-Surface Intensive Survey**

The cultural resources assessment included an intensive archeological survey using both pedestrian survey and shovel testing techniques (Figures 50-61). Pedestrian survey was used across the ground surface to locate quarries, cemeteries, chimneys, earthworks, and other above ground features, as well as any artifacts lying on the ground surface. Shovel testing was used to identify potential subsurface artifacts and assess locations surrounding potential isolated surface artifacts. As the survey area exhibited widely-varying potential for the presence of archaeological sites, shovel testing strategies likewise shifted by location to provide the appropriate horizontal and vertical coverage. In total, 27 shovel tests were excavated within the heavily disturbed soils of the existing landfill in the South Area, representing approximately 0.3 shovel tests per acre (0.74 shovel tests per hectare). A total of 181 shovel tests were excavated in the North area, representing approximately 2.47 shovel tests per acre (6 shovel tests per hectare). Surface inspection at 10meter transect intervals was employed in areas of heavy disturbance deemed not to contain in situ soils. A total of 208 shovel tests were completed as part of this cultural resources survey. No shovel tests returned positive results for subsurface artifacts. Subjective shovel tests were placed in areas with obvious soil disturbance to determine the nature of disturbance and the possibility for intact soils underlying disturbed portions.

Systematic shovel testing investigations focused primarily on those area with intact topsoil horizons. Systematic shovel testing was implemented along the stream zone with two transects on each bank, as well as within the northern agricultural field, within the southern agricultural field, and in the northwest corner of the North Area. Subjective shovel testing was employed in areas where disturbance was apparent, yet subsurface profiles were required to determine the nature and extent of any disturbances. Surface survey with limited shovel testing was conducted across areas where soil had been removed by sediment mining or had become deeply buried by sediments related to the landfill activities. Investigations recorded one historic structure (Field ID# 1201-HS1), which is a mid-20th century concrete storm shelter. After consultation with OAS, it was determined that this structure did not fit the criteria for allocation of a formal site trinomial. The HPRIF document which formally records the structure is provided in Appendix B. The site description for 1201-HS1 is presented below. The locations of shovel tests placed across the survey area are presented in the following figures. The obstacles which necessitated avoidance or impeded systematic shovel test grids are described in the section above.





Figure 50: Aerial project overview map indicating disturbance areas and shovel tests





Figure 51: USGS Spencer/Midwest City 7.5 min topo quad project overview map





Figure 52: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 1 of 5)





Figure 53: Topographic quad project map (topo map 1 of 5)





Figure 54: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 2 of 5)





Figure 55: Topographic quad project map (topo map 2 of 5)





Figure 56: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 3 of 5)





Figure 57: Topographic quad project map (topo map 3 of 5)





Figure 58: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 4 of 5)





Figure 59: Topographic quad project map (topo map 4 of 5)





Figure 60: Aerial project map with disturbances and shovel test locations (aerial map 5 of 5)





Figure 61: Topographic quad project map (topo map 5 of 5)



#### 1201-HS1

This site was identified and recorded on March 16, 2021 during surface survey and shovel testing associated with the Cultural Resources Survey of Northeast C&D Landfill 163.3-Acre Project Oklahoma County, Oklahoma. This site area was visited and tested to investigate a cluster of potential structures evident in historic 1954 aerial imagery. The site is located a distance of 582-meters (1,909-feet) west of the intersection of N. Midwest Blvd and NE 23rd St. (Hwy 62) in Spencer, Oklahoma. At a distance of 582-meters west of the above intersection, the site is located 38-meters north of the north roadway lane (Figure 62). Specifically, at a distance of 582-meters (1,909-feet) west of the above intersection, continue a distance of 38-meters (125-feet) bearing 0-degrees. The storm shelter is situated between a wooden fence to the south and an excavated pond to the north on landfill property. Vegetation consists of tall grasses and hackberry trees (*Celtis occidentalis*). Weather conditions at the time of recordation consisted of a sunny day with no adverse conditions. Tall grass obscured much of the ground with surface visibility at <25%.

No surface artifacts were observed during surface inspection spaced at 5-meter (16-feet) transect intervals. No subsurface artifacts were encountered in shovel tests placed around the storm shelter pad. Due to access restrictions by the built environment (property lines, ponds) survey methods included placing 11 shovel tests in a 10-meter (32-foot) offset grid, such that shovel tests were no more than 5-meters (16-feet) apart from one another, across the south portion of the storm shelter (Figure 63). Shovel tests measured a minimum of 30-centimeters (12-inches) in diameter and were excavated in 20-centimeter (8-inch) levels. Shovel test depths extended into the subsoil a minimum of 10-centimeters (4-inches) to accurately characterize the nature of the subsoil. All soil was screened through 1/4-inch mesh. Shovel test notes include soil color, texture and depth and any unique occurrences in soil profile.

The site includes a single structure (Figures 64-68) constructed of poured concrete, wood trim, and standard masonry units (SMUs), also known as cinder blocks. Below the concrete pad is a series of spiral stairs visible from the single rectangular entry door. The storm shelter pad measures 4-meters (13-feet) wide by 5-meters (16-feet) long. The SMU structure appears to have been constructed at a later date from the spiral stairs and subterranean void. The storm shelter is in the location of a cluster of structures visible in the historic 1954 aerial photograph. It is an isolated structure with no other structures extant in the immediate vicinity. Metal hardware located at the edges of the pad suggest a former superstructure was fastened to the pad.

The site boundary encompasses the storm shelter, adjacent utility poles and a low earthen mound that extends across the southern portion of the storm shelter. The site boundary measures approximately 30-meters (98-feet) E/W by 25-meters (82-feet) N/S for a site size of 750-square meters (8,036-square feet). Surface survey of the immediate and surrounding area was conducted at 5-meter (16-foot) transect intervals oriented north-south. No surface items were observed during surface inspections.

In total, eleven shovel tests were placed across the site to delineate the vertical and horizontal extent of deposits. No shovel tests encountered subsurface artifacts. 1202-HS1 is located within soils of the Teller fine sandy loam series (1 to 3 percent slopes, Soil Map Unit: TlrB) these soils

one Point Services

are Mollisols and Argiustolls, which formed in loamy sediments (residuum) of Pleistocene age associated with treads and risers of ancient stream terraces (Figure 69).

The topsoil horizon extended from the surface to a maximum depth of 47-centimeters (18-inches) below surface within a disturbed soil context, yet soil color and textures were generally consistent with the Teller fine sandy loam series. Topsoil colors included dark brown, red, reddish brown and dark reddish gray and consisted of fine sandy loam, sandy loam, and sandy clay loam (Figure 69). Variability in topsoil textures across the area is likely the result mixing by heavy machinery. The subsoil horizon typically consisted of very dark brown, yellowish red and red clay loam, sandy clay loam and clay loam. The average shovel test depth measured 52-centimeters (20-inches) below surface. While topsoil exhibited mixed topsoil and subsoil elements, shovel tests were all terminated within the subsoil component of the profile once the soil color, ped structure, and soil texture were confirmed.

Shovel Test	Cultural Material	Depth and Soil Descriptions
HS1-ST1	None	0-15 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
		15-38 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy loam
		38-59 cm: 7.5YR 2.5/3 very dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
HS1-ST2	None	0-19 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		19-31 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST3	None	0-12 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay loam
		12-15 cm: 5YR 4/6 yellowish red sandy clay loam
		15-26 cm: 7.5YR 4/4 brown sandy clay loam
		26-42 cm: 5YR 4/6 yellowish red compact sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST4	None	0-31 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam
		31-50 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST5	None	0-28 cm: reddish brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam
		28-42 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy clay loam
		42-60 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST6	None	0-33 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam
		33-52 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST7	None	0-25 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
		25-60 cm: 2.5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
HS1-ST8	None	0-30 cm: 2.5YR 3/3 dark reddish gray fine sandy loam
		30-55 cm: 2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay
		Shovel test terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST9	None	0-36 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) sandy clay loam
		mottled w/ reddish brown (2.5YR 4/4) sandy clay
		Terminated at concrete - buried edge of storm shelter pad

 Table 5: Shovel test data from 1201-HS1



HS1-ST10	None	0-47 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) loam 47-65 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam Terminated in subsoil
TR1-ST1	None	0-36 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam 36-61 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam Terminated in subsoil. ST associated with HS1 delineation

Deed information indicates the property was owned by the Fuchs family. The 1940 U.S. Census indicated that Arthur C. Fuchs resided in Crutcho Township in Oklahoma with his wife, Minnie, daughters Anna, Mildred and Florence and son, Charles. Arthur was a Superintendent at a bottling firm (Ancestry 20211). Historic deed information indicates that upon Arthur's death in 1943, Florence Fuchs-English became owner of Tract 1 and her sister, Mildred Fuchs-Wright, became the owner of Tract 2. Florence Fuchs-English was born in 1938 and passed away in 2016 (Kueteman 2021). Florence worked in the oil industry and retired from National Oilwell. The address associated with tract one was 7621 North 23rd Street. In 1994, ownership of tract one moved into the Florence E. English Living Trust. In 2003, tract one was sold to Northeast Landfill, Inc. by the trust.

Overall, 1201-HS1 is the remnant of a concrete storm shelter with a modern cinder block addition. The site is situated in the South Area near Hwy 62, south of a modern excavated pond. Eleven shovel tests were placed within the vicinity of the site to determine the horizontal and vertical nature of potential archaeological deposits. No shovel tests encountered subsurface historic materials. Surface survey observed no historic artifacts on the ground surface. A cluster of standing structures, possibly containing the storm shelter, are visible on the earliest available aerial photographs, dated 1954. Given the general age of the structure in aerial imagery, the structure may have been constructed while the Fuchs family owned the property during the 1950s.

Historic integrity is the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's prehistoric or historic period. Historic integrity is a composite of seven qualities including location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Although the storm shelter remains intact, it does not display significant integrity. The location is intact however there is no strong design, workmanship, or feeling exhibited. The association with other structures visible on the 1954 historic aerial photograph has been compromised by current storm shelter isolation from former structures. The lack of association with persons of historical significance, diffuse material assemblage and the mixed nature of the soil placement indicates that 1201-HS1 cannot provide information important to understanding the historic past. The inability for this site to answer important research questions suggests that 1201-HS1 does not meet the requirements for NRHP eligibility under Criterion A through D (see Chapter 3). The storm shelter located at the NE Landfill in Spencer, Oklahoma, is therefore recommended ineligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places.





Figure 62: USGS Spencer, Midwest City 7.5 min quad with location of site 1201-HS1





Figure 63: Site sketch map of 1201-HS1





Figure 64: View south toward the storm shelter and cinder block addition



Figure 65: View west toward the storm shelter opening





Figure 66: view west into the spiral stairway



Figure 67: View northeast of the concrete pad with metal fasteners





Figure 68: Closeup of concrete texture (scale = 1cm)



Figure 69: Representative soil profile from shovel test HS1-ST8 at site 1201-HS1

Stone Point Services

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Stone Point Services, LLC completed a cultural resource survey of the proposed Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Project Area located in Spencer, Oklahoma for Hydrex Environmental. The project area includes the "North Area," which covers an approximately 73.2-acre (30-hectare) area and the "South Area" of the existing landfill, which consists of 90.1-acres (36.36-hectares). The total area surveyed for this project is approximately 163.3-acres (66-hectares). As the North Area, which contains a tributary of Crutcho Creek, may be used in the future for borrow material, landfill construction, and other landfill activities, it is anticipated disturbance in this area may be extensive. As a Federal nexus has been identified for this project, oversight by the U.S. Corps of Engineers is required and likewise the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) will apply. The purpose of this cultural resources survey is to identify cultural resources (archaeological and historic) that may be impacted by the proposed borrowing, landfill construction and other associated landfill activities.

Background research was conducted on February 13, 2020. Background research indicated no listed, eligible, or potentially eligible sites for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within one mile of the survey area. Background research of historic aerial imagery indicated the presence of historic structures in the South Area and these areas were subjected to near-surface intensive survey. Areas of high-probability for archaeological sites along the unnamed tributary of Crutcho Creek were subjected to reduced-interval testing and encountered no archaeological materials. Close-interval surface survey of the Subject Property encountered no surface artifacts.

After coordination with the OAS, due to the lack of associated artifacts and disturbed integrity, 1201-HS1 was not given an Oklahoma site trinomial. Shovel tests were systematically placed surrounding this feature and encountered no associated subsurface artifacts. As this storm shelter does not fit the criteria for trinomial allocation, we recommend this structure as not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. We therefore find that this project will not impact NRHP listed, eligible, or potentially eligible structures or sites.

The survey included an assessment of direct effects. We find that this project will not impact NRHP listed, eligible, or potentially eligible structures or sites. All records produced as a result of this project will be prepared to OAS, OSHPO, and USACE standards and submitted to the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey at the University of Oklahoma for curation. Survey methods meet or exceed the minimum survey standards of the SWT Corps Regulatory Office outlined in the Guidelines for Cultural Resources Investigations (Sept 2019).

It is the recommendation of Stone Point Services that this project be allowed to proceed as planned. In the event of an inadvertent discovery of human remains and/or archeological cultural deposits, all project activity near the location will cease immediately until proper notification of consulting parties has occurred and mitigative measures have been determined and implemented.



## **References Cited**

Ancestry.com

- 2021a Marshall Crawford. U.S. Veterans Administration Master Index, 1917-1940. Accessed 2021. https://search.ancestry.com/cgibin/sse.dll?indiv=1&dbid=61861&h=1172533&tid=&pid=&queryId=0b6c385b6a830bb1 3b712ba2e993ded4&usePUB=true&_phsrc=Hdw446&_phstart=successSource
- 2021b Marshall Crawford. 1910 United States Federal Census. Accessed 2021. <u>https://www.ancestry.com/discoveryui-</u> <u>content/view/23040589:7884?tid=&pid=&queryId=0b6c385b6a830bb13b712ba2e993de</u> <u>d4&_phsrc=Hdw447&_phstart=successSource</u>
- 2021c Florence E. English. U.S., Public Records Index, 1950-1993, Volume 2. Accessed 2021. <u>https://www.ancestry.com/discoveryui-</u> <u>content/view/98124441:1732?tid=&pid=&queryId=84eef4fbfee4209f6d4e9af7a312dbd7</u> <u>& phsrc=Hdw400& phstart=successSource</u>
- 2021d Florence E. Fuchs English. Obituary published in the Oklahoman on September 18, 2016. Accessed 2021. https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/168908318/florence-e.-english
- 2021e Robert Edwin Wright. WWII Draft Cards Young Men, 1940-1947. Accessed 2021. https://search.ancestry.com/cgibin/sse.dll?db=YMDraftCardsWWII&indiv=try&h=14185043
- 2021f Jane R. Wright. U.S. Public Records Index, 1950-1951, Volume 1. Accessed 2021. <u>https://www.ancestry.com/discoveryui-</u> <u>content/view/267048856:1788?tid=&pid=&queryId=4ffb7fd1174087ecf47040df5c7b9bd</u> <u>6&_phsrc=Hdw396&_phstart=successSource</u>
- 2021g Jane R. Wright. U.S., Public Records Index, 1950-1993, Volume 2. Accessed 2021. <u>https://www.ancestry.com/discoveryui-</u> <u>content/view/365240164:1732?tid=&pid=&queryId=4ffb7fd1174087ecf47040df5c7b9bd</u> <u>6&_phsrc=Hdw395&_phstart=successSource</u>
- 2021h Earl M. Knighton Sr. 1940 US Federal Census. Accessed 2021. https://www.ancestry.com/imageviewer/collections/2442/images/m-t0627-03339-00176?treeid=&personid=&rc=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=Hdw414&_phstart=successSour ce&pId=89119238
- 2021i Earl M. Knighton, Sr. Memorial from the Wichita Eagle. Accessed 2021. https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/33766461/earl-m.-knighton
- 2021j Walter S. Jones. 1940 U.S. Federal Census. Accessed 2021. https://www.ancestry.com/imageviewer/collections/2442/images/m-t0627-03342-

tone Point Services

00273?usePUB=true&_phsrc=Hdw428&_phstart=successSource&usePUBJs=true&pId= 87143873

- 2021k Marshall Crawford. U.S. Union Soldiers Complied Service Records, 1861-1865. Accessed 2021. https://search.ancestry.com/cgibin/sse.dll?dbid=2344&h=229194885&indiv=try&o_vc=Record:OtherRecord&rhSource =7884
- 20211 Marshall Crawford. 1907 Crutcho Plat Map. Accessed 2021. https://www.ancestry.com/imageviewer/collections/1127/images/31617_072086-00855?treeid=&personid=&hintid=&usePUB=true&usePUBJs=true&_ga=2.212169684. 1134749774.1618438783-139213327.1596486899&pId=3203049
- 2021m Arthur Fuchs. 1940 US Federal Census. Accessed 2021. https://www.ancestry.com/imageviewer/collections/2442/images/m-t0627-03317-00466?usePUB=true&usePUBJs=true&pId=90123161

#### Barrett, T.H.

1872 General Land Office Survey of Township 12 North, Range 2 West, Indian Meridian, Oklahoma. Accessed 2021. https://glorecords.blm.gov/results/default.aspx?searchCriteria=type=survey|st=OK|cty=1 09|twp_nr=12|twp_dir=N|rng_nr=2|rng_dir=W

#### Bureau of Economic Geology

1992 Pecan Gap Chalk. Geologic Map of Texas: University of Texas at Austin, Virgil E. Barnes, project supervisor, Hartmann, B.M. and Scranton, D.F. Metadata available at: https://mrdata.usgs.gov/geology/state/sgmc-unit.php?unit=TXKpg%3B0. Accessed November 14, 2019.

#### Burton, Jeffrey.

1997 Indian Territory and the United States, 1866-1906: Courts, Government, and the Movement for Oklahoma Statehood. Vol. 1. University of Oklahoma Press.

Carlson, Leonard A., and Mark A. Roberts. "Indian lands, "Squatterism," and slavery: Economic
interests and the passage of the Indian Removal Act of 1830." *Explorations in Economic History* 43.3, pp. 486-504.

#### Chang, David A.

2010 The Color of the Land: Race, Nation, and the Politics of Landownership in Oklahoma, 1832-1929. Univ of North Carolina Press.

Dolese

2021 Dolese history. Accessed 2021. https://www.dolese.com/

Goldberg, P., and R. Macphail

2006 Practical and Theoretical Geoarchaeology. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK.

Hall, Stephen A.

tone Point Services

1988 Environment And Archaeology Of The Central Osage Plains, *Plains Anthropologist*, 33:120, pp. 203-218.

#### Kueteman, K.

2021 Florence E. Fuchs English. Accessed 2021. https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/168908318/florence-e.-english

#### Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

2021 *Soil Survey of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma*. US Department of Agriculture, National Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station and the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board.

#### Oklahoma Climatological Survey

1997 Climate of Oklahoma. Statewide Precipitation and Temperature Maps. Oklahoma Climatological Survey, College of Geosciences, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma. https://www.ocs.ou.edu.

**Oklahoma Forestry Services** 

2021 "The Ecoregions of Oklahoma." Accessed 2021. http://www.forestry.ok.gov/Websites/forestry/Images/OK%20Ecoregions%2011x17.pdf.

#### Oklahoma Historical Society

- 20121a <u>http://www.okhistory.org/publications/enc/entry.php?entry=DE010</u>, website accessed in 2021.
- 2021b <u>http://www.okhistory.org/publications/enc/entry.php?entry=MA008</u>, website accessed in 2021.
- 2021c <u>http://www.okhistory.org/publications/enc/entry.php?entry=IN018</u>, website accessed in 2021.
- 2021d http://www.okhistory.org/research/oktribes, website accessed in 2021.
- 2021e <u>http://www.okhistory.org/publications/enc/entry.php?entry=PR008</u>, website accessed in 2021

#### Oklahoma Historical Society

2021 Oklahoma County Plats, 1889. Crutcho Plat, T12N, R2W, Tract 22. Accessed 2021. Oklahoma County 1889 | Oklahoma Historical Society (okhistory.org)

#### Oklahoma County Tax Assessor's Office

2021 Oklahoma County Deed Information. Accessed 2021. https://oklahomacounty.geocortex.com/Html5Viewer/Index.html?configBase=http://okla homacounty.geocortex.com/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/OKCAssessor/viewers/OK CAssessor_gvh/virtualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default

ne Point Services

Oklahoma Prehistory Timeline

2021 http://www.ou.edu/archsur/flash/oklahoma.html, website accessed in 2021.

Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office

2020 Oklahoma guidelines of curation of archaeological materials. https://www.okhistory.org/shpo/shpoplanning.

Oklahoma State University Extension Services

2021 Oklahoma's Native Vegetation Types. Natural Resource and Ecology Management Department. Oklahoma State University, Stillwater. Oklahoma. <u>http://pods.dasnr.okstate.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-8062/E-993.pdf</u>.

Schoeneberger, P.J., D.A. Wysocki, E.C. Benham, and Soil Survey Staff

2012. Field book for describing and sampling soils, Version 3.0. Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Soil Survey Center, Lincoln, NE.

Story, D.A.

 Cultural History of the Native Americans. In Archeology and Bioarcheology of the Gulf Coastal Plain, Vol. 1, by D.A. Story, J.A. Guy, B.A. Burnett, M.D. Freeman, J.C. Rose, D.G. Steele, B.W. Olive, and K.J. Reinhard, pp. 163-366. Research Series No. 38. Arkansas Archaeological Survey, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

Tribes-Brief History

2021 http://www.theamericanindiancenter.org/oklahoma-tribal-history, website accessed in 2021.

USGS Historical Topographic Map Explorer

2021 <u>https://livingatlas.arcgis.com/topoexplorer/index.html</u>. Website accessed 2021.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

2021 http://www.epa.gov/wed/pages/ecoregions/ok_eco.htm, website accessed in 2020.

Verhagen, P., Whitley, T.G.

2012 Integrating Archaeological Theory and Predictive Modeling: a Live Report from the Scene. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 19 pp. 49–100.

Web Atlas of Oklahoma

2021 http://www.okatlas.org/okatlas/tofc.htm, website accessed in 2021.



# Appendix A: Shovel Test Log

Shovel Test	Cultural Material	Depth and Soil Descriptions
HS1-ST1	None	0-15 cm: 7 5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
1151 511	1 tone	15-38 cm: 7 5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy loam
		38-59 cm: 7 5YR 2 5/3 very dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
HS1-ST2	None	0.19 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
1151-512	None	10-31 cm; yellowish red (5VR $1/6$ ) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1_ST3	None	0.12  cm: 7.5 VR 3/4  dark brown sandy clay loam
1151-515	None	12 15 cm: 5VR 1/6 vellowish red sandy clay loam
		15.26 cm; 7.5VP 4/4 brown sandy clay loam
		26.42 cm: 5VP 4/6 vollowish red compact sends class loom
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST4	None	0-31 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam
	1,0110	31-50 cm; yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST5	None	0-28 cm: reddish brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam
		28-42 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy clay loam
		42-60  cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST6	None	0-33 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam
1101 010	1,0110	33-52 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST7	None	0-25 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
		25-60 cm: 2.5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
HS1-ST8	None	0-30 cm: 2.5YR 3/3 dark reddish grav fine sandy loam
		30-55 cm: 2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay
		Shovel test terminated in subsoil
HS1-ST9	None	0-36 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) sandy clay loam
		mottled w/ reddish brown (2.5YR 4/4) sandy clay
		Terminated at concrete - buried edge of storm shelter pad
HS1-ST10	None	0-47 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) loam
		47-65 cm: vellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
HS2-ST1	None	0-26 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) gravelly sandy clay loam
		26-33 cm: vellowish red (5YR 5/8 sandy clay
		33-44 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) compact sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
HS2-ST2	None	0-18 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		18-37 cm: dark reddish brown (2.5YR 3/4) sandy clay
		Terminated in compact subsoil
HS2-ST3	None	0-28 cm: 2.5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown fine sandy loam
102 010		28-51 cm: 5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Heavily compacted 45 cm+
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon



HS2-ST4	None	0-33 cm: 2.5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy clay with
		construction gravels
		33-56 cm: 2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay loam.
		Shovel test terminated in subsoil
HS2-ST5	None	0-14 cm; dusky red (2.5YR 3/2) sandy clay
1102 010	1,0110	14-41 cm: dark reddish brown (2.5YR 3/3) compact sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
HS2-ST6	None	0-20 cm: 7 5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
1152 510	1 tone	20-52 cm; 7 5YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
HS2-ST7	None	0.8  cm brown (7 5YR 4/4) gravelly sandy clay loam
1152 517	rtone	8-19 cm ⁻ red (2 5YR 4/8) gravelly sandy clay
		19-44 cm: brown (7 5YR 4/4) compact sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR1-ST1	None	0.36  cm: dark brown (7 5VR $3/4$ ) sandy loam
11(1-511	None	36-61 cm; yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil ST associated with HS1 delineation
TP1 ST2	None	0.13 cm; red (2.5VR 4/8) sandy loam
111-512	None	$13_{-32}$ cm: brown (7 5VR $4/4$ ) sandy round
		32-42 cm; reddish brown (5VR $4/4$ ) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR1-ST3	None	0-30 cm: 7 5VR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy loam
11(1-515	None	30-59 cm: 5VR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR2-ST1	None	0-20 cm: 7 5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
1112 511	ivone	20-53 cm: 5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR2-ST2	None	0-16 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/3) sandy clay
1112 512	rtone	16-39 cm ² reddish brown (2 5YR 4/4) sandy clay
		39-53 cm ² red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR2-ST3	None	0-31 cm ⁻ dark brown (7 5YR 3/4) sandy loam
1112 515	Ttone	31-52 cm ² vellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR2-ST4	None	0-10  cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown fine sandy loam
	1,0110	10-31 cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		31-58 cm: 5YR 2.5/2 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam with
		2.5YR 4/6 red mottling
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR2-ST5	None	0-12 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) loam
		12-24 cm: mottled dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) and yellowish red
		(5YR 5/8) sandy clay loam
		24-41 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) sandy clay loam
		41-52 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR2-ST6	None	0-17 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) sandy clay
		17-66 cm: very dark gray (5YR 3/1) sandy clay
		mottled w/ red (2.5YR 4/8) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil

TR2-ST7	None	0-23 cm: 2.5YR 4/1 dark reddish grav fine sandy loam
~ /		23-58 cm ⁻² 5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay
		Shovel test terminated in subsoil
TR3-ST1	None	0-48 cm ⁻ brown (7 5YR 4/4) sandy loam
110 511	rtone	48-80 cm: brown (7.5 YR 4/4) mottled with red (2.5 YR 5/8)
		sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TD2 ST2	Nono	0.38 cm; dark raddish brown (5VP 3/2) sandy loam
113-512	None	29.80  am reddish brown (5VR $4/4$ ) sandy found
		Termineted in subseil
TD2 9T2	None	0.12 cm 10VD 2/2 dock brown fine condulation
183-515	None	12 20 and 10 XD 2/4 dark brown line sandy loan
		12-38 cm: 10 Y K 3/4 dark yellowish brown sandy clay loam
		with 2.5 Y R 4/6 red mottling
		38-80 cm: 5 Y R 4/6 yellowish red sandy clay loam with 2.5 Y R
		4/6 red mottling
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR3-ST4	None	0-12 cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		12-20 cm: 5YR 5/6 yellowish red sandy loam
		20-66 cm: 5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		66-87 cm: 5YR 4/3 reddish brown sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR3-ST5	None	0-15 cm: very dark gray (7.5YR 3/1) sandy loam
		15-52 cm: strong brown (7.5YR 4/6) sandy loam
		52-74 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		74-80 cm: red (2.5YR 4/8) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR3-ST6	None	0-12 cm: dark reddish gray (5YR 4/2) sandy loam
		12-59 cm: red (2.5YR 4/8) sandy clay
		Terminated at bedrock
TR3-ST7	None	0-10 cm: 5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown fine sandy loam
		10-20 cm: 5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		20-45 cm: 5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated at sandstone bedrock
TR3-ST8	None	0-33 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) sandy loam
		33-80 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR3-ST9	None	0-20 cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown fine sandy loam
		20-50 cm: 5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		50-80 cm: 5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR3-ST10	None	0.35 cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
110 5110	1,0110	35-53 cm ² 2 5YR 4/6 soft red weathered sandstone vielding to
		hard sandstone
		Terminated at hard sandstone bedrock
TR3_ST11	None	0-11 cm; dusky red (2 5VR 3/2) sandy loam
113-3111	THOME	$11_{48}$ cm; dusky red (2.5 VR 3/2) sandy clay loam
		$A_{\rm A}=40$ cm; red (2.5VR $A/6$ ) sandy clay
		Terminated at sandstone badrock
1		I CHIMIAICU AL SAMUSIUNE UCULUCK



TR3-ST12	None	0-43 cm: 5YR 3/1 very dark gray sandy loam
		43-78 cm: 2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay
		Terminated at coarse roots within subsoil
TR3-ST13	None	0-8 cm: 5YR 2.5/2 dark reddish brown fine sandy loam
		8-33 cm: 5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		33-80 cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR3-ST14	None	0-14 cm: very dark brown (10YR 2/2) sandy loam
		14-57 cm: vellowish red (5YR $4/6$ )
		57-74 cm; red (2.5YR 5/8) sandy clay loam
		Terminated at sandstone
TR3-ST15	None	0-12 cm; dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) sandy loam
		12-37 cm; brown (7.5YR $4/3$ ) sandy clay loam
		37-80 cm ² brown (7 5YR 5/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR3-ST16	None	0-31 cm: 5YR 3/1 very dark gray sandy clay loam
110 5110	rtone	31-80 cm: 7 5YR 4/3 brown sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR3-ST17	None	0-19 cm: dark brown (7 5YR 3/2) sandy loam
110-5117	TUNE	10-61 cm: dark reddish brown (5VR 3/3) sandy loam
		$61_72$ cm; yellowish red (5VR $4/6$ ) loamy sand
		72 80 cm; red (2 SVR $4/8$ ) sand
		Terminated in subsoil
TD2 ST18	Nono	0.20 cm; 5VP 2.5/2 dark raddish brown fina sandy loam
1K3-5110	None	20.62 am; 5VD 4/4 raddish brown sandy alay loam
		20-02 cm. 5 T K 4/4 reduish blown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TD2 ST10	Nona	0.28 cm; dork roddish brown (5VR 2/2) condu loom
113-5119	None	28, 80 any vallowish red (5VD 4/6) sound alay
		Termineted in subsoil
TD2 ST20	Nona	0.22 cm; 2.5VB 2/1 dark raddich gray condy loom
1K3-5120	None	0-25 cm; 2.5VP 4/9 red gravally sondy alay
		25-55 Cill. 2.5 I K 4/8 red automaly grouply soundy clay
		Termineted due to coorse netural stream gravels
TD 4 CT1	Nana	0.22 mm 5VD 2/2 dark and the harmonic and the harmonic
1K4-511	None	0-33 cm: 5 Y R 3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		53-55 cm: 2.5 f R 5/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay
	N	
1R4-512	None	0-31 cm: 2.5 Y R $4/2$ weak red sandy loam
		31-55 cm: 2.5 Y R 3/6 dark red sandy clay
	N	
TR4-ST3	None	0-34 cm: 2.5 YR 4/2 weak red sandy loam
		34-52 cm: 2.5 Y R 3/6 dark red sandy clay
		1 erminated in subsoil
TR4-ST4	None	0-36 cm: 2.5 YR 4/2 weak red sandy loam
		36-54 cm: 2.5YR 4/6 red sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR4-ST5	None	0-26 cm: 5YR 4/2 dark reddish gray sandy loam
		26-54 cm: 5YR 4/6 yellowish red sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil



	~ ~	
TR4-ST6	None	0-34 cm: 5YR 4/2 dark reddish gray sandy loam
		34-48 cm: 5YR 4/6 yellowish red sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR5-ST1	None	0-5 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy loam
		5-22 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay loam
		22-50 cm: 5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR5-ST2	None	0-19 cm: 5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown fine sandy loam
		19-52 cm: 2.5YR 3/6 dark red sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR5-ST3	None	0-5 cm: 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown fine sandy loam
		5-27 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy clay loam
		27-51 cm: 2.5YR 3/6 dark red sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR5-ST4	None	0-12 cm; 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy loam
110 51	1,0110	12-23 cm ² 7 5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy clay loam
		23-50 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR5-ST5	None	$0.4 \text{ cm} \cdot 7.5 \text{YR} 3/4 \text{ dark brown loam}$
110 515	rtone	4-21 cm: 7 5YR 4/3 brown fine sandy clay loam
		21-49 cm; 5VR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TP5 ST6	None	0.8 cm; 5VP 3/2 dark reddish brown loam
113-510	None	8 20 cm; 5VP 3/2 dark reddish brown fine sandy clay loam
		20.54 cm; 5VP 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TD5 9T7	None	0.4 om 5VD 2/2 dork reddigh heaven loom
1K3-517	None	4. 26 cm; 5VP 3/2 dark reddish brown fine sendy clay loom
		26.52 am: 5VD 2/2 dark reddish brown condy clay loom
		Showel test terminated within subsoil herizon
TD5 CT9	None	0.4 area 5VD 2/2 dark reddick heaven laare
1K3-518	None	4.20  cm, 5VD $4/2$ read ish brown fine conductor loom
		4-50 cm: 5 YR 4/5 reddish brown line sandy clay loam
		30-53 cm: 5 Y R 4/3 reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil norizon
1R6-S11	None	0-27 cm: brown (7.5 YR 4/3) loam
		2/-50 cm: reddish brown (5 Y R $4/3$ ) clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR6-ST2	None	0-22 cm: brown (7.5 YR 4/3) loam
		22-36 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) loam
		36-47 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR6-ST3	None	0-24 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/3) loam
		24-54 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR6-ST4	None	0-22 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/3) loam
		22-53 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR6-ST5	None	0-20 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/3) loam
		20-52 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil



TR6-ST6	None	0-13 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/3) loam
		13-47 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR6-ST7	None	0-20 cm ⁻ brown (7 5YR 4/3) loam
1110 217	1,0110	20-52 cm ² vellowish red (5YR 5/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR7_ST1	None	$0_{-28}$ cm: reddish brown (5VR 5/4) sandy clay
11(7-511	None	28 40  cm: red (2 5VB $4/6$ ) sondy clay
		Termineted in subsoil
TD7 ST2	None	0.26  amy raddish brown (5VD 4/4) and y alow
1K/-512	None	26.48 since and $(2.5 VD A/6)$ slow
		50-48 cm. red (2.5 f K 4/0) cmay
<b>TD7 0T2</b>	N	
TR/-ST3	None	0-28 cm: reddish brown (5 Y R $4/4$ ) sandy clay
		28-42 cm: red (2.5 Y R 4/6) clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR7-ST4	None	0-36 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay
		36-53 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR7-ST5	None	0-31 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay
		31-44 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR7-ST6	None	0-37 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay
		37-51 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR8-ST1	None	0-20 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam
		20-57 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR8-ST2	None	0-13 cm: 5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy loam
		13-55 cm: 2.5YR 3/6 dark red soft sandstone clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR8-ST3	None	0-7 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/3) sandy loam
		7-37 cm; red (2.5YR 5/8) sandy clay loam
		Terminated at sandstone
TR8-ST4	None	0-23 cm ² 2 5YR 5/4 reddish brown sandy loam
	1 tone	23-56 cm: 7 5YR 4/4 brown sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR8-ST5	None	0-12  cm: dark brown (7 5YR 3/2) loam
110 515	rtone	12  cm: brown (7.5 YR 4/4) sandy loam
		50-60 cm: vellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TP8 ST6	None	0.14 cm; dark raddish brown (5VP 3/3) sandy clay loam
110-510	TAOLIC	14-58 cm: dark reddish brown (5VD 3/3) sandy clay loam
		mottled w/ red (2 5VR 5/8) conduction $(3 1 \text{ K} 3/3)$ satisfy the observed in the set of the set
		Termineted in subsoil
TD0 0T7	Nora	0.0 ami atrong brown (7.5VD 4/6) and dr lager
1K8-51/	inone	0.9 cm: strong brown (7.5 K 4/b) sandy loam
		9-21 CIII: red (2.5 Y K $5/\delta$ ) SOIL Sandstone 21. 40 cm dark knows (7.5 VD 2.2) cm 1 -1
		21-40 cm: dark brown (7.5 Y K $3/2$ ) sandy loam
1		I erminated in subsoil

TR8-ST8	None	0-17 cm: 7.5YR 2.5/2 very dark brown loam
		17-31 cm: 7.5YR 3/2 dark brown sandy loam
		31-42 cm: 7.5YR 2.5/2 very dark brown sandy clay loam
		42-58 cm: 2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR8-ST9	None	0-15 cm: very dark gravish brown (10YR 3/2) loam
		15-44 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/3) sandy loam
		44-55 cm; vellowish red (5YR 5/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR8-ST10	None	0-29 cm: dark reddish gray (2 5YR 4/1) sandy clay loam
110 5110	rione	29-52 cm ² reddish brown (2.5YR 4/4) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR8-ST11	None	0.31 cm: 2.5 VR 4/1 dark reddish gray sandy loam
110-5111	1 Volic	$31_{-60}$ cm: 2.5VR $4/4$ reddish brown sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TD9 6T12		0.26 am; yary dark brown (7.5VD 2.5/2) loom
1K0-5112		26.52  cm; brown (7.5VD 4/4) loam
		Termineted in subsoil
TDO CT1	Nono	0.4 am 10VD 4/4 dark vallewich beauge fine laam
189-511	None	4.10 cm 7.5VD 2/4 dork brown fine condu loom
		4-19 cm: 7.5 K 3/4 dark brown line sandy loam
		19-60 cm: 7.5 YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR9-ST2	None	0-4 cm: 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown fine loam
		4-20 cm: 7.5 YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
		20-59 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR9-ST3	None	0-5 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine loam
		5-12 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
		12-28 cm: 7.5YR 2.5/3 very dark brown fine sandy clay loam
		28-55 cm: 7.5YR 4/3 brown Sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR9-ST4	None	0-17 cm: 7.5YR 4/3 brown fine sandy loam
		17-35 cm: 5YR 4/3 reddish brown sandy clay loam
		35-60 cm: 5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR9-ST5	None	0-5 cm: 7.5YR 4/2 brown fine loam
		5-18 cm: 7.5YR 4/3 brown fine sandy loam
		18-38 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy clay loam
		38-61 cm: 7.5YR 2.5/3 very dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR9-ST6	None	0-6 cm: 10YR 4/3 brown fine loam
		6-16 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
		16-30 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy clay loam
		30-55 cm: 5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR9-ST7	None	0-12 cm: 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown fine sandy loam
		12-21 cm: 7.5YR 4/3 brown sandy clay loam
		21-62 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
		Shover test terminated within Subson nonzon


	NT	$0.15 \dots 7.5$ VD $2/2$ deals have see fine because		
189-518	None	0-15 cm: 7.5 YR 3/3 dark brown fine loam		
		15-34 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy clay loam		
		34-60 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay loam		
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon		
TR9-ST9	None	0-14 cm: 7.5YR 4/3 brown fine sandy loam		
		14-55 cm: 7.5YR 4/3 brown sandy clay loam		
		Mechanically disturbed		
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon		
TR10-ST1	None	0-45 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) loam		
		45-60 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR10-ST2	None	0.44 cm; dark brown (7 5VR 3/4) loam		
11(10 512	rione	44-61 cm: vellowish red (5VR $4/6$ ) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TD10 ST2	None	0.15 and dark brown (7.5VD 2/2) condy loom		
1K10-515	None	15 40 and $1000$ m $(7.51  K 5/5)$ satisfy to an $1000$		
		Touriset discussion red (51 K 4/6) sandy clay loam		
TR10-S14	None	0-38 cm: brown (7.5 YR 4/4) sandy loam		
		38-56 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR10-ST5	None	0-33 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy loam		
		33-53 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR10-ST6	None	0-27 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy loam		
		27-53 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR10-ST7	None	0-35 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy loam		
		35-57 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR10-ST8	None	0-36 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy loam		
		36-54 cm: vellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR10-ST9	None	0.26  cm brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy loam		
	1 tone	26-48 cm; vellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TP11 ST1	None	0.29 cm: reddish brown (5VR $4/4$ ) sandy loam		
1K11-511	None	20.47 am; vallewish red (5VR 4/4) sandy clew loam		
		Z9-47 Cill. yellowish led (31K 4/0) sandy ciay loan		
TD11 CT2	None	0.20  and reddich brown (5VD 4/2) condulator		
IKII-512	None	0-29 cm: reddish brown (5 Y K $4/5$ ) sandy loam		
		29-48 cm: yellowish red (5 Y R 4/6) sandy clay		
<b>TD 11 0TD</b>		lerminated in subsoil		
TRII-ST3	None	0-33 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam		
		33-46 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR11-ST4	None	0-32 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam		
		32-45 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR11-ST5	None	0-28 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam		
		28-41 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay		
		Terminated in subsoil		



TR11-ST6	None	0-29 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam
		29-48 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR11-ST7	None	0-27 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) sandy loam
		27-49 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR11-ST8	None	0-31 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam
		31-51 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR11-ST9	None	0-33 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam
		33-48 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR12-ST1	None	0-19 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam
		19-44 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR12-ST2	None	0-18 cm: 5YR 4/6 yellowish red sandy loam
		18-55 cm: 5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR12-ST3	None	0-28 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam
		28-43 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR12-ST4	None	0-18 cm: 5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown fine sandy clay loam
		18-52 cm: 5YR 4/6 yellowish red sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR12-ST5	None	0-23 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy loam
		23-41 cm: red (2.5YR 4/6) sandy clay
	N.	Terminated in subsoil
TR12-S16	None	0-19  cm: 7.5 YR 4/3 brown sandy loam
		19-60 cm: 7.5 Y R 3/3 dark brown sandy clay loam
TD 10 GT7	N	Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR12-S17	None	0-27 cm: reddish brown (5 Y R 4/4) sandy loam
		2/-46 cm: red (2.5 Y R 4/6) sandy clay
TD 12 0T1	N	
1R13-S11	None	0-6 cm: dark brown (7.5 YR 3/2) loam
		6-11 cm: brown (7.5 Y R 4/4) sandy loam
		11-3/ cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
TD12 CT2	News	I erminated in subsoli
1K15-512	None	14.26 amy vallowish red (5VD 5/8) candy alay loam
		Termineted in subsoil
TD12 0T2	Nona	0.8  any brown (7.5 VD 4/4)  and  100m
1K15-515	None	0-8 cm; foldwil (7.5 f K 4/4) sandy loam
		30.40  am rod (2 5VP $4/8$ ) sondy clay loam
		Torminated in subsoil
TD12 9T4	Nona	$\frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}$
1K13-514	INOILE	0-21 CIII. DIOWII (7.5 I K 4/5) CIAY IOAIII 21.44 am; vallowish rad (5VP 4/6) sandy alay loam
		Z1-44 CIII: yellowishi feu (S1K 4/0) sandy clay loani
1		

-			
TR14-ST1	None	0-10 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sand	
		10-46 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) sandy loam	
		46-72 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam	
		72-80 cm: red $(2.5YR 4/8)$ soft sandstone	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR14-ST2	None	$0_{-10}$ cm: 7 5VR 3/2 dark brown fine sandy loam	
1114-512	INDIC	10.20 am; 7.5VD 2/2 dark brown fine sandy loam	
		20.50 cm; 7.5VD 2/4 dark brown condy class from	
		50-50 cm: 7.5 f K $3/4$ dark brown sandy clay loam	
		50-80 cm: 7.5 cm: 3/3 dark brown sandy clay loam	
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon	
TR14-ST3	None	0-16 cm: dusky red (2.5YR 3/2) sandy loam	
		16-72 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated at tree root	
TR14-ST4	None	0-61 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) sandy loam	
		61-80 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR14-ST5	None	0-12 cm: 7.5YR 3/2 dark brown fine sandy loam	
1111 . 510	1,0110	12-25 cm; 5YR 4/6 vellowish red sandy clay loam	
		25-45 cm: 2 5VR 4/6 red soft sandstone	
		45cm L sandstone bedrock	
		Shovel test terminated at conditions hadrock	
	N	Shover test terminated at satisfield bedrock	
1K14-S16	None	0-18 cm: dark reddish brown (5 Y R 3/2) sandy clay loam	
		18-80 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated at depth	
TR14-ST7	None	0-11 cm: 7.5YR 3/2 dark brown fine sandy loam	
		11-22 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam	
		22-45 cm: 5YR 4/6 yellowish red sandy clay loam	
		45-80 cm: 2.5YR 4/6 red clay loam	
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon	
TR14-ST8	None	0-16 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) loam	
		16-25 cm: yellowish red (5YR 5/6) sandy loam	
		25-71 cm; dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) sandy clay loam	
		71-80 cm; reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR14-ST9	None	0-42 cm: dark reddish brown (5VR 3/3) sandy loam	
1114-517	None	42.80  cm; red (2.5VP $4/6$ ) sandy clay	
		Terminated at denth	
TD14 CT10	News	0.15 and 7.5VD 2/2 dark horses find and horse	
1814-5110	None	0-15 cm: 7.5 YR 3/2 dark brown fine sandy loam	
		15-40 cm: 7.5 Y R 3/3 dark brown sandy clay loam	
		40-80 cm: /.5 YR 4/3 brown clay loam	
L		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon	
TR14-ST11	None	0-12 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) loam	
		12-27 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) loam	
		27-50 cm: strong brown (7.5YR 5/8) clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR14-ST12	None	0-47 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/3) sandy loam	
		47-68 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	



TR14-ST13	None	0-12 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) loam	
		12-59 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy loam	
		59-80 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR14-ST14	None	0-18 cm: 7.5YR 3/2 dark brown fine sandy loam	
		18-42 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy clay loam	
		42-80 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay loam	
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon	
TR14-ST15	None	0-22 cm: dark reddish brown (2.5YR 3/4) sandy loam	
		Terminated at sandstone	
TR14-ST16	None	0-10 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/2) sandy loam	
		10-58 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) sandy loam	
		58-80 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated at depth	
TR14-ST17	None	0-13 cm; very dark brown (7.5YR 2.5/2) loam	
	1,0110	13-37 cm [•] vellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam	
		37-80 cm: dark brown (7 5YR 3/3) clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR14-ST18	None	0-13 cm; very dark brown (7 5YR 2 5/2) loam	
1114-5110	None	13-37 cm; vellowich red (5VR 1/6) sandy clay loam	
		37.80 cm: dark brown (7.5VR 3/3) clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TD14 ST10	None	0.14 cm years dork group (5VD 2/1) condy loom	
1K14-5119	None	0-14 CIII. Very dark gray (STR $5/1$ ) sandy loan	
		14-02 cm: reduisit brown (51K $4/5$ ) satisfy to am	
		52-80 cm: reduish brown (5 Y K 4/4) sandy clay loam	
	N	lerminated at depth	
1815-511	None	0-13 cm: very dark brown (10 Y R $2/2$ ) sandy loam	
		To-54 CIII: DIOWII (7.5 Y K 4/5) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR15-ST2	None	0-15 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine loam	
		15-30 cm: 7.5YR 4/4 brown sandy loam	
		30-60 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay loam	
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon	
TR15-ST3	None	0-34 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy loam	
		34-52 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR15-ST4	None	0-23 cm: 5YR 4/2 dark reddish gray sandy loam	
		23-54 cm: 5YR 5/4 reddish brown sandy clay	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR15-ST5	None	0-8 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) sandy loam	
		8-43 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy loam	
		43-55 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
TR15-ST6	None	0-25 cm: 7.5YR 2.5/2 very dark brown fine sandy loam	
_		25-46 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy clay loam	
		46-63 cm: 7.5YR 2.5/3 yerv dark brown sandy clay loam	
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon	
TR15-ST7	None	0-23 cm; very dark grav (5YR 3/1) sandy loam	
		23-56 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy clay loam	
		Terminated in subsoil	
	1		



TR15-ST8	None	0-19 cm: very dark gray (5YR 3/1) sandy loam		
		19-37 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated at tree roots		
TR15-ST9	None	0-32 cm: very dark brown (10YR 2/2) sandy loam		
		32-60 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR15-ST10	None	0-19 cm: 7.5YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam		
		19-36 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy clay loam		
		36-60 cm: 7.5YR 2.5/3 very dark brown sandy clay loam		
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon		
TR15-ST11	None	0-35 cm: dark brown (10YR 3/3) sandy loam		
		35-51 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR15-ST12	None	0-18 cm: 5YR 4/4 reddish brown fine sandy clay loam		
		18-50 cm: 5YR 4/6 vellowish red sandy clay loam		
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon		
TR15-ST13	None	0-24 cm; dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) sandy loam		
		24-43 cm; vellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR15-ST14	None	0-6 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) sandy loam		
	1,0110	6-20 cm; vellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam		
		20-31 cm ⁻ red (2.5YR 4/6) clay		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR15-ST15	None	0-34 cm: 2 5VR 3/1 dusky red sandy loam		
1113 5115	ittone	34-52 cm: 5YR 3/6 dark red sandy clay		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TR15-ST16	None	0-21 cm: 7 5YR 4/4 brown fine sandy loam		
	1 tone	21-39 cm: 7 5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy clay loam		
		39-56 cm: 7 5YR 3/3 dark brown sandy clay loam		
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon		
TR15-ST17	None	0-26 cm: very dark brown (10YR 2/2) sandy loam		
1113 5117	ivone	26-51  cm: brown (7 5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TP15 ST18	None	0.14 cm; 7.5VB 3/4 dark brown fine sandy loam		
1113-5110	None	14 26 cm; 7 5VD 2/2 dark brown fine sandy loam		
		36 55 cm: 7 5VR 4/3 brown sandy clay loam		
		Shovel test termineted with subseil herizon		
TD16 ST1	Nono	0.12 cm; dork roddish brown (5VP 2/2) sondy loom		
1K10-511	None	13 46 cm; raddish brown (5VP $4/4$ ) sandy clay loam		
		Termineted in cubecil		
TD16 ST2	None	0.10  amy brown  (7.5 VB  4/4)  condy loom		
1K10-512	None	10.42 and vallewich red (5VD 4/6) and value low		
		Terminated in subsoil		
TP16 ST2	Nono	0.12 cm: 7.5VR 3/2 dark brown loam		
1110-313	none	12 20 am: 7 5VD 2 5/2 yeary dark brown fine condy alow loom		
		20. 45 cm; 7.5VD 2.5/2 years dark brown condy clay loam		
		Shovel test termineted at very large root 45 embe		
TD16 OT4	Nega	0.20 any SVD doubt as d tick because and to be an		
1K10-514	none	20.45 cm; 5VD 4/4 reddich brown clay loam		
		Termineted subscil with soones rests		
1	1	reminated subson with coarse roots		



TR16-ST5	None	0-21 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/2) sandy loam
		21-43 cm; reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR16-ST6	None	0-14 cm ⁻ dark brown (7 5YR 3/3) sandy loam
	rtone	14-40 cm; reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR17-ST1	None	0-16 cm: 7 5VR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
	None	16-35 cm: 7 5YR 4/4 brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
$TP17_ST2$	None	$0_{-6}$ cm: brown (7 5VR 5/4) compact sandy loam
11(17-512	None	6.37  cm; brown (7.5 VP $4/4$ ) compact sandy claw loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TD17 ST2	Nona	0.17 cm; dork raddish brown (5VP 2/2) sondy alay loom
1K1/-515	None	17 44 cm; raddish brown (5VD 4/2) candy clay toani
		Termineted in subseil
TD 10 CT1	News	
1K18-511	None	0-24 cm: 7.5 YR 4/2 Brown sandy loam.
		24-44 cm: 5 Y R 4/6 yellowish red clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil. Topsoil disturbed by machinery
TR18-S12	None	0-10 cm: 7.5 YR 3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam
		10-23 cm: 7.5 YR 4/4 brown fine sandy clay loam
		23-42 cm: 7.5 YR 2.5/2 very dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR18-ST3	None	0-28 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) compact sandy loam
		28-43 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) compact sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR19-ST1	None	0-14 cm: reddish brown (5YR 5/3) compact sandy loam
		Terminated due to mechanical compaction
TR20-ST1	None	0-19 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/3) sandy clay loam
		19-46 cm: dark reddish brown (2.5YR 3/4) sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil
TR20-ST2	None	0-14 cm: 7.5YR 4/3 brown fine sandy loam
		14-25 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown fine sandy clay loam
		25-55 cm: 7.5YR 3/4 dark brown sandy clay loam
		Shovel test terminated within subsoil horizon
TR20-ST3	None	0-16 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy clay loam
		16-37 cm: yellowish red (5YR 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR21-ST1	None	0-24 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) sandy loam
		24-47 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) compact sandy loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR21-ST2	None	0-10 cm:2.5YR 5/6 red clay
		10-50 cm: 2.5YR 3/2 dusky red gravelly sandy loam with
		2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy loam clasts in matrix
		50-70 cm: 2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy loam with 2.5YR
		4/2 weak red sandy loam clasts in matrix
		Terminated in disturbed subsoil
TR21-ST3	None	0-8 cm: red (2.5YR 5/6) wet sand
		8-26 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/2) sandy loam
		26-44 cm: red (2.5YR 5/6) sand
		Terminated in slope wash



TP22 ST1	None	0.16 cm: very dark brown (7.5VP 2.5/3) sandy loam
11122-511	None	16.29 and dark brown (7.5VD $2/4$ ) can dy loam
		10-56 CIII. dalk blowii (7.51 K $3/4$ ) saildy loalli 29.54 cmc streng have $(7.5 \text{VD} A/6)$ cm have been
		38-54 cm: strong brown (7.5 Y R 4/6) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR22-ST2	None	0-39 cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		39-57 cm: 5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR23-ST1	None	0-18 cm: red (2.5YR 5/6) sand
		18-dark brown (7.5YR 3/4) sandy loam
		Disturbed from slope wash
TR24-ST1	None	0-10 cm: dark brown (7.5YR 3/3) mottled with red (2.5YR 5/8)
	1,0110	sandy loam
		10-37 cm: very dark brown (7 5YR 2/5/3) sandy loam
		37.55  cm: brown (7.5VR $A/A$ ) sandy clay loam
		Termineted in subseil
	News	$\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} $
1K24-512	None	0-60 cm: Mollied 5 Y K 5/2 sandy loam with 5 Y K 5/6 yellowish
		red sandy clay
		60-75 cm: 5YR 5/6 sandy clay
		Terminated within disturbed mix of topsoil and subsoil
TR25-ST1	None	0-9  cm: brown (7.5YR 4/2) wet loam
		9-31 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam
		31-57 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR25-ST2	None	0-30 cm: 5YR 4/2 dark reddish gray sandy loam
		30-50 cm: 5YR 5/6 yellowish red sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil. Topsoil scraped and mixed for oil pad
TR26-ST1	None	0-27 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/4) sandy loam
		27-50 cm; vellowish red (5YR $4/7$ ) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR26-ST2	None	0-31 cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
11120 012	rtone	31-50 cm: 5YR 5/6 vellowish red sandy clay
		Terminated in subsoil below disturbed topsoil
TD27 ST1	None	0.8 cm; dort brown (7.5VD 2/2) cond
1827-511	None	0.8  cm dark brown (7.5 K $3/2$ ) sand
		8-35 cm: dark brown (7.5 Y K $3/2$ ) sandy loam
		35-55 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR27-ST2	None	0-38 cm 5YR3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		38-48 cm 2.5YR3/3 dark reddish brown sandy clay
		Terminated in B Horizon
TR27-ST3	None	0-37 cm: 5YR 3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		37-54 cm: 5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR27-ST4	None	0-12 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/3) sandy clay loam
	-	12-41 cm: reddish brown (5YR 4/4) sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR27-ST5	None	0-47  cm 5YR4/6 vellowish red sandy loam
11127-015		47-63 cm 5YR4/2 dark reddish gray sandy clay
		Terminated in B Horizon

TR27-ST6	None	0-3 cm: 2.5 YR 3/2 dark reddish brown loam slopewash
11127 210	1,0110	3-35 cm ² 2 5 YR 4/8 red coarse well rounded sand quarry
		material
		Terminated in quarry sand deposit
TR27_ST7	None	$0_{-13}$ cm: dark brown (7 5VR 3/2) loamy sand
11127-517	None	$13_{25}$ cm: brown (7.5 VR $1/3$ ) sand
		15-25 cm; rod (2 5VP 5/8) coarse cond
		Z3-32 cm. red (2.3 r K 5/8) coarse said
<b>TD07</b> CT0		1 commated in said quarry init
1K2/-518		0-15 cm 2.5 Y R3/3 dark reddish brown coarse sand – quarry
<b>TD 00 (TT 1</b>		
TR28-ST1	None	0-9 cm: reddish yellow (5YR 6/8) sand
		9-43 cm: brown (7.5YR 4/3) sand
		43-54 cm: reddish brown (5YR 5/4) sand
		Terminated in subsoil
TR28-ST2	None	0-32 cm 5YR4/6 yellowish red sandy loam
		32-50 cm 5YR4/2 dark reddish gray sandy clay
		Terminated in B Horizon
TR28-ST3	None	0-33 cm: 5YR 5/6 yellowish red sand
		33-57 cm: 5YR 4/3 reddish brown sandy loam
		57-72 cm: 5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy clay loam
		Terminated in subsoil below quarry sand
TR29-ST1	None	0-28 cm 5YR4/6 yellowish red sandy loam
		28047 cm 5YR4/2 dark reddish grav sandy clay
		Terminated in B Horizon
TR29-ST2	None	0-6 cm: yellowish red (5YR 5/6) sand
		6-27 cm; light red (2.5YR 6/6) sand
		27-46 cm; dark reddish brown (5YR 3/3) sandy loam
		Terminated in subsoil
TR29-ST3	None	0-28 cm 5YR4/6 vellowish red sandy loam
	1,0110	28-45  cm 5YR4/2  dark reddish gray sandy clay
		Terminated in B Horizon
TR30-ST1	None	0-2 cm 2 5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy clay
11050 511	rone	2-21 cm 5VR3/2 dark reddish brown sandy loam
		Terminated at 2 inch tree root. Moved ST twice and still
		anountered impendential roots. ST terminated due to
		chetrustions
TD20 ST2	Nono	0.16  are red (2.5 VD 5%)  cond
1830-512	None	16.27 and dark reddick brown (5VD 2/2) can do be m
		16-57 cm: dark reddish brown (54 K 5/2) sandy loam
TD20 072	N	
1K30-ST3	INOne	U-35 cm: 2.5 Y K 5/8 red sand slopewash
		33-40 cm: 2.5 Y K $3/2$ dusky red sandy loam
		40-50 cm: 2.5 Y R 3/3 dark reddish brown clay loam
		Terminated in disturbed subsoil
TR31-ST1	None	0-40 cm: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/2) sandy loam with mulch
		Terminated due to runoff from nearby mulch pile
TR31-ST2	None	0-25 cm 5YR4/6 yellowish red sandy loam
		At 25 cm mulch of various sizes and hole filled with water.

# Appendix B: 1201-HS1 HPRI Form



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION FORM

PLEASE TYPE ALL DATA IN UPPERCASE - FIELDS IN RED ARE REQUIRED

1. P	ROPERTY NAME:						
2. R	. RESOURCE NAME:						
3. A	DDRESS:						
4. C	CITY:		5.	VICINITY:			
6. C	COUNTY NAME:						
7. L	OT:	8. BLOCK:		9. PLAT NAME:			
10. 5	SECTION:	11. TO	WNSHIP:		12. RANGE:		
13.	LATITUDE (NORTI	H): (ENTER AS: "dd.dddd	łd")				
14.	LONGITUDE (WES	T): (ENTER AS: "-dd.dddd	dd")				
15. U	UTM ZONE:	16. N	ORTHING	S:	17. EASTINGS:		
18.	RESOURCE TYPE:						
19.	HISTORIC FUNCT	ION:					
20.	CURRENT FUNCT	ION:					
21.	AREA OF SIGNIFIC	ANCE, PRIMARY:					
22.	AREA OF SIGNIFIC	ANCE, SECONDAF	RY:				
23.	DESCRIPTION OF	SIGNIFICANCE:					
24.	DOCUMENTATIO	N RESOURCE:					
25.	NAME OF PREPARI	ER:					
59.	SURVEY PROJECT	26. PI	ROJECT NA	ME:			
27.	DATE OF PREPARA	TION:		28. PHOTOGR	APHS		
29.	YEAR:						

30. ARCHITECT/BUILDER:				
31. YEAR BUILT:				
32. ORIGINAL SITE:	33. DATE MOVED:			
34. FROM WHERE:	35. ACCESSIBLE:			
36. ARCHITECTURAL STYLE:				
37. OTHER ARCHITECTURAL STYLE:				
38. FOUNDATION MATERIAL:				
39. ROOF TYPE:	40. ROOF MATERIAL:			
41. WALL MATERIAL, PRIMARY:				
42. WALL MATERIAL, SECONDARY:				
43. WINDOW TYPE:	44. WINDOW MATERIAL:			
45. DOOR TYPE:	46. DOOR MATERIAL:			
47. EXTERIOR FEATURES:				
48. INTERIOR FEATURES:				
49. DECORATIVE DETAILS:				
50. CONDITION OF RESOURCE:				
51. DESCRIPTION OF RESOURCE:				
52. COMMENTS:				
53. ATTACH LOCATION MAP				
54. LISTED ON NATIONAL REGISTER:				
5. NATIONAL REGISTER ENTRY:				
56. CONTINUATION				

## CONTINUATION SHEET, IF APPLICABLE

## References Cited:

#### Ancestry.com

2021 Arthur Fuchs. 1940 US Federal Census. Accessed 2021. <u>https://www.ancestry.com/imageviewer/collections/2442/images/m-t0627-03317-00466?usePUB=true&usePUBJs=true&pId=90123161</u>

Kueteman, K.

2021 Florence E. Fuchs English. Accessed 2021. https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/168908318/florence-e.-english



Figure 1: View south to shelter pad and cinder block door cover



Figure 2: View west to shelter door



Figure 3: View NW of stairs leading to subsurface shelter room



Figure 4: View NE of shelter pad corner with fastener hardware



Figure 5: site sketch map of storm shelter site. Field ID: 1201-HS1



Figure 6: USGS Spencer and Midwest City quadrangle with location of site boundary in center



Figure 7: Historic 1954 aerial imagery with site area in southern cluster of structures (red arrow)

## ATTACHMENT F

## **MITIGATION PLAN**

May 28, 2021



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District CESWT-RO 2488 R. 81st Street Tulsa, OK 74137-4290

RE: COMPENSATORY MITIGATION PLAN Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Property, Including 73.2-Acre Landfill Expansion 2601 North Midwest Blvd. Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma Hydrex Project No. A-12-1361

Hydrex Environmental (Hydrex) has been contracted by N.E. Landfill, LLC to coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concerning the expansion of the Northeast Landfill 163.3-acre landfill expansion area ("Project Area"). This 163.3-acre Project Area consists of an existing 90.1-acre construction and demolition (C&D) landfill permitted under Oklahama Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) Permit No. 3555050 and a proposed 73.2-acre lateral expansion area. The proposed plans involve a horizontal and vertical expansion of the landfill, which will be used for municipal solid waste disposal. This mitigation plan addresses compensatory mitigation requirements at the above-referenced project site to satisfy the requirements of the requested Individual Permit.

Based on the conclusions of the *Jurisdictional Determination* letter dated December 11, 2020 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District, proposed permanent impacts to waters of the U.S. amount to 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub wetland impacts, 0.68 acres of open water impacts, and 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of intermittent stream impacts. Based on proposed impacts to WOTUS (>0.5 acres), this project does not fall within the guidelines of any Nationwide Permits, and as such will require compensatory mitigation. Therefore, N.E. Landfill, LLC proposes to purchase stream and wetland credits from the Deep Fork Mitigation Bank (DFMB) in order to offset unavoidable, permanent impacts from the proposed landfill expansion. The Northeast Landfill Expansion is located within the primary service area of the DFMB.

The DFMB does not utilize any particular functional assessment method, therefore the *Texas Rapid Assessment Method* (TXRAM) 2.0, was conducted by Hydrex to evaluate wetland and stream quality. Utilizing TXRAM, Hydrex determined potential mitigation requirements for permanent impacts to the 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub Wetlands A and B, 0.68 acres of Open Water 5, and 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of Stream 2 within the project site.

COMPENSATORY MITIGATION PLAN Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Property, Including 73.2-Acre Landfill Expansion 2601 North Midwest Blvd. Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma Hydrex Project No. A-12-1361

According to the TXRAM wetland functional assessment, Wetland A (0.40 acres) scored 49.2 out of a possible 115, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality wetlands, therefore Wetland A will require the purchase of 1.6 wetland credits. Wetland B (0.16 acres) scored 49.3 out of a possible 115, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality wetlands, therefore Wetland B will require the purchase of 0.64 wetland credits. Open Water 5 did not require a functional assessment, as DFMB utilizes the 3:1 ratio for low quality wetlands, Open Water 5 will require the purchase of 2.04 wetland credits. Based on these scores, NELF will be required to purchase 4.28 wetland credits for impacts at the Northeast Landfill Expansion.

According to the TXRAM stream functional assessment, Stream 2 (746 linear feet) scored 39.5 out of a possible 105, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 2:1 for medium quality intermittent streams, therefore Stream 2 will require the purchase of 1,492 intermittent stream credits. However, at this time DFMB does not have sufficient intermittent stream credits to fulfill this compensatory mitigation requirement. Therefore, Hydrex is requesting approval for the purchase of perennial stream credits as needed to supplement the purchase of intermittent stream credits and satisfy mitigation requirements. At this time, DFMB has 366 intermittent stream credits available for purchase. Hydrex respectfully requests a 0.5:1 mitigation ratio for the purchase of perennial stream credits to satisfy the remainder of mitigation requirements. In the event that more intermittent stream credits become available during the permitting process, those will be purchased prior to any perennial stream credits.

In conclusion, the total required credits will be 4.28 wetland credits and 1,492 intermittent stream credits for the proposed landfill expansion. As of May 2021, RIBITS indicates that the DFMB only has 336 intermittent stream credits available, which will be purchased to satisfy mitigation requirements for Stream 2. Due to insufficient available intermittent stream credits, perennial stream credits are proposed to be purchased at a 0.5:1 ratio to satisfy the remainder of the compensatory mitigation needs for this project. The TXRAM functional assessment datasheets and final scoring sheets are attached.

If you have any questions regarding this plan, or if further clarification is necessary, please feel free to contact me at ccollier@hydrex-inc.com or (936) 568-9451.

Sincerely, Hydrex Environmental

Clayton A. Collier, REM, PWS Senior Environmental Scientist

#### Attachments

Scrub-Shrub Wetland A TXRAM 2.0 Final Scoring and Datasheets

Scrub-Shrub Wetland B TXRAM 2.0 Final Scoring and Datasheets

Intermittent Stream 2 TXRAM 2.0 Final Scoring and Assessment Datasheets

#### Version 2.0 – Final TXRAM WETLAND FINAL SCORING SHEET

Project/Site Name/No.: _	lortheast Landfill	Project Type: I Fill/Impact (I Linear I Non-linear) I Mitigation/Conservation		
Wetland ID/Name: A	WAA No.: 1	Size: 0.4 Acres D	ate: 4-15-2020	Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Wetland Type: Riverine,	PSS Ecoregion: N/A		Delineation P	erformed: 🗌 Previously 🔳 Currently
Aerial Photo Date and So	urce: 2018 (BING), 2017 (NAIP)	Site Photos:	March 17, 2020	Representative: 🔳 Yes 🗌 No
Notos: Permanent Sci	ub-Shrub Wetland Impact			

Core Element	Metric	Metric Score	Core Element Score Calculation	Core Element Score	
Landagang	Aquatic Context	2	Sum of metric scores / 8	5.8	
Landscape	Buffer	1.1	x 15		
	Water source	3		12.5	
Hydrology	Hydroperiod	1	Sum of metric scores / 12 x 30		
	Hydrologic flow	1			
	Organic matter	1			
Soils	Sedimentation	2	Sum of metric scores / 12	6.3	
	Soil modification	2			
	Topographic complexity	3		11.7	
Physical Structure	Edge complexity	2	Sum of metric scores / 12 x 20		
	Physical habitat richness	2	~		
	Plant strata	4		12.9	
	Species richness	2			
	Non-native/invasive infestation	2			
Biotic Structure	Interspersion	3	Sum of metric scores / 28		
	Strata overlap	2			
	Herbaceous cover	2			
	Vegetation alterations	3			
	Sum of core	e element scores = o	overall TXRAM wetland score	49.2	
Additional points for unique resources = overall TXRAM wetland score x 0.10 if: Area of Caddo Lake designated a "Wetland of International Importance" under the Ramsar Convention Bald cypress – water tupelo swamp Pitcher plant bog Spring			Not Applicable		
Additional points for lin	Not Applicable				

Representative Site Photograph:





Scrub-shrub Wetland A looking northeast.

Scrub-shrub Wetland A looking west.

#### Version 2.0 – Final

#### **TXRAM WETLAND DATA SHEET**

Project/Site Name/No.: Northeast Landfill		_ Project Type: [	∎ Fill/Impact (□ Linear	Non-linear)  Mitigation/Conservation
Wetland ID/Name: A WAA No.: 1	Size	0.4 Acres	Date: 4-15-2020	Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Wetland Type: <u>Riverine</u> , PSS Ecoregion: <u>N/A</u>	١		Delineat	tion Performed: 🗌 Previously 🔳 Currently
Aerial Photo Date and Source: 2018 (BING), 2017 (NAIP	')	Site Phot	os: <u>March 17, 2020</u>	Representative: 🔳 Yes 🗌 No
Notes:				

#### LANDSCAPE

Aquatic Context – Confirm in office review. See figu	ures in section 2.3.1.1 for e	examples.		
Notes on any barriers or alterations that prevent conne	ction:			
Aquatic resources within 1,000 feet of WAA to which w	etland connects (including n	umber for other consideration	ons): <u>3</u> <b>Score:</b> 2	
Buffer – Evaluate to 500 feet from WAA boundary. Confirm in office review. See figures in section 2.3.1.2 for examples.				
Buffer Type/Description	Score (See Narratives)	Percentage	Subtotal	
1. Forested	2	45%	0.9	
2. Landfill	0	40%	0.0	
3. Pasture	1	15%	0.15	
4. Open Water	N/A	N/A	N/A	
5.				

#### HYDROLOGY

Score: 1.1

Water Source – Degree of natural or unnatural/artificial influence. Confirm in office review for watershed.	Other:
Unnatural/Manipulated: Impoundment I Outfall Irrigation/pumping I Other artificial influence or control:	
Watershed: 🔳 Development 🔲 Irrigated agriculture 🗌 Wastewater treatment plant 🗌 Impoundment 🗌 Other:	
Degree of artificial influence/control: 🗌 Complete 🔳 High 🗌 Low 🗌 None	
Wetland created/restored/enhanced:  Sustainable/replicates natural  Controlled	Score: 3
Hydroperiod – Variability and recent alteration of the duration, frequency, and magnitude of inundation/saturatio	n.
Evaluate the hydroperiod including natural variation: Low variability	
Direct evidence of alteration: Natural: Log-jam Channel migration Other:	
Human: Diversions Ditches Levees III Impoundments III Other: Berm	
Riverine only: 🔳 Recent channel in-stability/dis-equilibrium (🔳 Degradation or 🔳 Aggradation)	
Indirect evidence of alteration: 🗌 Wetland plant stress: 🔲 Plant morphology:	
Upland species encroachment: □ Plant Community: □ Soil:	
Change/Alteration of hydroperiod: 🗌 None 🔲 Due to natural events 🔳 Human influences (🗌 Slight or 🔳 High)	
Degree hydroperiod of wetland created/restored/enhanced replicates natural patterns:	
Lacustrine fringe on human impoundment: 🗌 High variability 🗌 Low variability 🔲 Recent changes to hydroperiod	Score: 1
Hydrologic Flow – Movement of water to or from surrounding area and openness to water moving through the W	/AA.
Flow: Inlets: Outlets: Signs of water movement to or from WAA: Flow through site (Rainfall)	
Restrictions: 🗌 Levee 🔳 Berm/dam 🗋 Diversion 🗍 Other:	
High flowthrough: 🗌 Floodplain 🗋 Drift deposits 🗋 Drainage patterns 🗍 Sediment deposits 🗍 Other:	
Low flowthrough:  High landscape position  Stagnant water  Closed contours  Other:	Score: 1
SOILS	
Organic Matter – Use data and indicators from wetland determination data form(s) based on applicable regional s	supplement.
Moderate (indicator A9, S1, F1 in AW or A9, S1, S2, F1 in GP or A6, A7, A9, S7, F13 in AGCP)	
Low (indicated by thin organic or organic-mineral layer) 🔳 None observable in surface layer as described herein	Score: 1

Version 2.	0 -	Final
------------	-----	-------

Sodimentation Deposition of exerce codiment due to human setions. Confirm in office review for landscene	
Landscape with stress that could lead to excess sedimentation? I Yes No Landscape position:	High 🗌 Low
Magnitude of recent runoff/flooding events: High Low Percent of WAA with excess sediment dep	position: <u>50</u>
Sand deposits: <u>100</u> % of area, <u>4-6</u> average thickness Silt/Clay deposits: <u>%</u> of area, <u>average</u> average thickness	erage thickness
Lacustrine fringe only:  Upper end of impoundment  Degrades wetland  Contributes to wetland processes	Score: 2
Soil Modification – Physical changes by human activities. Confirm in office review for past.	
Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): Farming R/P Logging R/P Mining R/P	Filling R/ <u>P</u>
Grading R/P Dredging R/P Off-road vehicles R/P Other R/P:	
Percent of WAA with recent soil modification: 0 % Degree of modification: High Low	
Indicators of past modification: 🗌 High bulk density 🔳 Low organic matter 🗌 Lack of soil structure 🗌 Lack of horizons	s 🗌 Hardpan
□ Dramatic change in texture/color □ Heterogeneous mixture □ Other:	
Indicators of recovery: 🗌 Organic matter 🗋 Structure 🔳 Horizons 🗌 Mottling 🔳 Hydric soil 🗋 Other:	
Percent of WAA with past modification: 100 % Recovery: Complete High Moderate Low None	Score: 2
PHYSICAL STRUCTURE	
Topographic Complexity – See figures in section 2.3.4.1. Record % micro-topography and % WAA for each eleva	ation gradient.
Elevation gradients (EG): 2 Evidence: EPlant assemblages ELevel of saturation/inundation Path of water	r flow 🔳 Slope
Micro-topography: <u>15</u> % of WAA (By EG: <u>EG1: 10%; EG2: 5%</u>	)
Types: Depressions Pools Burrows Swales Wind-thrown tree holes Mounds Gilgai Islands	6
□ Variable shorelines □ Partially buried debris ■ Debris jams □ Plant hummocks/roots □ Other:	Score: <u>3</u>
Edge Complexity – Confirm in office review. See figure in section 2.3.4.2 to evaluate wetland boundary.	
WAA:  In seasonal floodplain  Contiguous to other wetland Edge vertical structure variation:  50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	
Horizontal variability: High Moderate Low Low None	Score: 2
Physical Habitat Richness – See definitions and table in Section 2.3.4.3 for habitat types applicable to each wetla	апа туре.
$11$ abol of babitat types qualifying as present in $N/N \in A$ , $J_1 \in N$	- 7
	Score: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	Score: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).	Score: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: $\geq 4$ $3$ $2$ $1$ $0$	Score: <u>2</u>
Eable of Habital types qualifying as present in WAA. $\underline{-4, 6, 5, 2, 72}$ BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: $\ge 4$ $3$ $2$ $1$ $0$ Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	Score: <u>2</u> Score: <u>4</u> a stratum.
Eable of Habitat types qualifying as present in WAA. $(4, 6, 5, 2, 4)$ BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: $\geq 4$ $3$ $2$ $1$ $0$ Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): $5$	Score: 2 Score: 4 a stratum. Score: 2
Eable of Habital types qualitying as present in WAA. $(4, 5, 5, 2, 4)$ BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: $\geq 4$ $3$ $2$ $1$ $0$ Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): $\frac{5}{2}$ Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for examples a species in section 2.3.5.4 for examples a species in section 2.3.5.5 for examples a species in section 2.3.5.5 for examples a species in	Score: 2 Score: 4 a stratum. Score: 2 mples.
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: $\geq 4$ $3$ $2$ $1$ $0$ Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): $\frac{5}{2}$ Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for examplement and determination data forms (s) and determination data forms: $\frac{15}{2}$	Score: <u>2</u> Score: <u>4</u> a stratum. Score: <u>2</u> mples. Score: <u>2</u>
Eable of Habital types qualifying as present in WAA. (4, 5, 2, 4)       Fotal. (1, 1, 2, 2, 4)         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for examples the degree of interspersion of         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of	Score: 2 Score: 4 Score: 4 score: 2 mples. Score: 2 fplant zones.
Elaber of Habital types qualifying as present in WAA. (1, s, s, s, s, s)	Score: 2 Score: 4 Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 fplant zones. Score: 3
Eaber of mabiliar types qualifying as present in WAA. (1, s,	Score: 2 Score: 4 Score: 4 Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 fplant zones. Score: 3 Score: 3 Score: 3
Eable of Habitat types qualitying as present in WAA. (1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,	Score:         2           Score:         4           a stratum.         5           Score:         2           mples.         5           Score:         2           f plant zones.         5           Score:         3           ection 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA
Eaber of Habitat types qualifying as present in WAA. 1993, 2, 41	Score:         2           Score:         4           a stratum.         Score:           Score:         2           mples.         Score:           Score:         2           fplant zones.         Score:           Score:         3           ection 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA           of WAA         2
Eabled of Hiabitat types qualifying as present in WAA. (Article 1974)       Total	Score:       2         Score:       4         a stratum.         Score:       2         mples.       5         Score:       2         f plant zones.       3         score:       3         ection 2.3.5.5.       % of WAA         of WAA       Score:       2
Eabel of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA. (1994) (1994)       Total. (1994)         BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s). Number of plant strata: (1994) (2004)       2 (1004)         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5       5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exame Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 %       %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: High Moderate (1004)       None (1004)         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in see High overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15       %         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15       % of WAA         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: Bottomland hardwood forest	Score:         2           Score:         4           a stratum.         Score:           mples.         5           Score:         2           mples.         Score:           Score:         3           ection 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA           Score:         2           % of WAA         Score:           Score:         2           ardwood forest         2
Eaber of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA. (and experiment in the experiment. See figures in section 2.3.5.3 for examplement experiment in the experiment in the experiment in the experiment. See figures in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate □ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in the experiment. See figures in see figures in see figures in see figures in the experiment. See figures in see figures in see figures in see figures in the experiment. See figures in see figures in see figures in the experiment. See figures in see figures in see figures in the experiment. See figures in see figures in see figures in the experiment. See figures in see figures in see figures in the experiment. See figures in see figures in see figures in the experiment. See figures in the experiment is the figure overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15 % o Total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): 40 % of WAA. Herbaceous Cover - Estimate for entire W	Score:       2         Score:       4         a stratum.         Score:       2         mples.       5         Score:       2         fplant zones.       3         score:       3         ection 2.3.5.5.       % of WAA         of WAA       Score:       2         ardwood forest       Score:       2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	Score: 2 Score: 4 Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 fplant zones. Score: 3 sction 2.3.5.5. % of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA Score: 2 Score: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata:       ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to count species more than once): 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exam         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exam         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion:       High □ Moderate □ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in see         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10 % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15 % of         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15 % of       of WAA         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: □ bottomland hardword for set 0 % of WAA         Herbaceous Cover –	Score:         2           Score:         4           a stratum.         Score:           Score:         2           mples.         5           Score:         2           f plant zones.         Score:           Score:         3           ection 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA           of WAA         Score:         2           ardwood forest         Score:         2           ng R/P         9         9
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	Score: 2 Score: 4 Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 fplant zones. Score: 3 Score: 3 Score: 3 Score: 2 % of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	Score:         2           Score:         4           a stratum.         Score:           Score:         2           mples.         5           Score:         2           fplant zones.         Score:           Score:         3           ection 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA           Score:         2           % of WAA         Score:           Score:         2           ardwood forest         Score:           Score:         2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	Score: 2 Score: 4 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 Score: 3 Score: 2 % of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA % of WAA
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	Score: 2 Score: 4 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 fplant zones. Score: 3 Score: 3 Score: 2 % of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA

#### Version 2.0 – Final TXRAM WETLAND FINAL SCORING SHEET

Project/Site Name/No.:	lortheast Landfill	Project Type: 🔳 Fill/Imp	pact (🗌 Linear 🔳 Non	-linear) 🗌 Mitigation/Conservation
Wetland ID/Name: B	WAA No.: 2	Size: 0.16 Acres D	_{Date:} 4-15-2020	Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Wetland Type: Riverine,	PSS Ecoregion: N/A		Delineation Per	formed: 🗌 Previously 🔳 Currently
Aerial Photo Date and So	urce: 2018 (BING), 2017 (NAIP)	Site Photos:	March 17, 2020	Representative: 🔳 Yes 🔲 No
Notes: Permanent Sc	rub-Shrub Wetland Impact			

Core Element	Metric	Metric Score	Core Element Score Calculation	Core Element Score	
Landagang	Aquatic Context	2	Sum of metric scores / 8	5.0	
Landscape	Buffer	1.15	x 15	5.8	
	Water source	3			
Hydrology	Hydroperiod	1	Sum of metric scores / 12	12.5	
	Hydrologic flow	1			
	Organic matter	1			
Soils	Sedimentation	2	Sum of metric scores / 12	6.3	
	Soil modification	2	× 10		
	Topographic complexity	3			
Physical Structure	Edge complexity	2	Sum of metric scores / 12	11.7	
	Physical habitat richness	2			
	Plant strata	4			
	Species richness 2	-			
	Non-native/invasive infestation	2	1	12.9	
Biotic Structure	Interspersion	3	Sum of metric scores / 28		
	Strata overlap	2			
	Herbaceous cover	2			
	Vegetation alterations	3			
	Sum of core	e element scores = o	verall TXRAM wetland score	49.3	
Additional points for u Area of Caddo Lak Bald cypress – wat Pitcher plant bog Spring	nique resources = overall TXRAM v ke designated a "Wetland of Interna ter tupelo swamp	vetland score x 0.10 tional Importance" ur	if: nder the Ramsar Convention	Not Applicable	
Additional points for lin	mited habitats = overall TXRAM we ve trees greater than 24-inch diame d mast (i.e., acorns and nuts) produc	tland score x 0.05 if: ter at breast height cing native species i	n the tree strata	Not Applicable	

Representative Site Photograph:





Scrub-shrub Wetland B looking west.

Scrub-shrub Wetland B looking north.

#### Version 2.0 – Final

#### **TXRAM WETLAND DATA SHEET**

Project/Site Name/No.:	Northeast Landfill		_ Project Type: [	🔳 Fill/Impact (🗌 Linear	■ Non-linear) □ Mitigation/Conservation
Wetland ID/Name: B	WAA No.: 2	Size:	0.16 Acres	Date: 4-15-2020	Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Wetland Type: Riverin	e, PSS Ecoregion: N	/A		Delinea	tion Performed: 🗌 Previously 🔳 Currently
Aerial Photo Date and S	ource: 2018 (BING), 2017 (NA	P)	Site Pho	tos: March 17, 2020	Representative: 🔳 Yes 🗌 No
Notes:					

#### LANDSCAPE

Aquatic Context – Confirm in office review. See figures in section 2.3.1.1 for examples.	
Notes on any barriers or alterations that prevent connection:	
Aquatic resources within 1,000 feet of WAA to which wetland connects (including number for other considerations): ³	score: 2

#### Buffer – Evaluate to 500 feet from WAA boundary. Confirm in office review. See figures in section 2.3.1.2 for examples.

Buffer Type/Description	Score (See Narratives)	Percentage	Subtotal
1. Forested	2	50%	1.0
2. Landfill	0	35%	0.0
^{3.} Pasture	1	15%	0.15
4. Open Water	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.			

## Score: 1.15

HYDROLOGY	
Water Source – Degree of natural or unnatural/artificial influence. Confirm in office review for watershed.	0.1
Natural: Precipitation Groundwater Overbank flow/stream discharge Overland flow Beaver activity	Other:
Unnatural/Manipulated: Impoundment Outfall Irrigation/pumping Other artificial influence or control:	
Watershed: Development 🗌 Irrigated agriculture 🗌 Wastewater treatment plant 🗌 Impoundment 🗌 Other:	
Degree of artificial influence/control: 🗌 Complete 🔳 High 🗌 Low 🗌 None	
Wetland created/restored/enhanced: Sustainable/replicates natural Controlled	Score: <u>3</u>
Hydroperiod – Variability and recent alteration of the duration, frequency, and magnitude of inundation/saturation	on.
Evaluate the hydroperiod including natural variation: Low variability	
Direct evidence of alteration: Natural: 🗌 Log-jam 🗌 Channel migration 🗌 Other:	
Human: Diversions Ditches Levees III Impoundments III Other: Berm	
Riverine only: 🔳 Recent channel in-stability/dis-equilibrium (🔳 Degradation or 🔳 Aggradation)	
Indirect evidence of alteration:  Wetland plant stress:  Plant morphology:	
Upland species encroachment: Plant Community: Soil:	
Change/Alteration of hydroperiod: 🗌 None 🗌 Due to natural events 🔳 Human influences (🗌 Slight or 🔳 High)	
Degree hydroperiod of wetland created/restored/enhanced replicates natural patterns:	
Lacustrine fringe on human impoundment: 🗌 High variability 🗌 Low variability 🔲 Recent changes to hydroperiod	Score: 1
Hydrologic Flow – Movement of water to or from surrounding area and openness to water moving through the W	VAA.
Flow: Inlets: Outlets: Signs of water movement to or from WAA: Flow through site (Rainfall)	
Restrictions: 🗌 Levee 🔳 Berm/dam 🗌 Diversion 🗋 Other:	
High flowthrough: 🗌 Floodplain 🗋 Drift deposits 🗋 Drainage patterns 🗋 Sediment deposits 🗋 Other:	
Low flowthrough:  High landscape position  Stagnant water  Closed contours  Other:	Score: 1
SOILS	
Organic Matter – Use data and indicators from wetland determination data form(s) based on applicable regional High (organic soil or indicator A1, A2, A3)	supplement.
Moderate (indicator A9, S1, F1 in AW or A9, S1, S2, F1 in GP or A6, A7, A9, S7, F13 in AGCP)	
Low (indicated by thin organic or organic-mineral layer) 🔳 None observable in surface layer as described herein	Score: 1

Version 2.	0 -	Final
------------	-----	-------

$\sim$	
Landscape with stress that could lead to excess sedimentation? Yes No Landscape position:	High 🗌 Low
Magnitude of recent runoff/flooding events: High Low Percent of WAA with excess sediment depos	sition: <u>50</u>
Sand deposits: <u>100</u> % of area, <u>4-6</u> average thickness Silt/Clay deposits: <u>%</u> of area, <u>average</u> average	ge thickness
Lacustrine fringe only: Upper end of impoundment Degrades wetland Contributes to wetland processes So	core: 2
Soil Modification – Physical changes by human activities. Confirm in office review for past.	
Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): 🗌 Farming R/P 🗌 Logging R/P 🔳 Mining R/P 🔳 Fill	lling R/ <u>P</u>
Grading R/P Dredging R/P Off-road vehicles R/P Other R/P:	
Percent of WAA with recent soil modification: 0 % Degree of modification: High Low	
Indicators of past modification: 🗌 High bulk density 🔳 Low organic matter 🗌 Lack of soil structure 🗌 Lack of horizons 🗌	🗌 Hardpan
Dramatic change in texture/color     Heterogeneous mixture     Other:	
Indicators of recovery: 🗌 Organic matter 🗋 Structure 🔳 Horizons 🗌 Mottling 🔳 Hydric soil 🗌 Other:	
Percent of WAA with past modification: 100 % Recovery: Complete High Moderate Low None So	core: 2
PHYSICAL STRUCTURE	
Topographic Complexity – See figures in section 2.3.4.1. Record % micro-topography and % WAA for each elevation	on gradient.
Elevation gradients (EG): 2 Evidence: EPlant assemblages ELevel of saturation/inundation Death of water flo	ow 🔳 Slope
Micro-topography: <u>15</u> % of WAA (By EG: <u>EG1: 10%; EG2: 5%</u>	)
Types: Depressions Pools Burrows Swales Wind-thrown tree holes Mounds Gilgai Islands	
□ Variable shorelines □ Partially buried debris ■ Debris jams □ Plant hummocks/roots □ Other: So	core: <u>3</u>
Edge Complexity – Confirm in office review. See figure in section 2.3.4.2 to evaluate wetland boundary.	
WAA:  In seasonal floodplain  Contiguous to other wetland Edge vertical structure variation:  50	
Horizontal variability: High Moderate Low Low None	core: 2
Physical Habitat Richness – See definitions and table in section 2.3.4.3 for habitat types applicable to each wetland	а туре.
L abel of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA [·] A [·] J [·] L [·] N	2
	core: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	core: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).	core: <u>2</u>
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata:         ■ ≥ 4       3       2       1       0       So	score: <u>4</u>
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a strate	score: <u>2</u>
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a set Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5 Solution	score: <u>2</u> score: <u>4</u> stratum. score: <u>2</u>
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: $\ge 4$ $3$ $2$ $1$ $0$ So         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a s       Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): $5$ So         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example $15$	score: <u>2</u> score: <u>4</u> stratum. score: <u>2</u> vles.
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: $\geq 4$ $\exists 3$ $2$ $1$ $0$ So         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a set Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): $\frac{5}{2}$ So         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: $\frac{15}{2}$ % So	score: <u>2</u> stratum. score: <u>2</u> les. score: <u>2</u>
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a s         Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5         Solution         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 % Solution         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of plant	$\frac{2}{\text{score: } 2}$
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata:       ≥ 4       3       2       1       0       So         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a se       Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once):       5       So         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example       Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of plat       So         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion:       High       Moderate       Low       None       Bottomland hardwood forest       So	Score: $2$ Score: $4$ Stratum. Score: $2$ Wes. Score: $2$ Mant zones. Score: $3$ Score: $3$
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata:       ≥ 4       3       2       1       0       So         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a se       Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to counting a species more than once):       5       So         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example       Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example       So         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of pla       Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion:       High       Moderate       Low       None       Bottomland hardwood forest       So         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in section       15       15	$\frac{2}{2}$
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a set of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5	acore: 2         stratum.         score: 2         oles.         acore: 2         ant zones.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a set Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5 Set Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of plat Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate ■ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest Set Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in section 15 work of WAA         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10 % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15 % of WAA	accore:       2         accore:       2         stratum.       3         accore:       2         bles.       3         accore:       2         ant zones.       3         accore:       3         ion 2.3.5.5.       % of WAA         VAA       2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a set Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to counting a species more than once): 5         Solar         Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to count species more than once): 5         Solar         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15       % Solar         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of plat       Solar         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □       High □       Moderate ■       Low □       None □       Bottomland hardwood forest       Solar         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in section       Solar averlap price (2 strata overlapping): 15       % of WAA         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10       % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15       % of WAA         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15<	acore: 2         stratum.         score: 2         oles.         acore: 2         oles.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         VAA         acore: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a set Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to counting a species more than once): 5         Solution         Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5         Solution         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determine the degree of interspersion of plat         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate ■ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest         Solution         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in section         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10       % of WAA         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15         Merbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: □ Bottomland hard	acore: 2         stratum.         acore: 2         bles.         acore: 2         ant zones.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         VAA         acore: 2         dwood forest
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	acore: 2         stratum.         score: 2         oles.         acore: 2         ant zones.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         VAA         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata:       ≥ 4       3       2       1       0       So         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a since of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once):       5       So         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms:       15       % So         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of plat Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion:       High       Moderate       Low       None       Bottomland hardwood forest       So         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in section 1.15       % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping):       15         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping):       10       % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping):       15         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping):       15       % of WAA       So         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA.       In South Central Plains or East Central Te	acore: 2         stratum.         acore: 2         bles.         acore: 2         ant zones.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         VAA         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2
BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0       So         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a se       Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to count species more than once): 5       So         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example       Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 % So         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of plat       Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate ■ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest So         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in section       Strata overlap in (2 strata overlapping): 15         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15       % of WAA         Merbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15       % of WAA So         Herbaceous cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plans or East Central Texas Plains: □ Bottomland hard       So         Total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): 40       % of WAA So         Vegetation Alterations – Unnatural (human-c	acore: 2         stratum.         score: 2         oles.         acore: 2         oles.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         _% of WAA         VAA         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         R/P
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	acore: 2         stratum.         score: 2         oles.         acore: 2         ant zones.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         VAA         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         P
BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0       Sc         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a st         Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to count species more than once): 5       Sc         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 % Sc         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of plat         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate ■ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest Sc         Strata Overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10       % of WAA         Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15       % of WAA         High overlap of wAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): 40       % of WAA Sc         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: □ Bottomland hard         Total cover of emergent and submergent plants: □ > 75% □ 51–75% ■ 26–50% □ ≤ 25%       Sc         Vegetation Alterations – Unatural (human-caused) stressors. Confirm in office review for past.       Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): □ Disking R/P □ Mowing/shredd	acore: 2         stratum.         acore: 2         bles.         acore: 2         ant zones.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         VAA         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         R/P         P
BIOTIC STRUCTURE	acore: 2         stratum.         score: 2         oles.         acore: 2         ant zones.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         VAA         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         R/P         %
BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: ■ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0       So         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in a set Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for example Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determine the degree of interspersion of plat Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate ■ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest Set Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in section 12.3 strata overlapping): 15 % of W         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10 % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15 % of W         Total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): 40 % of WAA Set Merbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: □ Bottomland hard         Total cover of emergent and submergent plants: □ > 75% □ 51–75% ■ 26–50% □ ≤ 25%       Set Vegetation Alterations – Unnatural (human-caused) stressors. Confirm in office review for past.         Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): □ Disking R/P □ Mowing/shredding R/P □ Logging R □ Cutting R/P □ Feral hog rooting R/P □ Woody debris removal R/P ■ Other R/P: Clearing for Mining         Percent of WAA with recent vegetation alteration: 10 % S	acore: 2         stratum.         acore: 2         des.         acore: 2         ant zones.         acore: 3         ion 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         VAA         acore: 2         dwood forest         acore: 2         R/P         %

### Version 2.0 - Final

#### **TXRAM STREAM DATA SHEET**

Project/Site Name/No.: North	east Landfill Project Type	e: 🛛 Fill/Impact (🗌 Linear 🗶 Non-line	ear) 🗌 Mitigation/Conservation
Stream ID/Name: Stream 2	SAR No.: <u>3</u> Si	ze (LF): 746 Date: 3-18-2020	Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Stream Type: Intermittent	Ecoregion: <u>N/A</u>	Delineation Perform	ned: 🗌 Previously 🗵 Currently
8-Digit HUC: 11100302	Watershed Condition (deve	loped, pasture, etc.): Developed	Watershed Size: Approx. 150 ac
Aerial Photo Date and Source:	2017 NAIP; 2018 BING	Site Photos: Attached	Representative: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No
_{Stressor(s):} Landfill	Are normal climatic/	hvdrologic conditions present? TYes	No (If no. explain in Notes)

#### **Stream Characteristics**

Stream Width (Feet) (Bank to Bank Distance Used for Buffer Calculation)	Stream Height/Depth (Feet)
Avg. Bank to Bank 8	Avg. Banks: 3.2
Avg. Waters Edge: 2.8	Avg. Water: 1.2
Avg. OHWM: 2.8	Avg. OHWM: 1.2
••	

Notes: *Approximately 1.67 inches of precipitation during site visit. Parameters directly effected by this have had scores adjusted accordingly.

#### CHANNEL CONDITION Floodplain Connectivity



Score: 1

Version 2.0 - Final

Stream ID/Name: SAR No.: 3

Score: 2

Bank Condition			
Left Bank Active Erosion: <u>70</u>	_% Right Bank Active Erosion: 50	_% Average: <u>60</u>	
Bank Protection/Stabilization:  Natural	Artificial:		
			Score: 1
Sediment Deposition			

Less than 10% of the bottom covered by excessive sediment deposition; bars with established vegetation (5)

 $\Box$  10–20% of the bottom covered by excessive sediment deposition; few established bars with indicators of recently deposited sediments (4)

□ 20–30% of the bottom covered by excessive sediment deposition; some deposition on old bars and creating new bars; some sediment deposits at in-stream structures; OR obstructed view of the channel bottom and a lack of other depositional features (3)

⊠ 30–50% of the bottom covered by excessive sediment deposition; some newly created bars; moderate sediment deposits at instream structures (2)

Greater than 50% of the bottom covered by excessive sediment deposition resulting in aggrading channel (1)

#### **RIPARIAN BUFFER CONDITION**

Riparian Buffer - See Table 26 to determine appropriate buffer distance. Confirm in office review. Identify each buffer type and score using the primary or secondary buffer method of evaluation (see sections 3.3.2.1.2 and 3.3.2.1.4).

	,		,, p							
	Primary Buffer Type	Canopy Cover	Vegetation Community	Land Use	Score	Percentage of Area	Subtotal			
	1. Forested Upland	40	Native/Undesirable	Moderate	2	95	1.90			
	2. Scrub-Shrub Wetland	20	Native/Undesirable	Moderate	1	5	0.05			
	3.									
	4.									
чk	5.									
	I	Left Bank Primary Buffer Subtotal: <u>1.95</u> X 0.7 = Left Bank Primary Buffer Total <u>1.37</u>								
eft Ba	Secondary Buffer Type	Canopy Cover	Land Use		Score	Percentage of Area	Subtotal			
	1. Forested Upland	40	Mode	erate	3	90	2.70			
	2. Scrub-Shrub Wetland	15	Mode	erate	2	10	0.20			
	3.									
	4.									
	5.									
	I		Left Bank Second	ary Buffer Subtota	l: <u>2.90</u> X 0.3 = Let	ft Bank Secondary	Buffet Total 0.87			
	Left Ba	ank Primary Buffe	r Total + Left Bank	Secondary Buffer	Total = Composite	Buffer Left Bank M	letric Score 2.24			
	Primary Buffer Type	Canopy Cover	Vegetation Community	Land Use	Score	Percentage of Area	Subtotal			
	1. Forested Upland	35	Native/Undesirable	Moderate	2	90	1.80			
	2. Scrub-Shrub Wetland	20	Native/Undesirable	Moderate	1	10	0.10			
	3.									
	4.									
	5.									
ank	I	R	ight Bank Primary	Buffer Subtotal:	1.90 X 0.7 = Rig	ht Bank Primary B	uffer Total 1.33			
ght B	Secondary Buffer Type	Canopy Cover	Land	l Use	Score	Percentage of Area	Subtotal			
ï	1. Forested Upland	50	Mode	erate	3	90	2.70			
	2. Scrub-Shrub Wetland	25	Mode	erate	2	5	0.10			
	3. Landfill	0	Com	plete	0	5	0			
	4.									
	5.									
		Ri	ght Bank Secondar	y Buffer Subtotal:	2.80 X 0.3 = Righ	t Bank Secondary	Buffer Total 0.84			
	Right Bank	Primary Buffer To	otal + Right Bank S	econdary Buffer T	otal = Composite E	Buffer Right Bank M	letric Score 2.17			

Version 2.0 - Final

#### **IN-STREAM CONDITION**

Substrate Composition (e	estimate p	ercentag	jes)											
Boulder: (	Gravel:		Fi	nes (silt,	clay, mu	ck):	Art	tificial:			Larg	e Wood	y Debris/l	Leaf
Cobble:	Sand:		Be	edrock (s	mooth):		Be	drock (fra	actured):		Pack	KS:		
Default score due to ex	xcessive	suspen	ded se	diment	X	Defa	ult sco	re due t	o depth	ו 🗆			Score:	1
In-stream Habitat (check	all habitat	types th	nat are p	resent a	nd chec	k box fo	r appror	oriate pe	rcent co	ver at e	ach trans	sect)		
Habitat Types by Preser	nce and	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13
Undercut Banks							./							
Overhanging Vegetation		• ./	▼ √	• •	▼ √	• -/	▼ √	• •						
Rootmats		•	•	•	v	•	•	•						
Rootwads														
Woody Debris/Leaf Packs	6		./			./	./	1						
Boulders/Cobbles		• ./	•			v	•	•						
Aquatic Macrophytes		•												
Bedrock with Interstitial S	pace			1	1									
Artificial Habitat Enhance	ment			•	V									
Other:														
Number Present		Δ	3	3	3	3	3	2						
Percent Cover in Stream	ns	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	<i>T</i> 8	Т9	T10	T11	T12	T13
Transect has 0% cover (0	))													
Transect has 1-5% cover	(1)			1	J		1	1						
Transect has 6-29% cove	er (2)		./	•	•	1	•	•						
Transect has 30-50% cov	ver (3)	v	v			•								
Transect has > 50% cove	er (4)													
Percent Cover Score	( )	2	2	1	1	2	1	1						
Percent Cover in Strean	ns	2 T1	- <u>-</u> T2	T3	TA	 	T6	T7	T8	то	T10	T11	T12	T13
OHWM Width > than 15' Transect has 0% cover (0	, ))	,,	12	13	14	10	10	,,,	10	15	110		112	110
Transect has 1-5% cover	(1)													
Transect has 6-14% cove	er (2)													
Transect has 15-30% cov	er (3)													
Transect has > 30% cove	er (4)													
Percent Cover Score														
Habitat Types by Preser	nce	T1	T2	T3	T4	<i>T5</i>	<i>T</i> 6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13
Riffle/Pool Sequence														
Canopy Cover 70% or Gr	eater													
Natural Step-pools														
Number Present		0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Total Score		6	5	4	4	5	4	4						
HYDROLOGIC CONDIT Flow Regime	ΓΙΟΝ	Ū				, C				Av	erage: _	1.6	Score: _	3
Noticeable surface	flow prese	ent (4)				🗌 Iso	lated po	ools and	l no evic	lence of	f surface	e or inte	rstitial flo	ow (1)
Continual pool of wa	ater but la	cking n	oticeabl	e flow (3	3)	🗌 Dry	/ chann	el and n	io obser	vable p	ools or i	nterstitia	al flow ((	J)
X Isolated pools and i	nterstitial	(subsur	face) flo	ow (2)		Artifici	al / alte	red wate	er sourc	e 🗌 No	Ye:	s:		
Channel Flow Status												:	Score: _	2*
	- <b>t</b> - <b>r</b> <del>t</del> - <b>·</b>	750/ 5			ha na 1 1 1	4la. I -	th a = 07	0/ - 4 1		ula a tra d	ia			
	ater than	/ 5% 0f 1	ne char	nnei bot		in; less	tnan 25	% of ch	annel si	upstrate	is expo	sea (4)		
U Water covering 50–	75% of th	e chanr	nel botto	om width	ı; 25–50	1% of ch	annel s	ubstrate	e is expo	osed (3)				
X Water covering 25–	-50% of th	e chanr	nel botto	om width	ı; 50–75	% of ch	annel s	ubstrate	e is expo	osed (2)				
Water present but o	overing le	ess than	25% of	f the cha	annel bo	ottom wie	dth; gre	ater tha	n 75% c	of chanr	nel subst	trate is e	exposed	(1)

□ No water present in the channel; 100% of channel substrate exposed (0)

#### Version 2.0 - Final TXRAM STREAM FINAL SCORING SHEET

Project/Site Name/No.: North	east Landfill Project T	Гуре: 🗹 Fill/Impact (🗌 Linear 🔽 Non-lir	near) 🗌 Mitigation/Conservation
Stream ID/Name: Stream 2	SAR No.: 3	Size (LF): 746 Date: 3-18-2020	Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Stream Type: Intermittent	Ecoregion: <u>N/A</u>	Delineation Perfor	med: 🗌 Previously 🗹 Currently
8-Digit HUC: 11100302	Watershed Condition (d	eveloped, pasture, etc.): Developed	_Watershed Size:
Aerial Photo Date and Source:	2017 NAIP; 2018 BIN	IG Site Photos: Attached	Representative: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Stressor(s): Landfill	Are normal clima	atic/hydrologic conditions present? 🗌 Ye	s 🗹 No (If no, explain in Notes)
Notes: *Approximately 1.67 inche	s of precipitation during site v	visit. Parameters directly effected by this have	e had scores adjusted accordingly.

#### **Stream Characteristics**

Stream Width (Feet) (Bank to Bank Distance Used for Buffer Calculation)	Stream Height/Depth (Feet)
Avg. Bank to Bank: 8	Avg. Banks: 3.2
Avg. Waters Edge: 2.8	Avg. Water: 1.2
Avg. OHWM: 2.8	Avg. OHWM: 1.2

#### Scoring Table

Core Element	Metric	Metric Score	Core Element Score Calculation	Core Element Score
	Floodplain connectivity	1		
Channel condition	Bank condition	1	Sum of metric scores / 15	8.0
	Sediment deposition	2		
Puffer condition	Composite buffer (left bank)	2.24	Sum of bank scores / 10	0.0
Buller condition	Composite buffer (right bank)	2.17	x 20	0.0
In stream condition	Substrate composition	1	Sum of metric scores / 10	10.0
In-stream condition	In-stream habitat	3	x 25	10.0
Hudrologia condition	Flow regime	3	Sum of metric scores / 8	10 5
	Channel flow status	2	x 25	12.5
		•		
	39.3			
Additional points for limited				
Dominated by native	-			
Sum of overall TXR	39.3			

### Representative Site Photograph:



View looking upstream along intermittent Stream 2.



View looking downstream along intermittent Stream 2.

## ATTACHMENT G

## LIMITATIONS

## LIMITATIONS

The work conducted by **Hydrex Environmental** and described in this report was performed in accordance with generally accepted scientific principles and practices, observing the same degree of care and skill generally exercised by the profession under similar circumstances and conditions. The opinions expressed in the report, together with the observations and findings are based on our professional judgment of the data developed and gathered during the course of this investigation and upon conditions that existed at the time of the specified field activities. Some of the information provided in this report may have been derived from a variety of published sources. It is not the intent or purpose of **Hydrex Environmental** to validate the precision of data generated by other parties.

The investigation is considered sufficient in detail and scope to form a reasonable basis for the conclusions presented in this report. Due to the nature of such investigations, interpretations and conclusions must be based on limited site data.

**Hydrex Environmental** is not responsible for the conclusions, opinions, or recommendations made by others based on the contents of this report. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made in regard to the work performed by **Hydrex Environmental** during the course of this investigation.

## ATTACHMENT H

## QUALIFICATIONS

## **Daniel Morgan Environmental Scientist**

### DISCIPLINE: Environmental Science

EDUCATION: Henderson State University Arkadelphia, AR B.S. Biology, Philosophy Minor Stephen F. Austin State University Nacogdoches, TX M.S., Environmental Science, Geographic Information Systems Minor

### **CERTIFICATIONS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION:**

- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Certified Small Unmanned Aircraft System (sUAS) Remote Pilot
- Wetlands Plant Identification Course with Dr. Charles Allen
- Hydrex Mussel Survey Methodology and Identification Training

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

- Wetland delineation
- Proficient in ArcGIS mapping
- Creating and analyzing maps with "ArcMap" software
- Processing and analyzing spatial data in Pix4D
- FEMA floodplain determination and development permitting

### **PUBLICATIONS:**

• Evaluation of Groundwater Sodium and Sodium Uptake in *Taxodium* and its Hybrids on Galveston Island, Texas. 2020.

### EXPERIENCE ACQUISITION:

Hydrex Environmental Nacogdoches, Texas Environmental Scientist


# Christina R. Keim, REM, PWS Biologist

## DISCIPLINE: Biology

**EDUCATION**: Stephen F. Austin State University Nacogdoches, Texas B.S. Horticultural Sciences, Forestry minor

# **CERTIFICATIONS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION:**

- National Registry of Environmental Professionals (NREP), Registered Environmental Manager (REM), No. 172290
- Society of Wetland Scientists (SWS), Professional Wetland Scientist (PWS), No. 2981
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Certified Small Unmanned Aircraft System (sUAS) Remote Pilot,
- No. 3922373
- Wetlands Delineation Training (USACE 1987 Manual and Regional Supplements)
- SafeLand USA Certification
- Commonground University ASTM E1527 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Online Course
- GIS 551 Introduction to Geographical Information Systems and Geospatial Analysis (SFASU-GIS 551)
- Advanced Plant Identification Course with Dr. Charles Allen
- Texas Freshwater Mussel Identification Workshop with TPWD
- GeoSearch Phase I ESA Online Training
- Hydrex Mussel Survey Methodology and Identification Training

# PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Experience emphasis on wetland delineation, stream assessment, biological assessments, environmental sampling, testing, and analyzing in addition to plant physiology, taxonomy, propagation and production. Committed to thorough professional reporting of waters of the United States (WOTUS) determinations, Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs), and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWP3).

# **SPECIFIC EXPERIENCE:**

# WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Knowledgeable in the determination and classification of hydric soils, hydrophytic vegetation, wetland hydrology, as well as functional assessments and jurisdictional determinations of waters of the United States Projects (WOTUS) include well pad siting and linear determinations for pipelines and roads.

# ECOLOGICAL

Experienced in assessing potential impacts of the proposed action on wildlife, including rare, threatened, and endangered species. Qualified in conducting habitat assessments and advancement of projects with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.



#### ENVIRONMENTAL

Experienced in conducting and reporting Phase I and II ESA and SWP3. Practiced in a variety of environmental sampling and analysis techniques pertaining to soil and water.

# GEOPGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) MAPPING/DRAFTING

Experienced in computer drafting with demonstrated proficiency in AutoCAD and ArcGIS.

### **PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:**

- Society of Wetland Scientists (SWS)
- National Registry of Environmental Professionals (NREP)

### **EXPERIENCE ACQUISITION:**

Hydrex Environmental Nacogdoches, Texas Biologist

Soil, Plant and Water Analysis Laboratory Nacogdoches, Texas Laboratory Technician

Stephen F. Austin State University SFASU Gardens Nacogdoches, Texas Student Research Associate



# Clayton A. Collier, REM, PWS General Manager, Sr. Environmental Scientist

## DISCIPLINE: Environmental Science

**EDUCATION:** Stephen F. Austin State University Nacogdoches, Texas B.S. Environmental Science, Geology minor Stephen F. Austin State University Nacogdoches, Texas Graduate Studies *Aquatic Vascular Plants Water Resource Management Geographic Information Systems* 

# **CERTIFICATIONS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION:**

- Registered Environmental Professional (REM) No. 918302383
- Professional Wetland Scientist (PWS) No. 2389
- NEPA and Environmental Review Training (HUD)
- Wetlands Delineation Course (1987 USACE Manual)
- Wetlands Delineation Course (Regional Supplement)
- Wetlands Permitting Course (USACE)
- Wetland Plant Identification
- Rosgen's Level I Applied Fluvial Geomorphology
- Rosgen's Level II River Morphology and Application
- Rosgen's Level III River Assessment and Monitoring
- Applied Groundwater Statistics Course
- Texas Risk Reduction Program Training
- SafeLand USA Certification
- 2012-2013 Leadership Nacogdoches Program
- Certified Small Unmanned Aircraft System (sUAS) Remote Pilot
- Member of the ATCOFA Advisory Council
- Hydrex Mussel Survey Methodology and Identification Training

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Over fifteen years have been dedicated to a range of environmental projects for government, commercial, industrial, and private entities. During these years, experience has been gained in a wide variety of projects pertaining to environmental sampling and analysis techniques for soil, gas, and water. Attention has been paid to the development of skills in the areas of wetlands delineation, permitting and mitigation, installation of monitoring systems, environmental site assessments, and geographic information system (GIS) mapping.

# SPECIFIC EXPERIENCE:

# WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Experienced in investigations and delineations concerning waters of the U.S. in accordance with the 1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual and 2010 Regional Supplements. Expertise in streamlining United States



Corps of Engineers (USACE) permitting and performing jurisdictional determinations. Proficient in mitigation ratios as well as to aid in feasibility studies for potential mitigation banks. Management performing functional analyses of waters of the U.S. for purposes of determining compensatory of projects related to the delineation, permitting and/or mitigation of Section 404 and Section 10 waters of the U.S. includes numerous large tracts proposed for development, multiple proposed mitigation banks, over 300 miles of linear projects (utility lines, roads, etc.) and over 200 multi-acre oil/gas facilities (well pads, comp, stations, frac pits, etc.).

#### ECOLOGICAL

Skilled in performing habitat surveys for rare, threatened, and endangered species and identifying the potential to affect their critical habitat. Qualified in advancing the project through consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL

Qualified in conducting Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESA), which are an integral part to many private, commercial, and industrial real estate transactions. Experienced in a variety of environmental sampling and analysis techniques along with the application and utilization of numerous sampling and monitoring devices. Accomplished in the sampling of groundwater monitor wells at solid waste facilities using both manual and low-flow purge techniques. Skilled in soil gas monitoring and sampling by way of the Summa canister method.

#### GIS MAPPING/DRAFTING

Qualified in GIS mapping and computer drafting with demonstrated proficiency in AutoCAD, AutoSketch, and various ESRI ArcGIS applications including ArcView and ArcPad. Accomplished in global positioning system (GPS) data collection and in the integration of collected data with ESRI Spatial Analyst and 3D Analyst mapping software.

#### GROUNDWATER

Accomplished in the installation, sampling, monitoring, statistical analysis, and reporting of groundwater monitoring systems.

#### **PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:**

- Society of Wetland Scientists
- National Registry of Environmental Professionals (NREP)
- Texas Association of Environmental Professionals
- 2012-2015 Nacogdoches County Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors
- 2016-2017 City of Nacogdoches Parks Master Plan Steering Committee

### **EXPERIENCE ACQUISITION:**

Hydrex Environmental Nacogdoches, Texas Senior Environmental Scientist



**Mitigation** Plan

August 17, 2021



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District CESWT-RO 2488 R. 81st Street Tulsa, OK 74137-4290

RE: COMPENSATORY MITIGATION PLAN Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Property, Including 73.2-Acre Landfill Expansion 2601 North Midwest Blvd. Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma USACE Project No. SWT-2020-00344

Hydrex Environmental (Hydrex) has been contracted by N.E. Landfill, LLC to coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concerning the expansion of the Northeast Landfill 163.3-acre landfill expansion area ("Project Area"). This 163.3-acre Project Area consists of an existing 90.1-acre construction and demolition (C&D) landfill permitted under Oklahama Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) Permit No. 3555050 and a proposed 73.2-acre lateral expansion area. The proposed plans involve a horizontal and vertical expansion of the landfill, which will be used for municipal solid waste disposal. This mitigation plan addresses compensatory mitigation requirements at the above-referenced project site to satisfy the requirements of the requested Individual Permit.

Based on the conclusions of the *Jurisdictional Determination* letter dated December 11, 2020 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tulsa District, proposed permanent impacts to waters of the U.S. amount to 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub wetlands, 0.68 acres of open waters, and 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of intermittent stream. Based on proposed impacts to WOTUS this project will require compensatory mitigation. Therefore, N.E. Landfill, LLC proposes to purchase stream and wetland credits from the Deep Fork Mitigation Bank (DFMB) in order to offset unavoidable, permanent impacts from the proposed landfill expansion. The Northeast Landfill Expansion is located within the primary service area of the DFMB.

The DFMB does not utilize any particular functional assessment method for wetlands, therefore the Texas Rapid Assessment Method (TXRAM) 2.0 was conducted by Hydrex to evaluate wetland quality. In addition, the Oklahoma Stream Mitigation Method (OSMM) was published on June 16, 2021, and was recently implemented by the DFMB. Therefore the OSMM was performed for impacts to Stream 2. Utilizing TXRAM and the OSMM, Hydrex determined potential mitigation requirements for permanent impacts to the 0.56 acres of scrub-shrub Wetlands A and B, 0.68 acres of Open Water 5, and 746 linear feet (0.05 acres) of Stream 2 within the project site.

COMPENSATORY MITIGATION PLAN Northeast Landfill 163.3-Acre Property, Including 73.2-Acre Landfill Expansion 2601 North Midwest Blvd. Spencer (Oklahoma County), Oklahoma USACE Project No. SWT-2020-00344

According to the TXRAM wetland functional assessment, Wetland A (0.40 acres) scored 44.5 out of a possible 115, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality wetlands, therefore Wetland A will require the purchase of 1.6 wetland credits. Wetland B (0.16 acres) scored 44.6 out of a possible 115, which can be considered medium quality. DFMB utilizes a compensatory mitigation ratio of 4:1 for medium quality wetlands, therefore Wetland B will require the purchase of 0.64 wetland credits. Open Water 5 did not require a functional assessment, as DFMB utilizes the 3:1 ratio for low quality wetlands for open water features. Applying the 3:1 ratio for low quality wetlands, Open Water 5 will require the purchase of 2.04 wetland credits. Based on these scores, Northeast L.F., LLC will be required to purchase 4.28 wetland credits for impacts at the Northeast Landfill Expansion.

The OSMM was performed to provide the compensatory mitigation requirements for Stream 2. The OSMM involves the evaluation of following criteria: Stream Type Impacted, Priority Waters, Existing Condition, Impact Duration, Impact Activity, and Linear Impact Magnitude. These factors are evaluated to generate the Sum of Factors which is applied to the linear feet of stream impact to determined the required credits. Stream 2 is an intermittent stream that was determined to be neither a Secondary or Priority Water. The existing condition of Stream 2 was determined to be Severely Impaired primarily due to the extensive history of mining activities dating back to the 1950s. In addition, Stream 2 was part of a large impoundment until sometime prior to 1996 and has also been affected due to the adjacent landfill activities to the south. Stream 2 is also downgradient of a culvert and road crossing of North Midwest Boulevard. Proposed impacts to Stream 2 will consist of Permanent impacts via Fill for the entirety of Stream 2 (746 linear feet). Therefore, the OSMM determined the impacts to Stream 2 would require 2,666.1 stream credits.

In conclusion, the total required credits will be 4.28 wetland credits and 2,666.1 stream credits for the proposed landfill expansion. As of August 2021, the DFMB is working to determine the number of credits generated through the OSMM. The TXRAM functional assessment datasheets and final scoring sheets and the OSMM Adverse Impacts Factors Worksheet are attached.

If you have any questions regarding this plan, or if further clarification is necessary, please feel free to contact me at ccollier@hydrex-inc.com or (936) 568-9451.

Sincerely, Hydrex Environmental

Clayton A. Collier, REM, PWS Senior Environmental Scientist

#### Attachments

#### Scrub-Shrub Wetland A TXRAM 2.0 Final Scoring and Datasheets

Scrub-Shrub Wetland B TXRAM 2.0 Final Scoring and Datasheets

Oklahoma Stream Mitigation Method Adverse Impact Factors Worksheet

#### Version 2.0 – Final TXRAM WETLAND FINAL SCORING SHEET

Project/Site Name/No.: No.:	ortheast Landfill	Project Type: 🔳 Fill/In	npact (🗌 Linear 🔳 No	on-linear) 🗌 Mitigation/Conservation
Wetland ID/Name: <u>A</u>	WAA No.: 1	Size: 0.4 Acres	Date: 4-15-2020	Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Wetland Type: <u>Riverine</u> , P	Ecoregion: N/A		Delineation P	erformed: 🗌 Previously 🔳 Currently
Aerial Photo Date and Sour	ce: 2018 (BING), 2017 (NAIP)	Site Photos	March 17, 2020	Representative: 🔳 Yes 🗌 No
Notos: Permanent Scru	b-Shrub Wetland Impact			

Core Element	Metric	Metric Score	Core Element Score Calculation	Core Element Score	
Landagang	Aquatic Context	2	2 Sum of metric scores / 8		
Landscape	Buffer	1.1	x 15	5.0	
	Water source	2		10	
Hydrology	Hydroperiod	1	Sum of metric scores / 12		
	Hydrologic flow	1			
	Organic matter	1			
Soils	Sedimentation	2	Sum of metric scores / 12	6.3	
	Soil modification	2	× 10		
	Topographic complexity	3			
Physical Structure	Edge complexity	2	Sum of metric scores / 12	11.7	
	Physical habitat richness	2			
	Plant strata	2		10.7	
	Species richness	2	-		
	Non-native/invasive infestation	2			
Biotic Structure	Interspersion	3	Sum of metric scores / 28		
	Strata overlap	2			
	Herbaceous cover	2			
	Vegetation alterations	2			
	44.5				
Additional points for unique resources = overall TXRAM wetland score x 0.10 if: Area of Caddo Lake designated a "Wetland of International Importance" under the Ramsar Convention Bald cypress – water tupelo swamp Pitcher plant bog Spring				Not Applicable	
Additional points for lin	mited habitats = overall TXRAM we ve trees greater than 24-inch diame I mast (i.e., acorns and nuts) produc TXRAM welland score and addition	tland score x 0.05 if: ter at breast height cing native species in pal points = total over	n the tree strata	Not Applicable	

Representative Site Photograph:





Scrub-shrub Wetland A looking west.

Scrub-shrub Wetland A looking southeast.

#### Version 2.0 – Final

#### **TXRAM WETLAND DATA SHEET**

Project/Site Name/No.:	Northeast Landfill	Project Type:	🛾 Fill/Impact (🗌 Linear 🔳	Non-linear) 🗌 Mitigation/Conservation
Wetland ID/Name: A	WAA No.: 1	Size: 0.4 Acres	Date: 4-15-2020	_ Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Wetland Type: Riverin	e, PSS Ecoregion: <u>N/</u>	Ά	Delineatio	n Performed: 🗌 Previously 🔳 Currently
Aerial Photo Date and S	ource: 2018 (BING), 2017 (NAII	P) Site Phot	_{os:} March 17, 2020	Representative: 🔳 Yes 🗌 No
Notes:				

LANDSCAPE			
Aquatic Context – Confirm in office review. See figu	ures in section 2.3.1.1 for exa	amples.	
Notes on any barriers or alterations that prevent conne	ction:		
Aquatic resources within 1,000 feet of WAA to which w	etland connects (including nun	nber for other consideration	ns): <u>3 <b>Score:</b> 2</u>
Buffer – Evaluate to 500 feet from WAA boundary.	Confirm in office review. See	e figures in section 2.3.1.2	2 for examples.
Buffer Type/Description	Score (See Narratives)	Percentage	Subtotal
1. Forested	2	45%	0.9
2. Landfill	0	40%	0.0
^{3.} Pasture	1	15%	0.15
4. Open Water	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.			
			Score: <u>1.1</u>
HYDROLOGY			
Water Source – Degree of natural or unnatural/artif	icial influence. Confirm in of	fice review for watershed	<i>l.</i>
Natural: Precipitation E Groundwater Overban	k flow/stream discharge 🔲 O	verland flow 🔳 Beaver ac	tivity [_] Other:
Unnatural/Manipulated: 🗌 Impoundment 🔲 Outfall 🗌	] Irrigation/pumping 🔲 Other	artificial influence or control	ol:
Watershed: 🔳 Development 🗌 Irrigated agriculture [	☐ Wastewater treatment plant	Impoundment 🗌 Oth	er:
Degree of artificial influence/control: 🗌 Complete 🔳 H	ligh 🗌 Low 🗌 None		
Wetland created/restored/enhanced:  Sustainable/re	plicates natural 🔲 Controlled		Score: 2
Hydroperiod – Variability and recent alteration of th	e duration, frequency, and r	magnitude of inundation/	saturation.
Evaluate the hydroperiod including natural variation:	Low variability		
Direct evidence of alteration: Natural: 🗌 Log-jam	Channel migration 🔲 Other:	:	
Human: 🗌 Diversions 🗌 Ditches 🔲 Levees 🔳	Impoundments I Other: Ber	rm, Beaver Activity, Clear	ring for Mining
Riverine only: 🔳 Recent channel in-stability/dis-ec	լuilibrium (🔳 Degradation or 🛽	Aggradation)	
Indirect evidence of alteration: 🔲 Wetland plant stress	3:	Plant morphology:	

Upland species encroachment:	Plant Community:	Soil:				
Change/Alteration of hydroperiod: None Due to natural events Human influences (Slight or High)						
Degree hydroperiod of wetland created/restored/enhanced replicates natural patterns:						

Lacustrine fringe on human impoundment: 🗌 High variability 🗌 Low variability 🔲 Recent changes to hydroperiod	Score: 1
Hydrologic Flow – Movement of water to or from surrounding area and openness to water moving through the WA	łΑ.
Flow: Inlets: 1 Outlets: 1 Signs of water movement to or from WAA: Flow through site (Rainfall)	
Restrictions: 🗌 Levee 🔳 Berm/dam 🗌 Diversion 🔳 Other: Beaver activity	
High flowthrough: 🗌 Floodplain 🔲 Drift deposits 🗌 Drainage patterns 🗌 Sediment deposits 🗌 Other:	
Low flowthrough:  High landscape position  Stagnant water  Closed contours  Other:	Score: 1

#### SOILS

Organic Matter – Use data and indicators from wetland determination data form(s) based on applicable regional s	supplement.
High (organic soil or indicator A1, A2, A3)	
Moderate (indicator A9, S1, F1 in AW or A9, S1, S2, F1 in GP or A6, A7, A9, S7, F13 in AGCP)	
Low (indicated by thin organic or organic-mineral layer) 🔳 None observable in surface layer as described herein	Score: 1

Version 2.0 – Fina	1		
--------------------	---	--	--

Sedimentation – Deposition of excess sediment due to human actions. Confirm in office review for landscape.         Landscape with stress that could lead to excess sedimentation?         Yes       No         Landscape position:	📕 High 🔲 Low
Magnitude of recent runoff/flooding events: High Low Percent of WAA with excess sediment de	position: <u>50</u>
Sand deposits: <u>85</u> % of area, <u>4-6 in.</u> average thickness Silt/Clay deposits: <u>5</u> % of area, <u>8-10 in.</u> average thickness	erage thickness
Lacustrine fringe only: 🗌 Upper end of impoundment 🔲 Degrades wetland 🔲 Contributes to wetland processes	Score: 2
Soil Modification – Physical changes by human activities. Confirm in office review for past.	
Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): T Farming R/P Logging R/P Mining R/P	Filling R/ <u>P</u>
Grading R/P Dredging R/P Off-road vehicles R/P Other R/P:	
Percent of WAA with recent soil modification: 0 % Degree of modification: High C Low	
Indicators of past modification: 🗌 High bulk density 🔳 Low organic matter 🗌 Lack of soil structure 🗌 Lack of horizor	ns 🗌 Hardpan
□ Dramatic change in texture/color □ Heterogeneous mixture □ Other:	
Indicators of recovery:  Organic matter  Structure  Horizons  Mottling  Hydric soil  Other:	
Percent of WAA with past modification: 100 % Recovery: Complete High Moderate Low None	Score: 2
PHYSICAL STRUCTURE	
Topographic Complexity – See figures in section 2.3.4.1. Record % micro-topography and % WAA for each eleva	ation gradient.
Elevation gradients (EG): 2 Evidence: EPlant assemblages ELevel of saturation/inundation D Path of water	r flow 🔳 Slope
Micro-topography: <u>15</u> % of WAA (By EG: <u>EG1: 10%; EG2: 5%</u>	)
Types: 🗌 Depressions 🗋 Pools 🗋 Burrows 🗋 Swales 🗋 Wind-thrown tree holes 🔳 Mounds 🗋 Gilgai 🗋 Islands	6
🗌 Variable shorelines 🔲 Partially buried debris 🔳 Debris jams 🗌 Plant hummocks/roots 🗌 Other:	Score: <u>3</u>
Edge Complexity – Confirm in office review. See figure in section 2.3.4.2 to evaluate wetland boundary.	
WAA:  In seasonal floodplain  Contiguous to other wetland Edge vertical structure variation: 50	
Horizontal variability: High Moderate Low None	Score: 2
Physical Habitat Richness – See definitions and table in section 2.3.4.3 for habitat types applicable to each wetla	
	and type.
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N       Total:       4	Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: <u>A, J, L, N</u> Total: <u>4</u> BIOTIC STRUCTURE	Score:
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N       Total:       4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s)	Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: <u>2</u>
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: <u>2</u> Score: <u>2</u> Score: <u>2</u> a stratum. Score: <u>2</u>
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples.
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s)         Number of plant strata: $arrow etam determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exam Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15   $	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 Score: 2 n a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones.
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 Score: 3
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: <u>A, J, L, N</u> Total: <u>4</u> BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s)         Number of plant strata: $] \ge 4$ 3       2       1       0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): <u>5</u> 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exame Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exame Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: <u>15</u> %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: High Moderate Low None Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in see high supplement for supplement. See figures in see high supplement (2 strate supplement) (3 strate supplement) (4 strate supplement) (4 strate supplement) (5 strate supplement)	Score: 2 Score: 2 n a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5.
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s)         Number of plant strata: 2 4 3 2 1 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to count species more than once): 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exam         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exam         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: High Moderate Low None Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in see         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10       % of WAA         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: Bottomland hardwood for external cover of emergent and submergent plants: 25	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 hardwood forest Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA a score: 2 % of WAA
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA Score: 2 mardwood forest Score: 2 Mard WAA
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA ascore: 2 % of WAA % of WA
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s)         Number of plant strata: 2 4 3 2 1 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to count species more than once): 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exait Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: High Moderate Low None Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in see High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10 % of WAA Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15         Total eccuer of emergent and submergent plants: > 75% 51–75% 26–50% ≤ 25%         Vegetation Alterations – Unnatural (human-caused) stressors. Confirm in office review for past.         Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): Disking R/P Mowing/shredding R/P Loggin         Cutting R/P Trampling R/P Herbicide treatment R/P Herbiovorg R/P Disea	Score: 2         Score: 2         n a stratum.         Score: 2         mples.         Score: 3         ection 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         of WAA         Score: 2         % of WAA         Score: 2         mardwood forest         Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s)         Number of plant strata:       ≥ 4       3       2       1       0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exar         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exar         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15       %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion of         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion:       High       Moderate       Low       None       Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in sec       High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10       % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15       Herbaceous Species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15       % of WAA         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA.       In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains:       Bot	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA ardwood forest Score: 2 mg R/P II R/P
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 mardwood forest Score: 2 Score: 2 Mardwood forest Score: 2 Score: 2 Mardwood forest Score: 2 Score: 2 Mardwood forest Score: 2 Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s)         Number of plant strata: □ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exait Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determine the degree of interspersion of Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate □ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in see High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10 % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15 % or total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): 40 % of WAA         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA.       In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: □ Bottomland hardwod forest.         Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): □ Disking R/P □ Mowing/shredding R/P □ Loggin □ Cutting R/P □ Trampling R/P □ Herbicide treatment R/P □ Herbicivg R/P □ Disease R/P □ Chemical spil □ Pollution R/P □ Feral hog rooting R/P □ Woody debris removal R/P □ Other R/P: Clearing for Mining         Perecent of WAA with past vegetation alteration: 10 % Degree of reco	score: 2 score: 2 a stratum. Score: 2 mples. Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5. % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 % of WAA of WAA Score: 2 mg R/P II R/P

#### Version 2.0 – Final TXRAM WETLAND FINAL SCORING SHEET

Project/Site Name/No.: _	lortheast Landfill	Project Type: 🔳 Fill/Impa	act (🗌 Linear 🔳 Non-	linear) 🗌 Mitigation/Conservation
Wetland ID/Name: B	WAA No.: 2	Size: 0.16 Acres Da	ate: 4-15-2020	Evaluator(s): CRK, DTM
Wetland Type: Riverine,	PSS Ecoregion: N/A		Delineation Perf	ormed: 🗌 Previously 🔳 Currently
Aerial Photo Date and So	urce: 2018 (BING), 2017 (NAIP)	Site Photos:	March 17, 2020	Representative: 🔳 Yes 🗌 No
Notes: Permanent Sc	rub-Shrub Wetland Impact			

Core Element	Metric	Metric Score	Core Element Score Calculation	Core Element Score	
Landagang	Aquatic Context	2	Sum of metric scores / 8	5.0	
Lanuscape	Buffer	1.15	x 15	5.9	
	Water source	2		10	
Hydrology	Hydroperiod	1	Sum of metric scores / 12 x 30		
	Hydrologic flow	1			
	Organic matter	1			
Soils	Sedimentation	2	Sum of metric scores / 12 x 15	6.3	
	Soil modification	2			
	Topographic complexity	3			
Physical Structure	Edge complexity	2	Sum of metric scores / 12 x 20	11.7	
	Physical habitat richness	2	×20		
	Plant strata	2			
	Species richness	2		10.7	
	Non-native/invasive infestation	2			
Biotic Structure	Interspersion	3	Sum of metric scores / 28		
	Strata overlap	2			
	Herbaceous cover	2			
	Vegetation alterations	2			
	44.6				
Additional points for unique resources = overall TXRAM wetland score x 0.10 if: Area of Caddo Lake designated a "Wetland of International Importance" under the Ramsar Convention Bald cypress – water tupelo swamp Pitcher plant bog Spring				Not Applicable	
Spring Additional points for limited habitats = overall TXRAM wetland score x 0.05 if: Dominated by native trees greater than 24-inch diameter at breast height Dominated by hard mast (i.e., acorns and nuts) producing native species in the tree strata				Not Applicable <b>44.6</b>	

Representative Site Photograph:





Scrub-shrub Wetland B looking west.

Scrub-shrub Wetland B looking north.

#### Version 2.0 – Final

#### **TXRAM WETLAND DATA SHEET**

Project/Site Name/No.:	Northeast Landfill			Project Type:	🛾 Fill/Impact (🗌 Linear	Non-linear)	Mitigation/Conservation	n
Wetland ID/Name: B	WAA No.:	2	Size:	0.16 Acres	Date: 4-15-2020	Evaluator(s	_{s):} CRK, DTM	
Wetland Type: Riverin	e, PSS	Ecoregion: N/A			Delineat	tion Performed:	Previously  Current	ly
Aerial Photo Date and S	ource: 2018 (BING	), 2017 (NAIP)		Site Phot	_{os:} March 17, 2020	Rep	presentative: 🔳 Yes 🗌 N	10
Notes:								

#### LANDSCAPE

Aquatic Context – Confirm in office review. See figures in section 2.3.1.1 for examples.	
Notes on any barriers or alterations that prevent connection:	
Aquatic resources within 1,000 feet of WAA to which wetland connects (including number for other considerations): 3 S	core: 2

#### Buffer – Evaluate to 500 feet from WAA boundary. Confirm in office review. See figures in section 2.3.1.2 for examples.

Buffer Type/Description	Score (See Narratives)	Percentage	Subtotal
1. Forested	2	50%	1.0
2. Landfill	0	35%	0.0
^{3.} Pasture	1	15%	0.15
4. Open Water	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.			

# Score: 1.15

HYDROLOGY			
Water Source – Degree of natural or unnatural/artificial influence. Confirm in office review for watershed.	Others		
	Other:		
Unnatural/Manipulated: 📋 Impoundment 📋 Outfall 📋 Irrigation/pumping 📋 Other artificial influence or control:			
Watershed: Development Dirrigated agriculture Wastewater treatment plant Dimpoundment Other:			
Degree of artificial influence/control: 🗌 Complete 🔳 High 🗌 Low 🗌 None			
Wetland created/restored/enhanced:  Sustainable/replicates natural  Controlled	Score: 2		
Hydroperiod – Variability and recent alteration of the duration, frequency, and magnitude of inundation/saturation	on.		
Evaluate the hydroperiod including natural variation: Low variability			
Direct evidence of alteration: Natural: 🗌 Log-jam 🗌 Channel migration 🔲 Other:			
Human: Diversions Ditches Levees I Impoundments Other: Berm, Beaver Activity, Clearing for N	Лining		
Riverine only: 🔳 Recent channel in-stability/dis-equilibrium (🔳 Degradation or 🔳 Aggradation)			
Indirect evidence of alteration:  Wetland plant stress:  Plant morphology:  Plant morphology:			
Upland species encroachment: Plant Community: Soil:			
Change/Alteration of hydroperiod: 🗌 None 🔲 Due to natural events 🔳 Human influences (🗌 Slight or 🔳 High)			
Degree hydroperiod of wetland created/restored/enhanced replicates natural patterns:			
Lacustrine fringe on human impoundment: 🗌 High variability 🗌 Low variability 🗌 Recent changes to hydroperiod Score: 1			
Hydrologic Flow – Movement of water to or from surrounding area and openness to water moving through the WAA.			
Flow: Inlets: Outlets: Signs of water movement to or from WAA: Flow through site (Rainfall)			
Restrictions: 🗌 Levee 🔳 Berm/dam 🔲 Diversion 🔳 Other: Beaver activity			
High flowthrough: 🗌 Floodplain 🔲 Drift deposits 🗍 Drainage patterns 🗌 Sediment deposits 🗍 Other:			
Low flowthrough:  High landscape position  Stagnant water  Closed contours  Other:	Score: 1		
SOILS			
Organic Matter – Use data and indicators from wetland determination data form(s) based on applicable regional High (organic soil or indicator A1, A2, A3)	supplement.		
Moderate (indicator A9, S1, F1 in AW or A9, S1, S2, F1 in GP or A6, A7, A9, S7, F13 in AGCP)			
Low (indicated by thin organic or organic-mineral layer) 🔳 None observable in surface layer as described herein Score: <u>1</u>			

Version 2.0 – Fina
--------------------

Codimentation Deposition of evenes codiment due to human actions. Confirm in office review for landscore	
Landscape with stress that could lead to excess sedimentation? I Yes No Landscape position:	High 🗌 Low
Magnitude of recent runoff/flooding events: High Low Percent of WAA with excess sediment de	eposition: <u>50</u>
Sand deposits: <u>75</u> % of area, <u>4-6 in.</u> average thickness Silt/Clay deposits: <u>10</u> % of area, <u>8-10 in.</u> av	verage thickness
Lacustrine fringe only:  Upper end of impoundment  Degrades wetland  Contributes to wetland processes	Score: 2
Soil Modification – Physical changes by human activities. Confirm in office review for past.	
Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): Farming R/P Logging R/P Mining R/P	Filling R/ <u>P</u>
Grading R/P Dredging R/P Off-road vehicles R/P Off-road vehicles R/P Past alteration - Impoundment	·····
Percent of WAA with recent soil modification: 0 % Degree of modification: High C Low	
Indicators of past modification: 🗌 High bulk density 🔳 Low organic matter 🗌 Lack of soil structure 🗌 Lack of horizo	ns 🗌 Hardpan
□ Dramatic change in texture/color □ Heterogeneous mixture □ Other:	
Indicators of recovery:  Organic matter  Structure  Horizons  Mottling  Hydric soil  Other:	
Percent of WAA with past modification: 100 % Recovery: Complete High Moderate Low None	Score: 2
PHYSICAL STRUCTURE	
Topographic Complexity – See figures in section 2.3.4.1. Record % micro-topography and % WAA for each elevel	ation gradient.
Elevation gradients (EG): 2 Evidence: EVi	er flow 🔳 Slope
Micro-topography: <u>15</u> % of WAA (By EG: <u>EG1: 10%; EG2: 5%</u>	)
Types: 🗌 Depressions 🗋 Pools 🗋 Burrows 🗋 Swales 🗋 Wind-thrown tree holes 🔳 Mounds 🗋 Gilgai 🗋 Islands	s
🗌 Variable shorelines 🗌 Partially buried debris 🔳 Debris jams 🗌 Plant hummocks/roots 🗌 Other:	Score: <u>3</u>
Edge Complexity – Confirm in office review. See figure in section 2.3.4.2 to evaluate wetland boundary.	
WAA:  In seasonal floodplain  Contiguous to other wetland Edge vertical structure variation:  50	<b>2</b>
Horizontal Variability: High Moderate Low None	
r nysical nabilat Nemess – See definitions and table in section 2.5.4.5 for nabilat types applicable to each wet	and type.
	2 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: <u>A</u> , J, L, NTotal:	_ Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: <u>A</u> , J, L, N	_ Score: <u>2</u>
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: <u>A, J, L, N</u> Total: <u>4</u> BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s)	_ Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: <u>A, J, L, N</u>	Score: 2). Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	<u>Score: 2</u> ). Score: 2 n a stratum.
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N	Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N	Score: 2 ). Score: 2 n a stratum. Score: 2 imples.
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N	<u>Score: 2</u>       
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N       Total:       4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).       Number of plant strata:       ≥ 4       3       2       1       0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once):       5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion o         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspection:       High       Mederate       Low       Nano	Score: 2 ). Score: 2 n a stratum. Score: 2 imples. 6 Score: 2 if plant zones. Score: 3
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N	Score: 2 Score: 2 n a stratum. Score: 2 mples. 6 Score: 2 f plant zones. Score: 3 ection 2.3.5.5
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2 ). Score: 2 n a stratum. Score: 2 mples. 6 Score: 2 of plant zones. Score: 3 Score: 3 S
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: <u>A</u> , J, L, N       Total: <u>4</u> BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s, Number of plant strata: ⊇ ≥ 4 □ 3 ■ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: <u>15</u> %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion or Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate ■ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in set High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): <u>10</u> % of WAA         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): <u>15</u> %         Total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): <u>40</u>	<u>Score: 2</u> <i>in a stratum.</i> Score: 2 <i>imples.</i> Score: 2 <i>if plant zones.</i> Score: 3 <i>iection 2.3.5.5.</i> % of WAA of WAA Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2         n a stratum.         Score: 2         mples.         6 Score: 2         of plant zones.         Score: 3         section 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         A Score: 2         hardwood forest         Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: <u>A</u> , J, L, N       Total: <u>4</u> BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: □ ≥ 4 □ 3 □ 2 □ 1 □ 0       Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to count species more than once): <u>5</u> Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determine the degree of interspersion o       Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate □ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in s       High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10% of WAA Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15% of WAA         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping): 15% of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15% of WAA         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: □ Bottomland H       Total cover of emergent and submergent plants: □ > 75% □ 51–75% □ 26–50% □ ≤ 25%         Vegetation Alterations – Unnatural (human-caused) stressors. Confirm in office review for past.       Section 22.50%	Score: 2         n a stratum.         Score: 2         mples.         6 Score: 2         of plant zones.         Score: 3         section 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         of WAA         A Score: 2         hardwood forest         Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata: □ ≥ 4 □ 3 ■ 2 □ 1 □ 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in         Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s) to count species more than once): 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion o         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: □ High □ Moderate ■ Low □ None □ Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in s         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10 % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15 % of         Total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): 40 % of WAA         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: □ Bottomland f         Total cover of emergent and submergent plants: □ > 75% □ 51–75% ■ 26–50% □ ≤ 25%         Vegetation Alterations – Unnatural (human-caused) stressors. Confi	Score: 2           n a stratum.           Score: 2           mples.           6 Score: 2           of plant zones.           Score: 3           section 2.3.5.5.           % of WAA           A Score: 2           hardwood forest           Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s, Number of plant strata: a ≥ 4 a 3 a 2 a 1 a 0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once): 5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exal Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion o         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: ☐ High ☐ Moderate   Low ☐ None ☐ Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in s         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10 % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15 % of Total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): 40 % of WAA         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: ☐ Bottomland Hartarions - Unnatural (human-caused) stressors. Confirm in office review for past.         Type (Check those applicable and circle R for recent or P for past): ☐ Disking R/P ☐ Mowing/shredding R/P ☐ Loggi ☐ Cutting R/P ☐ Trampling R/P ☐ Herbicide treatment R/P ☐ Herbivory R/P ☐ Disease R/P ☐ Chemical soi	Score: 2           n a stratum.           Score: 2           mples.           6 Score: 2           of plant zones.           Score: 3           section 2.3.5.5.           % of WAA           of WAA           A Score: 2           hardwood forest           Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE         Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s, Number of plant strata: a ≥ 4 a 3 a 2 a 1 a       0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms: 15 %         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion o         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion: High Moderate Low None Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in s         High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping): 10 % of WAA       Moderate overlap (2 strata overlapping): 15 % of         Total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present): 40 % of WAA         Herbaceous Cover – Estimate for entire WAA. In South Central Plains or East Central Texas Plains: Bottomland R         Total cover of emergent and submergent plants: > 75% 51–75% 26–50% ≤ 25%         Vegetation Alterations – Unnatural (human-caused) stressors. Confirm in office review for past.         Type (Check those applicable and circle R	Score: 2           n a stratum.           Score: 2           mples.           6 Score: 2           of plant zones.           Score: 3           section 2.3.5.5.           % of WAA           A Score: 2           hardwood forest           Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA: A, J, L, N	Score: 2           n a stratum.           Score: 2           mples.           6 Score: 2           of plant zones.           Score: 3           section 2.3.5.5.           % of WAA           A Score: 2           hardwood forest           Score: 2
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s, Number of plant strata:       ≥ 4       3       2       1       0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determination data forms:       15       9         Interspersion – Confirm in office review. Use figure in section 2.3.5.4 to determine the degree of interspersion o Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion:       High       Moderate       Low       None       Bottomland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in s       High overlap (≥ 3 strata overlapping):       15       %         Herbaceous Species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping):       15       %       %         Total eccent and submergent plants:       > 75%       51–75%       26–50%       ≤ 25%       ¥         Vegetation Alterations – Unnatural (human-caused) stressors. Confirm in office review for past.       Type (Check those	Score: 2         n a stratum.         Score: 2         mples.         % Score: 2         of plant zones.         Score: 3         section 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         A Score: 2         hardwood forest         Score: 2         ing R/P         ill R/P
Label of habitat types qualifying as present in WAA:       A, J, L, N       Total: 4         BIOTIC STRUCTURE       Plant Strata – Use applicable wetland delineation regional supplement and data from determination data form(s).         Number of plant strata:       ≥ 4       3       2       1       0         Species Richness – Use data from determination data form(s) to count species with 5% or more relative cover in Number of species across all strata and determination data forms (not counting a species more than once):       5         Non-Native/Invasive Infestation – Use data from determination data form(s). See tables in section 2.3.5.3 for exa         Average total relative cover of non-native/invasive species across all strata and determine the degree of interspersion o         Degree of horizontal/plan view interspersion:       High Moderate       Low       None       Bottmland hardwood forest         Strata Overlap – Use strata defined in plant strata metric using applicable regional supplement. See figures in s       High overlap (2 3 strata overlapping):       15       %         Herbaceous species/dense litter overlap (only in portion where there are no other strata overlapping):       15       %         Total ereview and submergent plants:       >75%       51–75%       265%       Yegetation Alterations – Unnatural (human-caused) stressors. Confirm in office review for past.         Total percentage of WAA with some form of overlap (if more than one present):       40       % of WAA	Score: 2         n a stratum.         Score: 2         mples.         6 Score: 2         of plant zones.         Score: 3         section 2.3.5.5.         % of WAA         A Score: 2         hardwood forest         Score: 2         ing R/P         ill R/P         Low         Score: 2

# ADVERSE IMPACT FACTORS WORKSHEET (A-1)

Stream Type Impacted (ST)       Ephemeral 0.3       O.4       O.4       O.6         Priority 0.05       O.4       O.4       O.8         Fully Functional 0.6       Moderately Functional 0.8         Condition (EC Ondition (EO O.1)       O.4       Permanent 0.8         Impaired 0.4       Permanent 0.8       Permanent 0.8         Impact Onation (ID)       Clearing 0.4       O.4       Permanent 0.5         Impact Activity (IA)       Clearing 0.15       Utility Grassing/Bridge Crossing/Bridge 0.05       Armor 0.15       Detention 10       Impound 1.6       Pipe Fill ment         Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)       O.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)       Pipe Fill ment       Fill ment         Site Name       Northeast Landfill       Intermittent       Intermittent       Intermittent       Intermittent         Station ID       Stream 2       Intermittent       Severely limparted       Intermittent       Intermittent       Intermittent         Impact Magnitude (IIM)       0.3       Permanent       Intermittent       Intermittent       Intermittent       Intermittent	Factors:	Variables:										
$\begin{array}{                                    $	Stream Type	Ephemeral				Intermittent			Perennial			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline Priority & All Other & Secondary & Priority & 0.8 \\ \hline 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.8 \\ \hline 0.4 & 0.6 \\ \hline 0.5 & 0.4 \\ \hline 0.6 & 0.6 \\ \hline 0.6 & 0.8 \\ \hline 0.6 & 0.8 \\ \hline 0.6 & 0.8 \\ \hline 0.7 & 0.05 \\ \hline 0.1 & 0.05 \\ \hline 0.0 & 0.1 \\ \hline 0.0 & 0.05 \\ \hline 0.05 & 0.15 \\ \hline 0.5 & 0.75 \\ \hline 1.5 & 0.0 \\ \hline 0.6 & 0.75 \\ \hline 1.5 \\ \hline 0.6 & 0.75 \\ \hline 1.5 \\ \hline 0.0 & 0.75 \\ \hline 1.5 \\ \hline 1.$	Impacted (ST)	0.3				0.4		0.8				
Waters (PW)         0.05         0.4         0.3           Existing Condition (EQ)         Severely Impaired 0.1         Impaired 0.4         0.4         Partially Impaired 0.6         Moderately Functional 0.8         Fully Functional 1.6           Impact Ouration (ID)         Temporary 0.05         0.4         O.8         Permanent 0.8         0.8           Impact Activity (IA)         Clearing 0.05 or 0.1*         Utility Crossing/Bridge Footing 0.15         Below Crossing/Bridge 0.05         Armor 0.5         Detention Facility 0.5         Morpho- 1.5         Impound- 0.6         Pipe 2.0         2.2         2.5           Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)         0.05         0.15         0.5         0.75         1.5         2.0         2.2         2.5           Site Name         0.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         Methast Landfill	Priority	All Other				Secondary			Priority			
	Waters (PW)		0.05			0.4			0.8			
Conclusion (L2)         Imparing 0.1         O.4         Impace 0.6         Permanent 0.15         O.3           Impact Activity (IA)         Clearing 0.05 or 0.1*         Utility Crossing/Bridge 5oting 0.15         Below Grade Culvert 0.3         Armor 0.5         Detention Facility         Morpho- logic Change 1.5         Pipe 0.3         Fill ment 0.2         Pipe 0.3         Fill ment 0.2         2.0         2.2         2.5           Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)         0.05         0.15         0.75         1.5         2.0         2.2         2.5           NMPACT FACTORS         0.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         Magnitude (LIM)         Stream 2	Existing	Sever	rely	Impaired		Partia	Partially Mod		derately	Fully Functional		al
Impact Duration (ID)Temporary 0.05Recurring 0.15Permanent 0.3Impact Activity (IA)Clearing 0.5Utility Crossing/Bridge Footing 0.15Below Grade Culvert 0.3Armor FacilityDetention FacilityImpound- mentPipe 0.3Fill mentImpact Activity (IA)Clearing 0.5Utility Crossing/Bridge Footing 0.15Below Grade Culvert 0.5Armor 0.5Detention FacilityImpound- mentPipe 0.3Fill mentImpact Magnitude (LIM)0.050.751.52.02.22.5Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)MPACT FACTORSNortheast LandfillSite NameNortheast LandfillStream Type Impacted (ST)0.4IntermittentPriority Waters (PW)0.05All OtherImpact Activity (IA)2.5FillImpact Activity (IA)2.5FillLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22Sum of Factors (M ) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746Required Credits (C) = M * LF2.666.1	Condition (LC)	0.1	rea	0	.4	0.6	0.6		0.8		1.0	
Duration (ID) $0.05$ $0.15$ $0.3$ Impact Activity (IA)Clearing $0.05$ Utility rossing/Bridge $0.05$ Below Grade Culvert $0.5$ Armor $0.5$ Detention Facility $0.5$ Morpho- logic $0.75$ Impound- ment $1.5$ Pipe $2.0$ Fill $2.2$ Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM) $0.003$ multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below) $0.003$ $0.75$ $1.5$ $2.0$ $2.2$ $2.5$ Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM) $0.003$ multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below) $0.003$ $0.75$ $1.5$ $2.0$ $2.2$ $2.5$ Site NameNortheast Landfill $1.5$ $0.003$ $1.5$ $0.003$ $1.5$ $0.75$ $1.5$ $0.003$ Station IDStream 2 $1.5$ $0.4$ Intermittent $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ Site NameNortheast Landfill $0.4$ Intermittent $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ Stream Type Impacted (ST) $0.4$ Intermittent $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ Priority Waters (PW) $0.3$ Permanent $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ Impact Duration (ID) $0.3$ Permanent $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM) $0.22$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ $1.5$ </th <th>Impact</th> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Temporary Recurring</th> <th></th> <th colspan="3">Permanent</th>	Impact		Temporary Recurring			Permanent						
Impact Activity (IA)         Clearing 0.05 or 0.1*         Utility Crossing/Bridge 0.15         Below Grade Culvert 0.0         Armor 0.5         Detention Facility 0.05         Morpho- logic Change 1.5         Impound- ment 2.0         Pipe 2.0         Fill           Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)         0.15         0.000 without by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         Morpho- logic Data         Impound- logic Change 1.5         Impound- ment         Pipe 2.0         Fill           Magnitude (LIM)         0.000 without by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         Mortheast Landfill         Impound- logic         Impound- lo	, Duration (ID)		0.0	05 0.1		D.15	5		0.3			
Activity (IA)         0.05 or 0.1*         Crossing/Bridge Footing 0.15         Grade Culvert 0.3         Facility 0.5         logic Change 0.75         ment Change 1.5         ment 2.0         2.2         2.5           Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)         0.5         0.75         1.5         2.0         2.2         2.5           Stenar Stenar         0.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         0.5         0.75         1.5         2.0         2.2         2.5           MPACT FACTORS         0.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         0.5         0.75         1.5         0.75         1.5         0.0         1           Stream Type Impacted (ST)         0.4         Intermittent         0.5         0.5         0.1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1 <th>Impact</th> <th>Clearing</th> <th>Ut</th> <th>ility</th> <th colspan="2">Below Armor Dete</th> <th>ntion</th> <th>Morpho-</th> <th>Impound-</th> <th>Pipe</th> <th>Fill</th>	Impact	Clearing	Ut	ility	Below Armor Dete		ntion	Morpho-	Impound-	Pipe	Fill	
O.03         Podung or 0.1*         Curvent 0.15         0.3         0.5         0.75         1.5         2.0         2.2         2.5           Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)         0.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         0.0003         multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)           MPACT FACTORS         MPAct Factors         Stream 2	Activity (IA)	0.05	Crossin	g/Bridge	Grade		Fac	ility	logic	ment		
Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)       0.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         IMPACT FACTORS         Site Name       Northeast Landfill         Station ID       Stream 2         Stream Type Impacted (ST)       0.4         Priority Waters (PW)       0.05         O.1       Severely Impaired         Impact Activity (IA)       2.5         Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)       0.22         Sum of Factors (M) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)       3.57         Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)       746         Required Credits (C) = M * LF       2,666.1		or 0.05		15		0.5	0.5	75	Change 1.5	20	22	25
Impact Magnitude (LIM)       0.0003 multiplied by linear feet (LF) of stream impact (recorded in each column below)         IMPACT FACTORS         Site Name       Northeast Landfill       Impact         Station ID       Stream 2       Impact         Stream Type Impacted (ST)       0.4       Intermittent       Impact         Priority Waters (PW)       0.05       All Other       Impact         Existing Condition (EC)       0.1       Severely Impaired       Impact         Impact Activity (IA)       2.5       Fill       Impact         Impact Magnitude (LIM)       0.22       Impact       Impact         Sum of Factors (M) = (ST+PVV+EC+ID+IA+LIM)       3.57       Impact       Impact         Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)       746       Impact       Impact         Required Credits (C) = M * LF       2,666.1       Impact       Impact	Linear			-		0.0	0.1				6.6	2.0
Magnitude (LIM)         Magnitude           IMPACT FACTORS         Site Name         Northeast Landfill         Impact           Site Name         Northeast Landfill         Impact         Impact           Stream Type Impacted (ST)         0.4         Intermittent         Impact           Priority Waters (PW)         0.05         All Other         Impact           Existing Condition (EC)         0.1         Severely Impaired         Impact           Impact Duration (ID)         0.3         Permanent         Impact           Impact Activity (IA)         2.5         Fill         Impact           Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)         0.22         Impact         Impact           Sum of Factors (M) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)         3.57         Impact         Impact           Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)         746         Impact         Impact           Required Credits (C) = M*LF         2,666.1         Impact         Impact         Impact	Impact		0.0003	3 multiplie	d by line	ar feet (LF) o	of strea	m imp	act (record	led in each co	lumn bel	ow)
IMPACT FACTORS         Site Name       Northeast Landfill       Image: Constraint of the state of t	Magnitude											
IMPACT FACTORS           Site Name         Northeast Landfill         Image: Constraint of the stream 2         Image: Constraint of t	(LIM)											
Site NameNortheast LandfillImage: Compensation Ratio 1* (C)Stream 10Stream 2Image: Compensation Ratio 1* (C)Stream Type Impacted (ST)0.4IntermittentPriority Waters (PW)0.05All OtherExisting Condition (EC)0.1Severely ImpairedImpact Duration (ID)0.3PermanentImpact Activity (IA)2.5FillLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22Image: Compensation Ratio 1* (C)	IMPACT FACTO	ORS										
Station IDStream 2IntermittentStream Type Impacted (ST)0.4IntermittentPriority Waters (PW)0.05All OtherExisting Condition (EC)0.1Severely ImpairedImpact Duration (ID)0.3PermanentImpact Activity (IA)2.5FillLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22ImpactSum of Factors (M ) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57ImpactLinear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746ImpactRequired Credits (C) = M * LF2.666.1Impact	Site Name			Northeast Landfill								
Stream Type Impacted (ST)0.4IntermittentImpactPriority Waters (PW)0.05All OtherImpactExisting Condition (EC)0.1Severely ImpairedImpactImpact Duration (ID)0.3PermanentImpactImpact Activity (IA)2.5FillImpactLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22ImpactImpactSum of Factors (M) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57ImpactImpactLinear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746ImpactImpactRequired Credits (C) = M * LF2,666.1ImpactImpactCompensation Batio1 * (C)ImpactImpactImpact	Station ID		Stream	m 2								
Priority Waters (PW)0.05All OtherExisting Condition (EC)0.1Severely ImpairedImpact Duration (ID)0.3PermanentImpact Activity (IA)2.5FillLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22ImpactSum of Factors (M) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57ImpactLinear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746ImpactRequired Credits (C) = M * LF2,666.1Impact	Stream Type Impacted (ST)		0.4	Ļ	Intermitten	t						
Existing Condition (EC)0.1Severely ImpairedImpact Duration (ID)0.3PermanentImpact Activity (IA)2.5FillLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22ImpactSum of Factors (M) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57ImpactLinear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746ImpactRequired Credits (C) = M * LF2,666.1Impact	Priority Waters	Priority Waters (PW)			5	All Other						
ImpairedImpairedImpact0.3PermanentImpact2.5FillActivity (IA)2.5FillLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22Sum of Factors (M) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746Required Credits (C) = M * LF2,666.1Compensation Batiol * (C)4.000	Existing Condition (EC)		0.1 Severel		Severely							
Impact Activity (IA)2.5FillLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22Impact FillSum of Factors (M) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57Impact Sum of Stream Impact (LF)The rest of Stream Impact (LF)746Impact Sum of Stream Impact (LF)Required Credits (C) = M * LF2,666.1Compensation Ratio1 * (C)Impact Sum of Stream Impact (LF)	Impact Duration	n (ID)				Impaired						
Impact Activity (IA)2.5FillLinear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22Sum of Factors (M) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746Required Credits (C) = M * LF2,666.1Compensation Batio1 * (C)			0.3 P		Permanent							
Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)0.22Sum of Factors (M ) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746Required Credits (C) = M * LF2,666.1Compensation Batio1 * (C)	Impact Activity (IA)		2.5		Fill							
Sum of Factors (M ) = (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)3.57Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)746Required Credits (C) = M * LF2,666.1Compensation Batio1 * (C)	Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM)			0.2	2							
Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)     746       Required Credits (C) = M * LF     2,666.1	Sum of Factors (M)= (ST+PW+EC+ID+IA+LIM)		3.57									
Required Credits (C) = M * LF     2,666.1	Linear Feet of Stream Impact (LF)			746	3							
Compensation Ratio ^{1 *} (C)	Required Credits (C) = M * LF			2,666.1								
1:1	Compensation Ratio ¹ * (C)			1:1								

# Total Credits Required from all Columns= _

2,666.1

1. **Compensation Ratio** - when the Corps determines that a third party mitigation source is acceptable to fulfill compensatory mitigation requirements the total credits determined on this worksheet shall be applied to mitigation banks or in-lieu fee programs at a 1:1 ratio when the impact area is within an approved service are, however, an increased compensation ratio may be used at the Corps discretion when an impact occurs beyond the geographic service area of an approved mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program.

* Impact Activity - Clearing on both sides of stream double the clearing category to 0.1.

#### Worksheet Factors for ADVERSE IMPACT FACTORS WORKSHEET (A-1)

2.b.i. Adverse Impact Factors: The factors below are used to determine the credits for the Adverse Impact Factors Worksheet (Appendix A-1).

2.b.i(1). Stream Types (ST):

2.b.i(1)(a) Ephemeral Streams: Streams that have flowing water only during and for a short duration after precipitation events during a normal precipitation year. Ephemeral streambeds are located above the water table year-round. Groundwater is not a source of water for the stream. Runoff from precipitation is the primary source of water for stream flow. Ephemeral streams typically support few aquatic organisms. When aquatic organisms are found they typically have a very short aquatic life stage.

2.b.i.(1)(b) Intermittent Streams: Streams that have flowing water during certain times of the year, when ground water provides water for stream flow. During dry periods, intermittent streams may not have flowing water. Runoff from precipitation is a supplemental source of water for stream flow. The biological community of intermittent streams is composed of species that are aquatic during a part of their life history or move to perennial water sources.

2.b.i(1)(c) Perennial Streams: Streams that have flowing water year-round during a normal precipitation year. The water table is located above the streambed for most of the year. Groundwater is a primary source of water for stream flow. Runoff from precipitation is a supplemental source of water for stream flow. Perennial streams support aquatic organisms year-round.

2.b.ii. Priority Waters (PW) [Appendix B]: The priority waters are divided into three categories:

2.b.ii(1) Primary waters include:

- Outstanding National Resource Waters.
- State Outstanding Resource Waters and tributaries.
- High Quality Waters designated by the state.
- Mussel Beds.
- Waters with Federal Listed Endangered and Threatened species.
- Streams with high aquatic biodiversity.

2.b.ii(2) Secondary waters include:

- Sensitive Water Supply also known as OWRB Sensitive Public and Private Water Supplies (SWS).
- Abutting an approved consolidated mitigation site (banks and in-lieu fee).
- Rivers and streams of the same or lower order within 1.0 mile upstream or downstream of primary priority waters of a project site.
- Oklahoma 303(d) List of Impaired Waters.

2.b.ii(3) All other waters not described above: These areas include all other freshwater systems not ranked as primary or secondary waters.

2.b.iii. Existing Conditions (EC): The following describes the condition of each stream segment where an impact activity is proposed before any project impacts that would occur from an applicant proposed project. This measures the ability to support normal hydraulic and geomorphic functions relative to the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of the system. If a stream is impaired, it cannot be considered fully functional.

2.b.iii(1) Fully Functional: Describes those stream segments that have been shown to or are likely to support healthy aquatic communities indicative of the ecoregion and stream type. These stream segments also have natural hydrologic variability and responses to precipitation events. Fully functional stream segments are characterized by a combination of little modification, relatively stable bed and banks, good water quality, and undisturbed riparian corridors. A fully functional stream represents a least-disturbed condition and therefore exhibits the conditions used to establish performance standards for restoration and mitigation.

User Note: Streams with a Strahler stream order number 4 or greater are automatically designated as fully functional (see next example drawing). Example Drawing on **Page 6** 

The evaluated stream segment is considered fully functional when 4 of 6 of the following criteria are met:

- Is unaltered in any major manner by human activities. It has not been channelized, impounded, or substantially constricted by structures, or had its flow substantially altered.
- Is not listed on the most current Clean Water Act 305 (b) Integrated lists as Category 4 or 5 developed by ODEQ. https://www.deg.ok.gov/water-quality-division/watershed-planning/integrated-report/
- Is stable and does not exhibit head cutting, incision, or excessive aggradation and the stream banks are not subject to
  excessive erosion or disturbance.
- Is connected to its overbank flood plain supporting normal hydrological functions.
- Has a riparian buffer of at least 50 feet in width on both sides of the stream that sustains deep-rooted, native vegetation that exceeds 50% cover. (3rd order stream or larger are expected to have wider riparian zones.)
- If a stream segment is impacted by a minor structural alteration along a stream that is otherwise considered fully functional, but
  does not substantially alter the stream reaches above and below the structure, the segment from 0.25 miles above to 0.25 miles
  below the alteration should be considered a separate segment that is moderately functional.

Exception: The Corps, at its discretion, may designate the largest streams within an 8-digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) as fully functional, regardless of whether they meet the criteria above, based on the stream's recreational, commercial, or water supply values (see Appendix C).

2.b.iii(2) Moderately Functional: Streams have been altered; however, system recovery has a moderate probability of occurring naturally. These streams support many, but not all, of the hydraulic and geomorphic characteristics of fully functioning streams of similar order in the watershed. All stream segments that do not meet the definition of fully functional or do not have the characteristics of an impaired stream segment are considered moderately functional.

2.b.iii(3) Partially Impaired: Describes those streams that have been degraded in one of the following parameters below and lacks resilience characterized by loss of one integrity function. Recovery is unlikely to occur naturally unless a major rehabilitation project is undertaken.

2.b.iii(4) Impaired: Describes those streams that have been degraded in two or three of the following parameters below and lacks resilience characterized by loss of two to three of the integrity functions. Recovery is unlikely to occur naturally unless a major rehabilitation project is undertaken.

2.b.iii(5) Severely Impaired: Describes those streams that have been degraded in four or more parameters and lacks resilience characterized by loss of four or more of the integrity functions. Recovery is unlikely to occur naturally unless a major rehabilitation project is undertaken.

2.b.iii(6) Seven Factors of Stream Impairment: A stream segment is considered impaired if it fails to meet a Fully Functional or Moderately Functional conditions. The criteria for determining a stream impairment is listed below:

2.b.iii(6)(a) Has been channelized and shows no evidence of self-recovery.

2.b.iii(6)(b) Is levee protected, impounded, or artificially constricted?

2.b.iii(6)(c) Is entrenched

- 2.b.iii(6)(d) Contains active head cut (i.e. abrupt drops in stream bed, both banks failing).
- 2.b.iii(6)(e) Has little or no riparian buffer of deep-rooted vegetation on one or both sides of the stream channel.

2.b.iii(6)(f) Has banks that are extensively eroded or unstable, obvious bank sloughing, and erosional scars.

2.b.iii(6)(g) Has four or more stream impacts within 0.5 miles upstream of the proposed stream impact including culverts that convey stream flow, pipes, or other manmade modifications, and stream impacts individually or cumulatively exceeds 100 feet in length.

2.b.iv. Impact Duration (ID): This is the amount of time the impact activity is expected to last. For purposes of this method the duration of the impact activity is factored in the following categories: temporary impacts, recurring impacts, and permanent impacts.

2.b.iv(1) Temporary Impacts: Means the impact activity will remain for a period of less than 6 months with system integrity recovering after cessation of the permitted activity or restoration to pre- construction contours and elevations. Under certain circumstances impacts may remain within a stream for a period greater than 6 months but the decision is contingent upon activity type, impact area, effects to instream flows, biological communities, water quality, and best management practices to minimize adverse effects. Examples of activities suitable to receive a temporary duration factor includes utility line crossings where appropriate natural substrate is used to backfill an open cut trench, temporary road crossings, work pads, or cofferdams.

User Note: Compensatory mitigation is not normally required for temporary impacts, where the disturbed area is fully restored and there is no permanent reduction in ecological function following the completion of the project.

2.b.iv(2) Recurring Impacts: Means that impact activities have occurred at this location before. Impacts to some or all aquatic resource functions and/or services are not considered a permanent loss. Recurring impacts to the impact area occur in such a frequency, the impact area could obtain additional effects to in-stream flows, biological communities, water quality, and best management practices that could adversely affect existing aquatic resource functions. An example of activities suitable to receive recurring duration factor includes sand or gravel mining activities.

User Note: Compensatory mitigation may be required for recurring impacts at a project location.

2.b.iv(3) Permanent Impacts: Means the impact activity will result in the permanent loss of some or all aquatic resource function and/or services. Examples of activities suitable to receive a permanent duration factor includes armoring, culverting, detention facilities, morphological changes, impounding, and piping are examples of permanent impact activities.

2.b.v. Impact Activity (IA): This is the type of impact proposed that will diminish the functional integrity of the stream. The following nine categories are types of impacts:

2.b.v(1) Armor: To riprap one or both stream channel banks or use other hard methods (i.e. concrete or block retaining wall) on one bank alone leaving the stream bed unaltered. Keying riprap revetments along the toe is an acceptable installation practice under this parameter.

User Note: Armoring of the stream bed and banks with riprap or installing a retaining wall along both channel banks should be assessed as a "Morphologic change".

2.b.v(2) Below Grade (embedded) Culvert: To route a stream through pipes, box culverts, or other enclosed structures for the purpose of a transportation crossing (100 linear feet or less of stream be impacted per linear transportation crossing). New or replacement culverts should be designed to convey geomorphic bankfull discharge with a similar average velocity as upstream and downstream sections. The culvert should be embedded and backfilled below the grade of the stream at least 1 foot for culverts greater than 48 inches diameter. On culverts less than 48 inches in diameter, the bottom of the culvert should be placed at a depth below the natural stream bottom. Bottomless culverts are acceptable in streams with non-erodible beds (i.e. bedrock or stable clay). Culverts that fail to meet the above design criteria will be evaluated under the impact activity known as pipe (see definition below).

2.b.v(3) Clearing: The removal of streambank vegetation or other activities that reduce or eliminate the quality and functions of vegetation within riparian habitat without disturbing the existing topography or soil.

User Note: This factor is intended for use in combination were no other impact activity is being evaluated. Additional mitigation could be required if both sides of the stream are cleared as a result of the proposed project. Clearing both sides doubles the adverse impact factor.

2.b.v(4) Detention Facility: The installation of a storm water management facility within a stream channel. This facility consists of a detention structure and a temporary ponding area upstream of the detention structure. The detention structure (i.e. dam or berm) itself is considered a "fill" activity, as defined below. Water velocities entering the temporary ponding area are typically reduced and may be temporarily held back while outflow is slowly released back into the channel downstream of the detention structure.

User Note: If the stream channel upslope of the detention structure is straightened, widened, dredged, excavated, or relocated it will be left to the discretion of the Regulatory Project Manager to determine whether the "morphologic change" or "fill" impact activity factor will be used.

2.b.v(5) Fill: The filling of a stream channel including the relocation of a stream channel (even if a new stream channel is constructed), or other fill activities.

2.b.v(6) Impoundment: The conversion of stream(s) to open water (pond or lake) through the construction of a dam or similar structure that modifies the natural stream flow. Channel impacts where the structure is located is considered a "fill" activity and the inundation will be considered as an impoundment.

2.b.v(7) Morphologic Change: To alter the established or natural dimensions, depths, or limits of an existing stream channel through straightening, widening, dredging, excavating, or channelizing (leave the channel in the same alignment). Examples of morphologic change include creation of a concrete lined open channel, in channel grading upstream of a detention structure, conversion of a stream to a grassed waterway, lining parallel banks with gabion baskets, concrete or block retaining walls, or channel reaming activities.

2.b.v(8) Pipe: To route a stream through pipes, box culverts, or other enclosed structures for purposes other than transportation crossings.

2.b.v(9) Utility Crossings: Activities required for the construction, maintenance, repair, and removal of utility lines within waters of the United States.

2.b.v(10) Bridge Footings: Activities requiring fill in waters of the United States are also considered in this activity factor. This factor also includes drilled shaft, column/pier placement, cofferdam for footing/pier placement, temporary crossing, and work pad.

2.b.vi. Linear Impact Magnitude (LIM): This is a mathematical calculation that addresses the scope of linear impact for each individual column recorded on the Adverse Impact Factor Worksheet. The corresponding value for each column shall be determined by multiplying a 0.0003 constant by the length of stream impacted per column (0.0003 x length of stream impacted per column). This factor considers those columns with greater affected stream length to have more extensive adverse effects on stream function than those columns containing lesser amounts of affected stream length.

Certification Letter from DEQ



May 9, 2023

Mr. David Bahrenburg N.E Landfill, LLC 1001 S Rockwell Oklahoma City, OK 73128

RE: Application No. SWT-2020-00344

Dear Mr. Bahrenburg:

The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has received your request for a Water Quality Certification under Section 401 of the Federal Clean Water Act [33 U.S.C. §1251 et seq. (1972)], for activities in the unnamed tributary to Crutcho Creek and associated wetlands to be permitted under Section 404 of the Act. DEQ rules governing 401 Water Quality Certification are contained in Oklahoma Administrative Code (O.A.C.) § 252:611-3 (2011) pursuant to 27A O.S. § 2-6-103(C)(2) (OSCN 1999). DEQ rules and regulations related to the 401 procedures are available at <u>611.pdf (ok.gov)</u> or through contacting the DEQ Office of Business and Regulatory Affairs (800) 869-1400.

We have reviewed and examined the proposed project as described in Public Notice No. SWT-2020-344 and your application. The unnamed tributary and associated wetlands are assigned the following default beneficial uses through the Oklahoma Water Quality Standards (WQS): Warm Water Aquatic Community, Agriculture: Livestock and Irrigation, Primary Body Contact Recreation, and Aesthetics (OAC 252:730-5-3). The current Oklahoma WQS are available from the Department of Environmental Quality at: https://www.deq.ok.gov/wp-content/uploads/deqmainresources/730.pdf.

The proposed project is for a 73.2-acre horizontal and vertical expansion of the existing 90.1-acre construction and demolition landfill. Additional features include stormwater management infrastructure, roads, and utilities to accommodate the landfill expansion. The proposed work involves the discharge of approximately 7,007 cubic yards of native soil into jurisdictional wetlands and streams resulting in permanent loss of waters of the United States (WOUS) including 0.56 acre of shrub-scrub wetlands, 746 linear feet of intermittent stream, 1,359 linear feet of ephemeral stream, and 0.76 acre of open water. The impacted streams will be replaced with a run-on channel designed for a peak flow associated with the 25-year, 24-hour storm event. The run-on channel will be grass and riprap-lined. The channel will discharge into an unnamed tributary to Crutcho Creek. Proposed compensatory mitigation for the proposed permanent impacts to the aquatic resources will consist of purchasing 686.3 perennial stream credits, 1,293.6 intermittent stream credits, 4,970.8 ephemeral stream credits and 3.92 wetland credits from Deep Fork Mitigation Bank.

The project is located in Section 22, Township 12 North, Range 2 West, in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma.

The conditions attached to this conditional Certification will be terms of the Section 404 permit. The state may require compliance with these conditions under state and/or federal law. Failure to comply with the conditions or any other applicable state requirements may result in proceedings brought by the state for the suspension, termination, modification or revocation of this Certification and/or for injunctive relief, damages and/or penalties as allowed by law. This Certification may be revoked or modified upon subsequent amendments or revisions to Oklahoma's Water Quality Standards requirements or upon expiration of the federal permit for the described activity.

This conditioned Water Quality Certification does not supersede the requirements of a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a permit required by the local floodplain board, or any other permit required for this project.

This certification does not authorize the discharge of industrial stormwater runoff, stormwater runoff from construction sites, or municipal/domestic wastewater discharges. These discharges may require permits from DEQ.

The certification is granted subject to the following conditions:

- Appropriate procedures shall be utilized during the construction of this project to prevent the release of construction debris, fuels and lubricants, or other deleterious materials into the aquatic resources to comply with CWA 301(a), OAC 252: 730-3-2(d), OAC 252: 730-5-9 (b), and OAC 252: 730-5-19.
- 2) All fueling and servicing of vehicles and equipment shall be done above the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) to comply with CWA 301(a), OAC 252: 730-3-2, OAC 252: 730-5-12(f)(4) and (6), and OAC 252: 730-5-19.
- 3) Environmental control practices, including but not limited to, effective erosion control measures and sediment control measures, shall be utilized during construction to comply with OAC 252: 730-5-12(f)(8).
- 4) All construction shall be done in a manner that will minimize increased turbidity and prevent downstream deposition of bank material during or after construction to comply with OAC 252: 730-5-12(f)(8).
- 5) All excess fill material, waste materials, construction debris, etc., must be removed from the site upon completion of the project to avoid the introduction of pollutants into the aquatic resources and to comply with OAC 252: 730-5-9 (b) and OAC 252: 730-5-19.
- 6) Post-project condition should not result in surface water quality degradation which will interfere with the attainment or maintenance of an existing or designated beneficial uses to ensure compliance with WQS, OAC 252: 730-3-2(d).
- 7) The applicant shall follow the USACE Tulsa District mitigation requirements of purchasing stream and wetland credits from the Deep Fork Mitigation Bank to comply with OAC 252: 730-3-2(d).

Page 3 Mr. Bahrenburg Application No. SWT-2020-00344

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Elena Jigoulina at 405-702-8200.

Sincerely,

Joe A. Long, Environmental Programs Manager Watershed Planning Section Water Quality Division

 cc: Robert Hoffman, Regulatory Branch, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa Kenneth Cunningham, Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation Brooks Tramell, Monitoring, Assessment and Wetlands Programs, Oklahoma Conservation Commission Daniel Landeros, EPA Region 6 (6WQ-EM) Jennifer Lewis, Assistant Attorney General, Conservation Unit, OK, Office of the Attorney General Unstable Areas

# SCS ENGINEERS

August 18, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Mr. Darrell Shults, Geologist Oklahoma Department of Mines 2915 N. Classen Blvd., Suite 213 Oklahoma City, OK 73106-5406

#### Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Application Notification Request for Location Restrictions Evaluation – Unstable Areas

Dear Mr. Shults:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma.

Three general site location maps (Figures 1, 3, and 6) are enclosed. Latitude/longitude of the corners of the permit boundaries are provided in Figure 3.

DEQ regulation states the following: no new waste management or disposal areas of a land disposal facility shall be located over a subsurface mining area or any other unstable area.

On behalf of GFL, we request you to review the enclosed maps and provide this determination as required by DEQ within 45 days of receipt of this letter. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Sandeep Saraf at (407) 923-7013. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Enclosures: Figures 1, 3, and 6

Ryan Kuntz, PE Vice President / Satellite Office Manager SCS Engineers







#### LEGEND

EXISTING LANDFILL BOUNDARY PROPOSED LANDFILL EXPANSION BOUNDARY CURRENT LIMIT OF WASTE PROPOSED LIMIT OF WASTE

PERMIT BOUNDARY				
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE		
100	N35 30' 13.47"	W97 23 51.04"		
101	N35 30' 13.49"	W97 23' 19.15"		
102	N35 30' 02.39"	W97 23 19.11		
103	N35' 30' 01.40"	W97 23 27.08"		
104	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23 27.06"		
105	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23' 19.08"		
106	N35 29' 48.32"	W97 23 19.05"		
107	N35 29' 48.33"	W97 23 39.01"		
108	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23' 38.97"		
109	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 42.96"		
110	N35 29' 41.80"	W97 23 42.98"		
111	N35 29' 41.81"	W97 23' 50.97"		

LIMITS OF WASTE				
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE		
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23 49.46"		
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"		
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"		
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"		
204	N35' 30' 02.01"	W97 23 28.29"		
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97* 23' 27.76"		
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23' 20.68"		
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"		
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23 39.61"		
209	N35' 29' 43.77"	W97 23' 42.53"		
210	N35' 29' 43.95"	W97 23 50.20"		











Airports

# SCS ENGINEERS

August 23, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Mr. Kent Wheeler Federal Aviation Administration Central Obstruction Evaluation Team Manager Southwest Region Office 10101 Hillwood Parkway Fort Worth, TX 76177

#### Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Permit Application Notification Request for Location Restrictions Evaluation - Airports

Dear Mr. Wheeler:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma.

Three general site location maps (Figures 1, 3, and 6) are enclosed along with Figure 7, which shows the location of the site on Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Airport Vicinity Map (Dallas-Ft. Worth Sectional, 104th Edition). Latitude/longitude of the corners of the disposal area (i.e., limit of waste) are provided on Figure 3.

DEQ regulation 252:515-5-52(e) states the following: if any waste management or disposal area of a new land disposal facility, or expansion of waste management or disposal areas of an existing land disposal facility, is to be located within 10,000 feet of any airport runway end used by turbojet aircraft or within 5,000 feet of any airport runway end used by only piston-type aircraft, a demonstration that the facility will not pose a bird hazard to aircraft shall be provided to the DEQ.

If any waste management or disposal areas of a new land disposal facility, or expansion of waste management or disposal areas of an active land disposal facility, will be located within a 5-mile radius of any airport runaway end used by turbojet or piston-type aircraft, the affected airport and the FAA must be notified and proof of such notification provided to DEQ (252:515-5-52(e)(1)(A)).

Based on our review of the attached FAA Airport Vicinity Map (i.e., Figure 7), no airports are located within 10,000 feet of the landfill. Therefore, our evaluation indicates a demonstration that the facility will not pose a bird hazard to aircrafts is not applicable for this landfill expansion. As shown in Figure 4, Tinker Air Force Base is located about 23,000 feet (4.4 miles) south of the proposed landfill expansion. Therefore, SCS is submitting this notification to FAA and Tinker Air Force Base in compliance with DEQ rule 252:515-5-52(e)(1)(A).

On behalf of GFL, we request your review of the enclosed maps. Please advise us of any concerns the FAA may have with the proposed landfill location at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Sandeep Saraf at (407) 923-7013. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandharg

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Enclosure: Figures 1, 3, 6, and 7

Ryan Kuntz, PE Vice President / Satellite Office Manager SCS Engineers







#### LEGEND

EXISTING LANDFILL BOUNDARY PROPOSED LANDFILL EXPANSION BOUNDARY CURRENT LIMIT OF WASTE PROPOSED LIMIT OF WASTE

PERMIT BOUNDARY				
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE		
100	N35 30' 13.47"	W97 23 51.04"		
101	N35 30' 13.49"	W97 23' 19.15"		
102	N35 30' 02.39"	W97 23 19.11		
103	N35 30' 01.40"	W97 23 27.08"		
104	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23 27.06"		
105	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23' 19.08"		
106	N35 29' 48.32"	W97 23 19.05"		
107	N35 29' 48.33"	W97 23 39.01"		
108	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23' 38.97"		
109	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 42.96"		
110	N35 29' 41.80"	W97 23 42.98"		
111	N35 29' 41.81"	W97 23' 50.97"		

LIMITS OF WASTE				
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE		
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23 49.46"		
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"		
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"		
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"		
204	N35' 30' 02.01"	W97 23 28.29"		
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97* 23' 27.76"		
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23' 20.68"		
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"		
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23 39.61"		
209	N35' 29' 43.77"	W97 23' 42.53"		
210	N35' 29' 43.95"	W97 23 50.20"		













# SCS ENGINEERS

August 18, 2023 Project No. 16219107.00

Tinker Air Force Base Legal Office 7460 Arnold Avenue Bldg. 72nd ABW Headquarters Tinker AFB, OK 73145

#### Subject: Northeast C&D Landfill Proposed Tier III Application Notification Request for Location Restrictions Evaluation - Airports

To Whom It may Concern:

As required by Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oklahoma Administrative Code 252:515-5-52(e) and on behalf of N.E. Land Fill, LLC (a subsidiary of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, a GFL Environmental [GFL] company), SCS Engineers is submitting this notification for a horizontal and vertical expansion of its existing construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfill. The proposed expansion will be located on GFL-owned property, north of the existing C&D landfill footprint. The proposed landfill expansion is located at 2601 N. Midwest Boulevard in Spencer, Oklahoma.

Three general site location maps (Figures 1, 3, and 6) are enclosed along with Figure 7, which shows the location of the site on Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Airport Vicinity Map (Dallas-Ft. Worth Sectional, 104th Edition). Latitude/longitude of the corners of the disposal area (i.e., limit of waste) are provided on Figure 3.

DEQ regulation 252:515-5-52(e) states the following: if any waste management or disposal area of a new land disposal facility, or expansion of waste management or disposal areas of an existing land disposal facility, is to be located within 10,000 feet of any airport runway end used by turbojet aircraft or within 5,000 feet of any airport runway end used by only piston-type aircraft, a demonstration that the facility will not pose a bird hazard to aircraft shall be provided to the DEQ.

If any waste management or disposal areas of a new land disposal facility, or expansion of waste management or disposal areas of an active land disposal facility, will be located within a 5-mile radius of any airport runaway end used by turbojet or piston-type aircraft, the affected airport and the FAA must be notified and proof of such notification provided to DEQ (252:515-5-52(e)(1)(A)).

Based on our review of the attached FAA Airport Vicinity Map (i.e., Figure 7), no airports are located within 10,000 feet of the landfill. Therefore, our evaluation indicates a demonstration that the facility will not pose a bird hazard to aircrafts is not applicable for this landfill expansion. As shown in Figure 4, Tinker Air Force Base is located about 23,000 feet (4.4 miles) south of the proposed landfill expansion. Therefore, SCS is submitting this notification to FAA and Tinker Air Force Base in compliance with DEQ rule 252:515-5-52(e)(1)(A).

On behalf of GFL, we request your review of the enclosed maps. Please advise us of any concerns the Tinker Air Force Base may have with the proposed landfill location at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Sandeep Saraf at (407) 923-7013. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandhypargf

Sandeep Saraf, P.E. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

Enclosure: Figures 1, 3, 6, and 7

Ryan Kuntz, PE Vice President / Satellite Office Manager SCS Engineers






#### LEGEND

EXISTING LANDFILL BOUNDARY PROPOSED LANDFILL EXPANSION BOUNDARY CURRENT LIMIT OF WASTE PROPOSED LIMIT OF WASTE

PERMIT BOUNDARY			
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	
100	N35 30' 13.47"	W97 23 51.04"	
101	N35 30' 13.49"	W97 23' 19.15"	
102	N35 30' 02.39"	W97 23' 19.11"	
103	N35 30' 01.40"	W97 23 27.08"	
104	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23 27.06"	
105	N35 29' 54.86"	W97 23' 19.08"	
106	N35 29' 48.32"	W97 23 19.05"	
107	N35 29' 48.33"	W97 23 39.01"	
108	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 38.97"	
109	N35 29' 35.26"	W97 23 42.96"	
110	N35 29' 41.80"	W97 23 42.98"	
111	N35' 29' 41.81"	W97 23 50.97"	

LIMITS OF WASTE			
POINT #	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	
200	N35 30' 10.61"	W97 23 49.46"	
201	N35 30' 11.63"	W97 23' 36.89"	
202	N35 30' 11.55"	W97 23' 21.45"	
203	N35 30' 05.27"	W97 23' 20.81"	
204	N35' 30' 02.01"	W97 23 28.29"	
205	N35 29' 54.32"	W97* 23' 27.76"	
206	N35 29' 54.10"	W97 23 20.68"	
207	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23' 21.29"	
208	N35 29' 48.99"	W97 23 39.61"	
209	N35 29' 43.77"	W97 23 42.53	
210	N35 29' 43.95"	W97* 23' 50.20"	













Appendix A-3

Boundary Survey and Legal Description



		LEGEND
	•	Found Existing Monument as Noted
	Δ	Set Meg Nail w/LS 1702 Washer
	*	Light Pole
		Power Pole
	P.O.B.	Point of Beginning
		Subject Tract Property Line
		Existing Easement
		Existing Right-of-Way
		USPLSS Reference Lines
		Adjoining Parce Lines (Approx.)
G		Gas Pipe Line
×	x	Fence
DHE		Overhead Electric
_m	ro	Fiber Optic Cable
—usr —	UGT	Underground Telephone
		Underground Electric
usc	usc	Underground Cable



PAF	rt of the O	E EAST HALF (E/2), SEC. 22, T12N, R2W, I.M., KLAHOMA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA	
REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	m/\\son
			SURVEYING & CONSULTING, INC.
			PO BOX 571 • GENTRY, AR 72734 • (479)238-3109
Project N	^{oject No.} 21105 BOUNDARY SURVEY FOR:		/ FOR:
Original D	)ate:	GFL ENVIRONMENTAL	
	02-17-2022	GFL ENV	IRONMENTAL
( Drawn By	)2-17-2022 :: JMLN	GFL ENV NE LAI 2601 N. M	IRONMENTAL ID FILL, LLC 1IDWEST BLVD

-(N)

Appendix A-4

Proof of Property Ownership

#### LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY QUIT CLAIM DEED (Statutory Form)

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

THAT B.E. Land, LLC, an Oklahoma Limited Liability Company, party of the first part, in consideration of the sum of Ten dollars and Zero cents and other valuable considerations to it in hard paid, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged does hereby quit claim, scant, bargain, sell and convey unto NE Land Fill, LLC, an Oklahoma Limited Liability Company party of the second part, all of its right, title, interest, estate, and every claim and demand, both at law and in equity, in and to all of the following described real property situate in Oklahoma County, State of Oklahoma, o-wit:

See Attached EXHIBIT A for Legal Description

together with all the improvements thereon and the appurtenances thereunto belonging.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the above described premises unto the said party of the second part, his/her heirs and assigns of the survivor forever.

B.E

By

and

Signed and delivered this 7th day of December, 2009.

CAPITOL ABSTRACT AND TITLE COMPANY 6601 N. BROADWAY EXT., BLDG. #5 OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA 73116

Gars M Demyberry, Vice President of Heritage Test Company, Manager

LLC ACKNOWLEDGMENT

01:17:57

BK RE11261 PS 19

County of Oklahoma

Oklahoma County Clerk Carolynn Caudill

1969

DEED

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

COUNTY OF OKLAHOMA

Before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public, in and for said County and State, on this 7th day of December, 2009 personally appeared Gasy M Derryberry, Vice President of Heritage Trust Company, Manager of B.E. Land, LLC, an Oklahoma Limited Liability Company to me known to be the identical person who signed the name of the maker thereof to the within and foregoing instrument as its Manager and acknowledged to me that he executed the same as his fore and voluntary act and deed for the uses and purposes therein set forth.

SS.

Given under my hand and seat the day and year last above written. My Commission Expires: Nor Public December 7, 2009 Jennifer Johnson 9100506

2/15

EXHIBIT A

A part of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4) of Section Twenty-two (22), Township Twelve (12) North, Range Two (2) West of the Indian Meridian, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point which is 1420.6 feet South from the Northeast corner of said Quarter Section; thence South along the East line thereof a distance of 1120 feet to a point which is 100 feet North from the Southeast corner of said quarter section; thence West 330 feet to a point; thence South 100 feet to the South line of said Quarter Section; thence West along the South line to the South west corner of said Quarter Section; thence West line of said Quarter Section a distance of 1220 feet to a point; thence East to the East line of said Quarter Section, the point or place of beginning.

> 20091211011634320 Filing Fee: \$15.00 Doc. Stamps: \$1,068.00 12/11/2009 01:17:57 PM DEED



Appendix A-5

Copy of Agreement with City of Spencer

#### **RESOLUTION #23-**

#### A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SPENCER AUTHORIZING THE ACCEPTANCE OF SETTLEMENT OF THE APPEAL REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF N.E. LAND FILL, LLC FOR A USE PERMITTED IN 1-3, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

WHEREAS, on or about March 31, 2020, a hearing was held at Public Meeting to consider the Application of N.E. Land Fill, LLC for a Use Permitted on Review in the I-3 Heavy Industrial District. The Application was denied at the Public Meeting.

WHEREAS, subsequently N.E. Land Fill, LLC filed an Appeal with the Oklahoma County District Court in the case styled N.E. Land Fill, LLC v. The City of Spencer Board of Adjustment, CV-2020-1489.

WHEREAS, the parties attended Court ordered mediation with Joe Hampton, mediator with JH ADR and the matter was resolved between the parties per the terms contained within the attached Settlement Term Sheet attached hereto as Exhibit "A", pending City Council's approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the CITY OF SPENCER:

Adopts in its entirety the Settlement reached between N.E. Land Fill, LLC and The City of Spencer per the terms contained within the Settlement Term Sheet attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

PASSED AND ADOPTED on this 30th day of March, 2023.

ATTEST:

#### EXHIBIT "A" TO RESOLUTION #23-

#### NE LAND FILL, LLC — CITY OF SPENCER SETTLEMENT TERM SHEET

1. NELF will not seek to include a permit for MSW disposal. Its expansion plans will be for its current operation as a C&D landfill.

2. NELF will make a one time lump sum payment of Two Hundred Thousand and no/100 Dollars (\$200,000.00) to Spencer upon issuance of the expansion permit.

3. Upon issuance of the expansion permit and during the life of the landfill (while remaining capacity exists and waste being accepted), NELF will pay Spencer an annual fee of One Hundred Thousand and no/100 Dollars (\$100,000.00). Over the estimated life of the landfill this delivers a potential benefit of Two Million and no/100 Dollars (\$2,000,000.00) to Spencer.

4. Upon issuance of the expansion permit and during the life of the landfill (while remaining capacity exists and waste being accepted) NELF will pay Spencer a host fee of Fifty and no/100 Cents (.50) per ton for each ton of C&D waste disposal at the landfill.

5. Upon Spencer's approval of the agreement, NELF will pay Spencer a non-refundable, one time sponsorship payment of Seventy Five Thousand and no/100 Dollars (\$75,000.0) for the football field project.

6. NELF Will complete a beautification project at the landfill consisting of a new gate, fencing (8') and trees consistent with the renderings attached hereto as Exhibits "A" and "B" for illustration. Supplemental tree plantings will be made along the north side and NE 23rd Street side of the landfill. Entrance gate to be no less than 50' from the center of Midwest Boulevard.

7. NELF commits to cooperate fully and in good faith with Spencer in its efforts to widen the existing roadway.

8. Spencer has the right to inspect the landfill on a weekly basis.

9. This matter and agreement is to be presented to the Spencer City Council at its meeting on March 23, 2023.

10. Upon approval of the agreement by the Spencer City Council and all required local approvals, the parties will dismiss the pending litigation.

11. Spencer agrees to cooperate with all ODEQ approvals and consent to C&D expansion.

**EXHIBIT** "A"





This next picture shows a close-up of black slats on a galvanized mesh. Notice the gap between the slats. Bottom locking slats obscure about 75% visibility. This will require post spacing to be reduced from the standard 10ft to 5-6 ft depending on the wind conditions in your area. Your fence is turning into a sail, it will need more bracing. They have a 25 year limited warranty and because each slat ties into the track at the bottom, they can be individually replaced if ever damaged. You'll never need to replace more than you need to.

EXHIBIT "B"

· ·

1.4. 2



Appendix B

Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Investigation

## Appendix B Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Investigation

## Northeast C&D Landfill

Prepared for:

N.E. Land Fill, LLC 2601 North Midwest Blvd Spencer, OK 73084

Prepared by:

**SCS ENGINEERS** 1901 Central Drive, Suite 550 Bedford, TX 76021 817-571-2288

> August 2023 File No. 16219107.00

> Offices Nationwide www.scsengineers.com

Northeast C&D Landfill

Section

Page

1.0	INTRODUCTION1			
	1.1	Backgr	ound	1
	1.2	Workp	ans and Approvals	1
2.0	REGI	ONAL C	HARACTERIZATION	1
	2.1	Region	al Soils	2
	2.2	Region	al Geology	2
		2.2.1	Seismicity	3
	2.3	Region	al Hydrology and Water Quality	4
3.0	BOR	BORING PROGRAM		
	3.1	Boring	Logs	5
	3.2	Downh	ole Geophysical Logs	5
	3.3	Soil Te	sts	6
		3.3.1	Sieve Analysis	7
		3.3.2	Atterberg Limits/Moisture Content	7
		3.3.3	Standard Proctor Density Summary/Moisture Density Relationships	7
		3.3.4	Hydraulic Conductivity Summary	8
		3.3.5	Soil Classification Summary	8
		3.3.6	Standard Penetration Test Summary	8
		3.3.7	Suitability for Landfill Uses	8
4.0	GRO	UNDWA	TER STUDY	8
	4.1 Piezometers Installed		8	
		4.1.1	Piezometer Development	9
	4.2	Ground	dwater Elevations	9
		4.2.1	Monthly Measurements	9
		4.2.2	Highest Groundwater Elevations and Groundwater Flow Direction	9
		4.2.3	Continuous Measurements	10
		4.2.4	Area Rainfall	10
	4.3	Aquife	r Testing	11
5.0	CON	CLUSION	VS	11
6.0	PROPOSED GROUNDWATER MONITORING SYSTEM13			
7.0	REFERENCES14			

Table of Contents

#### Figures

Figure 1.1	Site Location Map
Figure 1 0	Cita Lavaut Man

- Figure 1.2 Site Layout Map
- Figure 2.1 Location of Soil Units Figure 2.2
- Regional Geologic Map
- Figure 2.3 Site Geologic Map
- Figure 2.4 Hydrologic Atlas Map
- Figure 2.5 Groundwater Resource Map

- Figure 3.1 Boring Location Map
- Figure 3.2 Cross Section Location Map
- Figure 3.3 Cross Section A-A'
- Figure 3.4 Cross Section B-B'
- Figure 3.5 Cross Section C-C'
- Figure 3.6 Cross Section D-D'
- Figure 3.7 Cross Section E-E'
- Figure 3.8 Cross Section F-F'
- Figure 4.1 Hydrograph
- Figure 4.2 Hydrograph
- Figure 4.3 Hydrograph
- Figure 4.4 Hydrograph
- Figure 4.5 Hydrograph
- Figure 4.6 Potentiometric Map Highest Groundwater Elevation
- Figure 4.7 Potentiometric Map March 2021
- Figure 4.8 Hydrograph Continuous Groundwater Monitoring
- Figure 5.1 Current Groundwater Monitoring Network
- Figure 5.2 Proposed Groundwater Monitoring Network
- Figure 5.3 Typical Monitoring Well Construction

#### Tables

- Table 2.1Stratigraphic Column
- Table 3.1Boring Construction Details
- Table 3.2Geotechnical Samples
- Table 4.1
   Monthly Groundwater Measurements
- Table 4.2 Precipitation of Spencer, OK
- Table 4.3Hydraulic Conductivities

#### Appendices

- Appendix A Work Plan and Approval
- Appendix B Boring/Lithologic Logs and Construction Diagrams
- Appendix C Geophysical Logs
- Appendix D Century Borehole Geophysical Report
- Appendix E Geotechnical Laboratory Test Results
- Appendix F AQTESOLV Analysis Graphs

#### Certification

This Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Investigation Report has been prepared in accordance with good engineering practice including consideration of industry standards and the requirements of the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality.

Prepared by:

Tell is fourter

8/21/23 Robert Fowler, P.G. Senior Project Professional SCS Engineers

muller

8/21/23

Dan McCullough, P.G. Senior Project Manager SCS Engineers

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This hydrogeological report documents the investigation conducted for the Tier III permit modification application at the Northeast C&D landfill (landfill). The investigation was performed to meet the requirements of Title 252 Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) chapter 515, "Management of Solid Waste." The investigation followed the DEQ approved Work Plan (SCS, December, 2019) and the specific references to DEQ Regulation 252:515 are included within applicable subsection titles of this report.

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

The combined total permit boundary (existing and expansion) will be 163.3 acres, and the combined total waste disposal area (existing and expansion) available for C&D waste disposal upon obtaining approval of the permit application will be 121.2 acres. A site location map is presented as Figure 1.1 and a facility layout, including the existing and proposed landfill, is presented as Figure 1.2.

## **1.2** WORKPLANS AND APPROVALS

A Drilling Work Plan (Plan) was submitted to DEQ for approval in December 2019 in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-4, which was approved by DEQ on February 10, 2020. This Plan included the name, address, and telephone number of the owner/operator, the consulting firm, and the person in charge of the project. In addition, the following maps were included in the Plan as per regulation 252:515-7-4:

- General location map, flood plan map, and quadrangle topographic map in accordance with OAC 252:515-3-52;
- Existing contour map in accordance with OAC 252:515-3-55, showing the locations, estimated elevations and total depths of any proposed or existing borings on site;
- Site specific maps showing any wetlands, fault areas, seismic impact zones, and alluvium or terrace deposits and their recharge areas; and
- Drawings of proposed piezometers and/or monitoring wells to demonstrate their construction will be in accordance with the requirements of the OWRB (OAC 252:515-7-3).

As outlined in the Plan, the locations and depths of the borings were completed in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(3)&(4). The Plan, along with the DEQ approval letter, are included as Appendix A of this report.

In accordance with OAC 252:515-7-5, once approval was granted for the Plan, a Notice of Intent to Drill was prepared and submitted to DEQ prior to initiating drilling activities. All subsurface drilling activities were conducted in accordance with the approved Plan and were supervised by a qualified groundwater scientist.

## **2.0** REGIONAL CHARACTERIZATION

In accordance with OAC 252:515-7-38, this section discusses the regional climate, soils, hydrology, geology, hydrogeology, and water quality of the area surrounding the landfill. The information contained in these sections was compiled from published literature, previous studies conducted at the site, and from the borings advanced during the current investigation.

## 2.1 REGIONAL SOILS

According to the Soil Survey of Garvin County, Oklahoma, published by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (USDA, 1985) and the review of information provided by the Web Soil Survey website (July 8, 2015), the soils in the vicinity of the landfill can be classified as seven distinct soil units:

- Vanoss silt loam (1 to 3% slopes) (approximately 26.7%)
- Harrah fine sandy loam (3 to 45% slopes) (approximately 15.7%)
- Teller fine sandy loam (5 to 8% slopes) (approximately 13.1%)
- Teller fine sandy loam (3 to 5% slopes) (approximately 11.4%)
- Teller fine sandy loam (1 to 3 % slopes) (approximately 11.4%)
- Vanoss silt loam (0 to 1 % slopes) (approximately 6.0%)
- Teller fine sandy loams eroded (3 to 5%) (approximately 5.4%)

Figure 2.1 shows the locations of the soil units from USDA 1985 Soil Survey and the Web Soil Survey website (May 28, 2020) in relation to the landfill property boundary. The soils were mapped prior to activities within the proposed landfill area. Note the majority of soils on the landfill property consist of the Vanoss silt loam, Harrah fine sandy loam, and Teller fine sandy loam. A review of the Web Soil Survey also identified areas defined as pits or soils from mine spoils or earthy fill derived from sedimentary rocks (approximately 3.6%) which was located along the boundary of the site and the existing landfill property. The soil information described below is from the Soil Survey of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma USDA (2003) and Web Soil Survey Site (May 28, 2020).

The Vanoss series consists of very deep, well drained soils that formed in loamy alluvium of Pleistocene age. These soils occur on treads of stream terraces in the Central Rolling Read Prairies. Slopes range from 0 to 8 percent. The surface layer is comprised of grayish brown to very dark grayish brown loam. Surface soils have a weak fine granular structure that is slightly hard and friable and is approximately 11 inches thick. The sub soil is brown to dark brown with a medium sub angular blocky structure that is hard and friable.

The Harrah fine sandy loam series (3 to 45% slopes) consists of soils that are very deep, well drained, and moderately permeable. The Harrah series is formed from sandy and loamy colluvium weathered from sandstone of Permian age. These soils are on back slopes and foot slopes of low hills. The surface layer is a brown fine sandy loam that has a weak fine granular structure which is soft and friable and is approximately 9 inches thick. The sub soil is light brown loamy sand which is also soft and friable.

The Teller fine sandy loam series consists of very deep, well drained and moderately permeable soils that formed in loamy sediments of Pleistocene age. The Teller series soils are nearly level to gently sloping soil and are on treads and risers of stream terraces in the Central Rolling Red Prairies. Slope ranges from 0 to 8 percent. The surface layer is comprised of dark brown fine sandy loam that is weak fine and a medium granular structure that is slightly hard and very friable and is approximately 15 inches thick. The subsoil is brown to dark brown fine sandy loam that is weak with a medium sub angular blocky structure, which is slightly hard and friable.

## 2.2 REGIONAL GEOLOGY

The landfill is located within the Osage Plains, a section of the Central Lowland province, which in turn is part of the larger Interior Plains physiographic province. Three sub-regions make up the Osage Plains, the Flint Hills, Blackland Prairies, and the Cross Timbers. The sub-region that stretches across central Oklahoma is known as the Cross Timbers region. The woodland and savanna portions of the Cross Timbers are mainly Post Oak and Blackjack Oak on coarse, sandy soils, while the prairie portions are chiefly tallgrass on finer, dry soils.

The landfill is located within the Permian-age sandstone known as the Garber Sandstone and is underlain by the Wellington Formation which is also of Permian age. Both the Garber Sandstone and the Wellington Formation consist of lenticular beds of massive appearing, cross-bedded sandstone irregularly inter-bedded with shale which is part sandy to silty. The sandstone layers are fine to very fine grained and loosely cemented. The sandstone is poorly cemented and crumbles easily. Color ranges from nearly white to pink, orange, deep red, or purple. Although some sandstone beds are relatively thick, beds five feet or less in thickness are common. The thickness of the Garber Sandstone is approximately 350 feet in Oklahoma County. The Wellington Formation is approximately 799 feet in thickness in the subsurface. Therefore, the two formations as a unit have a total thickness that ranges from 800 to 1000 feet (Wood/Burton, 1968). Table 2.1 shows the Geologic Column from surface to a 500 feet. Figure 2.2 depicts a Regional Geologic Map and Figure 2.3 depicts a Site Geologic Map.

OAC 252:515-5-5(a) states that no area within the permit boundary of a new land disposal facility, or expansion of the permit boundary of an existing land disposal facility, shall be located within an area designated as alluvium or terrace deposits and their recharge areas, as shown on "Map of Aquifers and Recharge Areas in Oklahoma" complied by Kenneth S. Johnson, Oklahoma Geological Survey (1991).

According to the "Geologic Map of the Midwest City 7.5' Quadrangle, Cleveland and Oklahoma Counties, Oklahoma" compiled by Thomas M. Stanley and Neil H. Suneson, 2000 and the "Geologic Map of the Spencer 7.5' Quadrangle, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma" complied by Thomas M. Stanley and Neil H. Suneson, 1999; the proposed landfill is not located in alluvium or terrace deposits. See Figure 2.3 for the Site Geologic Map

The "Map of Aquifers and Recharge Areas of Oklahoma" complied by Kenneth S. Johnson, Oklahoma Survey (1991) is at such a large scale that locating the site with precision as it relates to terrace deposits is not possible. The 7.5' Quadrangle maps are much smaller scale than the Kenneth S. Johnson Map and the boundaries shown are more representative of actual conditions. In addition, site specific geologic conditions obtained during previous subsurface investigations and presented in the Tier III Permit Application, dated November 2005 for the Northeast C&D Landfill, indicate that the site is underlain by silty sands underlain by weathered sandstone. Information from these historic investigations in addition to the information presented in this current investigation as provided in the following sections of this report indicate the lithology underlying the site is consistent with weathered Garber Sandstones and not alluvium or terrace deposits.

## 2.2.1 Seismicity

Based on the USGS U.S. Seismic Hazard Map, Peak Horizontal Acceleration with 2% Probability of Exceedance in 50 Years (2014), the location of the site is depicted as exhibiting a maximum horizontal acceleration (or effective peak ground acceleration) in rock of between 0.005 and 2.2 percent of gravity with a 98 percent probability of not exceeding the horizontal acceleration within a 50-year reoccurrence.

The proposed landfill is located within a seismic impact zone with a peak ground acceleration (PGA) of 0.17g from U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Unified Hazard Tool and USGS Hazard Map 2014. Appendix C (Slope Stability and Final Cover Veneer Slope Analysis) address seismic issues in conjunction with the slope stability analyses for the landfill.

## **2.3** REGIONAL HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

According to the Hydrologic Atlas (HA-4) Reconnaissance of the Water Resources of the Oklahoma City Quadrangle, the facility is located in areas which are comprised of numerous saturated layers of fine to medium grained sandstone. Yields of deeper wells are generally greater than shallower wells because more of the sandstone layers are penetrated. The Hydrologic Atlas also noted that wells within these areas yield less than 150 to 300 gallons per minute. See Figure 2.4 Hydrologic Atlas Reconnaissance of the Water Resources of the Oklahoma City Quadrangle.

The Garber Sandstone is one of the most transmissive geological units within the Central Oklahoma aquifer and yields substantial amounts of water. Groundwater quality within the Garber sandstone is generally good quality, yield water containing 500 mg/l or less of dissolved solids. The presence of an undesired constituent or excessive hardness may make the water unsuitable for some purposes.

According to the Oklahoma Water Resources Board, the site is underlain by the Central Oklahoma Aquifer. The Central Oklahoma Aquifer underlies about 3,000 square miles of central Oklahoma. The Central Oklahoma Aquifer is referred to as the Garber-Wellington Aquifer since it is dominantly composed of the Permian aged Garber Sandstone and Wellington Formation. The aquifer ranges in thickness from 300 feet in the south to about 800 feet in the north. Wells commonly yield 25 to 400 gallons per minute and are generally of good quality with total dissolved solids ranging from 200 to 1,000 parts per million. Recharge areas consist of outcrops of the aquifer and extend eastward to the approximate top of shales that make up much of the lower one-third of the Wellington Formation.

A Groundwater Resource Map has been provided as Figure 2.5. The Resource Map shows groundwater wells that are located in the vicinity of the landfill Property. As shown on the Figure 2.5, 71 monitoring wells, 45 groundwater wells, and 12 other wells are located within a mile of the landfill property. The imagery for the Resource map was taken from OWRB.OK.gov.

Surface elevations at the site range from approximately 1,170 to 1,220 feet above mean sea level (fmsl). Surface water drains primarily east and north through the property into an intermittent stream which flows to the northwest approximately 0.5 miles into Crutcho Creek.

The landfill is located in the watershed of Crutcho Creek. Crutcho Creek flows north to the North Canadian River and drains an area of approximately six square miles which includes a portion of Tinker Air Force Base. The Crutcho Creek watershed mainly consists of urban development with parking lots, businesses, and housing developments. Crutcho Creek is located in the Central Great Plains ecoregion.

## **3.0** BORING PROGRAM

In February-March 2020 a characterization of the subsurface and groundwater conditions in the area of the proposed landfill was conducted. The field work was conducted in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-4 and the DEQ approved Drilling Work Plan prepared by SCS dated December, 2019 (see Appendix A). A total of sixteen (16) borings were drilled and piezometers were installed in eleven (11) of these borings. The boreholes ranged in depth from approximately 31 feet below ground surface (bgs) to a maximum depth of approximately 101 feet bgs. Further discussion of the lithology encountered in these borings and groundwater elevations measured over time can be found in Sections 3.1 and 4.2 respectively. Construction details for each boring drilled can be found on Table 3.1 and boring logs in Appendix B. The location of each boring is included on Figure 3.1.

The drilling contractor for drilling activities was Anderson Engineering of Little Rock, Arkansas. A buggy mounted CME-45 drill rig was utilized to advance the borings. The soil borings were advanced utilizing 8.25 OD hollow stem augers with continuous sampling unless auger refusal was reached. When hollow stem auger refusal occurred, the borings were drilled utilizing air rotary drilling techniques to the specified depth below ground surface. During air rotary drilling samples were collected at five-foot interval utilizing a split-spoon sampler. A SCS Field Geologist logged each boring and a detailed field boring log for each soil boring is presented in Appendix B.

#### **3.1** BORING LOGS

In accordance with OAC 252:515-7-32 and 33, boring and lithologic logs were completed for each borehole for its entire depth. Each log includes the following information:

- All pertinent information, such as the depth at which water was encountered,
- Depth of water at the time of drilling and again 24 hours later,
- Geotechnical information about drilling, such as penetration rates, hydraulic conductivity test intervals and results, and drill bit changes,
- Identification of all soil and rock layers encountered during drilling describing color, texture, thickness, degree of compaction or consolidation and amount of moisture present in each layer,

In accordance with OAC 252:515-35, soil samples were collected continuously utilizing a 5-foot soil core barrel within the hollow stem auger. Once auger refusal was reached and drilling with wash rotary methods began, samples were collected at five-foot intervals utilizing a split spoon. Samples were placed in plastic Ziploc bags to preserve the sample. Samples will be stored until obtaining approval of the permit from DEQ.

The site geology and hydrogeologic conditions were defined by the sixteen borings drilled within the proposed expansion area and two existing monitoring wells (MW-3R and MW-4R). The soil boring/lithologic logs are presented in Appendix B of this report. In addition, a series of cross-sections were prepared to provide a visual presentation of the lithology beneath the proposed landfill area. The cross-section location map is Figure 3.2. The six cross-sections are Figures 3.3 through 3.8.

As the boring logs and cross-section present, the lithology beneath the site is consistent with the Garber Sandstone and with the geology as discussed in Section 2.2 of this report. The site geology consists of loosely cemented sandstone ranging in color from orange to red (Garber Sandstone) along with clay, silty clay, sandy clay, silty sand, and sand.

As indicated on cross-sections D (Figure 3.6), E (Figure 3.7), and F (Figure 3.8), there was little to no sand encountered in the borings along the southern edge of the proposed expansion area. Borings within the west-central and western portion of the landfill area found sand with thickness ten feet or greater. In the majority of these borings the sand beds were entirely saturated. However, unsaturated sand was found in borings EB-8/PZ-9 and PZ-3 located along the western and northern edge of the expansion area respectively.

## **3.2** DOWNHOLE GEOPHYSICAL LOGS

Downhole geophysical logs were obtained in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-34 which states that for waste disposal areas of 20 acres or less, at least three boreholes shall be logged by geophysical tools, one of which must be run on the deepest drilled borehole. In addition, one additional borehole shall be logged for each additional 20 acres of waste disposal. Gamma ray/neutron logs from total depth

to the surface were logged within the casing of 9 of the boreholes during this investigation. Geophysical Logs are included in Appendix C of this report.

In accordance with OAC 252:515-7-32(a) and OAC 252:515-7-34(a), borehole geophysical logging was performed within boreholes that were converted to piezometers along with the 100-foot deep boring (EB-1) per OAC 252:515-7-34(a). Logging was performed on 9 of the onsite borings. The geophysical logs were performed by Century Geophysical Corporation of Tulsa, Oklahoma and include natural gamma, resistivity, and conductivity.

The natural gamma log is the recording of a scintillation counter or detector to the natural gamma radiation emitted by naturally occurring formations, or materials placed in the well bore annulus. Higher gamma readings occur in the presence of clay and shale. The neutron log uses a 1.0 Ci, Americium Beryllium neutron emitting radioactive source to measure the relative porosity of the formation. In cased hole applications, raw counts are recorded and scaled proportionally with increasing counts to the right, which are indications of sands or limestone. Decreasing counts to the left of the scale show higher water content or more clay or shale type formations. The borehole geophysical logs are included in Appendix C. A further description of the borehole geophysical methods used is included in the *Report of Geophysical Logs, NELF, for SCS Engineering* (Century Geophysical Corporation, 2020) which is included as Appendix D.

The natural gamma logs indicate variable response (0-150 API units), indicating some interbedded and moderately clean sand zones, and higher response from clay type materials. The conductivity response is mostly related to the dissolved salts and permeability of the pore spaces of the material. The calculated resistivity log indicates clays and shales are to the left and sandstones are to the right.

## **3.3** SOILS TESTS

In order to characterize the proposed expansion area in terms of geotechnical properties, samples were collected from boreholes drilled during this investigation. A total of 17 samples were collected from 13 boreholes. These 17 samples were taken at various depths and locations at the site and submitted to Anderson Engineering, Inc. for geotechnical analysis. The purpose of these analyses was to gain information on the geotechnical properties of the samples and to properly characterize each individual soil type found on site.

The appropriate geotechnical lab tests outlined below were conducted for characterization purposes, and in accordance with OAC252:515-7-36(3):

- Soil classification according to the specifications of ASTM D2487
- Particle-size analysis of soil according to the specifications of ASTM D422
- Sieve analysis for the following screen sizes: #4, #10, #40, #200
- Percent fines (#200 sieve) according to the specifications of ASTM D1140
- Atterberg limits according to the specifications of ASTM D4318
- Moisture content according to the specifications of either the oven drying method of ASTM D2216 or the microwave drying method of ASTM D4643
- Moisture-density relationship according to the specifications of the standard proctor test of ASTM D698 or the modified proctor test of ASTM D1557
- Hydraulic conductivity according to the specifications of ASTM D5084

Appendix E contains all geotechnical laboratory test results associated with soils present in the proposed landfill area. The following sections summarize the results of the geotechnical testing conducted during this investigation.

#### 3.3.1 Sieve Analysis

Particle size analyses were conducted on the samples collected during this investigation for the purpose of analyzing grain size distribution and classification associated with soils native to the proposed expansion area.

In the sieve analysis, a series of sieves (screens) differing in opening size are stacked with the larger sizes over the smaller. The soil sample being tested is dried, clumps are broken, and the sample is passed through the series of sieves by shaking. Larger particles are caught on the upper sieves, and the smaller particles filter through to be caught on one of the smaller underlying sieves. The weight of material retained on each sieve is conventionally presented as a grain or particle size distribution on tables presented in the results.

Sieve analysis was conducted in 17 samples from the onsite soils. The percent of particles passing the #200 sieve within the clays ranged from 57% to 72% and within the sand ranged from 7% to 41%. As indicated in Table 3.2, samples were analyzed in the laboratory for grain size distribution in accordance with ASTM D422 and ASTM D1140.

#### 3.3.2 Atterberg Limits/Moisture Content

In the remolded state, the consistency of clay soil varies in proportion to the water content. At higher water content, the soil-water mixture possesses the properties of a liquid. At lesser water contents a soil-water mixture possesses properties that resemble a plastic. At still lesser water contents, soil-water mixtures approach a solid or semi-solid state. The water content indicating the division between the liquid and plastic state has been designated as the Liquid Limit. The division between the plastic and semi-solid state is referred to as the Plastic Limit. The numerical difference between the Liquid Limit and the Plastic Limit is identified as the Plasticity Index. These values are often referred to as Atterberg Limits. The Atterberg Limits test is used to obtain basic index information on soils and is used to estimate strength, settlement, and workability characteristics. It is the primary form of classification for cohesive soils properties for soils commonly used in the construction of landfill liner systems. As presented in Table 3.2, 11 samples were analyzed for Atterberg Limits during this investigation.

In general, on-site clays determined to have Plasticity Indices greater than 10 can be considered for use in the construction of any clay liner system. The Plasticity Indices within the onsite clays ranged from 7 to 22 percent with all but two of the samples being greater than 10%. Liquid Limits ranged from 23 percent to 37 percent and the plastic limits ranged from 13 to 16 percent within the onsite clays. The Atterberg Limits results are presented in Appendix E.

# 3.3.3 Standard Proctor Density Summary/Moisture Density Relationships

Standard Proctor density tests were performed on a sample taken during the investigation in order to better classify the geotechnical properties of the soils on-site. The sample was obtained from a representative soil (EB-7 5'-10') within the study area to determine the suitability in the construction of the clay liner system. The sample was obtained and analyzed by Anderson Engineering, Inc. for determining the moisture-density relationship as defined in ASTM D698. Based on Standard Proctor analyses taken from the sample, it is anticipated that the optimum moisture content will be approximately 14.1% with a maximum dry density of approximately 114.3 pounds per cubic foot (pcf). Standard proctor results are presented in Appendix E and Table 3.2.

#### **3.3.4** Hydraulic Conductivity Summary

Soil samples were obtained from EB-6 (20'-25'), EB-7 (5'-7'), PZ-4 (5'-10'), and PZ-6 (2'-5') for the purpose of characterizing the permeability characteristics of area soils. Results of these samples are presented in Appendix E. Table 3.2 summarizes the results of remolded hydraulic conductivity analyses for local soils. All tests were completed on remolded specimens in accordance with ASTM D-5084. EB-6 (20'-25') was obtained within the onsite sand and PZ-4 (5'-10'), EB-7 (5'-10'), and PZ-6 (2'-5') were obtained from the onsite Clays. The values from the sand unit tested was  $5.06x10^{-4}$  cm/sec. The values obtained from the clay units tested were  $2.83x10^{-7}$  cm/sec,  $1.28x10^{-8}$  cm/sec and  $2.05x10^{-8}$  cm/sec with an average result of  $1.67x10^{-8}$  cm/sec.

#### 3.3.5 Soil Classification Summary

The Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) is commonly used in engineering and construction applications. Soil Classifications are on the basis of coarse and fine grained soils and are categorized based on laboratory tests including the grain size distribution analyses and Atterberg Limits. In general, the following soil classifications were identified within and near the expansion area.

- CL: Clay
- SP: Poorly Graded Sand
- SM: Silty Sand
- SC: Clayey Sand
- ML Silt

The samples collected for geotechnical analyses were from bulk samples. The Soil Classifications can be seen in Appendix E of this report.

#### 3.3.6 Standard Penetration Test Summary

Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) were conducted on overburden soils in the borings drilled within the proposed expansion area. The boring logs completed by SCS, located in Appendix D, note the "field" blow counts associated with the SPT analyses in the Comments portion of the logs.

#### 3.3.7 Suitability for Landfill Uses

There are liner and final cover quality soils located on the site that meet the requirements of OAC 252:515-11-33. A discussion of this material is presented in the Permit Application.

## **4.0** GROUNDWATER STUDY

## 4.1 PIEZOMETERS INSTALLED

As per OAC regulation 252:515-7-52&53, the piezometers were installed in the uppermost saturated zone at locations approved by DEQ in order that data collected is representative of the expansion area. The lateral expansion area is 67.7-acres, therefore a minimum of five (5) piezometers were required by OAC 252:515-7-53(a)&(b). During this investigation nine (9) piezometers were installed and water levels were obtained on a monthly basis at the nine (9) piezometers and six (6) existing onsite monitoring wells and continuously via in-situ water level troll at PZ-6 and PZ-7.

The piezometer construction consisted of a 2-inch diameter Schedule 40 PVC solid riser and ten feet of 0.010" slotted screen. The sand filter pack extends to a minimum of two (2) feet above the screened

interval. A minimum 2-foot bentonite pellet seal was placed immediately above the filter pack. After placement of the entire bentonite seal, the pellets were allowed to hydrate prior to the placement of a cement/bentonite grout mixture from the top of the bentonite seal to approximately two (2) feet below grade level. The backfill material was mixed in accordance with the ratio requirements set forth in OAC 785:35-7-2(b)(6)(C).

The depth of sand or bentonite was measured with a cloth tape as the material was added to the borehole to ensure that bridging did not occur within any portion of the borehole. All piezometers were surveyed after completion. The piezometer installation diagrams are included in Appendix B. The monthly groundwater elevations measured in the piezometers are included on Table 4.1.

#### 4.1.1 Piezometer Development

Once the piezometers were installed, each piezometer was developed utilizing a Waterra Hydrolift-2 inertial pump. Well development is necessary in order to remove silt and sediment in the bottom of the piezometer along with the fines from the sand pack and well screen that accumulated during drilling. Each piezometer was considered developed once a minimum of 5 well volumes were removed. Newly installed piezometers were developed no sooner than 24 hours after the installation of grout.

#### **4.2** GROUNDWATER ELEVATIONS

Based on the results of these borings/piezometers it appears that onsite groundwater lies within onsite sands with high permeability.

During the current investigation, piezometers were installed within nine (9) of the boreholes to allow the gathering of additional information relative to the groundwater flow in the expansion area (PZ-1 through PZ-9). At borehole EB-3 moisture was noted shallower than expected. A piezometer (PZ-8) was installed and the piezometer was bailed until dry. Water level in the piezometer did not return back to its original elevation indicating that the moisture was not groundwater.

Attributes for each of these piezometers are listed in Table 3.1. The well construction diagrams are presented in Appendix B.

At each of the piezometers, groundwater depths were noted when they were encountered during drilling. The water levels were also obtained 24 hours after completion.

#### 4.2.1 Monthly Measurements

In accordance with OAC 252:515-7-54, a groundwater elevation survey was conducted to determine the relationship between the highest water table and the lowest waste placement elevations. Groundwater measurements were taken monthly at piezometers PZ-1 through PZ-9 and existing wells monitoring wells MW-1, MW-2, MW-3R, MW-4R, MW-5 and MW-6 from April 2020 to March 2021. Groundwater measurements were recorded on approximately the same date each month. See Table 4.1 and Figures 4.1 through 4.5 for the recorded monthly groundwater data.

# 4.2.2 Highest Groundwater Elevations and Groundwater Flow Direction

During this investigation the highest groundwater elevation was measured in piezometer PZ-1 (1185.20 fmsl). PZ-1 is located on the southeast portion of the proposed expansion area. The lowest groundwater elevation recorded occurred in piezometer PZ-7 (1159.66 fmsl), located along the

northwestern portion of the expansion area. A potentiometric surface map as Figure 4.6 was constructed utilizing the highest recorded elevation during the investigation. This potentiometric surface was utilized to show separation between highest groundwater elevation and the deepest excavation of the landfill bottom. The deepest placement of waste would therefore be 5 feet above this elevation which would be the top of protective cover. The potentiometric surface and the deepest elevation depth (landfill bottom) are presented on cross section (Figures 3.3 through 3.8)

A second potentiometric surface map utilizing the water levels taken at all of the piezometers in March 2021 was produced to show the groundwater flow across the site. The March 2021 potentiometric surface is depicted on Figure 4.7. As you can see in the figure groundwater flows from Southeast to North-Northwest across the expansion area.

#### 4.2.3 Continuous Measurements

In accordance with OAC 252:515-7-54(b) and the approved Work Plan, an In-situ water level troll was installed in PZ-6 and PZ-7 and allowed to monitor water levels for a 12-month period beginning in April 2020 through March 2021. All groundwater elevations were measured in accordance with the specifications outlined in ASTM D4750. A Hydrograph depicting the data from the continuous water level monitoring system is included as Figure 4.8. As depicted on the figure, over the course of a year the water level showed very little variation between the highest recorded water level and the lowest recorded water level. It should be noted that, as depicted in Figure 4.8, variation that was observed in PZ-7 during May-June 2020 is due to the transducer being accidentally installed at a higher elevation within the piezometer.

#### 4.2.4 Area Rainfall

The climate for Oklahoma County, Oklahoma is humid and temperate, and is characterized by warm summers and cold, dry winters. Temperatures average near 60 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), with a slight increase from north to south. Average temperatures range between 93°F in July to 26°F in January. The coolest month for Oklahoma County is typically January with a mean temperature of 37.5°F. The warmest months are July and August with a mean temperature of 81.3°F. Mean annual precipitation is approximately 34.5 inches, with approximately 219 days in the growing season. Wet months are usually May, June, and October. The driest months are December, January, and February. On average, about 33 percent of the annual precipitation is in spring, 29 percent in summer, 25 percent in fall, and 13 percent in winter.

In accordance with OAC 252:515-7-55, daily and monthly precipitation data was obtained from the climatological station closest to the proposed landfill area for the months of April 2020 through March 2021 along with the preceding 12 months. Table 4.2 shows the precipitation for Spencer. During the period from April 2020 through March 2021, July 2020 (5.92 inches) had the highest rainfall and November 2020 (0.58 inches) had the least rainfall. No significant increases or decreases were recorded in the water level data from those months at any of the piezometers.

Oklahoma has an average rainfall of 38.75 inches which is 0.4 inches of rain less than the national average of 39.17. Spencer has had an average rainfall of 36.78 inches over the last 30-years, which is 2.39 inches fewer than the average nationwide, and 1.97 inches fewer than the average in Oklahoma.

## 4.3 AQUIFER TESTING

During April 2020, slug tests were performed all seven (7) of the piezometers PZ-1 through PZ-7 and two (2) existing monitoring wells (MW-3R and MW-4R) located within the proposed expansion area. A falling and raising head test was performed in each of these piezometers/monitoring wells. The falling head test was performed by lowering a slug into the well and measuring the initial rise in water level followed by the gradual fall in water level to pre-slug conditions. The rising head tests were performed by removing the slug and measuring the initial fall in water level followed by the gradual rise in water level to pre-slug conditions. The rising head tests were performed by removing the slug and measuring the initial fall in water level followed by the gradual rise in water level to pre-slug conditions. The slug test data were analyzed using the Bower and Rice method for unconfined aquifers. Data analysis was performed using the computer program AQTESOLV and analysis graphs are included in Appendix F.

As presented on Table 4.3, the hydraulic conductivity (K values) between  $1.250x10^{-3}$  cm/sec (3.544 ft/day) and  $8.045x10^{-5}$  cm/sec (0.02281 ft/day). The average hydraulic conductivity is  $4.410x10^{-4}$  cm/sec or 0.1250 ft/day. The site hydraulic conductivities ranges reported at the site are low for the reported range of hydraulic conductivities (0.09 to 60 ft/day) within the Garber Sandstone (USGS, 1993)

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- The soils in the vicinity of the landfill can be classified as Seven distinct soil units:
  - 1. Vanoss silt loam (1 to 3% slopes) (approximately 26.7%)
  - 2. Harrah fine sandy loam (3 to 45% slopes) (approximately 15.7%)
  - 3. Teller fine sandy loam (5 to 8% slopes) (approximately 13.1%)
  - 4. Teller fine sandy loam (3 to 5% slopes) (approximately 11.4%)
  - 5. Teller fine sandy loam (1 to 3 % slopes) (approximately 11.4%)
  - 6. Vanoss silt loam (0 to 1 % slopes) (approximately 6.0%)
  - 7. Teller fine sandy loams eroded (3 to 5%) (approximately 5.4%)
- The landfill is located within the Permian-age sandstone known as the Garber Sandstone and is underlain by the Wellington Formation which is also of Permian age. Both the Garber Sandstone and the Wellington Formation consist of lenticular beds of massive appearing, cross-bedded sandstone irregularly inter-bedded with shale which is part sandy to silty. The sandstone layers are fine to very fine grained and loosely cemented. The sandstone is poorly cemented and crumbles easily. Color ranges from nearly white to pink, orange, deep red, or purple.
- Information from historic investigations in addition to the information presented in this Hydrogeologic and Geotechnical investigation indicate the lithology underlying the site is consistent with weathered Garber Sandstones and not alluvium or terrace deposits.
- The Site is located in areas comprised of numerous saturated layers of fine to medium grained sandstone. Yields of deeper wells are generally greater than shallower wells because more of the sandstone layers are penetrated.
- The Garber Sandstone is one of the most transmissive geological units within the Central Oklahoma aquifer and yields substantial amounts of water. Groundwater quality within the Garber sandstone is generally good quality, yield water containing 500mg/l or less of dissolved solids.

#### Northeast C&D Landfill Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Investigation

- In February-March 2020, a characterization was conducted of the subsurface and groundwater conditions in the area of the proposed landfill. A total of sixteen (16) additional borings were drilled and piezometers were installed in eleven (11) of these borings. The boreholes ranged in depth from approximately 31 feet below ground surface (bgs) to a maximum depth of approximately 101 feet bgs.
- The site geology and hydrogeologic conditions were defined by the sixteen borings drilled within the proposed landfill area and two existing monitoring wells (MW-3R and MW-4R). The lithology beneath the site is consistent with the Garber Sandstone and with the geology as discussed in Section 2.2 of this report. The site geology consists of loosely cemented sandstone ranging in color from orange to red (Garber Sandstone) along with clay, silty clay, sandy clay, silty sand, and sand.
- Borehole geophysical logging was performed within the nine (9) of the 16 boreholes including the 100-foot deep boring (EB-1). The results of these logs indicated that the majority of the boreholes do not show a clear defined change in neutron counts which makes it difficult to determine the change to a saturated zone. The natural gamma logs for the site indicate alternating layers of clays, shales and sands.
- During this investigation nine (9) piezometers were installed and water levels were obtained on monthly at each of these piezometers and continuously via In-situ water level troll at PZ-6 and PZ-7.
- Groundwater elevation measurements were obtained monthly at piezometers PZ-1 through PZ-9 and monitoring wells MW-1, MW-2, MW-3R, MW-4R, MW-5 and MW-6 from April 2020 to March 2021.
- During this investigation the highest groundwater elevation was measured in piezometer PZ-1 (1185.20 fmsl). The lowest groundwater elevation recorded occurred in piezometer PZ-7, located along the northwestern portion of the expansion area.
- The highest potentiometric surface map was utilized to show separation between highest groundwater elevation and the deepest excavation of the landfill bottom. The deepest placement of waste would therefore be 5 feet above this elevation which would be the top of protective cover. The potentiometric surface and the deepest elevation depth (landfill bottom) are presented on cross section (Figures 3.3 through 3.8).
- Hydrographs depicting the data from the continuous water level monitoring system are included as Figure 4.8. As depicted on the figure, over the course of a year the water level showed very little variation between the highest recorded water level and the lowest recorded water level.
- During the period of investigation, July (5.92 inches) had the highest rainfall and November (0.58 inches) had the least rainfall. No significant increases or decreases were recorded in the water level data from those months at any of the piezometers.
- As presented on Table 4.3, the hydraulic conductivity (K values) between 1.250x10⁻³ cm/sec (3.544 ft/day) and 8.045x10⁻⁵ cm/sec (0.02281 ft/day). The average hydraulic conductivity is 4.410x10⁻⁴ cm/sec or 0.1250 ft/day. The site hydraulic conductivities ranges are consistent

with hydraulic conductivities reported (0.09 to 60 ft/day) within the Garber Sandstone (USGS, 1993)

#### **6.0** PROPOSED GROUNDWATER MONITORING SYSTEM

As provided in OAC 252:515-9, a groundwater monitoring system must be installed that consists of a sufficient number of wells installed at appropriate locations and depths to yield groundwater samples from the uppermost aquifer that: 1) represent the quality of background groundwater that has not been affected by the disposal unit and 2) represent the quality of groundwater that has passed underneath the disposal facility.

The current groundwater monitoring system for the C&D disposal area of landfill consists of six (6) monitoring wells designated as MW-1, MW-2, MW-3R, MW-4R, MW-5, and MW-6 (Figure 5.1). All six of the existing monitoring wells are completed within the Garber Sandstone. The proposed groundwater monitoring system to be utilized for both the existing and the proposed landfill will consist of a series of existing and new groundwater monitoring wells designed to address the current site comprehensive hydrogeologic model. Existing piezometer PZ-1 was installed to monitoring well specifications to be utilized within the monitoring network as groundwater monitoring well MW-7. Three new monitoring wells (MW-8, MW-9, and MW-10) will be installed prior to waste disposal within the proposed expansion area. The new monitoring network is shown on Figure 5.2.

Specific details of the proposed groundwater monitoring system were designed to monitor the proposed landfill area and to add to the site-wide monitoring program and are shown on **Figure 5.2**. The proposed monitoring system will consist of existing monitoring wells MW-1, MW-2, MW-5, MW-6, with new wells MW-7, MW-8, MW-9, and MW-10.

It should be noted that MW-1 and MW-7 are located south or southeast of the disposal unit and are considered up-gradient monitoring wells. MW-2, MW-5, MW-6, MW-8, MW-9, and MW-10 are considered down-gradient monitoring wells. Each of these down-gradient wells are screened within the uppermost saturated zone.

The piezometer (PZ-1) that will be converted to monitoring well (MW-7) was installed in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-3 and OWRB 785:35-7-2. Monitoring wells MW-8, MW-9, and MW-10 will be installed in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-3. A drilling plan to install these monitoring wells will be submitted to DEQ for approval once the final permit is issued.

Existing monitoring wells, MW-3R and MW-4R, will be decommissioned in accordance with the "EPA Handbook of Suggested Practices for Design and Installation of Groundwater Monitoring Wells" and OAC 252:515-7-71 prior to waste disposal within the proposed expansion area. Additionally, existing piezometers will be plugged according to the requirements of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board (OWRB).

A work plan will be prepared and submitted to DEQ for approval that details the installation of the proposed monitoring wells and the decommissioning of monitoring wells MW-3R and MW-4R in addition to the decommission of piezometers that will not be included as part of the groundwater monitoring network.

The groundwater samples will be collected according to the approved Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Plan (GWSAP) for the facility. An updated GWSAP that will follow all aspects of OAC 252:515-9 will be submitted to DEQ for approval once the final permit is issued.

The permanent groundwater monitoring wells will be subject to the strict sampling, testing and reporting requirements of OAC 252:515-9 and the final permit. Four rounds of background data will be collected for groundwater quality constituents listed in OAC 252:515-9-31 (d)(1)(A) as well as Appendix A parameters in accordance with OAC 252:515-9-31(d)(1)(B). Additional sampling events may be required prior to the first statistical evaluation. As previously stated, an updated GWSAP will be submitted to DEQ for approval once the final permit has been issued. The GWSAP will include the requirements for detection monitoring and any required reporting for verified SSIs and subsequent testing programs. The monitoring program will include semi-annual sampling of Appendix A parameters.

The groundwater monitoring system will follow all aspects of DEQ OAC 252:515-9. A typical monitoring well construction diagram is included as Figure 5.3.

## 7.0 REFERENCES

ASTM International. 2012. Standard Practice for Thin-Walled Tube Sampling of Soils (D1587-08(2012)e1). ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA.

ASTM International. 2011. Standard Test Method for Penetration Test and Split-Barrel Sampling of Soils (D1586-11). ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA.

ASTM International. 2011. Standard Practice for Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes (Unified Soil Classification System) (D2487-11). ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA.

ASTM International. 2009. Standard Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedure) (D2488-09A). ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA.

Bouwer, H. and R.C. Rice. 1976. A Slug Test for Determining Hydraulic Conductivity of Unconfined Aquifers with Completely or Partially Penetrating Wells. Water Resources Research, v.12, pp. 423-428.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. Flood Map Service Center. Accessed November 13, 2019. https://msc.fema.gov/portal.

Oklahoma Geological Survey Circular 71, Groundwater-Resources Cleveland and Oklahoma Counties, P.R. Wood and L.C. Burton, 1968 (Wood/Burton 1968) http://ogs.ou.edu/docs/circulars/C71.pdf

Oklahoma Water Resources Board, Central Oklahoma. Accessed November 14, 2019 http://owrb.ok.gov/studies/groundwater/garber-wellington/php

OklahomaConservationCommission.AccessedJuly14,2020.https://www.ok.gov/conservation/Agency_Divisions/Water_Quality_Division/WQ_Blue_Thumb/BT_Data_Interpretations/BT_Crutcho_Creek:_Interstate_40.html

Hvorslev, M.J. 1951. Time Lag and Soil Permeability in Ground-water Observations (Bulletin No. 36, Waterways Experiment Station). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, MS.

Oklahoma Climatological Survey. The Climate of Oklahoma County. Accessed November 12, 2019. http://climate.ok.gov/county_climate/Products/County_Climatologies/county_climate_oklahoma.pd f.
Oklahoma Geological Survey. Oklahoma Geological Quadrangle Maps. Accessed November 13, 2019. http://www.ogs.ou.edu/geolmapping.php.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2015. Web Soil Survey. Accessed November 13, 2019. http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm

U.S. Geological Survey. Earthquake Hazards Program. Accessed November 13, 2019. http://earthquake.usgs.gov.

U.S. Geologicial Survey, Open-File Report 92-642, Parkhurst, Christenson, Breit, 1993, Ground-Water-Quality Assessment of the Central Oklahoma Aquifer, Oklahoma: Geochemical and Geohydrologic Investigations, pp 77-78.

U.S. Geological Survey, 20181214, USGS US Topo 7.5-minute map for Midwest City, OK 2018: USGS - National Geospatial Technical Operations Center (NGTOC).

U.S. Geological Survey, 20181214, USGS US Topo 7.5-minute map for Spencer, OK 2018: USGS - National Geospatial Technical Operations Center (NGTOC).

SCS ENGINEERS

Figures











APPROXIMATE SCALE IN FEET

3000'

	DESCRIPTION OF UNITS	â		
Qal	ALLUVIUM (Holocene)–Clay, slit, sand, and gravel in channels and on flood plains of modern streams. Includes terrace deposits of similar composition located directly above and adjacent to modern channels and flood plains. Thickness: 0 to about 30 ft			
Qacy	. ALLUVIUM OF NORTH CANADIAN RIVER (Holocene)–Clay, sift, sand, and gravel in channels and on modern flood plain of North Canadian River. Area probably subject to frequent flooding. Thickness: generally 0 to about 40 ft, rarely over 40 ft			
Qacm	ALLUVIUM OF NORTH CANADIAN RIVER (Holocene)–Clay, silt, sand, and gravel on Recent flood plain of North Canadian River about 5-10 ft above Qacy. Area rarely subject to flooding. Thickness: unknown, possibly as much as 50 ft	CRIPTION		
Qtg,	TERRACE DEPOSITS (Holocene)–Clay, silt, sand, and gravel on terraces immediately above and adjacent to modern channels and flood plains. Consists entirely of locally derived sediment. Thickness: unknown, possibly 0 to about 20 ft	DES		
Qtg,	REMNANTS OF TERRACE DEPOSITS (Pleistocene)–Concentrations of distally derived sediment, mostly subrounded quartz and quartzite cobbles and pebbles, more than 50 ft above modern flood plains. Deposits are in Cimarron River drainage basin. May represent former course of North Canadian River or eroded and redeposited Pleistocene gravel similar to Qgco. Thickness: 0 to about 10 ft	Ш		
Ogco	REMINANTS OF OLDER TERRACE DEPOSITS (Pleistocene)–Clay, silt, sand, and gravel adjacent to the flood plain of the North Canadian River. Sand commonly is medium- to coarse- grained and very light colored; gravel locally consists of concentrations of distally derived pebbles and cobbles, mostly subrounded quartz and quartzite. Base of unit is about 40-60 ft above the modern flood plain and ranges in elevation from 1190 ft above sea level to 1220 ft above sea level. Top of the unit is as much as 65 ft above the modern flood plain and rises high as 1245 ft above sea level. Unit includes small amount of sand and gravel washed down into small north- flowing streams. Present only on west side of the North Canadian River. Thickness: 0 to 10 ft	REV DA		
Phy	HENNESSEY FORMATION (Permian)—Shale and siltstone, poorly exposed, mostly moderate reddish brown (10R4/6), moderate red (SR4/6), to moderate reddish orange (10R6/6) with conspicuous light greenish gray (5GY8/1) inon-reduction spots. The lower 20-30 ft is predominantly a blocky-weathering sitty shale and clayshale that exhibits good paleosol development. A dusky yellow (5Y6/4) to moderate orange pink (10R8/2) dolomitic sittstone bed, 3- 5 in. thick, overlain by shale with rare root clasts, is present locally near contact with the Garber Formation. Above the lower part, thin-bedded to laminated sittstones and very fine grained sandstones are more common. Occurs on tops of hills and ridges, generally expressed as highly weathered, muddy soil.	DGIC MAP	&D LANDFILL SION GIC REPORT	
	The lower part of the Hennessey Formation probably correlates with the Fairmont Shale Formation (Hennessey Group) of Bingham and Moore (1975), which is not recognized in this work because it is not mappable on a regional basis. Thickness: 0-60 ft, top eroded.	GEOL	AST C XPAN EOLO	
Pgr	GARBER FORMATION (Permian)-Sandstone, mostly fine-grained to less commonly very fine to medium-fine-grained; appears to be very fine grained near base; moderate reddish brown (10R4/6), moderate reddish orange (10R6/6), moderate red (5R54/4), light brown (5YR5/6), and dark yellowish orange (10YR6/6); minor sandstone- and silistone-pebble conglomerate and/or breccia, dolomite conglomerate and/or breccia, silistone, and shale. Sandstone bypically porous and friable. Commonly weathers to smooth, rounded outcrops; locally with platy to fiaggy to rarely slabby appearance. Locally weathers to hard, dark-colored (grayish black [N2]) beds completely cemented with hematite, calcite, and/or silica. Dark-colored sandstone blocks locally form lag deposit over weathered outcrops. Large- and small-scale crossbeds, trough encosped stratification also present. Shale and/or silitstone rip-up clasts uncommon; burrows extremely rare; one plant fossil observed. Sandstone locally color-banded (e.g. moderate reddish prevanile appearance). Small calcareous	DRAWING TITLE		
	Indi-Joulus spinetes occur locally on weathered suffaces. Sandstone locally contains catcle, dolomite, and/or bartie-commented septarian nodules. Circular inon-reduction spots very rare. Sandstone, siltstone, and dolomite conglomerate and breccias appear to be of two types; one is clearly sedimentary, the other appears to be diagenetic and may represent incipient paleosol development on a sand. Conglomerates and breccias common near base of formation. Awidespread moderate red (SR6/2) to pale red (SR3/2), 3-, to rarely 7-14-thick conglomerate bed is also present near top of formation. The bed consists of coarse-granule to pebble-size siltstone, shale, and dolomite(?) clasts in a medium- to coarse-grained sandstone matrix. Siltstone and shale sandy, color-banded (e.g., moderate reddish brown (108/4/6) and yellowish gray (5Y7/2)), stratified to unstratified, and with uncommon iron-reduction spots as large as 2 in. In diameter. Typically soft, weather to "badisone. Siltstone and shale common near base and top of formation. In places, siltstone and shale contain evidence of paleosol development such as blocky weathering, fractures with fracture surfaces marked by small silkensides, through-going curved fractures, and calcareous concretions. Thickness: about 600 ft, based on cross section		ID FILL, LLC MIDWEST BLVD. R, OK 73084	
Pwe	WELLINGTON FORMATION (Permian)-Sandstone, mostly fine- to very fine grained, moderate orange pink (10R7/4) to moderate reddish brown (10R4/6), moderate reddish orange (10R6/6) to pale red (5R6/2); siltstone, typically color-banded consisting of, for example, pale reddish brown (10R5/4) and light greenish grav (5CY8/1); siltstone- and dolomite-breccia and congjomerate; and minor shale, moderate reddish brown (10R4/6) and light greenish grav (5GY8/1). Sandstone mostly porous and friable, locally with variable amounts of hematite and calcite cement. Sedimentary structures include large- and small-scale crossbeds, trough crossbeds, locally steeply inclined stratification and less common channelform features. In places, weathers to "silckrock" appearance. Sandstone locally color-banded and multicolored. Siltstone commonly contains abundant concretions and septiarian nodules with conspicuous calcite, dolomite and conglomerates similar to those in overlying Garber Formation; some clearly are sedimentary in origin and may represent slightly reworked paleosols; others may represent slightly reworked splacesols; others may represent slightly reworked splacesol; others may represent slightly reworked splacesol; others may r	CLIENT	N.E. LAN 2601 NORTH 2601 NORTH 2601 NORTH	
	paleosols. Shale typically is color-banded. Principal difference between Garber and Wellington Formations is generally coarser grain size of Garber, although lower part of Garber appears to contain finer-grained sandstones and more sitistone and shale than middle part. In the northeastern part of the Jones quadrangle, the top of the Wellington consists of a widespread shale at least 20 ft thick that is capped by a thick, well-developed paleosol horizon. Thickness: 105 ft, base not exposed	SCS ENGINEERS	Bit High         STEAMULY         CONRULTING EXCINATE AND SCHMIDT           FORSULTING ENGINEERS         FORSULTING ENGINEERS         FORSULTING ENGINEERS           PH (817) 571-2288 FAX NO. (817) 571-2188         FAX NO. (817) 571-2188         FAX NO. (817) 571-2188           FOR ADD.         Dev. Enc. NO.         Enc. NO.         FAX NO. (817) 571-2188           FOR ADD.         Dev. Enc. NO.         FAX NO. (817) 571-2188           FOR ADD.         Dev. Enc. SDS         7/A RW Br.           FOR ADD.         Dev. Enc. SDS         7/A RW Br.           FOR ADD.         Dev. Enc. SDS         7/A RW Br.           FOR ADD.         Dev. Enc. RF         APP. BR. BR.	
	SANDEEP D. SARAF 32896 Superson	DATE: SCALE FIGUR	07/2023 AS SHOWN E NO.	
	201 - 18-23		2.3	

 $\sim$ 



0

Alluyium and terrace deposits Water is available from saturated layers of fine to coarse sand and gravel. Yields are highest along the Cimarron, North Canadian, and Canadian Rivers where the saturated layers of sand and gravel are thickest.



## EXPLANATION

MAJOR AQUIFERS





**Bedrock** Bedrock Water is available from numerous saturated layers of fine- to medium grained sandstone. Yields of deeper wells are generally greater than shallower wells because more of the sandstone layers are penetrated. In some areas the bedrock aquifers are overlan by aquifers in alluvium and terrace deposits (shown on the map where the alluvium crosses the bedrock). In such areas, water is available from either of the two aquifers. The bedrock aquifer can be reached by drilling through the overlying alluvium and terrace deposits.

Range in Yield of Major Aquifers, in Gallons per Minute



Generally less than 25

Note: Locally, an individual well in one of the areas shown on the map might yield slightly more water than the yield pattern, for that area indicates.

Area boundary, dashed where approximately located





SOURCE:



Alluvium and Terrace Deposits and Their Recharge Areas (Quaternary in age). Unconsolidated deposits of sand, silt, clay, and gravel that occur along or adjacent to modern and ancient streams. Thickness generally ranges from 10 to 50 ft (locally as much as 100 ft). Wells generally yield 10 to 500 gpm of water (locally several thousand gpm), and most water is of good quality (less than 1,000 mg/L dissolved solids). Recharge areas are essen-tially the same as distribution of the alluvium and terrace depos-its. its.

OTHER WELLS

0

×

GROUNDWATER WELLS

MONITORING WELLS



MAP OF AQUIFERS AND RECHARGE AREAS IN OKLAHOMA, KENNETH S. JOHNSON OKLAHOMA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, DATED 1991.

BY	
DESCRIPTION	
REV DATE	
DRAWING TITLE GROUNDWATER RESOURCE MAP	VD. PROJECT TILE NORTHEAST LANDFILL TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION
	BLV 7
CLIENT	N.E. LAND FILL, LL 2601 NORTH MIDWEST SPENCER, OK 7308
	Construction         N.E. LAND FILL, IL           Construction Contract Date Science         N.E. LAND FILL, IL           Construction Contract Date Science         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2700 FAX           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2700 FAX           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2700 FAX           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2700 FAX           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX NO. (8/1) 571-2108         2700 FAX           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX         2700 FAX           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX         2700 FAX           H (8/1) 571-2208 FAX         2700 FAX
	Test State         Description         Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>
CLENT SCALE SCALE SCALE	EXAMPLE         District of the set of the se
CTENT SCALE FIGURE	Construction         Output         N.E. LAND FILL, ILL           N.E. LAND FILL, ILL         N.E. LAND FILL, ILL           Remains, constant and remains         N.E. LAND FILL, ILL           Remains, constant and remains         1901 constant and remains           Remains, constant and remains         2601 NORTH MIDWEST           Remains, constremains         2601 NORTH MIDWEST      <







E	<b>EAST</b> 1240	BY	
	- 1230	RIPTION	
PZ-1	1220	DESCR	
	1210	DATE	
	1200	REV	
1185.2 (03/2020) _▽	1190	I A-A'	DFILL FICATIOI I
ONAL HIGH	1180	ECTION	ST LANI IT MODII ICATION
	1170	ROSS S	orthea III perm Appl
	1160	RAWING TITLE C	ROJECT TITLE N TIER
	1150		<u>م</u>
	1140		ST BLVD 73084
	1130		H MIDWE
	1120		SPENC
LEGEND:	1110	CLIENT	
EXISTING GRADE         PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTION         SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATE         SILTY CLAY         SILTY CLAY         SANDY CLAY         CLAYEY SAND         CLAY         SILTY SAND         SILTY SAND         SILTY SAND         CLAYEY SILT         SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATE         SANDSTONE         CLAYEY SILT         SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATE         LEVEL IN PIEZOMETER	VE COVER R SURFACE R	SCS ENGINEERS SCS ENGINEERS SCALE: SCALE: FIGURE	March         March <th< td=""></th<>





GROUNDWATER OBSERVED					
BORING ID	DURING DRILLING	AFTER 24 HOURS			
EB-8	1161.28	1162.67			
EB-7	1165.70	1168.78			
PZ-4	1169.32	1170.36			
EB-6	1170.12	1177.23			
PZ-6	1166.32	1177.45			
EB-4	1177.91	1183.50			



HORIZONTAL SCALE IN FEET

	EAST	1250	BY		
		1240	N		
		1230	DESCRIPTIO		
		1220			
EB-4		1210	REV DAT	1994	1
		1200	-B'		
		1190	CTION E		
н		1180	JSS SE	RTHEAS	
		1170	NG TITLE CRO	ECT TITLE NOI	
		1160	DRAW	PROJE	
		1150	0	T BLVD.	
		1140			
		1130		NORTH	
		1120	CLIENT	2601	,
LEGEND.			U U		
EXISTING GRAD				76021	RF RR
PROPOSED TO	P OF PROTECTIVE (		ເຮັ⁻	RD, TX 8	2/A RVW
SILTY CLAY				, BEDFC 571-218	
SANDY CLAY				IEERS UITE 550 10. (817)	, RRK
CLAYEY SAND				i ENGIN DRIVE, S 38 FAX N	DWN. BY CHK. BY
SAND			М Ш З З	ULTING ENTRAL I 571-22	7.00
CLAY			SC STEAR	CONS 1901 CE PH (817	01. NO. 621910 I. BY: RF
SILTY SAND			CADD F	ILE:	PRC DSN
SANDSTONE			3.3 - 3.8 CR DATE:	USS SECTION	(5-2-23)
CLAYEY SILT			SCALE:	1/202	
WEATHERED SA	ANDSTONE		FIGURE	NO.	J TVIN
1178.17 SEASONAL HIG LEVEL IN PIEZ	H GROUNDWATER OMETER			3.4	







GF	OUNDWATER OBSERV	ED
BORING ID	DURING DRILLING	AFTER 24 HOURS
MW-4R	1154.00	NA
EB-7	1165.70	1168.78
EB-5	1157.83	1159.31

F	so	3.3 D7				CLIENT	DRAWING TITLE	REV DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
UF	CAL	- 3.8 ATE			2210		CROSS SECTION D-D	$\triangleleft$		
ε I	С Е: А	8 CRC	STEARNS, CC	ONRAD AND SCHM	DT	N.E. LAND FILL. LLC				
٥. 3.	.//	iss s	E CONSULTING	à engineers deive suite eed bed	EODD TV 76031		PROJECT TITLE	$\triangleleft$		
.6	SH	ECTIC	PH (817) 571-22	88 FAX NO. (817) 571-2	2188		NURI HEASI LANDFILL	$\triangleleft$		
)	100	)N (5	PROJ. NO.	DWN. BY:	0/A RVW BY:	SPENCER, OK 73084	TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION	$\triangleleft$		
	VN	-2-	16219107.00	JLJ	RF		APPI ICATION	<		
		23)	DSN. BY: RF	CHK. BY: RRK	APP. BY: RRK					-



PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER

SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATER SURFACE



_ _ _

200

4444 . 0.0

1165.15⊻

EXISTING GRADE

SILTY CLAY

SANDY CLAY CLAYEY SAND

SILTY SAND CLAYEY SILT

WEATHERED SANDSTONE

SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATER LEVEL IN PIEZOMETER

SAND CLAY









		B
		DESCRIPTION
тн		REV DATE
		DRAWING TILE CROSS SECTION E-E' PROJECT TITLE NORTHEAST LANDFILL TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION
	SANDEEP D. SARAF 32896 SALATON SARAF	CLENT N.E. LAND FILL, LLC 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD. SPENCER, OK 73084
LEG	END: EXISTING GRADE PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE COVER SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATER SURFACE SILTY CLAY SANDY CLAY CLAYEY SAND SAND CLAY SILTY SAND SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATER LEVEL IN PIEZOMETER	CADD LIFE: 313 - 796 GLOSE ENGLINE CONSULTING ENGLINE HIGT STATES PART OF THE AND SCHMIDT CONSULTING ENGLINE TO THE AND SCHMIDT CONSULTING ENGLINE TO THE AND SCHMIDT CONSULTING ENGLINE TO THE AND SCHMIDT TO THE AND
		AS SHOWN

3.7





GF	ROUNDWATER OBSERV	ED	
BORING ID	DURING DRILLING	AFTER 24 HOURS	
PZ-1	1179.84	1185.95	
EB-4	1177.91	1183.50	
PZ-2	PZ-2 1183.19 1183.70		

	BY	
DRTH	REV DATE DESCRIPTION	
	DRAWING TITLE CROSS SECTION F-F'	PROJECT TITLE NORTHEAST LANDFILL TIER III PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION
SANDEEP D. SANDEEP D.	CLIENT	N.E. LAND FILL, LLC 2601 NORTH MIDWEST BLVD. SPENCER, OK 73084
EXISTING GRADE          PROPOSED TOP OF PROTECTIVE         SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATER         SILTY CLAY         SANDY CLAY         CLAYEY SAND         SAND         CLAY         SILTY SAND         SILTY SAND         CLAY         SILTY SAND         CLAYEY SAND         CLAY         SILTY SAND         SANDSTONE         CLAYEY SILT         SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATER	COVER SURFACE SURFACE SURFACE SCAL	STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT           STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHMIDT           CONSULTING ENGINEERS         TONSULTING ENGINEERS           1901 CENTRAL DIVIS, SUITE 30, 153, 151-12188         FXX NO. (817) 571-2188           PH (817) 571-2288         FXX NO. (817) 571-2188           PAL NO.         PAL NO.           FIFT         PAL NO.           PAL NO.         PAL NO.           FIFT         PAL NO.           PAL NO.         PAL NO.           FIFT         OAN END           PAL NO.         PAL NO.           PAL NO.         PAL NO.
LEVEL IN PIEZOMETER	FIGU	<b>3.8</b>















	LEGEND	β	
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1)		
	EXISTING C&D LANDFILL LIMITS OF WASTE		
·· ·	PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL EXPANSION PERMIT BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 1)		
	PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION AREA LIMITS OF WASTE (SEE NOTE 2)	RIPTION	
	PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION DISPOSAL AREA PHASE BOUNDARY	DESCE	
	PROPOSED PERIMETER ROAD		
o	PROPOSED FENCE		
MW−10	PROPOSED MONITORING WELL		
_ ×	EXISTING FENCE	DATE	
	EXISTING 10' CONTOUR (SEE NOTE 3)	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	
-1182	HIGHEST GROUNDWATER ELEVATION CONTOURS	٩	
	EXISTING ROADS	MA	NO
GAS	EXISTING EASEMENT (APPROX., SEE NOTE 4) EXISTING GAS LINE (APPROX., SEE NOTE 4)	OUR	FILL
MW-1	EXISTING MONITORING WELL (TO REMAIN)	I. ±	무별공
PZ-1 MW-7	EXISTING PIEZOMETER TO BE CONVERTED INTO MONITORING WELL	ES1 CO	
	EXISTING PIEZOMETER (TO BE ABANDONED/DECOMMISSIONED)	TER	EAS' PLIC
● ^{MW-4R}	EXISTING MONITORING WELL (TO BE ABANDONED/DECOMMISSIONED)		AP AP
A	LANDFILL CROSS-SECTION LOCATION		ROJECT TITLE NC TIER II

 EXISTING AND PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA: A. EXISTING C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA = 90.1 AC.
 PROPOSED C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY AREA = 73.2 AC.
 TOTAL C&D LANDFILL PERMIT BOUNDARY (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 163.3 AC.
 EXISTING AND PROPOSED C&D WASTE DISPOSAL BOUNDARY AREA: A. EXISTING C&D LANDFILL DISPOSAL AREA = 67.7 AC.
 PROPOSED C&D EXPANSION LANDFILL WASTE DISPOSAL AREA = 53.5 AC.
 TOTAL C&D LANDFILL DISPOSAL AREA (EXISTING AND EXPANSION) = 121.2 AC.

 EXISTING CONTOURS ARE FROM AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PERFORMED BY COOPER AERIAL SURVEYS CO. ON 01/23/2023.

HIGHEST GROUNDWATER RECORDED									
PIEZOMETER NAME	ELEVATION	DATE RECORDED							
MW-1	1180.67	APRIL 2020							
MW-2	1177.81	MAY 2020							
MW-3R	1174.99	MAY 2020							
MW-4R	1172.10	APRIL 2020							
MW-5	1168.31	MAY 2020							
MW-6	1174.85	SEPTEMBER 2020							
PZ-1	1185.20	MARCH 2020							
PZ-2	1184.89	DECEMBER 2020							
PZ-3	1174.50	MAY 2020							
PZ-4	1171.31	MARCH 2020							
PZ-5	1166.77	MARCH 2020							
PZ-6	1178.17	MAY 2020							
PZ-7	1159.66	MAY 2020							
PZ-8	1183.70	MARCH 2020							
PZ-9	1163.39	JUNE 2020							

CLIENT CONSULTING ENGINEERS STEARNS, CONRAD AND SCHIMIDT STEARNS, SURFERS, STEARNS, STEARNS, STEARNS, STEARNS, STEARNS, STEARNS, STEARNS, STEARNS, SPENCER, OK 73084 SPENCER, SPENCER, OK 73084 SPENCER, SPENCER, OK 73084 S

#### FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY









G-\Northeast C&D\Hvdroaeologic Report_ DWG\5.3 TYP_PIFZOMETER - DTI (8-6-2)

8/6/2023 7:29 PM

SCS ENGINEERS

Tables

Depth	Group	Age	Formation	Description				
0-50								
50-100								
100-150				Orange-brown to red-brown fine grained Sandstone, irregularly bedded with red				
150-200			Garber Sandstone (Pgr)	brown shale and some chert and mudstone congolomerates. Siltstones and shale are common near base and the top of the formation. Estimated				
200-250	Sumner Group	Permian (Early)						
250-300								
300-350								
350-400			Wellington Formation (Pw)	Reddish-brown to orange brown fine grained sandstone containing a maroon mudstone and chert conglomerate. Base of formation is mapped at the base of the Fallis Sandstone, which is more of a fine, to locally medium grained				
400-500			wealington ronnation (PW)	sandstone interval. Total thickness is aproximately 799 ft thick in Oklhahoma County				

### TABLE 3.1 Boring Construction Details

Well	Northing	Easting	GS Elev. (fmsl)	Stick-up (ft)	TOC Elev. (fmsl)	Total Drilled Depth (bgs)	Bottom of Boring Elev. (fmsl)	PZ Installed Depth (bgs)	Screened Interval (fmsl)	Groundwater Observed during Drilling (bgs)	Observed GW Elev. (fmsl)	GW Stablilized (24 hrs) (bgs)	Date Stabilized WL Obtained	GW Stabilized (24hrs) Elev. (fmsl)
PZ-1	182844.43	2150429.36	1213.84	3.1	1216.94	61.5	1152.34	39.35	1184.49-1174.49	34	1179.84	27.89	3/13/2020	1185.95
PZ-2	183891.08	2150425.85	1207.19	2.78	1209.97	56.5	1150.69	35.12	1182.07-1172.07	24	1183.19	23.49	3/16/2020	1183.70
PZ-3	183913.50	2149229.41	1198.91	3.62	1202.53	56	1142.91	33.80	1175.11-1165.11	30.5	1168.41	25.58	3/25/2020	1173.33
PZ-4	183242.87	2148594.06	1175.32	3.01	1178.33	35	1140.32	15.42	1169.90-1159.90	6	1169.32	4.96	3/9/2020	1170.36
PZ-5	183888.17	2148688.62	1176.28	3.18	1179.46	35	1141.28	19.75	1166.53-1156.53	7	1169.28	9.74	3/25/2020	1166.54
PZ-6	183260.11	2149653.36	1196.32	3.17	1199.49	56	1140.32	38.68	1167.64-1157.64	30	1166.32	18.87	3/12/2020	1177.45
PZ-7	183731.02	2147860.91	1198.91	2.73	1201.64	66	1132.91	49.41	1159.50-1149.50	40	1158.91	39.41	3/30/2020	1159.50
EB-1	182874.18	2147882.86	1210.65	NA	NA	101	1109.65	NA	NA	42	1168.65	40.43	3/26/2020	1170.22
EB-2	182898.09	2148854.27	1190.51	NA	NA	46	1144.51	NA	NA	18	1172.51	16.66	3/9/2020	1173.85
EB-3/PZ-8	182862.63	2149748.47	1204.10	3	1207.1	60	1144.10	24.90	1189.20-1179.20	33	1171.10	23.34	3/13.2020	1180.76
EB-4	183261.62	2150212.06	1207.91	NA	NA	56	1151.91	NA	NA	30	1177.91	24.41	3/12/2020	1183.50
EB-5	183810.96	2148269.44	1162.33	NA	NA	31	1131.33	NA	NA	4.5	1157.83	3.02	3/31/2020	1159.31
EB-6	183403.46	2149274.23	1190.62	NA	NA	46	1144.62	NA	NA	20.5	1170.12	13.39	3/25/2020	1177.23
EB-7	183206.75	2148329.74	1193.70	NA	NA	53.5	1140.20	NA	NA	28	1165.70	24.92	3/5/2020	1168.78
EB-8/PZ-9	183332.65	2147872.18	1203.28	2.78	1206.06	71	1132.28	40.02	1173.26-1163.26	42	1161.28	40.61	4/1/2020	1162.67
EB-9	183764.22	2149774.77	1202.00	NA	NA	51	1151.00	NA	NA	26	1176.00	22.69	4/1/2020	1179.31
MW-3R	182799.57	2149191.49	1197.30	3.2	1200.53	45	1152.30	45.00	1162.30-1152.30	35	1162.30	NA*	NA*	NA*
MW-4R	182763.61	2148479.06	1196.00	3.2	1199.22	49.5	1146.50	49.50	1156.50-1146.50	42	1154.00	NA*	NA*	NA*

*Monitoring well installed prior to this investigation

### TABLE 3.2 Geotechnical Sample Summary

Boring	Depth	Soil Classification	Soil Description	Moisture Content (%)	% Passing # 200 Sieve	Liquid Limit (%)	Plasitic Limit (%)	Plasticity Index (%)	Optimum Moisture (%)	Max Dry Density (pcf)	Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/sec)
Method		D2487	D2487	D2216	D1140	D4318	D4318	D4318	D698	D698	D5084
EB-2	4'-8'	CL	Reddish Brown & Brown Sandy Lean Clay	8.9	59.1	28	13	15	DNR	DNR	DNR
	0-3'	CL	Reddish Brown Lean Clay W/Sand	16.8	71.5	35	15	20	DNR	DNR	DNR
EB-3	10'-14'	CL	Reddish Brown Sandy Lean Clay	14.6	57	31	14	16	DNR	DNR	DNR
	25'-27'	SP-SM	Reddish Brown Poorly Graded Sand W/Silt	6.7	10.2	CNBD	CNBD	Non Plastic	DNR	DNR	DNR
EB-4	10'-12'	SM	Reddish Brown Silty Sand 13.1 47.9 CNBD		CNBD	Non Plastic	DNR	DNR	DNR		
ER G	ED 0 0-5' CL		Reddish Brown & Brown Sandy Lean Clay	19	57.6	30	15	15	DNR	DNR	DNR
ED-0	20'-25'	SP-SM	Reddish Brown Poorly Graded Sand W/Silt	21.7	7	CNBD	CNBD	Non Plastic	DNR	DNR	5.06X10 ⁻⁴
EB-7	5'-10'	CL	Reddish Brown & Brown Sandy Lean Clay	17.3	68.7	31	15	16	DNR	DNR	1.28X10 ⁻⁸
EB-8	15'-20'	SM	Reddish Brown Silty Sand	6.4	41.9	CNBD	CNBD	Non Plastic	DNR	DNR	DNR
EB-9	5'-8'	CL	Reddish Brown & Brown Sandy Lean Clay	15.1	50.6	23	15	8	DNR	DNR	DNR
PZ-1	10'-13'	ML	Reddish Brown Sandy Silt	11.5	59.1	CNBD	CNBD	Non Plastic	DNR	DNR	DNR
D7 0	2'-5'	CL-ML	Brown & Reddish Brown Sandy Silty Clay	10.7	51.4	23	16	7	DNR	DNR	DNR
FZ-2	15'-17'	SM	Reddish Brown Silty Sand	9.2	33.4	CNBD	CNBD	Non Plastic	DNR	DNR	DNR
PZ-4	5'-10'	SC	Reddish Brown Clayey Sand	21.5	35.6	25	15	10	DNR	DNR	2.83X10 ⁻⁷
PZ-5	0-5'	CL	Brown & Reddish Brown Sandy Lean Clay	17.8	63.6	26	15	10	DNR	DNR	DNR
PZ-6	2'-5'	CL	Reddish Brown & Brown Sandy Lean Clay	17.6	68.8	37	15	22	15.4	112.1	2.05X10 ⁻⁸
PZ-7	6'-8'	CL	Reddish Brown & Brown Lean Clay W/Sand	18.4	72	32	16	16	14.1	114.3	DNR

DNR = Did Not Run on this Sample CNBD = Could Not Be Determined

# Table 4.1 Monthly Groundwater Elevation Summary Northeast Landfill

		March 2020		April 2020		Мау	May 2020		2020	July 2020		Augus	st 2020	September 2020	
Well	Top of Casing Elevation (ft msl)	Depth to Groundwater (ft below TOC)	Groundwater Elevation (ft msl)	Depth to Groundwater (ft below TOC)	Groundwater Elevation (ft msl)	Depth to Groundwater (ft below TOC)	Groundwater Elevation (ft msl)	Depth to Groundwater (ft below TOC)	Groundwater Elevation (ft msl)	Depth to Groundwater (ft below TOC)	Groundwater Elevation (ft msl)	Depth to Groundwater (ft below TOC)	Groundwater Elevation (ft msl)	Depth to Groundwater (ft below TOC)	Groundwater Elevation (ft msl)
MW-1	1211.62	31.37	1180.25	30.95	1180.67	31.09	1180.53	31.52	1180.10	31.73	1179.89	32.10	1179.52	32.04	1179.58
MW-2	1213.22	35.94	1177.28	35.54	1177.68	35.41	1177.81	35.60	1177.62	35.76	1177.46	36.03	1177.19	36.06	1177.16
MW-3R	1200.53	25.81	1174.72	25.59	1174.94	25.54	1174.99	25.93	1174.60	26.01	1174.52	26.43	1174.10	26.26	1174.27
MW-4R	1199.22	27.34	1171.88	27.12	1172.10	27.20	1172.02	27.49	1171.73	27.59	1171.63	27.84	1171.38	27.79	1171.43
MW-5	1218.53	51.61	1166.92	50.46	1168.07	50.40	1168.13	50.42	1168.11	50.45	1168.08	50.50	1168.03	50.63	1167.90
MW-6	1228.68	55.14	1173.54	54.57	1174.11	54.48	1174.20	54.49	1174.19	54.33	1174.35	54.24	1174.44	53.83	1174.85
PZ-1	1216.94	31.74	1185.20	33.88	1183.06	33.57	1183.37	33.37	1183.57	33.22	1183.72	33.26	1183.68	33.46	1183.48
PZ-2	1209.97	26.38	1183.59	26.01	1183.96	25.81	1184.16	25.60	1184.37	25.36	1184.61	25.21	1184.76	25.21	1184.76
PZ-3	1202.53	28.52	1174.01	28.19	1174.34	28.03	1174.50	28.03	1174.50	28.12	1174.41	28.23	1174.30	28.35	1174.18
PZ-4	1178.33	7.02	1171.31	7.25	1171.08	7.18	1171.15	7.80	1170.53	7.84	1170.49	8.29	1170.04	7.98	1170.35
PZ-5	1179.46	12.69	1166.77	12.77	1166.69	12.91	1166.55	13.41	1166.05	13.72	1165.74	14.06	1165.40	13.76	1165.70
PZ-6	1199.49	21.92	1177.57	21.51	1177.98	21.32	1178.17	21.37	1178.12	21.40	1178.09	21.65	1177.84	21.70	1177.79
PZ-7	1201.64	42.43	1159.21	42.14	1159.50	41.98	1159.66	41.98	1159.66	42.09	1159.55	42.25	1159.39	42.40	1159.24
PZ-8	1207.10	23.40	1183.70	28.51	1178.59	26.80	1180.30	27.82	1179.28	27.50	1179.60	27.66	1179.44	27.70	1179.40
PZ-9	1206.06	NA	NA	42.68	1163.38	42.68	1163.38	42.67	1163.39	42.67	1163.39	42.67	1163.39	42.67	1163.39

Highest Recorded GW Elevation (12 Month Period) ft below TOC - feet below top of casing

ft MSL - feet above mean sea level

		0		N		D		1		E.I		Mana	0004
		Depth to		November 2020		December 2020		January 202 I Denth to		Depth to		Marc Depth to	1 202 1
Well	Top of Casing Elevation (ft msl)	Groundwater (ft below TOC)	Groundwater Elevation (ft msl)										
MW-1	1211.62	32.66	1178.96	32.62	1179.00	32.49	1179.13	32.73	1178.89	32.25	1179.37	32.36	1179.26
MW-2	1213.22	36.37	1176.85	36.37	1176.85	36.47	1176.75	36.46	1176.76	36.34	1176.88	36.40	1176.82
MW-3R	1200.53	26.35	1174.18	26.42	1174.11	26.46	1174.07	26.25	1174.28	26.10	1174.43	26.07	1174.46
MW-4R	1199.22	27.93	1171.29	27.95	1171.27	27.84	1171.38	27.92	1171.30	27.61	1171.61	27.62	1171.60
MW-5	1218.53	51.06	1167.47	51.08	1167.45	50.69	1167.84	51.25	1167.28	50.57	1167.96	50.70	1167.83
MW-6	1228.68	53.96	1174.72	53.88	1174.80	53.85	1174.83	54.46	1174.22	54.27	1174.41	54.55	1174.13
PZ-1	1216.94	33.78	1183.16	33.96	1182.98	33.58	1183.36	34.17	1182.77	33.78	1183.16	33.69	1183.25
PZ-2	1209.97	25.44	1184.53	25.53	1184.44	25.08	1184.89	25.69	1184.28	25.21	1184.76	25.23	1184.74
PZ-3	1202.53	28.64	1173.89	28.71	1173.82	28.49	1174.04	28.92	1173.61	28.59	1173.94	28.60	1173.93
PZ-4	1178.33	7.69	1170.64	7.90	1170.43	7.98	1170.35	7.56	1170.77	7.54	1170.79	7.37	1170.96
PZ-5	1179.46	13.78	1165.68	13.61	1165.85	13.58	1165.88	13.32	1166.14	13.23	1166.23	13.01	1166.45
PZ-6	1199.49	22.15	1177.34	22.22	1177.27	21.95	1177.54	22.37	1177.12	21.80	1177.69	21.75	1177.74
PZ-7	1201.64	42.53	1159.11	42.57	1159.07	42.54	1159.10	42.66	1158.98	42.58	1159.06	42.60	1159.04
PZ-8	1207.10	27.67	1179.43	27.71	1179.39	27.71	1179.39	27.79	1179.31	27.79	1179.31	27.81	1179.29
PZ-9	1206.06	42.68	1163.38	42.69	1163.37	42.68	1163.38	42.69	1163.37	42.68	1163.38	42.68	1163.38

Highest Recorded GW Elevation (12 Month Period) ft below TOC - feet below top of casing

ft MSL - feet above mean sea level

# TABLE 4.2NORTHEAST LANDFILL PRECIPITATION

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual Total
981 - 2010 Normal	1.45	1.77	3.11	3.03	5.16	5.25	3.28	3.13	3.72	4.21	2.21	1.75	38.09
Mesonet Average	1.43	1.58	2.84	3.77	4.85	4.72	3.67	3.57	3.19	3.54	1.87	1.77	36.79
1994	0.22	3.28	3.51	3.26	3.66	2.15	2.92	2.16	2.52	2.82	6.85	1.73	35.08
1995	1.57	0.03	3.54	5.14	8.17	7.75	1.99	4.11	4.86	1.18	0.45	2.77	41.56
1996	0.1	0.06	2.15	2.23	1.71	2.72	8.52	4.65	5	3.26	4.6	0.01	35.01
1997	0.45	3.12	0.72	4.78	3.58	2.89	4.9	5.7	3.42	4.14	1.57	3.8	39.07
1998	4.71	0.45	6.61	3.37	2.3	1.93	0.79	0.22	3.28	4.63	3.6	0.85	32.74
1999	1.3	0.64	4.53	6.94	3.93	4.71	0.49	0.24	6.65	2.38	0.02	3.11	34.94
2000	0.95	1.64	2.43	5.32	2.13	6.48	3.25	0	1.25	8.78	3.73	1.53	37.49
2001	3.21	2.05	1.01	1.29	5.18	2.67	1.15	4.03	7.77	1.66	1.34	1.35	32.71
2002	2.12	1.54	2.01	4.82	2.35	3.16	4.02	4.16	3.79	4.03	0.55	3.36	35.91
2003	0.05	1.08	2.88	1.56	1.83	2.4	0.32	4.4	3.02	3.66	1.58	1.42	24.2
2004	1.91	1.47	6.01	1.43	1.67	8.85	4.47	6.33	0.55	6.38	4.92	0.7	44.69
2005	2.06	3.31	0.65	0.55	2.45	6.38	3.59	5.05	1.84	1.9	0.03	0.21	28.02
2006	0.5	0.32	2.17	2.94	1.82	3.82	1.24	3.78	2.02	1.68	1.45	2.93	24.67
2007	2.69	0.74	5.39	1.98	9.17	13.32	6.93	5.08	2.12	3.03	0.72	3.14	54.31
2008	0.71	2.42	3.87	3.44	5.1	6.25	0.89	4.6	0.86	2.05	1.1	0.66	31.95
2009	0.73	1.06	2.62	4.51	4.42	0.88	6.22	7.48	4.8	6.91	0.4	1.02	41.05
2010	1.37	3.79	1.23	3.5	6.85	10.08	6.62	0.18	3.24	1.17	0.99	0.53	39.55
2011	0.07	1.49	0.13	1.64	7.41	2.36	0.63	1.4	2.13	4.67	3.39	1.53	26.85
2012	1.17	1.29	5.04	3.58	1.99	2	0	3.47	3.49	3.09	0.99	0.76	26.87
2013	1.71	3.61	0.8	7.09	10.1	7.01	5.36	4.65	2.96	3.17	1.06	1.26	48.78
2014	0.09	0.21	1.73	1.95	4.8	5.69	10.85	1.19	1.84	2.97	2.35	1.01	34.68
2015	1.43	0.48	3.99	4.89	13.78	4.22	5.52	1.37	0.99	3.24	4.63	5.07	49.61
2016	0.37	1.53	0.99	6.52	2.96	1.06	6.19	1.02	2.23	0.49	0.8	0.71	24.87
2017	1.91	2.67	3.26	7.66	2.5	0.01	2.23	7.05	2.89	5.18	0.15	0.33	35.84
2018	0.31	3.16	0.48	2.57	4.8	8.1	3.01	2.67	5.97	4.38	0.79	4.18	40.42
2019	2.33	0.69	2.37	6.3	12.71	7.34	1.11	7.42	2.68	4.3	1.81	0.56	49.62
2020	3.92	1	6.91	2.54	3.55	3.09	5.92	3.89	4.08	4.49	0.58	3.3	43.27
2021	2.08	0.99	2.43										

Source: Mesonet (www.mesonet.org/index.php/weather/monthly_rainfall_table/spen

### Station Information: Spencer (SPEN)

County	Oklahoma
Commissioned	1/1/1994
Lat	N 34.542080°
Lon	W -97.341460°

# TABLE 4.3 Aquifer Test Results

WELL		K VALUE (ft/day)	K VALUE (cm/sec)	MEAN K VALUE (ft/day)	MEAN K VALUE (cm/sec)	
D7 1	Slug In	2.087E-01	7.362E-05	2 2815 01	9 0 <i>45</i> 5 05	
FZ-1	Slug Out	2.474E-01	8.728E-05	2.2812-01	0.045E-05	
P7 0	Slug In	3.827E-01 1.350E-04		1 0365+00	3 65 45 04	
Γ <i>L</i> -Ζ	Slug Out	1.689E+00	5.958E-04	1.0382+00	5.6542-04	
D7 3	Slug In	3.753E-01	1.324E-04	1 1945+00	4 21 35 04	
FZ-3	Slug Out	2.013E+00	7.101E-04	1.1942+00	4.2132-04	
D7 /	Slug In	6.378E-01	2.250E-04	6 688E 01	2 359E 04	
F Z-4	Slug Out	6.998E-01	2.469E-04	0.0000-01	2.337E-04	
D7 5	Slug In	1.245E+00	4.392E-04	1 5825+00	5 579E 04	
FZ-3	Slug Out	1.918E+00	6.766E-04	1.3821100	3.3772-04	
D7 6	Slug In	1.076E+00	3.796E-04	1 5125+00	5 236E 04	
F Z-0	Slug Out	1.949E+00	6.876E-04	1.5132100	5.550E-04	
D7 7	Slug In	1.029E-01	3.630E-05	3 8665 01	1 3645 04	
Γ <i>Δ</i> -7	Slug Out	6.702E-01	2.364E-04	3.8002-01	1.304E-04	
MANA/ 2D	Slug In	1.511E+00	5.330E-04	2 5445+00	1 2505 02	
/v\vv-3K	Slug Out	5.577E+00	1.967E-03	3:344E+00	1.250E-05	
AA\A/ 4D	Slug In	1.077E+00	3.799E-04	1 1015+00	3.882E-04	
/v\ v v -4K	Slug Out	1.124E+00	3.965E-04	1.1012+00		
	Average K Value			1.250E+00	4.410E-04	

Northeast C&D Landfill Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Investigation SCS ENGINEERS

> Appendix A Workplan and Approvals
## SCS ENGINEERS

December 13, 2019

Ms. Kaylee Shiplet Solid Waste Section Land Protection Division P.O. Box 1677 Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677

Subject: Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion of the Northeast Landfill Waste Corporation of Oklahoma, LLC., Northeast Landfill Permit No.: 3555050

Dear Ms. Shiplet:

Stearns, Conrad, and Schmidt, Consulting Engineers, Inc. (dba SCS Engineers) on behalf of Waste Corporation of Oklahoma, LLC. (WCA) is pleased to present you with the Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion of the Northeast Landfill. The purpose of this Drilling Plan (Plan) is to provide guidance and rationale for the subsurface investigation proposed for the 73.2-acre horizontal expansion area for the Northeast Landfill. The attached Plan has been developed and prepared in accordance with the ODEQ, OAC 252:515.

Please contact us if you have any questions concerning this Plan.

Sincerely,

spat a th

Robert Fowler Project Geologist SCS Engineers

Can mchellerge

Dan McCullough, PG Project Director SCS Engineers

RF

Encl. Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion of the Northeast Landfill

## DRILLING PLAN FOR HORIZONTAL EXPANSION OF THE NORTHEAST LANDFILL

WCA of Oklahoma, LLC. 2601 North Midwest Blvd Spencer, OK 73084 405-495-0800



16219107.00 | December 2019

11219 Richardson Drive North Little Rock, AR 72113 501-812-4551

#### Table of Contents

Sect	ion	Pag	je
1.0	INTR	DUCTION	1
	1.1	PURPOSE	1
	1.2	Scope and objectives	1
2.0	BAC	ROUND INFORMATION	2
	2.1	PHYSICAL SETTING	2
	2.2	CLIMATE	2
	2.3	PHYSIOGRAPHY	2
	2.4	60ILS	2
	2.5	GEOLOGY AND HYDROGEOLOGY	3
	2.6	SEISMICITY	3
3.0	TECH	IICAL APPROACH	3
	3.1	PLAN STRATEGY	3
	3.2	SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION	4
		3.2.1 Soil and Bedrock	4
		3.2.2 Groundwater	5
	3.3	SAMPLING AND GROUNDWATER ELEVATIONS	6
		3.3.1 Soil Sampling	6
		3.3.2 Groundwater Elevations	6
	3.4	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL	6
		3.4.1 Precision and Accuracy	7
		3.4.2 Representativeness	7
		3.4.3 Completeness	7
		3.4.4 Comparability	7
	3.5	REPORTING	7
4.0	PRO	DURES	7
	4.1	IEALTH AND SAFETY	8
	4.2	DRILLING AND SAMPLING	8
		1.2.1 Auger Drilling	8
		1.2.2 Air Rotary Drilling	8
		1.2.3 Soil Sampling	8
		1.2.4 Borehole Abandonment	9
	4.3	PIEZOMETER INSTALLATION	9
		1.3.1 Drilling Methods	9
		1.3.2 Piezometer Materials	9
		1.3.3 Installation	9
	4.4	PIEZOMETER DEVELOPMENT	10
		1.4.1 Methods	10
	4.5	VATER LEVEL MEASUREMENTS	11
	4.6	N-SITU HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY TESTING	11
		1.6.1 Slug Test	11

5.0	SAMPLE IDENT		12
6.0	DOCUMENTATI	ON, SAMPLE CUSTODY, PACKAGING AND SHIPPING	12
	6.1 GENERAL	L REQUIREMENTS	12
	6.1.1 L	ogging Soils (Unconsolidated Materials)	13
	6.1.2 L	ogging Rock (Consolidated Materials)	13
7.0	SURVEYING		14
8.0	REFERENCES.		14

#### Figures

Figure 1	Site Location Map
Figure 2	General Topographic Map
Figure 3	Boring Location Map
Figure 4	Floodplain Map
Figure 5	Alluvium and Terrace Deposits and Recharge Areas
Figure 6	Wetland Map
Figure 7	Typical Piezometer Detail

#### Tables

Table 1.	Proposed Boring Information	5
----------	-----------------------------	---

#### Appendices

- Soil Sampling for Geotechnical Analysis USGS Seismic Hazards Appendix A Appendix B

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Waste Corporation of Oklahoma, LLC. (WCA) owns and operates the Northeast Landfill (landfill) located in Oklahoma County, near Spencer, Oklahoma. The landfill operates under Permit No. 3555050 issued, by the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ). WCA is planning to expand the existing landfill horizontally and vertically.

The current landfill has a permit boundary of approximately 90.1 acres, which includes approximately 67.7 acres which is utilized for construction and debris (C&D) waste disposal. The proposed landfill horizontal expansion area is approximately 73.2 acres located north of the existing permit boundary. Therefore, following approval of a Tier III permit modification, in accordance with Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ), Oklahoma Administrative Code (OAC) 252:4-7-60, the landfill permit boundary will be comprised of approximately 163.3 acres. The proposed horizontal expansion area and vertical expansion of existing disposal area will be utilized for a municipal solid waste (MSW) disposal area. A site location map is presented as **Figure 1** and boring location map, including proposed horizontal expansion area and existing conditions, is presented as **Figure 2**.

### 1.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Drilling Plan (Plan) is to provide guidance and rationale for the subsurface investigation proposed for the 73.2-acre horizontal expansion area for the Northeast Landfill. This Plan has been developed and prepared in accordance with the ODEQ, OAC 252:515.

## **1.2** SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The Plan will involve obtaining geologic and hydrogeologic data to aid in the design and construction of the proposed landfill expansion. The work will entail the drilling of borings, the installation of piezometers, and aquifer testing along with the analysis of the conditions and materials present at the proposed horizontal expansion area. As indicated, the proposed horizontal expansion area is approximately 73.2 acres, therefore, a total of eighteen (18) borings are required in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(3)(C). Select borings will be completed as piezometers, dependent upon hydrogeologic conditions and spatial location. Existing data from borings and piezometers will be utilized to aid in characterizing the hydrogeologic and soil conditions at the site. Aquifer testing will be performed to evaluate the hydraulic properties of the materials that underlie the site. Groundwater levels and precipitation measurements will be collected to determine seasonal potentiometric surface variations and the effect of surficial recharge on the uppermost continuous aquifer beneath the site.

It should be noted that existing monitoring wells MW-3R and MW-4R are located within the footprint of the proposed expansion area. The borings for these two monitoring wells were drilled ten feet into the uppermost saturated zone, however, the total depths for these two monitoring wells will not meet the requirement stating that all borings should be a minimum of thirty feet below the deepest placement of waste. These borings are completed as described above within the uppermost saturated zone which will be the controlling factor in the final permitted design of the proposed lateral expansion area. WCA is therefore requesting a variance and approval to utilize MW-3R and MW-4R as two of the required borings even though depths will not be 30 feet below the deepest placement of waste. Therefore, this Plan proposes to install 16 additional borings at the Site for evaluating subsurface conditions.

In association with the preparation of this Plan, published regional information and the results of previous hydrogeologic investigations conducted at the landfill have been reviewed. Tasks performed

as part of this Plan are proposed to build upon existing data and previously stated conclusions. Previously published information will continue to be reviewed and utilized during implementation of this Plan.

## **2.0** BACKGROUND INFORMATION

## **2.1** PHYSICAL SETTING

The proposed horizontal expansion area site (Site) is located north of the existing landfill permit boundary and is located on North Midwest Boulevard, west of Spencer in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma. The Site is more specifically located in the south half of the southeast ¹/₄ of the northwest ¹/₄ of Section 22, Township 12 North, Range 2 west in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma. Refer to **Figure 1** for the property location map.

The following site specific maps have been incorporated into this Plan in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(2):

- Figure 1 Site Location Map
- Figure 2 General Topographic Map
- Figure 3 Boring Location Map
- Figure 4 Floodplain Map
- Figure 5 Alluvium and Terrace Deposits and Recharge Areas
- Figure 6 Wetland Map
- Figure 7 Typical Piezometer Detail
- Appendix D USGS Seismic Hazards

### 2.2 CLIMATE

The climate for Oklahoma County, Oklahoma is humid and temperate, and is characterized by warm summers and cold, dry winters. Temperatures average near 60 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), with a slight increase from north to south. Average temperatures range between 93 °F in July to 26 °F in January. Mean annual precipitation is approximately 34.5 inches, with approximately 219 days in the growing season.

### 2.3 PHYSIOGRAPHY

The proposed Site is located within the Osage Plains, a section of the Central Lowland province, which in turn is part of the larger Interior Plains physiographic province. Three sub-regions make up the Osage Plains; the sub-region that stretches across central Oklahoma is known as the Cross Timbers region. The woodland and savanna portions of the Cross Timbers are mainly Post Oak and Blackjack Oak on coarse, sandy soils, while the prairie portions are chiefly tallgrass on finer, dry soils.

Surface elevations at the Site range from approximately 1170 to 1220 feet above mean sea level. Surface water drains primarily east and north through the property into an intermittent stream that flows to the northwest approximately 0.5 miles into the Crutcho Creek.

#### 2.4 SOILS

Soils on the Site are primarily comprised of the Vanoss silt loam (approximately 27.0%) with slopes of 1 to 3 percent, and Harrah fine sandy loam (approximately 16.4%) with slopes of 3 to 45 percent. The

Site is also comprised of Teller fine sandy loam (approximately 13.7%) with 5 to 8 percent slopes, Teller fine sandy loams (approximately 12.1%) with 3 to 5 percent slopes, and Teller fine sandy loams (approximately 10.6%) with 1 to 3 percent slopes. A small portion of the Site consists of Vanoss silt loam (approximately 4.2%) with 0 to 1 percent slopes, and Teller fine sandy loams eroded (approximately 5.5%) with slopes of 3 to 5 percent. A review of the web soil survey also identified areas defined as Pits or soils from mine spoils or earthy fill derived from sedimentary rocks (approximately 3.5%) which was located along the boundary of the Site and the existing landfill property. Water was identified in approximately 5.0% of the expansion area.

## **2.5** GEOLOGY AND HYDROGEOLOGY

According to the Oklahoma Geological Survey, the local geology consists of the Permian-age sandstone known as the Garber Sandstone and is underlain by the Wellington Formation which is also of Permian age. Both the Garber Sandstone and the Wellington Formation consist of lenticular beds of massive appearing, cross-bedded sandstone irregularly inter-bedded with shale which is part sandy to silty. The sandstone layers are fine to very fine grained and loosely cemented. The sandstone is poorly cemented and crumbles easily. Color ranges from nearly white to pink, orange, deep red, or purple. Although some sandstone beds are relatively thick, beds five feet or less in thickness are common. The thickness of the Garber Sandstone is approximately 350 feet in Oklahoma County. The Wellington Formation is approximately 799 feet in thickness in the subsurface. Therefore, the two formations as a unit have a total thickness that ranges from 800 to 1000 feet (Wood/Burton, 1968)

According to the Oklahoma Water Resources Board, the site is underlain by the Central Oklahoma aquifer. The Central Oklahoma Aquifer underlies about 3,000 square miles of central Oklahoma. The Central Oklahoma aquifer is referred to as the Garber-Wellington aquifer since it is dominantly composed of the Permian aged Garber Sandstone and Wellington Formation. The aquifer ranges in thickness from 300 feet in the south to about 800 feet in the north. Wells commonly yield 25 to 400 gallons per minute and is generally of good quality with total dissolved solids ranging from 200 to 1,000 parts per million. Recharge areas consist of outcrops of the aquifer and extend eastward to the approximate top of shales that make up much of the lower one-third of the Wellington Formation.

### 2.6 SEISMICITY

Based on the USGS U.S. Seismic Hazard Map, Peak Horizontal Acceleration with 2% Probability of Exceedance in 50 Years (2014), the location of the Site is depicted as exhibiting a maximum horizontal acceleration (or effective peak ground acceleration) in rock of between 0.005 and 2.2 percent of gravity with a 98 percent probability of not exceeding the horizontal acceleration within a 50-year reoccurrence. This acceleration factor may be utilized during seismic analysis of soil performance to liquefaction and during design of structural elements to resist earthquake forces.

## **3.0** TECHNICAL APPROACH

### 3.1 PLAN STRATEGY

This Plan will utilize a strategy that will allow for flexibility while meeting the regulatory criteria for the proposed Site. This will allow the detail of information collected to be increased or decreased in order to accommodate specific situations encountered during the work.

## **3.2** SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

### 3.2.1 Soil and Bedrock

Data collected from previous investigations was utilized in determining placement of 16 additional borings, which will be drilled to aid in the characterization of the hydrogeologic and soil conditions underlying the proposed Site. As discussed in Section 1.2, WCA has requested approval to utilized MW-3R and MW-4R as borings and piezometers for this investigation. MW-3R has a completed depth elevation is 1155.53 fmsl or 9.47 feet below deepest placement of waste. MW-4R has a completed depth of 1149.22 fmsl or 15.78 feet below the deepest placement of waste. If approved, the total number of borings will be 18 and the total number of piezometers will be 9. **Table 1** lists the 16 proposed borings (PZ-1 through PZ-7, and EB-1 through EB-9) with approximate locations and depths, and **Figure 3** depicts the proposed boring and piezometer locations. Data from previously completed borings, existing wells, and piezometers will be used to aid in the characterization of the Site. The boring locations provided below will be advanced using a combination of hollow stem auger and air rotary drilling methods.

Per OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(4): all borings will be drilled a minimum of thirty feet below the deepest proposed placement of waste, the elevation of which shall be reported in relation to mean sea level; and at least six borings will be drilled a minimum of ten feet into the uppermost saturated zone.

Groundwater levels and precipitation measurements will be collected to determine seasonal potentiometric surface variations and the effect of surficial recharge on the uppermost continuous aquifer beneath the site pursuant to OAC 252:515-7-54(a). In addition, one boring (EB-1) will be drilled 100 feet below ground surface as required by OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(4)(C). Depth to water will be measured in each boring at the time of drilling and again 24 hours later per OAC 252:515-7-32(c).

Geophysical logging will be completed on the seven boreholes that will be converted to piezometers and EB-1 which will be drilled to 100 feet below ground surface. The geophysical logs will be obtained using gamma ray/neutron logs or an alternative method approved by ODEQ from the total depth to the surface, in either open hole or behind casing.

Soil/rock samples will be collected at a rate of 1 sample per 5 feet of soil/rock drilled and at soil and rock changes from the surface to the total depth drilled. The samples will be stored onsite until final action on the permit application is taken by ODEQ. Specific details concerning subsurface investigative methodologies and procedures are provided in **Section 4.0** of this Plan.

Boring/PZ Number	Northing	Easting	Deepest Placement of Waste (ft msl)	Target Elevation (ft msl)	Approx. Ground Surface Elevation (ft msl)	Target Depth (ft bgs)
PZ-1	182843.6990'	2150428.2777'	1165	1135	1214.000'	79
PZ-2	183925.2176'	2150401.7123'	1165	1135	1207.007'	73
PZ-3	183922.4725'	2149230.0025'	1165	1135	1199.076'	65
PZ-4	183243.1652'	2148593.5279'	1165	1135	1175.348'	41
PZ-5	183889.5268'	2148688.0282'	1155	1125	1175.296'	51
PZ-6	183261.4811'	2149654.6457'	1155	1135	1196.037'	62
PZ-7	183736.5892'	2147856.6854'	1155	1125	1197.680'	73
EB-1	182874.7496'	2147877.9945'	1165	1109	1210.191'	100
EB-2	182906.5890'	2148830.5602'	1165	1135	1190.211'	56
EB-3	182862.8404'	2149747.5998'	1165	1135	1204.242'	70
EB-4	183256.0393'	2150191.4214'	1165	1135	1207.480'	73
EB-5	183915.9739'	2148372.5951'	1165	1135	1169.387'	35
EB-6	183402.9772'	2149275.2847'	1165	1135	1190.332'	56
EB-7	183237.9921'	2148314.8039'	1165	1135	1190.148'	56
EB-8	183333.1922'	2147872.3289'	1155	1125	1202.655'	78
EB-9	183735.3932'	2149861.2142'	1165	1135	1196.489'	62

Tahlo 1	Pronosed Boring Information
	rioposca bonng information

*The target elevation is the deepest proposed placement of waste minus 30' with exception of EB-1 which will be advanced to 100'.

#### 3.2.2 Groundwater

At a minimum seven borings will be advanced into the uppermost water-bearing geologic unit beneath the Site. Seven borings will be completed as piezometers and are designated PZ-1 through PZ-7. These seven proposed piezometers will be logged with geophysical methods. See **Figure 3** for approximate locations and surface elevations.

The water-bearing unit will need to yield sufficient quantities of groundwater for regular sampling events. Aquifer testing and/or field hydraulic conductivity (slug) tests will be performed on selected piezometers.

Details describing the specific procedures for installation and completion of the piezometers and performance of field testing are presented in **Section 4.0**.

## **3.3** SAMPLING AND GROUNDWATER ELEVATIONS

#### 3.3.1 Soil Sampling

To aid in the subsurface characterization of the Site, soil samples will be collected for testing (see **Appendix A**). The samples will be shipped to a geotechnical laboratory and tested under the direction of a licensed professional engineer. The following tests will be conducted on each type of soil sampled:

- Soil classification according to the specifications of ASTM D2487
- Particle-size analysis of soil according to the specifications of ASTM D422
- Sieve analysis for the following screen sizes: #4, #10, #40, #200
- Percent fines (#200 sieve) according to the specifications of ASTM D1140
- Atterberg limits according to the specifications of ASTM D4318
- Moisture content according to the specifications of either the oven drying method of ASTM D2216 or the microwave drying method of ASTM D4643
- Moisture-density relationship according to the specifications of the standard proctor test of ASTM D698 or the modified proctor test of ASTM D1557
- Hydraulic conductivity according to the specifications of ASTM D5084

### 3.3.2 Groundwater Elevations

Groundwater elevations will be collected monthly for one year, to aid in establishment of groundwater flow direction and aquifer geometry underlying the proposed Site. WCA will install a continuous water level monitoring system in one piezometer, and will monitor the water levels in all other piezometers once each month for 12 consecutive months on approximately the same date each month. If significant changes in the water level in the continuous monitor are identified following heavy rainfall events, ODEQ may require additional measurements in other piezometers to further define the level of highest groundwater elevation. In the event that trends in the data indicate that groundwater characteristics are similar to previously collected data, a shortened potentiometric measurement period may be requested.

WCA will obtain daily and monthly precipitation data from the climatological station closest to the expansion area, for the months in which the on-site measurements were taken and for the preceding 12 months. CLIMOCS will be used to obtain the 30-year mean precipitation from the climatological station. The precipitation data will be used to interpret any fluctuations in the potentiometric surface throughout the site characterization period.

## **3.4** QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL

The quality assurance (QA) objective for analytical data is to collect environmental monitoring data of known and acceptable quality. To meet this objective, the following quality control (QC) parameters must be addressed:

- Precision
- Accuracy
- Representativeness
- Completeness
- Comparability

Each of these parameters will be briefly discussed in the following subsections.

## 3.4.1 Precision and Accuracy

The primary objective of field measurements is to obtain reproducible measurements to a degree of accuracy with the limits imposed by the intended use of the data. Thus, QC procedures for field measurements will be limited to checking the reproducibility of field measurements by taking readings and by calibration of the instruments.

#### 3.4.2 Representativeness

The objective in addressing representativeness is to assess whether the information obtained during the investigation accurately represents the actual site conditions. Representativeness will be assessed after initial data validation and reduction and will be based only on validated data.

#### 3.4.3 Completeness

The objective for completeness is to provide sufficient valid data to meet the goals of the investigation. Completeness will be assessed by comparing the number of valid sample results to the number of samples collected.

#### 3.4.4 Comparability

The objective of comparability is to establish that the data developed during the investigation are comparable with applicable criteria and with data available from other scientific studies in the area.

#### 3.5 REPORTING

Per OAC 252:515-7-38, WCA will complete a regional hydrogeologic study of the proposed Site and the results included with the Tier III permit modification application. WCA will collect the following information to be included:

- The formation underlying the deepest formation penetrated by the boreholes and/or piezometers;
- All formations exposed in the outcrop on or within 1/4 mile of the proposed permitted boundary;
- A geologic column and structural information of all rock formations occurring from surface to a depth of 500 feet;
- A regional surface geological map;
- Illustrations of the regional stratigraphic column and geologic or hydrogeologic cross sections;
- A description of regional groundwater quality; and
- References indicating the sources of information.

## 4.0 PROCEDURES

This section presents the details regarding specific types of field investigation procedures. These procedures include drilling, piezometer installation, aquifer testing, sample collection, and decontamination. In addition, health and safety measures, methods for managing investigation-derived waste, and sample-handling/chain of custody procedures are provided.

## 4.1 HEALTH AND SAFETY

Drilling and sampling personnel will conduct operations in accordance with promulgated Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. Upon arrival at the site work location, field personnel will record the time, location, and weather conditions in the field logbook. Field personnel will be suited in Modified Level D personal protective equipment (PPE), which consists of:

- Steel-toed boots
- Hard hat
- High-visibility vest or shirt
- Safety glasses, splash goggles, or face shield
- Hearing protection

#### 4.2 DRILLING AND SAMPLING

Drilling and sampling procedures will be conducted by using a combination of auger drilling and air rotary methods. The variability of geologic and topographic conditions, in addition to the engineering or protocol requirements will dictate the type of equipment and methodologies to be employed on any specific location.

#### 4.2.1 Auger Drilling

The borings will be advanced using an ATV-mounted drilling rig, equipped with hollow-stem augers that have an outside diameter (0.D.) of 8.25-inch inside diameter (I.D.) of 4.25-inch hollow-stem through overburden until auger refusal occurs. Auger drilling utilizes a spiral tool form to convey dug material to the surface. An auger is essentially a conveyor which has a drill head, or cutting bit, or combination head and bit at its bottom end to cut the formation, which is then conveyed upward. Auger drilling does not normally require the use of drilling fluids.

### 4.2.2 Air Rotary Drilling

In the event that auger refusal occurs, air rotary drilling methods will be utilized. Air rotary drilling is a drilling method in which drill pipe with an attached bit is continuously rotated against the face of the borehole while air is pumped through the pipe and bit to flush the cuttings to the surface. In air rotary drilling, air is compressed and circulated down through the drill rods and up the open hole. The rotary drill bit is attached to the lower end of the drill pipe, and as the bit cuts into the formation, cuttings are immediately removed from the bottom of the borehole and transported to the surface by the air that is circulating down through the drill pipe and up through the annular space.

#### 4.2.3 Soil Sampling

Soil samples will be collected continuously on 5-foot intervals to total depth within the overburden using split spoon samplers, continuous split barrel samplers, and/or thin walled sampling tubes (Shelby Tubes). Geotechnical soil samples will be collected for chemical or geotechnical analysis using the following procedure:

- 1. For split spoon or continuous split barrel samplers, remove the sub and shoe and split open the two halves of the sampler. Samples collected using Shelby Tubes will be capped and extruded at the testing laboratory.
- 2. Visually examine and log the remaining geologic material.
- 3. Geotechnical samples will be collected as described in Appendix A.

4. Transfer the soil into the appropriate sample containers.

#### 4.2.4 Borehole Abandonment

A temporary borehole not converted into a monitoring well or piezometer will be plugged in accordance with OAC 785:35-11.

#### 4.3 PIEZOMETER INSTALLATION

#### 4.3.1 Drilling Methods

Installation methods will include the use of hollow stem auger or air rotary drilling techniques with minimal introduction of drilling fluid into the borehole. All groundwater piezometers will be installed to yield representative water level and groundwater quality data.

#### 4.3.2 Piezometer Materials

Piezometers installed for long term monitoring will be two inches in diameter and constructed of PVC. All joints will be flush-threaded without the use of cementing compounds. Piezometer completion will be in accordance with OAC 785:35-7-2.

#### 4.3.3 Installation

#### Borehole Diameter and Depth

The nominal borehole diameter for piezometer installation will be determined as per subsurface conditions and potential use. It is anticipated that the borehole utilized during auger drilling will be 8.25 inches. If auger refusal occurs, the borehole utilized during air rotary will be 6 inches. The depth of each borehole will be based on the results of drilling activities.

#### Screen and Casing Placement

Well screens and well casings will be clean and free of foreign matter prior to use. Pre-washing will not be necessary if the materials have been packaged by the manufacturer and the packaging is intact up to the time of installation. Well casing will bear the manufacturer's markings that identify the material as that specified. Washed screens and casings will be stored in clean plastic sheeting or the manufacturer's packaging until insertion into the borehole.

Screen bottoms will be securely fitted with a threaded cap or plug of the same composition as the screen. No solvents or glues will be used for attachment.

In general, monitoring well screens will be no more than five feet in length. However, situations may arise where a greater length of well screen may be needed to fully monitor a specific zone.

#### Filter Pack Placement

The annular space between the screen and borehole will be filled with a filter pack, and aggregates used for the filter pack will consist of uncontaminated quartz sand, silica or other material that will not affect the groundwater quality. The filter pack will be selected to prevent or minimize infiltration of the formation fines. The filter pack will extend two feet above the top of the screen, and will be placed in the well annulus in such a manner that bridging of the filter pack material will not occur.

#### Bentonite Seal

A minimum of two feet of bentonite pellets, chips or granules between 0.25 and 0.75 inches in size will be placed immediately above the filter pack in the annular space between the well casing and borehole and properly hydrated.

#### Cement/Bentonite Grout Placement

Above the bentonite seal, a cement/bentonite grout mixture or other suitable backfill material will be placed from the top of the bentonite seal to approximately two feet below grade level. The backfill material will be mixed in accordance with the ratio requirements set forth in OAC 785:35-7-2(b)(6)(C).

When the placement of grout will exceed 20 feet, the grout will be placed using a tremie pipe and filled or pumped from the bottom upward.

#### Surface Seal

A concrete or cement grout surface seal will be placed around the casing immediately above the annular seal, from a depth of two feet to land surface.

#### Protective Cover and Concrete Pad

When the grout has cured to the proper depth below ground surface (bgs), a 3-foot diameter concrete pad with a minimum thickness of 3.5 inches will be placed around the piezometers. The surface pad will be sloped in a manner to ensure that all surface water flows away from the piezometer.

All protective casings will be free of extraneous openings, and devoid of any asphaltic, bituminous, encrusting, and/or coating except the paint or primer applied by the manufacturer.

A steel surface casing will be set a minimum of 12 inches through the cement or concrete surface pad and will extend a minimum of 24 inches above the pad or ground. The top of the protective casing will be fitted with a locking cap and will be marked to clearly identify the well as a piezometer or site assessment observation well.

#### Surveying

Upon completion of the drilling activities and installation of piezometers, the locations and casing elevations of each piezometer will be surveyed in accordance with criteria described in **Section 7.0**.

#### **4.4 PIEZOMETER DEVELOPMENT**

The purpose of well development is to remove fines (clay, silt, fine sand, rock flour) and drilling fluid residue from the filter pack and the natural formation in the vicinity of the screened interval in the monitoring well. Additionally, well development results in the settlement and stabilization of the material adjacent to the well screen.

#### 4.4.1 Methods

Following well completion, well development will be performed to remove fluids used during drilling and to remove fines from the natural formation. This will provide a particulate-free discharge for sampling. When possible, development will be done by reversing flow direction or surging the well. If possible, no fluids other than natural formation water will be added during development. There are a number of different methods to develop a piezometer. Bailing, air lifting, pumping, and pumping and surging are all adequate methods for well development. The appropriate method that is actually utilized for a particular well is highly dependent upon hydrogeologic conditions, volume of groundwater produced by the formation, and the drilling method used for the installation.

Newly installed piezometers will be developed no sooner than 24 hours after the installation of grout. Wells can be developed by bailing, air lifting, pumping, and/or surging and pumping. If surging and pumping is used, a surge block will be used to force the groundwater in and out of the filter pack and surrounding native material. Water will be removed using a submersible pump, inertial pump, or bailer. Water will be removed from the entire water column in the well by periodically raising and lowering the pump. Surging and pumping will be repeated in cycles until the well development parameters are met.

## 4.5 WATER LEVEL MEASUREMENTS

An electronic water level meter will be used to gauge the piezometers. The following procedure will be used to measure to measure the water levels:

- 1. Decontaminate the cable and probe. Wipe the cable with paper towels as the cable is rewound onto the reel.
- 2. Turn on the water level indicator and press the instrument test button to check the batteries.
- 3. Lower the probe into the borehole or well by pulling the cable from the hand-held reel until the indicator light illuminates or the audible signal sounds.
- 4. Move the cable up and down to determine the upper groundwater surface. Note the exact length of the cable extended from the probe fluid sensor to the reference point at the top of the well casing. Record the measurement to the nearest 0.01 foot, the boring or well designation, and the date the measurement was taken.
- 5. Measure the total depth by gently lowering the probe or weighted tape to the bottom of the boring or well until the cable becomes slack. Reel in the slack cable and note the length of the cable extended from the tip of the probe to the reference point. Add the length of the distance between the end of the probe and the fluid sensor to the total depth measurement. Record the depth to the nearest 0.01 foot in the field logbook.
- 6. Decontaminate the probe prior to gauging the next boring or well.

## 4.6 IN-SITU HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY TESTING

Determination of the in-situ hydraulic conductivity of a formation is an aspect in the characterization of a site. The usage of slug tests can provide data that will aid in understanding the dynamics of the geology and hydrogeology of the site.

### 4.6.1 Slug Test

Slug tests will be used to determine the hydraulic conductivity of distinct water bearing geologic horizons under in-situ conditions. Slug tests will be conducted on selected piezometers.

Water will not be added to any of the piezometers. All equipment to be used in piezometers will be decontaminated prior to the slug test to avoid cross-contamination. Slug tests will be conducted only on piezometers at which development has been completed. If a test is conducted on a well recently purged for water sampling, the measured water level must be within 0.1 foot of the static water level prior to testing.

The slug test may be conducted using an electronic data-logger and pressure transducer or by manually measuring well recovery. All data collected with the data-logger will be stored electronically. The information will be directly transferred to a computer and analyzed. A computer printout of the data will be kept in the project files for documentation. Manual readings will be recorded in the field logbook.

Slug testing will be performed in accordance with ASTM D 4044-96 Standard Test Method (Field Procedure) for Instantaneous Change in Head (Slug) Tests for Determining Hydraulic Properties of Aquifers. Data analysis will be performed using the computer program AQTESOLV. The data analysis will be performed using the Hyorslev (1951) or the Bouwer and Rice (1976) method.

## 5.0 SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION

All samples will be identified with a unique sample number. The sample will be comprised of the sampling point, sample designator, and depth interval, as appropriate.

The sampling point indicates the location of sampling; e.g., B1, where "B" indicates a boring and "1" is the first boring.

The sample designator will be comprised of a matrix abbreviation followed by a consecutive sample number. The matrix abbreviations are as follows:

- SS Soil
- CT Rock / Soil Cuttings
- RC Rock Core
- GW Groundwater

Subsurface soil and rock samples will be further identified according to location and depth. Samples collected from each boring will be consecutively numbered by depth. The actual sample depth will be recorded in the field logbook and on the chain of custody record.

In summary, the sample numbering system will consist of the sampling point, sample designator, and depth interval (if necessary). The following are examples of the sample numbering systems:

<u>Sampling Point</u>	Sample Designator	Depth Interval
EB-1	SS1	0-4'
EB-1	SS2	8-10'
EB-1	GW1	10'

If piezometers are installed in a boring, the identifier "B" will be converted to "PZ" for piezometer.

# **6.0** DOCUMENTATION, SAMPLE CUSTODY, PACKAGING AND SHIPPING

#### 6.1 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The following are the general requirements for logging consolidated and unconsolidated geologic materials.

- 1. For each borehole, a geologic log will be prepared in the field by a qualified groundwater scientist. Logs will be prepared on forms specified by the client or on the SCS Drilling Log.
- 2. The drilling logs will be filled out as completely as possible, where appropriate information is available. At entry points on the form that are not applicable, write "N/A" (e.g., "N/A" is written in the bedrock footage section if bedrock is not encountered in the borehole).
- 3. Stratigraphic or lithologic changes will be identified under the description of material column as a solid horizontal line which corresponds to a measured borehole depth where the changes occur. Gradational changes in stratigraphy and lithology or changes identified from cuttings or methods other than direct observation will be represented as a horizontal dashed line at appropriate depth based upon the best judgment of the logger.
- 4. Borehole measurements (i.e., run depths and water levels) will be recorded to the nearest 0.1 foot.
- 5. The logs will show total depth of penetration and sampling. The bottom of the borehole will be represented with notation of "T.D. = ____ft. bgs".
- 6. Any evidence of contamination will be noted in "Remarks," including color, odor, etc.
- 7. The depth to groundwater will be recorded in the header box labeled "Depth Groundwater Encountered." After drilling is completed and the water level has stabilized, a second water depth measurement will be recorded in the box labeled "Depth to Water and Elapsed time after Drilling Completed."
- 8. The length of core or soil sample (recovery) will be measured with a tape measure to the nearest 0.1 foot and recorded in the "Recovery" column.
- 9. The size and type of sampler or coring bit and barrel will be recorded on the form in the header. Logs will show borehole and sample diameters and depths at which sampling method or equipment changes.
- 10. Logs will show the drilling fluid used, including, as appropriate: source of makeup water; drilling fluid additives by brand and product name; mixture proportions; and type of filter for compressed air.
- 11. The amount of water used during drilling will be noted and recorded on the form. Any water gains or losses estimated rates and depths will be noted in the "Remarks" column.
- 12. The depth and type of temporary casing used will be noted in the "Remarks" column.
- 13. Depth intervals of borehole instability that are encountered during drilling will be recorded on the drilling log. In addition, difficulties during drilling (e.g., drilling speed, rates or downhole torque) and special sampling problems will be noted, along with problem resolution.
- 14. Samples retained for lithologic or chemical analyses will be noted in the "Sample No." column.

### **6.1.1** Logging Soils (Unconsolidated Materials)

- 1. Unconsolidated materials will be visually classified in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) and ASTM D2488. The visual field classification will provide principal and minor soil constituents along with approximate proportions.
- 2. The moisture content will be described in relative terms (e.g., dry, damp, moist, wet) and noted in the description. In addition, relative plasticity and consistency (cohesive soils), relative gradation and density (cohesionless soils), grain size, angularity, depositional environment, and structure will be recorded in the description column.
- 3. Bedding characteristics and evidence of bioturbation, root holes, or fractures will be recorded.

## **6.1.2** Logging Rock (Consolidated Materials)

1. Bedrock will be described based on visual observations, in accordance with standard geologic nomenclature.

- 2. This nomenclature includes, but is not limited to: formation name (if known); relative hardness; density; texture; grain size; weathering; bedding; fractures, joints, and cavities; and other descriptive features, such as fossils.
- 3. The moisture content will be described in relative terms (e.g., dry, damp, moist, wet) and noted in description.

## 7.0 SURVEYING

Following the completion of field activities, a surveyor will determine the positions of all unsurveyed sample locations, including subsurface sampling locations with piezometers and other discrete sampling points.

All sample locations will be surveyed horizontally to the nearest 0.1 foot and tied to the State Plane Coordinate System. The ground surface elevation of the sampling locations will be measured to the nearest 0.1 foot relative to mean sea level (MSL). For all piezometers, the top of the riser pipe will be used as a reference point and surveyed to the nearest 0.01 foot relative to MSL.

## 8.0 REFERENCES

ASTM International. 2012. Standard Practice for Thin-Walled Tube Sampling of Soils (D1587-08(2012)e1). ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA.

ASTM International. 2011. Standard Test Method for Penetration Test and Split-Barrel Sampling of Soils (D1586-11). ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA.

ASTM International. 2011. Standard Practice for Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes (Unified Soil Classification System) (D2487-11). ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA.

ASTM International. 2009. Standard Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedure) (D2488-09A). ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA.

Bouwer, H. and R.C. Rice. 1976. A Slug Test for Determining Hydraulic Conductivity of Unconfined Aquifers with Completely or Partially Penetrating Wells. Water Resources Research, v.12, pp. 423-428.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. Flood Map Service Center. Accessed November 13, 2019. <u>https://msc.fema.gov/portal</u>.

Oklahoma Geological Survey Circular 71, Groundwater-Resources Cleveland and Oklahoma Counties, P.R. Wood and L.C. Burton, 1968 (Wood/Burton 1968) <u>http://ogs.ou.edu/docs/circulars/C71.pdf</u>

Oklahoma Water Resources Board, Central Oklahoma. Accessed November 14, 2019 <u>http://owrb.ok.gov/studies/groundwater/garber-wellington/php</u>

Hvorslev, M.J. 1951. Time Lag and Soil Permeability in Ground-water Observations (Bulletin No. 36, Waterways Experiment Station). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, MS.

Oklahoma Climatological Survey. The Climate of Oklahoma County. Accessed November 12, 2019. <u>http://climate.ok.gov/county_climate/Products/County_Climatologies/county_climate_oklahoma.pd</u> <u>f</u>. Oklahoma Geological Survey. Oklahoma Geological Quadrangle Maps. Accessed November 13, 2019. <u>http://www.ogs.ou.edu/geolmapping.php</u>.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2015. Web Soil Survey. Accessed November 13, 2019. <u>http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm</u>

U.S. Geological Survey. Earthquake Hazards Program. Accessed November 13, 2019. <u>http://earthquake.usgs.gov</u>.

U.S. Geological Survey, 20181214, USGS US Topo 7.5-minute map for Midwest City, OK 2018: USGS - National Geospatial Technical Operations Center (NGTOC).

U.S. Geological Survey, 20181214, USGS US Topo 7.5-minute map for Spencer, OK 2018: USGS - National Geospatial Technical Operations Center (NGTOC).

Figures







19 4:27 PM //BED-FS02/Data/Civil 3D Projecte/CADD/Northeest C&D/16219107.00 - Ter III Permit Mod Application







FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY





#### LEGEND

RIVERINE



CURRENT PERMITTED LANDFILL BOUNDARY PROPOSED PERMITTED LANDFILL BOUNDARY ESTUARINE AND MARINE DEEPWATER ESTUARINE AND MARINE WETLAND FRESHWATER EMERGENT WETLAND FRESHWATER FORESTED/SHRUB WETLAND FRESHWATER POND LAKE OTHER

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, NATIONAL STANDARDS AND SUPPORT TEAM, WETLANDS TEAM@FWS.GOV | ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, IPC | USDA FSA



FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY





Appendix A

Soil Sampling for Geotechnical Analysis

#### SOIL SAMPLING FOR GEOTECHNICAL ANALYSES

Soil samples collected from the borings or excavations may be retained for selected physical analyses that can be performed on disturbed soil samples. Representative samples for grain size analyses (ASTM International (ASTM) D-6913) can be obtained from the interval in which the screen for the monitoring well will be placed (if well is screened in unconsolidated materials).

Disturbed soil samples collected for physical/geotechnical analysis will be placed in sealable plastic bags if moisture content analysis (ASTM D-2216) is requested. Remaining sample material will be placed in sealable plastic bags or buckets and labeled with the date, boring number, and depth of sample for Atterberg limits (ASTM D-4318) or grain size analysis.

In the event that undisturbed soil samples are collected, a thin-walled sample of "Shelby Tube" will be used to obtain these samples (ASTM D-1587). These samples can be taken in cohesive or granular material for laboratory classification and limited testing purposes. The sampling procedures when using a drilling rig are as follows:

- 1. Advance the borehole to the required depth, taking care not to disturb material to be sampled.
- 2. Examine the thin-walled tube to determine that it is free of rust, dents or scratches. The cutting edge should be beveled and drawn-in slightly less than the outside diameter of the tube.
- 3. Attach the thin-walled sampler to the head assembly and drill rods.
- 4. Lower the sampler assembly to the required depth and press the sampler 2 feet into the soil.
- 5. To insure good recovery, leave the assembly in the borehole for 10 to 15 minutes, to allow buildup of skin friction within the thin-wall sampler. Then rotate entire assembly 1 or 2 revolutions to shear off sample from soil below withdraw assembly from the borehole and disassemble.
- 6. Remove any disturbed material from the tube ends and measure the recovery.
- 7. Seal, mark, and store the tube in an upright position during storage and shipment to testing laboratory.

Appendix B

**USGS** Seismic Hazards



Two-percent probability of exceedance in 50 years map of peak ground acceleration





Figure caption on page 37.

Figure 7. Modified Mercalli Intensity maps and chance of damage for the Western United States and the Central and Eastern United States (CEUS) based on peak horizontal ground acceleration and 1-hertz spectral acceleration. For A-D, the map of the Western United States shows data based on the long-term 2014 National Seismic Hazard Model, and the map of the CEUS shows data based on the 2016 one-year model. A-B, Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) maps at 1-percent probability of exceedance in 1 year for the United States obtained (A) by converting peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGA) to MMI and (B) by converting 1-hertz (Hz; 1-second) spectral acceleration to MMI. These maps (A and B) are site amplified. C-D, Chance of damage (MMI greater than or equal to VI) from an earthquake in 2016, obtained from the rate of occurrence of (C) PGA ground motions and (D) 1-Hz (1-second) ground motions that are correlated with MMI VI for a uniform alluvial soil (National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program site class D).

Figures 7*C* and 7*D* show maps of the United States that also include the 2014 NSHM long-term tectonic hazard for the Western United States for comparison with the 2016 model hazard for the CEUS. In these maps, we consider the chances of experiencing damaging earthquakes for a fixed ground shaking level that corresponds with MMI VI (0.12 g PGA and 0.10 g 1-Hz [1-s] spectral acceleration). As in figures 7*A* and 7*B*, figures 7*C* and 7*D* show higher hazard for the PGA-based MMI compared to MMI obtained from converting 1-Hz (1-s) spectral acceleration. A weighted combination (average) of these maps may provide a more robust estimate of the potential earthquake intensity (MMI).

#### **Final Maps**

The final hazard maps show forecasts for MMI values and the chance of damaging earthquakes (MMI of VI or more). These parameters may be more comprehensible for many people than unconverted PGA or spectral acceleration values (fig. 8). Figure 8A presents an MMI map with a 1-percent probability of exceedance in 1 year for the United States obtained by averaging figures 7A and 7B. Sites in north-central Oklahoma, southernmost Kansas, central Arkansas, the Dallas-Fort Worth area, and the Raton Basin near the border of Colorado and New Mexico show MMI values that are greater than VI, VII, or VIII. Forecasted ground shaking in the north-central Oklahoma and Dallas, Tex., regions are consistent with damage levels observed over the past decade (Wald and others, 2011).



SCOTT A. THOMPSON Executive Director

OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

KEVIN STITT Governor

January 28, 2020

Mr. David Bahrenburg WCA Waste Corporation – Northeast Landfill 1001 S. Rockwell Ave. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73128

Re: Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion WCA Northeast Landfill ODEQ Permit #3555050

#### NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY

Dear Mr. Bahrenburg:

The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) received the Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion on December 16, 2019 by SCS Engineers on behalf of Northeast C&D Landfill.

Oklahoma Administrative Code (OAC) 252:515-7-1 requires a subsurface investigation and groundwater study prior to the landfill submitting a permit modification application for a lateral expansion. The subsurface investigation determines the location of the uppermost saturated zone and is designed to protect all saturated zones encountered while drilling. The Drilling Plan is the first step in the subsurface investigation and encompasses approximately 73.2 acres of future waste disposal area. The Drilling Plan, subsurface investigation, and groundwater study results will be submitted as part of a Tier III permit modification application. DEQ has reviewed the report and identified the following deficiencies:

1. WCA is requesting a variance and approval to use MW-3R and MW-4R as two of the required eighteen borings at the site for evaluating subsurface conditions. OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(3)(D) allows the landfill to substitute up to one-fourth of required borings with existing borings located within 200 feet of the proposed permit boundary. The report notes that the existing monitoring wells MW-3R and MW-4R are located within the footprint of the proposed expansion area; however, the total depths for these two monitoring wells (drilled ten feet into the uppermost saturated zone) will not meet the requirement of OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(4)(A) that all borings should be a minimum of 30 feet below the lowest placement of waste. During the evaluation of whether or not the two monitor wells can be used to replace two of the required borings, DEQ found that the estimated depth of waste placement near the wells would be in groundwater based on the water level elevations in the two wells given in the most recent groundwater monitoring report. Further, it appears if the estimated elevation of waste were corrected to be at least 5 feet above the water levels, then the two monitor wells would be acceptable replacements for two borings. Please reevaluate the estimated elevation of deepest

0

Mr. David Bahrenburg January 28, 2020 Page 2 of 2

> placement of waste and include the two monitor wells in Table 1. Note: a variance from the rules which is a Tier III permit modification requiring public participation and a demonstration of how the variance is at least as protective as the rule would be required for the original requested approval.

- 2. Currently, the proposed horizontal expansion does not meet the siting criteria in OAC 252:515-5-32(d); no new disposal areas shall be located in wetland areas. Also the expansion area does not meet the location restriction of OAC 252:515-5-51(a) Terrace deposits. A Tier III variance request and proposal will be required in the future permit modification application that demonstrates environmentally protective measures to be taken to justify the proposed expansion of the permit boundary into an area designated as alluvium or terrace deposits.
- 3. It appears the permit boundary on the south side may be incorrectly drawn on the figures. Please verify the existing permit boundary and modify the figures if necessary.

Lastly it is stated in the introduction that the proposed lateral expansion area and the vertical expansion of the existing disposal area will be utilized for a municipal solid waste (MSW) disposal area. If this is the plan, please discuss with DEQ as soon as possible prior to submitting the application. There are many regulatory and technical issues associated with merging of a MSW and a C&D landfill that will need to be addressed, including: liner construction materials, groundwater monitoring requirements, and post-closure monitoring period, etc. Also, DEQ would not approve a vertical expansion for disposal of MSW over a C&D landfill.

Please update the Drilling Plan addressing the deficiencies noted. If you have any questions, please contact Kaylee Shiplet at (405) 702-5196.

Sincerely,

Hillary Young, P.E. Chief Engineer Land Protection Division

HY/ks

cc: Robert Fowler, SCS Engineers

## SCS ENGINEERS

February 4, 2020

Ms. Hillary Young, P.E. Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality Land Protection Division P.O Box 1677 Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677

#### Subject: Response to Notice of Deficiency Letter Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion WCA Northeast Landfill – ODEQ Permit #3555050

#### Dear Ms. Young:

Stearns, Conrad, and Schmidt, Consulting Engineers, Inc. (dba SCS Engineers) on behalf of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC. (WCA) is submitting the following response to the notice of deficiency (NOD) letter, dated January 28, 2020, related to the Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion, dated December 13, 2019. For ease of review, we have included your original NOD comments below (in *italics*), followed by our response (in **bold**):

1. <u>Comment #1</u>: WCA is requesting a variance and approval to use MW-3R and MW-4R as two of the required eighteen borings at the site for evaluating subsurface conditions. OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(3)(D) allows the landfill to substitute up to one-fourth of required borings with existing borings located within 200 feet of the proposed permit boundary. The report notes that the existing monitoring wells MW-3R and MW-4R are located within the footprint of the proposed expansion area; however, the total depths for these two monitoring wells (drilled ten feet into the uppermost saturated zone) will not meet the requirement of OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(4)(A) that all borings should be a minimum of 30 feet below the lowest placement of waste. During the evaluation of whether or not the two monitor wells can be used to replace two of the required borings, DEQ found that the estimated depth of waste placement near the wells would be in groundwater based on the water level elevations in the two wells given in the most recent groundwater monitoring report. Further, it appears if the estimated elevation of waste were corrected to be at least 5 feet above the water levels, then the two monitor wells would be acceptable replacements for two borings. Please reevaluate the estimated elevation of deepest placement of waste and include the two monitor wells in Table 1. Note: a variance from the rules which is a Tier III permit modification requiring public participation and a demonstration of how the variance is at least as protective as the rule would be required for the original requested approval. .

<u>Response</u>: Since groundwater elevations have not been defined across the proposed expansion area, the deepest placement of waste, as presented in Table 1, is approximate and conservative to ensure all proposed boring depths are drilled deep enough to satisfy OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(4)(A). The actual deepest placement of waste will be defined by information obtained during the subsurface investigation. Considering groundwater elevations will be the limiting factor in the design, all borings will be advanced 25 feet into the uppermost aquifer to confirm that the 30-foot requirement of OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(4)(A) is achieved. It is anticipated that in some areas waste placement could correspond to elevations as deep as 1155 feet
above mean sea level (ft MSL) and in other areas it is anticipated that the deepest placement of waste would be much shallower (1180 ft MSL). Table 1 of the Drilling Plan has been updated to include existing monitoring wells MW-3R and MW-4R, as requested. Additionally, we have updated Table 1 to correct the "Deepest Placement of Waste" for PZ-6 to be 1165 ft MSL.

2. <u>Comment #2</u>: Currently, the proposed horizontal expansion does not meet the siting criteria in OAC 252:515-5-32(d); no new disposal areas shall be located in wetland areas. Also the expansion area does not meet the location restriction of OAC 252:515-5-51(a) Terrace deposits. A Tier III variance request and proposal will be required in the future permit modification application that demonstrates environmentally protective measures to be taken to justify the proposed expansion of the permit boundary into an area designated as alluvium or terrace deposits.

<u>Response</u>: WCA is aware that wetlands and waters of the United States (WOTUS) may exist at the proposed expansion area. WCA plans to have an assessment performed by a qualified subconsultant to evaluate the extent of WOTUS at the proposed site, coordinate with the United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE), and have the required USACE Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) approvals prepared and submitted, as necessary, for the proposed expansion area.

OAC 252:515-5-5(a) states that no area within the permit boundary of a new land disposal facility, or expansion of the permit boundary of an existing land disposal facility, shall be located within an area designated as alluvium or terrace deposits and their recharge areas, as shown on "Map of Aquifers and Recharge Areas in Oklahoma" complied by Kenneth S. Johnson, Oklahoma Geological Survey (1991).

According to the "Geologic Map of the Midwest City 7.5' Quadrangle, Cleveland and Oklahoma Counties, Oklahoma" compiled by Thomas M. Stanley and Neil H. Suneson, 2000 and the "Geologic Map of the Spencer 7.5' Quadrangle, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma" complied by Thomas M. Stanley and Neil H. Suneson, 1999; the proposed expansion area is not located in alluvium or terrace deposits.

The "Map of Aquifers and Recharge Areas of Oklahoma" complied by Kenneth S. Johnson, Oklahoma Survey (1991) is at such a large scale that locating the site with precision as it relates to terrace deposits is not possible. The 7.5' Quadrangle maps are much smaller scale than the Kenneth S. Johnson Map and the boundaries shown are more representative of actual conditions. In addition, site specific geologic conditions obtained during previous subsurface investigations and presented in the Tier III Permit Application, dated November 2005 for the Northeast C&D Landfill indicate that the site is underlain by silty sands underlain by weathered sandstone. This is consistent with weather Garber Sandstones and not alluvium or terrace deposits. It is anticipated that information derived from the proposed subsurface investigation will provide similar site specific information and will be presented in the Tier III Permit Application for the proposed horizontal expansion described in our December 13, 2019 Drilling Plan.

3. <u>Comment #3:</u> It appears the permit boundary on the south side may be incorrectly drawn on the figures. Please verify the existing permit boundary and modify the figures if necessary.

Ms. Hillary Young February 4, 2020 Page 3

<u>Response:</u> WCA owns all property designated as both existing permit boundary and proposed expansion area defined in the December 13, 2019 Drilling Plan. Based on review of a Tier I permit modification, entitled "Phase 5 Liner System Construction," dated May 2010 and submitted by Sheppard Engineering Design Co., Inc., the existing permit boundary depicted on the south side is correct as depicted on the figures presented in the drilling plan. However, in the event the property depicted on the south side of the property is not currently part of the existing permit boundary in DEQ records, please note that it is WCA's intentions to include this portion of the property into the permit boundary.

4. <u>Comment #4:</u> Lastly it is stated in the introduction that the proposed lateral expansion area and the vertical expansion of the existing disposal area will be utilized for a municipal solid waste (MSW) disposal area. If this is the plan, please discuss with DEQ as soon as possible prior to submitting the application. There are many regulatory and technical issues associated with merging of a MSW and a C&D landfill that will need to be addressed, including: liner construction materials, groundwater monitoring requirements, and post-closure monitoring period, etc. Also, DEQ would not approve a vertical expansion for disposal of MSW over a C&D landfill.

<u>Response:</u> Comment noted. WCA and SCS Engineers have scheduled a pre-application meeting with DEQ on March 10, 2020 to discuss the required DEQ regulatory criteria and WCA proposed plans for the Northeast Landfill expansion. As such, we look forward to further discussions with DEQ on available options for lateral and vertical expansions of the Northeast Landfill, so that the design and application contents are prepared in accordance with DEQ regulations for MSW landfills in due consideration of the currently permitted C&D landfill area.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this document, please do not hesitate to contact Robert Fowler at (501) 812-4551 or <u>rfowler@scsengineers.com</u> or Ryan Kuntz, P.E. at 817-358-6117 or rkuntz@scsengineers.com.

Sincerely,

- Jult i

Robert Fowler Project Geologist SCS Engineers

cc: Ms. Kaylee Shiplet – ODEQ Ronald Poor – WCA David Bahrenburg – WCA (e-copy only) Eduardo Choquis – WCA (e-copy only) Dan McCullough – SCS Engineers

Encl. - Table 1. Proposed Boring Information

Ryan Kuntz, P.E. Vice President / Project Director SCS Engineers

Boring/PZ Number	Northing	Easting	Deepest Placement of Waste (ft msl)	Target Elevation (ft msl)	Approx. Ground Surface Elevation (ft msl)	Target Depth (ft bgs)
PZ-1	182843.6990'	2150428.2777'	1165	1135	1214.000'	79
PZ-2	183925.2176'	2150401.7123'	1165	1135	1207.007'	73
PZ-3	183922.4725'	2149230.0025'	1165	1135	1199.076'	65
PZ-4	183243.1652'	2148593.5279'	1165	1135	1175.348'	41
PZ-5	183889.5268'	2148688.0282'	1155	1125	1175.296'	51
PZ-6	183261.4811'	2149654.6457'	1165	1135	1196.037'	62
PZ-7	183736.5892'	2147856.6854'	1155	1125	1197.680'	73
EB-1	182874.7496'	2147877.9945'	1165	1109	1210.191'	100
EB-2	182906.5890'	2148830.5602'	1165	1135	1190.211'	56
EB-3	182862.8404'	2149747.5998'	1165	1135	1204.242'	70
EB-4	183256.0393'	2150191.4214'	1165	1135	1207.480'	73
EB-5	183915.9739'	2148372.5951'	1165	1135	1169.387'	35
EB-6	183402.9772'	2149275.2847'	1165	1135	1190.332'	56
EB-7	183237.9921'	2148314.8039'	1165	1135	1190.148'	56
EB-8	183333.1922'	2147872.3289'	1155	1125	1202.655'	78
EB-9	183735.3932'	2149861.2142'	1165	1135	1196.489'	62
MW-3R	182799.5700'	2149191.4900'	1179**	NA***	1197.530'	NA***
MW-4R	182763.6100'	2148479.0600'	1176**	NA***	1196.220'	NA***

### Table 1.Proposed Boring Information

*The target elevation is the deepest proposed placement of waste minus 30' with exception of EB-1 which will be advanced to 100'. **The deepest placement of waste elevation is five feet above the groundwater elevation as presented in the First Half 2019 (May 2019) Groundwater Monitoring Report.

***MW-3R and MW-4R are existing monitoring wells.

# 3.2.2 Groundwater

At a minimum seven borings will be advanced into the uppermost water-bearing geologic unit beneath the Site. Seven borings will be completed as piezometers and are designated PZ-1 through PZ-7. These seven proposed piezometers will be logged with geophysical methods. See **Figure 3** for approximate locations and surface elevations.

The water-bearing unit will need to yield sufficient quantities of groundwater for regular sampling events. Aquifer testing and/or field hydraulic conductivity (slug) tests will be performed on selected piezometers.

Details describing the specific procedures for installation and completion of the piezometers and performance of field testing are presented in **Section 4.0**.



SCOTT A. THOMPSON Executive Director

## OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

KEVIN STITT Governor

February 10, 2020

Mr. David Bahrenburg WCA Waste Corporation – Northeast Landfill 1001 S. Rockwell Ave. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73128

Re: Response to Notice of Deficiency Letter of Intent to Drill WCA Northeast Landfill ODEQ Permit #3555050

Dear Mr. Bahrenburg:

The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) issued a Notice of Deficiency (NOD) on January 28, 2020 for the WCA Northeast C&D Landfill's Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion, dated December 13, 2019. On February 4, 2020, DEQ received a response to the NOD (Response) and Intent to Drill, submitted by SCS Engineers via email.

In the Response, WCA provided updated information regarding MW-3R and MW-4R and included the wells in the Proposed Boring Information Table along with a revised estimation of the deepest placement of waste. The updated information shows the wells meet the requirement that borings must be drilled 30 feet below the deepest placement of waste as outlined in OAC 252:515-7-4(b)(4)(A). DEQ accepts the proposal to use MW-3R and MW-4R as two of the required borings.

The Response addressed the location restrictions associated with wetlands and terrace deposits. DEQ acknowledges that WCA plans to evaluate the expansion area for wetlands and work with the Army Corps of Engineers to obtain any required permits.

DEQ understands that alluvial or terrace deposits indicated on the 1991 Kenneth S. Johnson map may not actually exist in the expansion area due to the large map scale. Site specific information is needed to accurately depict the presence or absence of terrace deposits as proposed in the Response. It should be noted that, WCA must demonstrate clearly and convincingly, with site specific hydrological and geological data, as stated in OAC 252:515-5-51(a)(2), that the proposed expansion does not lie in alluvial or terrace deposits. If the subsurface investigation does not show the absence of alluvium and terrace deposits, a Tier III variance will be required that demonstrates (per OAC 252:515-3-32(b)) the variance proposal will equal or exceed the protection provided by the rule and will not result in a hazard to human health or the environment. Additional liner components may be needed in this case.

please recycle

Mr. David Bahrenburg February 10, 2020 Page 2 of 2

WCA and SCS Engineers scheduled a pre-application meeting with DEQ on March 10, 2020, to discuss the options for lateral and vertical expansions so that the design and application contents are prepared in accordance with DEQ regulations. The discussion will focus on available options for the lateral and vertical expansions of the Northeast Landfill so that the design and application meet regulatory requirements for MSW landfills considering the currently permitted area is for C&D disposal.

A notice of Intent to Drill was submitted with the Response in accordance with OAC 252:515-7-5(a). The proposed date to begin drilling is February 17, 2020, contingent on the approval of the drilling plan. This date is being requested based on the availability of the subcontractor and time constraints of the project. SCS anticipates drilling activities will take approximately three weeks to complete.

DEQ reviewed the Response and determined the deficiencies to be resolved. The drilling plan and intent to drill beginning February 17, 2020 are approved. If you have any questions, please contact Kaylee Shiplet at (405) 702-5196.

Sincerely,

Hillary Young, P.E. Chief Engineer Land Protection Division

HY/ks

cc: Brett DeVries, SCS Engineers Robert Fowler, SCS Engineers February 4, 2020

Ms. Kaylee Shiplet Solid Waste Section Land Protection Division P.O. Box 1677 Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677

Subject: Letter of Intent to Drill WCA of Oklahoma, LLC, Northeast Landfill Permit No.: 3555050

Dear Ms. Shiplet:

Stearns, Conrad, and Schmidt, Consulting Engineers, Inc. (dba SCS Engineers) on behalf of WCA of Oklahoma, LLC (WCA) is pleased to present this Letter of Intent to Drill at the Northeast Landfill to the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). SCS is providing DEQ with this intent to drill as per OAC Regulation 252:515-7-5(a) and in anticipation of approval of the "Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion" dated December 2019, and our letter response to Notice of Deficiency comments, dated February 5, 2020.

OAC 252:515-7-5(a) states that "after DEQ approval of the drilling plan, the DEQ shall be provided with written notice of intent to drill at least two (2) weeks prior to initiating drilling", however, SCS is respectfully requesting to conduct the drilling activities as outlined in the "Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion" at the Northeast Landfill beginning Monday February 17, 2020 following approval of the drilling plan and this letter of intent. This date is being requested based on the availability of the subcontractor and the time constraints of the project. SCS anticipates that drilling activities will take approximately three weeks to complete.

If you have any questions or comments on this request, please contact me 501-812-4551 or email at <u>rfowler@scsengineers.com</u>.

Sincerely,

spat i th

Robert Fowler Project Geologist SCS Engineers

Cc; Ronald Poor, WCA David Bahrenburg, WCA (e-copy only) Eduardo Choquis, WCA (e-copy only) Ryan Kuntz, SCS

Can mchiller

Dan McCullough, PG Project Director SCS Engineers

# SCS ENGINEERS

March 2, 2019

Ms. Kaylee Shiplet Solid Waste Section Land Protection Division P.O. Box 1677 Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677

Subject: Request for alternate location of boring EB-5 at the Northeast Landfill Waste Corporation of Oklahoma, LLC., Northeast Landfill Permit No.: 3555050

Dear Ms. Shiplet:

Stearns, Conrad, and Schmidt, Consulting Engineers, Inc. (dba SCS Engineers) on behalf of Waste Corporation of Oklahoma, LLC. (WCA) is submitting this letter to request to relocate the proposed boring location for EB-5 approximately 150 feet west of the location as approved in the Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion of the Northeast Landfill. This request is being made since access to the approved EB-5 location is limited at this time. A map depicting the approved location as well as the alternate location for EB-5 has been included as an attachment to this letter. Page 5 of the drilling plan has also been updated to include the corrected location and elevations for the new EB-5 location and is included as an attachment to this letter.

Please contact us if you have any questions concerning this Plan.

Sincerely,

sper aff

Robert Fowler Project Geologist SCS Engineers

On mchillerge

Dan McCullough, PG Project Director SCS Engineers

RF

Attachments: Boring Location Map

Revised Page 5 of the Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion



Boring/PZ Number	Northing	Easting	Deepest Placement of Waste (ft msl)	Target Elevation (ft msl)	Approx. Ground Surface Elevation (ft msl)	Target Depth (ft bgs)
PZ-1	182843.6990'	2150428.2777'	1165	1135	1214.000'	79
PZ-2	183925.2176'	2150401.7123'	1165	1135	1207.007'	73
PZ-3	183922.4725'	2149230.0025'	1165	1135	1199.076'	65
PZ-4	183243.1652'	2148593.5279'	1165	1135	1175.348'	41
PZ-5	183889.5268'	2148688.0282'	1155	1125	1175.296'	51
PZ-6	183261.4811'	2149654.6457'	1165	1135	1196.037'	62
PZ-7	183736.5892'	2147856.6854'	1155	1125	1197.680'	73
EB-1	182874.7496'	2147877.9945'	1165	1109	1210.191'	100
EB-2	182906.5890'	2148830.5602'	1165	1135	1190.211'	56
EB-3	182862.8404'	2149747.5998'	1165	1135	1204.242'	70
EB-4	183256.0393'	2150191.4214'	1165	1135	1207.480'	73
EB-5	183918.1728	2148221.6592	1165	1135	1168.171'	34
EB-6	183402.9772'	2149275.2847'	1165	1135	1190.332'	56
EB-7	183237.9921'	2148314.8039'	1165	1135	1190.148'	56
EB-8	183333.1922'	2147872.3289'	1155	1125	1202.655'	78
EB-9	183735.3932'	2149861.2142'	1165	1135	1196.489'	62
MW-3R	182799.5700'	2149191.4900'	1179**	NA***	1197.530'	NA***
MW-4R	182763.6100'	2148479.0600'	1176**	NA***	1196.220'	NA***

### Table 1.Proposed Boring Information

*The target elevation is the deepest proposed placement of waste minus 30' with exception of EB-1 which will be advanced to 100'. **The deepest placement of waste elevation is five feet above the groundwater elevation as presented in the First Half 2019 (May 2019) Groundwater Monitoring Report.

***MW-3R and MW-4R are existing monitoring wells.

# 3.2.2 Groundwater

At a minimum seven borings will be advanced into the uppermost water-bearing geologic unit beneath the Site. Seven borings will be completed as piezometers and are designated PZ-1 through PZ-7. These seven proposed piezometers will be logged with geophysical methods. See **Figure 3** for approximate locations and surface elevations.

The water-bearing unit will need to yield sufficient quantities of groundwater for regular sampling events. Aquifer testing and/or field hydraulic conductivity (slug) tests will be performed on selected piezometers.

Details describing the specific procedures for installation and completion of the piezometers and performance of field testing are presented in **Section 4.0**.



SCOTT A. THOMPSON Executive Director

OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

KEVIN STITT Governor

March 23, 2020

Mr. David Bahrenburg WCA Waste Corporation – Northeast Landfill 1001 S. Rockwell Ave. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73128

Re: Request for Alternate Location of boring EB-5 WCA Northeast Landfill ODEQ Permit #3555050

Dear Mr. Bahrenburg:

The Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) received the Request for Alternate Location of boring EB-5 on March 2, 2020, via email from SCS Engineers on behalf of Northeast C&D Landfill.

The purpose of the submittal is to request to relocate the proposed boring site for EB-5; approximately 150 feet to the west of the location as approved in the Drilling Plan for Horizontal Expansion of the Northeast Landfill. The request is being made since access to the previously approved location is limited at this time. The Drilling Plan has been updated to include the corrected location and elevations for the new EB-5 boring.

The request to relocate boring EB-5 is approved. If you have any questions, please contact Kaylee Shiplet at (405) 702-5196.

Sincerely,

Hillary Young, P.E. Chief Engineer Land Protection Division

HY/ks

cc: Brett DeVries, SCS Engineers Robert Fowler, SCS Engineers Appendix B

Boring Logs and Construction Diagrams

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	EB-1		SHEET NU	MBER: 1 of 3
	11219	P Richardson Drive			DDILLE				
	Nor	h Little Rock. AR				<u>K:Garr</u> ) CME-	<u>/ Moyers</u> 55 Ria	TOC FLEVATION: NA	0./ ft ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC				METHOD Auger/W		WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 1 01	fbas
PRC	DJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ande	rson	LOCATION:	
PROJE	ECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engine	eering	NORTHING: 18287	4.18
PROJECT	I LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	ltants, Inc.	EASTING: 21478	82.86
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	IG METHOD: 5	Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 40.	43 fbgs
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	5/2020		BOK	NG DIAMETE WELL DIAMETE	<u>K: 8.25</u> R: NA	/4.25	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2	$\frac{70.22}{10}$
		0/2020				2		······································	
(FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOV (ff)		MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
0 _		Silty Clay; dark brown, with	SPT	0-1.5	1,2,2	1			<u> </u>
		rootlets (topsoil)							
			Cont.	1.5-5		3.5			_
									_
5 —									- 1205
	Silfy Clay	Silty Clay;							_
		reddish brown	Cont.	5-10.		2			_
									_
10									_
10 			Shalby	10.12		2		Backfilled boring 0	— 1200
			Sheiby	10-12.		2		to TD (101 ft bgs)	_
_	Clavey Sand	Clayey Sand;	SPT	12-12.	12,14,	1.5		with bentonite plug	_
_	ciayey saila	brown		12.5-1				aroundwater	_
15 —	Sand	transitions to	Cont.	5		1.5		elevation was	_
	ound	reddish brown						obtained	— 1195
_		orange, fine to							_
_		<u>medium grained</u>	Cont	15-20.		1			—
_		brown to							_
20 —		orange, fine							_
_	Clayey Sand	grained, trace	STP	20-21.	50/5"	5"			— 1190
_		Clayey Sand;							—
_		reddish brown	Cont	21.5-2		1.5			—
_		medium	Com.	5		1.5			_
25 —		grained with							_
_		some cemented weathered							— 1185
_		sandstones							_
_	Silty Clay	Silty Clay;	Conf.	25-30.		3.5			—
_		friable							_
30 —		-							-
_		Sand: oranae							
_		to brown sands	Cont	30-25		2			
_	Sand	with thinly	Com.	30-35.		<u>۲</u>			
_		light tan to							
35 —		brown							
				1	1	1	100000 00000		1 11/3
BOUND	ARY LINES BETWE	EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A	CTUAL						
TRANSIT	IONS MAY BE GR	ADUAL							

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	<b>EB-1</b>		SHEET NU	MBER: 2 of 3
	11219	9 Richardson Drive							076
	Nor	th Little Rock, AR				<u>:K:Garry</u> G.CMF_/	<u>Moyers</u> 55 Ria	TOC FIFVATION: NA	0./ ft ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC				uaer/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 101	fbas
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ander	son	LOCATION:	
PRO. PROJEC	IECT NUMBER: 162 CT LOCATION: Spe	219107.00 ncer, Oklahoma		_		Engine Consu	eering Itants, Inc.	NORTHING: 18287 EASTING: 21478	4.18 82.86
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	IG METHOD: 3	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 40.	43 fbgs
	START DATE: 3/1	9/2020		BOR	NG DIAMETI	R: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 117	70.22 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/2	25/2020			WELL DIAMETI			WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2	26/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVER) (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
_		sandstones							_
-			Cont.	35-40.		1	40.43		_
40 —	-	Clayey Sand; reddish brown	SPT	40-41. 5	50/5"	5"			1170
	Clayey Sand	to light brown, some thin cemented sandstones, wet at 43'	Cont.	41.5-4 5		3		Wet @ 43' bgs	_
4J - -			Cont.	45-50	Cont.	0.5			1165  
-	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; reddish brown to light gray.						Switched to Wash Rotary at 48 ft bgs	_
- 50	-	very hard	SPT	50-51. 5	50/2"	0			1160
-	_								_
_ 55 —	-								 1155
-	-	Sand; orange	SPT	56-57. 5	50/1"	0			
- - 60 —	Sand	brown, fine to medium grained							 
-	-		SPT	61-62. 5	50/1"	1"			_
-	_								_
65 —	_								
-			SPT	66-67. 5	50/1"	1"			— 1145 —
-	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; reddish brown							
- 70 —		silt seams							
-		Sandstone: liaht		71-72.					
THE STI BOUNE TRANS	RATIFICATION LINE DARY LINES BETWE ITIONS MAY BE GR	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A ADUAL	CTUAL						

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	<b>EB-1</b>		SHEET NU	MBER: 3 of 3
	11219	9 Richardson Drive			DDUU				076
	Nor	th Little Rock. AR				<u>(K:Garr</u> ) C. CME	/ Moyers 55 Pia		<u>0./ ff</u>
		A of Oklahoma IIC				uger/W	JJ Kig Vash Rotarv	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 101 fbgs	
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING		R:Ander			
PROJ	ECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engine	NORTHING: 18287	4.18	
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	EASTING: 21478	82.86	
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	IG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 40.	43 fbgs
	START DATE: 3/1	9/2020		BORI	NG DIAMETE	<u>R: 8.25</u> "	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 117	70.22 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/2	5/2020			Well Diameth	:R: NA ≻		WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2	26/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVER (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
		gray, fine	SPT	5		3"		Very hard drilling	-
	Sanasione	grained,						71'-75'	
	*********	very hard							
/5 —									1135
_			SPT	76-77.	50/5	5"			
_	202020000	_	511	5	50/5	5			
-									
80 —									1120
-		_		81-82					- 1130
-			SPT	5	50/4"	3"			
-		Silty Clay,							
_		reddish brown							
85 —		with light gray							
_	Silty Clay	silt seams, some							
_		interbedded	SPT	86-87.	50/2"	1"			
_		sandstones		5		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
_									
00									
90									
			SPT	91-92.	50/2"	0			
_		_		5					
_									
95 —									
-			007	96-97.	FO /0"	<u> </u>			
-		Sandy Clave	SPT	5	50/2"	0			
-	Sanahy Claur	reddish brown,							
-		fine grained							
00 —		sands							
			CDT	101.10	EQ /2"	2"			
			<u> </u>	1.5	50/3	<u> </u>	1	orilied IVI bgs	
THE STR		S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE							
BOUND	ARY LINES BETWE	EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A	CTUAL						

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	EB-2		SHEET NU	MBER: 1 of 2
	11219	Richardson Drive							0 5 6
	Nort	h Little Rock, AR				G. CMF-	55 Ria	TOC FIEVATION: NA	0.5 m
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING		uaer/V	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 46	fbas
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ande	rson	LOCATION:	
PROJ PROJEC	ECT NUMBER: 162 T LOCATION: Spe	19107.00 ncer. Oklahoma		Engineering Consultants, Inc.				NORTHING: 182898 EASTING: 21488	3.09 54.27
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	NG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 16.0	56 fbgs
	START DATE: 3/4	/2020		BOR	NG DIAMETE	R: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 117	'3.85 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/5	/2020			WELL DIAMETE	R: NA		WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/9	/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
0 –		Silty Clay, dark	SPT	0-1.5	2,4,4	100			
		brown (topsoil)	Cont.	1.5-5		86			
5 –	Silty Clay		Bulk	4-8.		60		Backfilled boring 0 to TD (46 ft bgs) with bentonite plug	1185  
_		Silty Clay; brown	Cont.	5-10.				groundwater	_
10 —			SPT	10-11. 5	14,20, 17	100		obtained	1180
-			Cont.	11.5-1 4		80			_
-	Sandy Clay	Sandy Clay; orange	Shelby	14-15.	-				
15 — 	Clayey Sand	Clayey Sand; orange	Cont.	15-20.	-	10	- 16.66	Saturated at 18 ft	1175  
_ 20 —					-			bgs Very little recovery	_ 
-			SPT	21-22. 5	8,10,1 9	100		very lime recovery	_
	1	Sand; reddish	Cont.	21.5-2 5		14			_
23 - - - 30 -	Sand	brown to brown, course grained to fine grained, Some gravels between 31-36 feet (<5%)	Cuttings	25-31.					
_			SPT	31-32. 5	50/2"	11		Switched to Wash Rotary	_
 35	-		Cuttings	31-36.				····· ,	_
	ATIFICATION LINES	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE N SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A	CTUAL						1155
IKANSI	IIUNS MAT BE GR	ADUAL							

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	EB-2		SHEET NUA	ABER: 2 of 2
	11219	9 Richardson Drive			DRILLEI	R:Garr	v Movers	SURFACE ELEVATION: 1 1 90.5 ft	
	Nor	th Little Rock, AR			DRILLING RIC	G: CME-	.55 Rig	TOC ELEVATION: NA	ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING	G METHOD: A	uger/V	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 46 f	bgs
PRO	DJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anderson			rson	LOCATION:	
PROJ	ECT NUMBER: 162	219107.00		_		Engin	eering	NORTHING: 182898	3.09 54.27
PROJEC	LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma		S & AA DI II		Consu Sermal		WATER LEVEL 16 A	6 fbas
	START DATE: 3/4	/2020		BOR	NG DIAMETEI	8.25	"/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 117	3.85 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/5	5/2020			WELL DIAMETER	R: NA	/ 7.23	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/9	/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	ECOVERY (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
			SPT	36-37. 5	50/3"	17			
  40		Silter Chara	Cuttings	36-41.				Very hard drilling	_
_	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; reddish brown, stiff	SPT	41-42. 5	50/5"	28		6.21	1150 
 45 —			Cuttings	41-46.				TD drilled to 46' bas	 1145
_			SPT /	46-46.	50/2"	11			_

11219 Richardson Drive North Liftle Rock, AR         DBILLING Carry Moyers         SUFFACE REVAILON: 1204.1 fr DBILLING RG: CAE:55 Rig UCCLT: MARK-Mortheome, LC         SUFFACE REVAILON: 1204.1 fr DBILLING RG: CAE:55 Rig UCCLT: MARK-Mortheome, CBD Londfill           PROJECT INMER: 16219107:00         DBILLING CONTRACTOR, Anderson Engineering Consultants, Inc.         DBILLING CONTRACTOR, Anderson Engineering Consultants, Inc.         UCATION: 180264 A17           ROUCOSH: Robert Fowler         SAMPIING METOD: 5' Sampler / Safit Speon         WAIRE RVEL 23.34 ftpg: UCATION: 180764 A17           GROUCOSE: Robert Fowler         SAMPIING METOD: 5' Sampler / Safit Speon         WAIRE RVEL 23.34 ftpg: UCATION: 180764 A17           GROUCOSE: Robert Fowler         SAMPIING METOD: 5' Sampler / Safit Speon         WAIRE RVEL 23.34 ftpg: UCATION: 180764 A17           GROUCOSE: Robert Fowler         SAMPIING METOD: 4.627         1.5           GROUCOSE: Robert Fowler         SAMPIING METOD: 4.647         1.5           Sitty Clay; reddiab brown         SPT         0-1.5         4.67         1.5           Sitty Clay; reddiab brown         SPT         0-1.5         4.67         1.5         2.1           Sitty Clay; reddiab brown         SPT         0-1.5         4.67         1.5         2.1         1.10011           Sitty Clay; reddiab brown         SPT         0-1.5         4.6.7         1.5         3.4.6         1.5	S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	BORING NO.:	EB-3/	'PZ-8	SHEET NU/	MBER: 1 of 2
Clown Linke Node, Yink         Dollar Node, Yink         Dollar Node, Yink         Dollar Node, Yink           Clown Wick A of Michanna, LLC         Dellunk Rich Michanna, LLC         Dellunk Rich Michanna, LLC         Node, Yink         Viel DPIH HOWE/D0006 of fligs           Project Nukke Northeast C&D Landfill         Dellunk Rich Michanna, LLC         Dellunk Rich Michana         Node, Yink         Viel DPIH HOWE/D0006 of fligs           Project Nukke Northeast C&D Landfill         Dellunk Rich Michana         Dellunk Rich Michana         Node, Yink         100 And Pieze           Project Nukke Northeast Rich 23 (9 / 2020         Boens Diake Bill, Pieze         Sinke 21 (9 / 2020         WATE Elevinost Rich 31 (9 / 2020)         WATE Elevinost Rich 31 (9 / 2020           PPTM         UTHOLOCY         UTHOLOCY DESCRIPTION         Sinke Bill, Pieze         Sinke Bill, Pieze         Sinke Bill, Pieze         More Rich Anderson         WATE Elevinost Rich 31 (9 / 2020)           PPTM         UTHOLOCY DESCRIPTION         Sinke Bill, Pieze         Sinke Bill, Pieze         Sinke Bill, Pieze         Sinke Bill, Pieze         More Rich Anderson         Elevinost Rich Anderson           0         Sinke Bill, Pieze         Sinke Bil		11219 Nort	P Richardson Drive				R:Garry	Moyers	SURFACE ELEVATION: 1 20	4.1 ft
PROJECT LOCATION: Spencer, Oklohoma         Consultants, Inc.         EASTING: 2149748.47           GEOLOGST: Robert Towler         SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon         WATR LIVEL: 23.34 fbgs           START DATE: 3/6/2020         BORNG DIALETRE RA         WATR LIVEL: 23.34 fbgs           DPT/H         UTHOLOGY         Bender         WATR LIVEL: 23.7           DPT/H         UTHOLOGY         Bender         Watre LiveL: 24.13/2020           DPT/H         UTHOLOGY         Bender         Bender           Silty Clay         Silty Clay; dark         SPT         0-1.5         4,6/7         1.5           Silty Clay         Silty Clay; dark         SPT         0-1.5         4,6/7         3.5           Social Silty Clay; dark         Shelby         5-7.         Silty Clay; dark         Special filty Clay; dark         Special filty Clay; filty Clay	PRO	CLIENT: WC OJECT NAME: Nor ECT NUMBER: 162	A of Oklahoma, LLC theast C&D Landfill 19107.00		DRILLING METHOD: Auger/Wash Rotary DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anderson Engineering				UCCELEVATION: NA H WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 60 fbgs	
GCOCICGS1R.Robert Fowler         MAIRE ISPE: 23.34 fbgs:           SIRT DIA: 3/6/2020         WILE UDA: 5' Sempler/Split Spoon         WAIRE ISPE: 23.34 fbgs:           SIRT DIA: 3/9/2020         WILE UDA: 5' Sempler/Split Spoon         WAIRE ISPE: 23.34 fbgs:           DIFTH         UTHOLOGY DESCRIPTION         Silty Clay; Joint Spoon         Montoene will incommon.         Montoene will incommon.         ERMANDE           DIFTH         UTHOLOGY DESCRIPTION         Silty Clay; Joint Spoon         Montoene will incommon.         Montoene will incommon.         ERMANDE           DIFTH         UTHOLOGY DESCRIPTION         Silty Clay; Joint Spoon         Montoene will incommon.         Remain any spin of the spoon spin of the spin	PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma		_		Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 214974	48.47
Diriki Date 3/9/2020         Boom State Date 3/9/2020         Mark Live Date 3/9/2020         Mark Live Date 3/9/2020         Mark Live Date 3/9/2020         Effective Cover         Concrete Pade		GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler /2020		SAMPLI	NG METHOD: 5	'Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 23.3	34 fbgs
DBPH (T)         UTHOLOGY         LITHOLOGY         DESCRIPTION         Name Type         Name Serie         Now Construction         Series Series         Now Construction         Stick Up (3.00 ft) Protective Cover         Now Construction         Now Construction         Stick Up (3.00 ft) Protective Cover         Now Construction         Stick Up (3.00 ft) Protective Cover         Now Construction         Now Construction         Stick Up (3.00 ft) Protective Cover         Now Construction <td></td> <td>FINISH DATE: 3/9</td> <td>/2020</td> <td></td> <td>DUK</td> <td>WELL DIAMETE</td> <td><u>R: NA</u></td> <td>/4.25</td> <td>WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/1</td> <td>3/2020</td>		FINISH DATE: 3/9	/2020		DUK	WELL DIAMETE	<u>R: NA</u>	/4.25	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/1	3/2020
Silty Clay, Silty Clay, silty Clay, context context context s         SPT context (Bulk 0-3)         0-1.5 4,6.7         4,6.7         1.5 1.5         Stick Up (3.00 ft) Protective Cover Concrete Pad (Approximately 6")         1205           5         Clay, reddish brown         SPT         0-1.5         4,6.7         1.5         2 in dia. Sch. 40 PVC soild riser from 0 - 15 ft bgs         1200           5         Clay, reddish brown         Shelby         5-7.         2         10         1200           10         Silty Clay, reddish brown to orange         Cont.         7-10.         1         1         Sector 10 ft bgs         1195           20         Silty Clay, reddish brown to orange         Cont.         11.5-1 (Bulk 10-14)         3,4,6         1.5         1           20         Clayey Sand orange         Cont.         15-20         0.5         1         Sand filter pack from 13 ft to 25 ft bgs         10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 stor, Sch. 40 PVC sreen Installed depth = 25' bg End Cap         1180	DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			Silty Clay, dayle	CDT	0.1.5	447	1.5		Stick Up (3.00 ft) Protective Cover Concrete Pad	 1205 
5         Clay: reddish brown         I.5-5         3.5         3.5         2 in dia. Sch. 40         PVC soild riser from         1200           10         Silty Clay: reddish brown         Shelby         5-7.	_	Silty Clay	brown with rootlets	Cont	0-1.5	4,6,7	1.5		(Approximately 6)	_
Johnn         Shelby         5.7.         Image: Cont.         Shelby         5.7.           10         Silty Clay;         Silty Clay;         Cont.         7.10.         1         Bentonite/portland grout from ground surface to 10 ft bgs         1195           10         Silty Clay;         SPT         10.11.         3.4.6         1.5         Bentonite/portland grout from ground surface to 10 ft bgs         1195           15         Silty Clay;         reddish brown to orange         Cont.         11.5-1         3.4.6         1           15         Cont.         Cont.         11.5-1         3.4.6         1         1           15         Cont.         11.5-20         0.5         1         Sand filter pack from 13 ft to 25 ft bgs         1           20         Clayey Sand; orange         SPT         20-21.         10.22, 1.5-2         1.5-5         1           25         Cont.         15-20         0.5         1         10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40         PVC sreen           25         Silty Clay;         Cont.         21.5-2         1         10.22, 1.5-2         1         1           25         Silty Clay;         Cont.         25-30         4         4         25' bgs         1180	 5	Clay	Clay; reddish	(Bulk 0-3)	1.5-5	-	3.5		2 in dia. Sch. 40 PVC soild riser from 0 - 15 ft bas	1200 
10 - 3ilty Clay; $Silty Clay;$ $reddish brown to orange - Cont.$ $20 - Clayey Sand - Clayey Sand; orange - Cont.$ $Silty Clay; reddish brown to orange - Cont.$ $Silty Clay; reddish brown to orange - Cont.$ $SPT = 20 - 21.$ $Cont.$ $15 - 20 - 21.$ $10 - 22,$ $20 - 21.$ $Clayey Sand$ $Clayey Sand; orange - Cont.$ $SPT = 20 - 21.$ $10 - 22,$ $20 - 21.$ $Cont.$ $21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 5 - 20,$ $1 - 21 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21,$ $2 - 21$	-		biowii	Shelby	5-7.				Wet at 33' bgs	
10       Silty Clay; reddish brown to orange       SPT       10-11. 5       3,4,6       1.5         15       Cont. (Bulk 10-14)       11.5-1 5       1       1       10         15       Cont. (Bulk 10-14)       11.5-1 5       1       1       10         20       Cont. Clayey Sand       Cont. (Bulk 10-14)       15-20       0.5       Sand filter pack from 13 ft to 25 ft bgs       1190         20       Clayey Sand orange       Cont.       15-20       0.5       10       10       10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40       1186         25       Silty Clay; reddish brown       Cont.       21.5-2 5       1       10       25-30       4       10       10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40       1180         25       Silty Clay; reddish brown       Cont. (Bulk 25-27)       25-30       4       4       10       10       10       10       10       1180	-			Cont.	7-10.		1		Bentonite/portland grout from ground surface to 10 ft bgs	_ 1195
Silty Clay       reddish brown to orange       Cont. (Bulk 10-14)       3,4,6       1       11.5-1       1         15       1       1       5       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	- 10		Silty Clay;	SPT	10-11. 5	3,4,6	1.5		Bentonite pellet seal	
15       Cont.       15-20       0.5       from 13 ft to 25 ft bgs         20       Clayey Sand; orange       SPT       20-21.       10.22, 20-21.       1.5         20       Clayey Sand; orange       Cont.       21.5-2 5       10,22, 20-21.       10,22, 20-21.       10.5         25       Cont.       21.5-2 5       1       10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40       1180         25       Silty Clay; reddish brown       Cont.       25-30       4       4       10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40       1180		Silty Clay	reddish brown to orange	Cont. (Bulk 10-14)	11.5-1 5	3,4,6	1		ft bgs Sand filter pack	  1190
20 - Clayey Sand Clayey Sand; orange Clayey Sand; orange Cont. $21.5-2 - 5 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1.5 - 20 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 1 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 20 - 10.22, 2$	15 — — —			Cont.	15-20		0.5		from 13 ft to 25 ft bgs	
Clayey Sand Clayey Sand; orange 25 Cont. SPT SPT SPT 20-21. 10.22, 20 1.5 20 1.5 20 1.5 20 1.5 20 1.5 20 1 10,22, 20 1 10,22, 20 1 10,22, 20 1 10,22, 20 1 10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40 PVC sreen Installed depth = 25' bgs End Cap 1177 1180 1177 1180 1177 1180 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177 1177	 20 —	-			00.01	10.00				1185 
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-	Clayey Sand	Clayey Sand;	SPT	20-21. 5	10.22, 20	1.5	2 <mark>2.1</mark> 9		-
25 - Silty Clay; reddish brown - Silty Clay; reddish brown - Silty Clay; -	- - -		ordige	Cont.	21.5-2 5	20	1		10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40 PVC sreen	 1180
Silty Clay with orange	25 — - - -	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; reddish brown with orange	Cont. (Bulk 25-27)	25-30		4		Installed depth = 25' bgs End Cap	
30	30 — _		and light gray mottling, hard, dry	SPT	30-31. 5	35,50/ 2"	8"			

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	EB-3/	PZ-8	SHEET NU/	MBER: 2 of 2
	1121	9 Richardson Drive				P. Carr	Movers		114
	Nor	th Little Rock, AR				G: CME-	55 Ria	TOC ELEVATION: NA	4.1 11
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING	METHOD: A	uger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 60 1	bgs
PRC	DJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R: Ander	rson	LOCATION:	
PROJE	ECT NUMBER: 162	219107.00		_		Engine	eering	NORTHING: 182862	2.63 18.47
PROJEC	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SA AA DI IN		Consu Sample	r/Split Spoon	WATER IFVEL: 23 1	R4 fbas
	START DATE: 3/6	0/2020		BOR		R: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 118	0.76 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/9	2/2020		,	WELL DIAMETE	R: NA		WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/1	3/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
_				31.5-3	35,	0.5"			
_			Cont.	5	<u>_50/2</u>	0.5		Radifilled baring 25	1170
35 —		Sand; reddish						ft to total depth (60	
_	Sand	brown to	SPT	35-36. 5	50/6"	0.5		ft bgs)	
_		brown, tine arained. wet			50/6"				_
_		g							_
_	Trininini nini nini	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							1165
40 —		Silty Clay;							_
-	Silty Clay	reddish brown with thin aray	SPT	41-41		2"			-
-		silt seams		$\frac{11}{5}$	50/2"				_
-		Sandstone:			\ <u>50/2"</u> /				-
-	Sandstone	reddish brown							— 1160
45 —		to tan							-
-		-	CDT	46-47.	EO // "	0.5			—
-			581	5	50/6	0.5	- 20 20		-
_									-
									— 1155
50 —									
		Silty Clay, reddish brown	SPT	51-51.	50/5"	5"			_
	Silty Clay	to brown with		<u>5</u>					
		some gray silt							1150
55 —		seams							- 1150
		_							
_		-	SPT	56-56.	50/2"				
_									
_									1145
60 —								TD Drilled 60' bgs	_
_									_
_									_
-									_
_									
THE STR		S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE							
BOUND	ARY LINES BETWE	EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A	CTUAL						

11219 Richardson Drive North Little Rock, AR     DRILLER: Garry Moyers     SURFACE ELEVATION: 12 DRILLING RIG: CME-55 Rig       CLIENT: WCA of Oklahoma, LLC     DRILLING METHOD: Auger/Wash Rotary     WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56       PROJECT NAME: Northeast C&D Landfill     DRILLING METHOD: Auger/Wash Rotary     WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56       PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00     DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anderson     LOCATION: Engineering     NORTHING: 18326       PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00     EASTING: 21502     Consultants, Inc.     EASTING: 21502       GEOLOGIST: Robert Fowler     SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon     WATER LEVEL: 24       START DATE: 3/10/2020     BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"     WATER ELEVATION: 11       FINISH DATE: 3/11/2020     WELL DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"     MONITORING WELL       0     Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets     Somple Type     Sample Bepth     Blow     Sometors       0     Silty Clay; reddish brown to orange     Somple Cont.     1.5-5     3.5     Backfilled boring 0 to TD (56 ft bgs)	
North Little Rock, AR     Diklitik Oditry Moyers     Source Litration: 12       CLIENT: WCA of Oklahoma, LLC     DRILLING RIG: CME-55 Rig     TOC ELEVATION: NA       PROJECT NAME: Northeast C&D Landfill     DRILLING METHOD: Auger/Wash Rotary     WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56       PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00     DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anderson     LOCATION: 56       PROJECT LOCATION: Spencer, Oklahoma     DRILLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon     WATER LEVEL: 24       GEOLOGIST: Robert Fowler     SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon     WATER LEVEL: 24       START DATE: 3/10/2020     BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"     WATER LEVEL: 24       PEPTH     LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION     Sample Type     Sample Depth     Blow     Difference       0     Silty Clay:     SiltyClay;     SiltyClay;     SiltyClay;     SiltyClay;     SiltyClay;     SiltyClay;     Source       5     SiltyClay:     SiltyClay;     SiltyClay;     Cont.     1.5-5     3.5     Backfilled boring 0       6     Cont.     1.5-5     3.5     Source     Backfilled boring 0     to TD (56 ft bgs)       0     SiltyClay:     SiltyClay;     Cont.     1.5-5     3.5     Source     Source	704
CLIENT: WCA of Oklahoma, LLC     DRILLING METHOD: Auger/Wash Rotary     WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56       PROJECT NAME: Northeast C&D Landfill     DRILLING METHOD: Auger/Wash Rotary     WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56       PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00     DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anderson     LOCATION:       PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00     Engineering     NORTHING: 18326       PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00     Engineering     NORTHING: 18326       PROJECT LOCATION: Spencer, Oklahoma     Consultants, Inc.     EASTING: 21502       GEOLOGIST: Robert Fowler     SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon     WATER LEVEL: 24       START DATE: 3/10/2020     BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"     WATER LEVATION: 11       FINISH DATE: 3/11/2020     WELL DIAMETER: NA     WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/       DEPTH (FT)     LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION     Semple Type     Semple Depth     Blow Counts     Blow Depth     MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION     MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES       0     Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets     SPT     0-1.5     4,7,8     1.5     Backfilled boring 0 to TD (56 ft bgs)       5     Silty Clay; reddish brown to orange     Cont.     1.5-5     3.5     3.5     Backfilled boring 0 to TD (56 ft bgs)	)/.9 TT
PROJECT NAME: Northeast C&D Landfill       DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anderson       LOCATION:         PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00       Engineering       NORTHING: 18326         PROJECT LOCATION: Spencer, Oklahoma       Consultants, Inc.       EASTING: 21502         GEOLOGIST: Robert Fowler       SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon       WATER LEVEL: 24         START DATE: 3/10/2020       BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"       WATER LEVEL: 3/         FINISH DATE: 3/11/2020       WELL DIAMETER: NA       WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/         DEPTH (FT)       LITHOLOGY       LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION       Semple Type       Blow Counts       Semple Semple       Blow Counts       Semple Semple       Blow Counts       MONITORING WELL construction       MONITORING WELL construction       MONITORING WELL construction       MONITORING WELL construction         0       Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets       SPT       0-1.5       4,7,8       1.5       Backfilled boring 0 to TD (56 ft bgs)       Monitore indexet groundwater       elevation was obtained	fbas
PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00       Engineering Consultants, Inc.       NORTHING: 18326 EASTING: 21502         PROJECT LOCATION: Spencer, Oklahoma       SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon       WATER LEVEL: 24         GEOLOGIST: Robert Fowler       SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon       WATER LEVEL: 24         START DATE: 3/10/2020       BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"       WATER ELEVATION: 11         FINISH DATE: 3/11/2020       WELL DIAMETER: NA       WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/         DEPTH (FT)       LITHOLOGY       Sample Type       Sample Type       Blow Counts       Blow Counts       MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION       MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION         0       Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets       SPT       0-1.5       4,7,8       1.5       Backfilled boring O to TD (56 ft bgs)         5       Silty Clay; reddish brown to orange       Cont.       1.5-5       3.5       Backfilled boring O to TD (56 ft bgs)       With bentonite plug once stabilized groundwater       elevation was obtained	
GEOLOGIST: Robert Fowler       SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler/Split Spoon       WATER LEVEL: 24         START DATE: 3/10/2020       BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"       WATER ELEVATION: 11         FINISH DATE: 3/11/2020       WELL DIAMETER: NA       WATER ELEVATION: 11         DEPTH (FT)       LITHOLOGY       LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION       Sample Type       Sample Depth       Blow Counts       Blow Coun	1.62 12.06
START DATE: 3/10/2020       BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"       WATER ELEVATION: 11         FINISH DATE: 3/11/2020       WELL DIAMETER: NA       WATER ELEVATION: 11         DEPTH (FT)       LITHOLOGY       LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION       Sample Type       Sample Depth       Blow Counts       Blow Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets       Monitoring WELL construction       Monitoring WELL construction       Monitoring O to TD (56 ft bgs)         0       Silty Clay; 5       Silty Clay; 5       Silty Clay; reddish brown to orange       SPT       0-1.5       4,7,8       1.5       Backfilled boring O to TD (56 ft bgs)	41 fbgs
FINISH DATE: 3/11/2020     WELL DIAMETER: NA     WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/       DEPTH (FT)     LITHOLOGY     LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION     Sample Type     Sample Depth     Blow Counts     Blow Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets     MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION     MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION     MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES       0     Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets     SPT     0-1.5     4,7,8     1.5     Backfilled boring 0 to TD (56 ft bgs) with bentonite plug once stabilized groundwater elevation was obtained	33.5 ft
DEPTH (FT)       LITHOLOGY       LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION       Sample Type       Sample Depth       Blow Counts       Blow Counts       Blow Construction       MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION       MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES         0	2/2020
0	ELEVATION (FT)
Silty Clay     SiltyClay;       reddish brown     Cont.       to orange         Cont.         3.5         with bentonite plug       once stabilized       groundwater       elevation was       obtained	_
5 reddish brown to orange obtained	1205 
Conf. 5-10. 1.5	 
10 Clayey Sand; Clayey Sand to orange, fine grained Cont.	
Sandstone     Sandstone; tan       to brown,     10-12.       15     Competant	1195 
Cont. 15-20. 3 Shelby Tube attemped pushed 1" and crushed tube	  1190 
Silty Clay with orange and gray silty seams Cont. 20-25. 1 24.4T	  1185 
25 Cont. 25-26.	
Cont. 26-30. 2" Wet @ 28' bgs	 1180 
SPT 30-31. 39,50/ 8"	
Clayey Sand;	1175 
Clayey Sand reddish brown THE STRATIFICATION LINES REPRESENT APPROXIMATE BOUNDARY LINES BETWEEN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: ACTUAL TRANSITIONS MAY BE GRADUAL	

S	SCS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	EB-4		SHEET NUA	ABER: 2 of 2
	1121	9 Richardson Drive			DDILLE				7.0.6
	Nor	th Little Rock. AR				<u>K:Garry</u> CMF-/	<u>/ Moyers</u> 55 Ria		/.9 tt ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC				uger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56 f	bas
F	ROJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anders			LOCATION:	- 9 ⁻
PRC	DJECT NUMBER: 162	219107.00		_		Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183261	.62
PROJ	ECT LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 215021	2.06
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	pert Fowler		SAMPLIN	IG METHOD: 5	Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 24.4	11 fbgs
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	1/2020			NG DIAMETE VELL DIAMETE	<u>R: 8.25</u> R: NA	/4.25	WATER ELEVATION: 118 WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/1	$\frac{3.5 \text{ ff}}{2/2020}$
		1/2020				2			2/2020
DEPT (FT)		LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVE (ff)		MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
	_	to orange, fine						Switched to Wash	_
		gruined						Rotary at 36 tt bgs	- 1170
	_								_
40 -	_								_
		_							_
			SPT	41-42. 5	50/2"	2"			_
				5				Hard drilling at 43'	1165
									_
45 -		Silty Clay;							
43		to brown with							
	Silty Clay	thin	SPT	46-47.	50/2"	1"			
		interbedded		5	,				1160
		layering							
50									_
50 -								Hard drilling,	_
		Sandstone	SPT	51-52.	50/2"	0		sandstone pieces in	
		reddish brown		5				cuttings	1155
	Sanastone	to tan, hard							
		competant							_
55 -								TD Drilled 56' bgs	_
				56-56.	50/2" /	0			_
				<u>2</u>					1150
40									_
80 -									
1									
1									
1									
THES		S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE							
BOUN	NDARY LINES BETWE	EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A	CTUAL						
IRAN	ISTIONS MAY BE GR	ADUAL							

	CS EI	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO .:	EB-5		SHEET NU/	MBER: 1 of 1
	11219	Richardson Drive			DOUL				
	Nort	h Little Rock, AR				:K:Garry	/ Moyers		2.3 tt
		A of Oklahoma UC					JJ KIG	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 11 4	tt Shac
PRO		theast C&D Landfill				R. Ander		bgs	
PROJEC	CT NUMBER: 162	19107.00			contracte	Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183910	).96
PROJECT	LOCATION: Spei	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 214826	69.44
G	EOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	NG METHOD: S	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 3.02	2 fbgs
5	START DATE: $3/2$	7/2020		BOR	NG DIAMETI	ER: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 115	9.31 ft
F	INISH DATE: $3/2$	7/2020			WELL DIAMETI	ER: 2"		WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/3	1/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ft)		MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
0 _	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; dark brown with	SPT	0-1.5	WH,1, 1	8"			
  5	Sandy Clay	rootlets Sandy Clay; dark brown, fine grained sand, gravels	Cont.	1.5-5	-	4	3.02	Wet @ 4.5' bgs	1160  
		<5%	Cont.	5-10.		0.5			1155 1155
_	Clayey Sand	dark brown to							_
10 —		course grained	SPT	10-11. 5	3,3,3	1.5		Backfilled boring 0 to TD (31 ft bgs)	_
- - 15 -			Cont.	11.5-1 5		4	-	with bentonite plug once stabilized groundwater elevation was obtained	1150 
-	Sand	Sand; brown to orange, fine to course grained, gravels <5%	Cont.	15-20.		2.5			1145 
20 _			SPT	20-21.	50/5"	5"		Switched to Wash	—
				5				Rotary at 20 ft bgs	1140 
25 —		Silty Clay;							
		reddish brown		26-27.	22.50/				
  30	Silty Clay	with light gray clay, some thinly bedded cemented sandstone	SPT	5	5"	10"			1135  
			SPT	31-21	50/4"	2"		TD Drillad 21' has	
			<u> </u>	1 31-31.		<b>↓</b>	1 L	sga וג palling of	

S	CS EI	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	EB-6		SHEET NU	MBER: 1 of 2
	11219	Richardson Drive			DDUU				
	Nort	h Little Rock. AR				<u>:K:Garry</u> C. CME	<u>/ Moyers</u> 55 Pia		20.6 ft ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC				uger/V	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 46	fbas
PR	OJECT NAME: Nort	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING		R:Ande	rson	LOCATION:	
PROJ	ECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engine	eering	NORTHING: 18340	3.46
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	ltants, Inc.	EASTING: 21492	/4.23
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	IG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 13.	39 tbgs
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	7/2020			WELL DIAMETE	: <u>k: 0.25</u> :R: NA	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2	5/2020	
DEPTH	<u></u>	,		Samala	Plan	CERY			ELEVATION
(FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Туре	Depth	Counts	(F	CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	(FT)
0 -	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets	SPT	0-1.5	1,1,1	1.5	-		- 1190 -
			Cont. (Bulk 0-5)	1.5-5		3			
5 -	Sandy Clay	Sandy Clay; brown to	SPT	5-6.5	6,7,10	1.5		Backfilled boring 0 to TD (46 ft bgs)	1185 
-		Clayey Sand; orange to	Cont.	6.5-10		2.5		with bentonite plug once stabilized groundwater elevation was	
- 10	-	Clayey Sand; orange to	SPT	10-11. 5	50/3"	2"		obtained	— 1180
-	Clayey Sand	orange to reddish brown, fine to medium grianed	Cont.	11.5-1 5		1	13.39	5', pushed 1" and crushed tube	_
15 —	-	-	SPT	15-16. 5	50/4"	4"			1175 
-			Cont.	16.5-2 0		1			_
20 —			SPT	20-21. 5	50/6"	6"			1170
- - -		Sand; orange to reddish brown , fine	Cont. (Bulk 20-25)	21.5-2 5		3.5			_
25 — - -		grained, saturated at 20.5' bgs						Wet @ 28' has	— 1165 — —
-									
30 —	-	-	SPT	31-31	50/6"	0		Switched to Wash Rotary at 30 ft bas	1160
-	-			5					
-	-								
-									
35 —	_								1155
	RATIFICATION LINES	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE	CTUAL				i biolo i olori l		
TRANSI	TIONS MAY BE GR.	ADUAL							

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF	BORING NO.	EB-6		SHEET NU	MBER: 2 of 2	
	11219	9 Richardson Drive			יוומס				044	
	Nor	th Little Rock. AR				<u>C.CMF</u>	<u>y Moyers</u>	TOC FLEVATION: NA ft		
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC				Juger/V	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 46	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 46 fbgs	
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	)R:Ande	erson	LOCATION:		
PRO.	IECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engin	eering	NORTHING: 18340	3.46	
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	ultants, Inc.	EASTING: 21492	74.23	
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPL	NG METHOD:	5' Sampl	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 13.	39 fbgs	
	START DATE: 3/1	7/2020		BOF	RING DIAMET	ER: 8.25	"/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 117	77.23 ft	
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	//2020			WELL DIAMEI			WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2	25/2020	
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVER (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)	
_			SPT	36-37.	50/3"	3"			—	
_		-		5	,				-	
_									-	
40		Silty Clay;								
40 —	<u>perferen</u> ;	with aray							1150	
_	Silty Clay	mottling, some	CDT	41-42.	50/4"	<b>/</b> "				
-		small sandstone	Jr I	5	30/4	4	- 1888 - 1889			
-		gravels								
-										
45 —								TD Drilled 16' bas	1145	
-			SPT	46-46.	50/2"	1"		TD Diffied 40 bgs	1145	
-	_			5			1			
-										

S	CS EI	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	EB-7		SHEET NU	MBER: 1 of 2
	11219	Richardson Drive							2276
	Nort	h Little Rock. AR				<u>(K:Garr</u> )	<u>/ Moyers</u> 55 Pia	TOC ELEVATION: NA	/ <u>3./ ††</u> f+
		A of Oklahoma IIC					Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 53	5 fbas
PR	OJECT NAME: Nort	heast C&D Landfill		DRILLING		R:Ander	rson	LOCATION:	0 18 95
PROJ	ECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183206.75	
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spei	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	ltants, Inc.	EASTING: 21483	29.74
	GEOLOGIST: Robe	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	IG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 24.92 fbgs	
	START DATE 3/2	/2020		BOR	NG DIAMETE	<u>R: 8.25"</u>	WAIER ELEVATION: 110	58./8 tt	
	FINISH DATE: 3/3	/ 2020				:r:INA ≿	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/3	5/2020	
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVE (ff)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
0 –	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; brown with	SPT	0-1.5	4, 6, 8	1.5			
		black organics (topsoil)	Cont.	1.5-5		3			 1190 
	Clay	Clay; reddish brown	Bulk	5-10.		2.5			  1185
10 —	Ciuy		SPT	10-11.	455	1.5		Backfilled boring 0	
- - - 15			Cont.	5 11.5-1 5	-, 3, 3	2		to TD (53.5 ft bgs) with bentonite plug once stabilized groundwater elevation was obtained	  1180 
	Sandy Clay-	Sandy Clay; reddish brown	Cont.	15-20		1.25			_ _ 11 <b>75</b> _
20			Shelby	20-21					_
		Sand: orange	SPT	21-22.	12,	1			_
	Sand	to tan, unconsolidated	Cont.	5 22.5-2 5	18, 17	1	24.92		1170
25 — _ _ _	Weathered Sandstone	Weathered Sandstone; tan to brown, friable, slight mosture not saturated	Cont.	25-30		5		Very hard drilling @ 25' Wet @ 28' bgs	  1165
30 — - - 35 —			Cont.	30-35		3.5			  1160 
THE STR BOUND TRANSI	ATIFICATION LINES ARY LINES BETWEE TIONS MAY BE GRA	5 REPRESENT APPROXIMATE IN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A ADUAL	CTUAL						<u> </u>

PROJECT N PROJECT LOO GEO STAF	11219 Nort CLIENT: WC/ CT NAME: Nort NUMBER: 162 DCATION: Sper	P Richardson Drive h Little Rock, AR A of Oklahoma, LLC heast C&D Landfill 19107.00		DRILLING	DRIL DRILLING G METHOD: CONTRACT	<u>.LER: Garry</u> RIG: CME Auger/M	/ Moyers 55 Rig /ash Rotary	SURFACE ELEVATION: 1 1 9 TOC ELEVATION: NA WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 53.5	3.7 ft ft 5 fbgs	
PROJECT PROJECT LO PROJECT LO GEO STAF	CLIENT: WC CLIENT: WC CT NAME: Nort NUMBER: 162 OCATION: Sper	h Liffle Kock, AK A of Oklahoma, LLC heast C&D Landfill 19107.00		DRILLING	DRILLING G METHOD: CONTRACT	RIG: CME Auger/W	55 Rig /ash Rotary	TOC ELEVATION: NA WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 53.5	ft 5 fbgs	
PROJEC PROJECT 10 PROJECT LOG GEO STAF FINIS	CLIENT: WC/ CT NAME: Nort NUMBER: 162 DCATION: Sper	A of Oklahoma, LLC heast C&D Landfill 19107.00		DRILLING	<u>G METHOD:</u> CONTRACT	Auger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 53.5	5 fbgs	
PROJECT N PROJECT N PROJECT LOU GEO STAF	CT NAME: Nort NUMBER: 162 OCATION: Sper	heast C&D Landfill 19107.00		DRILLING	CONTRACT	OR Ander	an a		WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 53.5 fbgs	
PROJECT ( PROJECT LO GEO STAF	NUMBER: 162 OCATION: Sper	19107.00	PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00					LOCATION:		
PROJECT LO GEO STAI	CATION: Sper	<u> </u>				Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183206	6.75	
GEO STAI FINIS		ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 214832	29.74	
STA: FINIS	DLOGIST: Robe	ert Fowler		SAMPLI	NG METHOD	: 5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 24.9	92 fbgs	
FINIS	RT DATE: $3/2$	/2020		BOR	RING DIAME	TER: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 116	8.78 ft	
	SH DATE: $3/3$	/2020			WELL DIAME	TER: NA		WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/5	/2020	
DEPTH (FT) LI	ITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ft)		MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)	
	Sand	Sand; reddish brown to orange, unconsolidated	Cont.	35-40		4			 1155 	
			Cont.	40-45		0		Sampler stuck within augers, could not open sampler	  1150	
45 —			SPT	45-46.		2"		Switched to Wash		
	-Clay	Clay; reddish brown, hard dry						Kotary	 1145	
		Silty Clay							1145	
50 —	Silty Clay	reddish brown with thin light	SPT	50-51. 5		3"			_	
		gray to tan seams	SPT	52-53. 5				TD Drillad 52 5' bac	_	
 55		gray							1140 	

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF E	ORING NO.:	EB-8/	/PZ-9	SHEET NUA	ABER: 1 of 3
	1121	9 Richardson Drive				Garn	Movers	SUPEACE FLEVATION, 1 20	2 2 ft
	Nor	th Little Rock, AR				CME-	55 Ria	TOC ELEVATION: 120	6.1 ft
	CLIENT: WO	CA of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING	G METHOD: AU	Jger/V	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 71 f	bgs
PR	OJECT NAME: Noi	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTOR	R:Ande	rson	LOCATION:	
PRO.	ECT NUMBER: 162	219107.00		_		Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183332.65 FASTING: 2147872.18	
PROJEC	GEOLOGIST: Rob	encer, Okianoma		SAMPIII		Sample	or /Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 40 6	2.10
	START DATE: 3/2	25/2020		BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"				WATER ELEVATION: 116	2.67 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/2	25/2020			WELL DIAMETER	R: NA	1	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2	6/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ff)		MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
_	_								_
-	_							Stick Up (2.78 ft)	1205
-	_							Protective Cover	
o —		Classes eilt						Concrete Pad	
-	_Clayey Silt	brown, with	SPT	0-1.5	2,2,2	1		(Approximately 6")	
-		some rootlets			2,2,2				_
-			Cont.	1.5-5		3			- 1200
-									_
5 —									_
			Shelby	5-7.					_
-		Silty Clay;						2 in dia. Sch. 40	—
-	Silty Clay	reddish brown, with some fine	Cont.	7-10.		1		PVC soild riser from	— 1195
-		sand (<10%)						0 - 30 ft bgs	-
10 —			SPT	10-11.	2.3.5	1.5		Portland/Bentonite	-
			-	5	2.3.5			grout from ground	-
_				11.5-1				surface to 25 ff bgs	-
_			Cont.	5		2			
15 —									_
-			SPT	15-16. 5	4,10,1	1.5			
-	-	Clayey sand;			4,10,1				_
-	Clayey Sand	fine grained	Cont. (Bulk	16.5-2	2_/	2			1185
	-	sands	15-20)	0					_
20 —				20-21.	5.12.1				_
	-		SPT	5	8	1			_
-	-				5,12,1				<b>—</b>
-	-		Cont.	21.5-2 5		1.5			— 1180
-	-			·					-
25 —	-		SPT	25-26.	11,23,	1.5		Bentonite pellet seal	-
		Sand; tan to		5	29			from 25 ft bgs to	-
<b>_</b>	Sand	coarse to fine		26.5-3	29	_		27.5 ft bgs	—
_	_	grained, trace	Cont.	0		1			1175
30 —	_	amounts of clay		00.0-					
- 1	_		SPT	30-31. 5	50/5"	2"		Sand filter pack	
<u> </u>								trom 27.5 ft to 40 ft	
THE STI	RATIFICATION LINE	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE	CTUAL						
TRANS	TIONS MAY BE GR	RADUAL							

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF E	BORING NO.:	EB-8/	/PZ-9	SHEET NU	MBER: 2 of 3
	1121	9 Richardson Drive			DDULLE				
	Nor	th Little Rock, AR				<u>:K:Garry</u> G.CMF-	<u>/ Moyers</u> 55 Ria	TOC FLEVATION: 1.20	) <u>3.3 ft</u> )6 1 ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING	G METHOD: A	uger/V	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 71	fbgs
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ande	rson	LOCATION:	
PRO.	JECT NUMBER: 162	219107.00				Engin	eering	NORTHING: 183332.65	
PROJEC	CT LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma		CAMDII			litants, inc.	WATER LEVEL 40	12.10
	START DATE: 3/2	25/2020		BOR	ING MEIHODES	- Sample R. 8 25"	// 25"	WATER ELEVATION: 116	51 15gs 52.67 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/2	25/2020			WELL DIAMETE	R: NA	/0	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2	26/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
	_		Cont.	31.5-3 5	<u>50/5"</u>	2		bgs	1170
35 — -		Silty Clay;	SPT	35-36. 5	18,17, 50/2"	1			_
-	Silty Clay	reddish brown to brown	Cont.	36.5-4 0	18,17, 50/2"	2		10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40 PVC sreen	1165
40 — _	Sandstone	to brown, competant	SPT	40-41. 5	50/1"	1"	- -	End Cap Installed depth =	_
-		Sand; reddish	Cont.	41.5-5 0	50/1"	4		40 bgs Wet at 42' bgs	_ 1160 
45 — _			SPT	45-46. 5	50/5"	4"			_
- - 50 —	Sand	brown to tan; fine grained with some sandstone gravels							1155 
-		-	SPT	51-52. 5	50/2"	0			
-					50/2"				
55 — –			SPT	56-57.	50/3"	1"	-	Backfilled boring 40 ft to total depth (71	
_		-		5	50/3"			ft bgs)	— — 1145
60 —									_
_		Silty Clay; reddish brown with liaht gray	SPT	61-62. 5	50/2"	1"	- 000		 
- 65 — -	Silty Clay	silt seams, some thin interbedded sandstones							
		-	SPT	66-67. 5	50/3"	3"			
THE STI BOUNE TRANSI	RATIFICATION LINE DARY LINES BETWE ITIONS MAY BE GR	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A	CTUAL						

SCS ENGINEERS	LOG OF BORING NO.: EB-8/PZ-9	SHEET NUMBER: 3 of 3	
11219 Richardson Drive			
North Little Rock, AR	DRILLER: Garry Moyers	TOC ELEVATION: 1203.3 ft	
CLIENT: WCA of Oklahoma, LLC	DRILLING METHOD: Auger/Wash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 71 fbgs	
PROJECT NAME: Northeast C&D Landfill	DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anderson	LOCATION:	
PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00	Engineering	NORTHING: 183332.65	
CFOLOGIST: Robert Fowler	SAMPLING METHOD: 5' Sampler /Split Speen	WATER IEVEL: 40.61 fbgs	
START DATE: 3/25/2020	BORING DIAMETER: 8.25"/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 1162.67 ft	
FINISH DATE: 3/25/2020	WELL DIAMETER: NA	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/26/2020	
DEPTH (FT) LITHOLOGY LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION Sample Type	ample Blow G & MONITORING WELL Depth Counts O CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ ELEVATION DRILLING NOTES (FT)	
70	71-71. <u>50/2"</u> 0 <u>5</u> 50/2"	TD Drilled 71' bgs	
THE STRATIFICATION LINES REPRESENT APPROXIMATE			

S	CS EI	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	EB-9		SHEET NU	MBER: 1 of 2
	11219	Richardson Drive							))) (I
	Nort	h Little Rock, AR				<u>:K:Garry</u> G•CMF-	<u>/ Moyers</u> 55 Ria	TOC FIFVATION: NA	ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING	METHOD: A	uaer/V	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 51	fbas
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ande	rson	LOCATION:	- 0-
PROJ	ECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engin	eering	NORTHING: 18376	4.22
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 21497	/4.//
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	NG METHOD:	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon		69 fbgs
	FINISH DATE: 3/3	1/2020		BOR	WELL DIAMET	<u>:K:8.∠⊃</u> ER: 2"	WATER LEVEL DATE: 4/1	/2020	
		.,				ERY I		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
(FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOV (ff)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	(FT)
0 _	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets	SPT	0-1.5	5,5,5	1.5			1200
_			<b>C</b> .			0.5			
_			Conf.	1.5-5		3.5			_
5 —	Clay	brown to			-				_
_		orange							_
_			Cont.						- 1195
_			(Bulk 5-8)	5-10.		2.5			_
_	Clavey Sand	clayey Sand; reddish brown	5-0)						_
10 —		to orange, fine		10.11	7.00.4				_
_		grained	SPT	5	5	1.5		to TD (51 ft bors)	_
-								with bentonite plug	— 1190
-			Cont.	11.5-1		2.5		once stabilized	_
		reddish brown		5				groundwater	_
15 —	Silty Clay	with orange			-			elevation was	_
-		and gray						obtained	_
-		rootlets	Cont	15.00		4			— 1185
-			Com.	13-20.		4			_
-									_
20 —		Clayey Sand:		20-21.	30.50/	0"			—
-	Clayey Sand	dark brown	SPI	5	2"	8			—
-		with thin							
-		cememed layers	Cont.	21.5-2		3			_
-				5					_
25 —	-				-				—
-	-							Wet @ 26' bas	—
_	-		Cont.	25-30.		1		<u> </u>	
	-	Sand; reddish							_
_	Sand	brown to							_
30 —		cemented layers	SPT	30-31.	50/3"	.3"		Switched to Wash	
		-		5				Rotary at 30 ft bgs	
_									
35	_								
55									
THE STR	ATIFICATION LINE								
BOUND TRANSI	OARY LINES BETWEE TIONS MAY BE GR.	EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A ADUAL	CTUAL						
L	51								

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO .:	EB-9		SHEET NU	MBER: 2 of 2
	1121 Nor CLIENT: WC	9 Richardson Drive th Little Rock, AR CA of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLINC	DRILLE DRILLING RIC G METHOD: A	<u>R:Garry</u> G:CME-5 uger/W	Moyers 5 Rig ash Rotary	SURFACE ELEVATION: 1 2C TOC ELEVATION: NA WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 51	12 ft ft fbgs
PR PROJ PROJEC	DJECT NAME: Nor ECT NUMBER: 162 T LOCATION: Spe	theast C&D Landfill 219107.00 ncer, Oklahoma		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R: Anders Engine Consul	son ering tants, Inc.	LOCATION: NORTHING: 183764.22 EASTING: 2149774.77	
	GEOLOGIST: Rob START DATE: 3/3 FINISH DATE: 3/3	ert Fowler 30/2020 31/2020		SAMPLIN BOR	NG METHOD: 5 ING DIAMETE WELL DIAMETE	' Sampleı <u>R: 8.25"</u> / R: 2"	r/Split Spoon (4.25"	WATER LEVEL: 22.69 fbgs WATER ELEVATION: 1179.31 ft WATER LEVEL DATE: 4/1/2020	
DEPTH (FT)	DEPTH (FT) LITHOLOGY LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION Sample Type				Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ff)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
40 —   45 — 	Clayey Sand	Clayey Sand; reddish brown to orange	SPT SPT SPT	36-37. 5 41-42. 5	50/5" 50/2" 50/2"	5" 2"			1165           
50	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; reddish brown with interbedded sandstone layers	SPT	<u>5</u> 51-51. <u>5</u>	50/3"			TD Drilled 51' bgs	- - - - 1150

S	CS EI	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO .:	PZ-1		SHEET NUA	ABER: 1 of 2
	11219	Richardson Drive							404
	Nort	h Little Rock, AR				G. CMF-	55 Ria	TOC FLEVATION: 1.21	0.9 ft 6 9 ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC			S METHOD: A	uaer/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 61.5	5 fbas
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ander	son	LOCATION:	
PROJ	ECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engine	eering	NORTHING: 182844	.43
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	ltants, Inc.	EASTING: 2150429.36	
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	NG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 27.8	39 fbgs
	START DATE: 3/1	2/2020		BOR	ING DIAMET	: <u>R: 8.25 ~</u> :R: ク"	/4.25	WATER LEVATION: 118	3.73 TT
	THRIGH DATE. O/ T	2/2020				<u>ک</u>			5/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVE (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
-	-							Stick Up (3.10 ft) Protective Cover	  1215
0 —		Silty Clay; dark						Concrete Pad	
-	Silty Clay	brown with						(Approximately 6)	_
-		rootlets	Cont.	0-5		5		arout from around	_
-								surface to 25 ft bas	-
	Clav	Clay; dark						Bentonite pellet seal	1210
5 —		brown, fat						from 25 ft bgs to 28	_
-								ft bgs	_
-		Silty Clay;	Cont.	5-10.		3		Sand filter pack from 28 ft to 40 ft bgs	 1205
10 — - -	Silty Clay	orange and gray mottling	Cont. (Bulk 10-13)	10-15.	-	3			
- 15 — -	Sand	Sand; orange to tan with some thin cemented layers			-			2 in dia. Sch. 40 PVC soild riser from	1200 
- - 20 —	-	Clauser Sand	Cont.	15-20	-	2		0 - 30 ft bgs	 1195 
-	Clayey Sand	reddish brown, fine grained with some cemented layering	Cont.	20-25		1			  1190
25 — _ _ _	Silty Clay	Silty Clay, reddish brown	Cont.	25-30	-	2	27.89		
 30 —		to gray, thinly bedded and competent.			-			Backfilled boring 40 ft to total depth (61.5 ft bas)	
	Clavey Sand	Clayey Sand;						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
THE STR BOUNE TRANSI	ATIFICATION LINES ARY LINES BETWEE TIONS MAY BE GR.	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A ADUAL	CTUAL						

>	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO .:	PZ-1		SHEET NU	MBER: 2 of 2
	11219	9 Richardson Drive			יוומס				40 fr
	Nor	th Little Rock. AR				<u>:K:Garry</u>	<u>/ Moyers</u> 55 Pia		6.9 ft
		A of Oklahoma IIC					/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 61, 5, fbgs	
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING		R: Ander	rson		
PROJ	ECT NUMBER: 162	219107.00				Engine	eering	NORTHING: 182844.43	
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	EASTING: 21504	29.36	
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLI	NG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	WATER LEVEL: 27.	89 fbgs	
	START DATE: 3/1	1/2020		BOR	ING DIAMETE	<u>R: 8.25</u> "	WATER ELEVATION: 118	35.95 ft	
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	2/2020			WELL DIAMETE	R: 2"	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/13/2020		
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVER' (ff)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
		reddish brown	Cont.	30-35		3			
		to orange, tine							1180
_ م ح		at 34 ft bgs						Wet at 34' bgs	
35 —	1						1 ▓▓≣▓▓	10 ft of 2 in dia,	
_	*********	Sandstone; red						0.010 slot, Sch. 40	
	Sandstone	with thin silty	Cont.	35-40		4		PVC sreen	
		competant							
-	-	Sand; orange							- 11/5
40 —		to reddish			1			End Cap	
	Sand	some thin	CDT	41-42.	50 // "			Installed depth = $40'$ have	
	-	consolidated	SPI	5	50/6	6	- 22 23	40 bgs Switchod to Wash	_
-	-	layers						Rotary at 40 ft bas	
									1170
45 —		Clay; reddish							_
-	Clay	brown with thin		46.47			- 22 23		-
-		sandstone	SPT	40-47.	50/2"	0			-
-									_
-	Sandstone	Sandstone; red,							— 1165
50 —		comperant							-
-		_		<b>51 50</b>			- 2000		_
-	66666666		SPT	51-52.	50/5"	5"			_
-									_
-		Silty Clay;							— 1160
55 —	Silty Clay	reddish brown							_
_	<u>Reserve</u>	with gray silty					- 200		_
-		scallis, hara, ary	SPT	56-57.	50/2"	0			_
_		_					- 22 23		_
_									1155
60 —	*************								-
Ѓ –	Clay	Clay; reddish	SPT	60-61.	44,50/	8"		TD Drilled 61.5' bgs	
_		dark aray		<b></b> >	<u> </u>				
_		mottling							_
_									1150
_	1	J		I	1	<u> </u>	J		J 11 <i>5</i>
<u> </u>									
THE STR	ATIFICATION LINE		CTUAL						
TRANSI	TIONS MAY BE GR	ADUAL	CIUAL						

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO .:	PZ-2		SHEET NUA	ABER: 1 of 2
	11219	Richardson Drive			DDUU				0.6
	Nort	h Little Rock, AR				<u>:K:Garry</u> G.CMF_ [/]	<u>Moyers</u> 55 Ria	TOC FLEVATION: 121	0 ft 0 ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING		uger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56.5	i fbgs
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R: Ander	rson	LOCATION:	Ū
PRO.	IECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00		_		Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183891.08	
PROJEC	CEOLOGIST, Pab	ncer, Oklahoma		CAAADUIN		Consu	ITANTS, INC.	WATER LEVEL 23 A	0 fbac
	START DATE: 3/1	2/2020		BOR		-R: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 118	3.7 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	3/2020			WELL DIAMETE	R: 2"	/	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/1	6/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ff)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
-	-							Stick Up (2.78 ft) Protective Cover	1210 
0		Silty Clay; dark brown with rootlets	Cont. (Bulk 2-5)	0-5	-	3		Concrete Pad (Approximately 6") Portland/Bentonite grout from ground surface to 20 ft bgs Bentonite pellet seal from 20 ft bgs to 23	 1205 
- - - 10 —	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; orange with gray mottling	Cont.	5-10.	-	0.5		ft bgs Sand filter pack from 23 ft to 35 ft bgs	1 200 
-			Shelby	10-12.		2			_
-		Silty Clay; reddish brown with gray mottling	Cont.	12-15.		1			
-	Sandy Clay-	Sandy Clay; reddish brown, fine grained	Cont (Bulk	15-20		1		2 in dia. Sch. 40 PVC soild riser from 0 - 25 ft bgs	1190
_ 20 —	Clayey Sand	Clayey Sand; reddish brown, fine grained	(13-17)		-				
-	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; reddish brown with orange and gray mottling	Cont.	20-25		4	23.49 	Wet at 24' bas	1185 
25 — - -			Cont.	25-30		2			  1180 
- 30 — -		Clayey Sand; orange to						Backfilled boring 35 ft to total depth (56.5 ft bgs)	
THE STI BOUNI TRANS	RATIFICATION LINE DARY LINES BETWEE ITIONS MAY BE GR	5 REPRESENT APPROXIMATE EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A ADUAL	CTUAL						

S	SCS ENGINEERS			LOG OF BORING NO.: <b>PZ-2</b>				SHEET NUMBER: 2 of 2	
11219 Richardson Drive									
North Little Rock AR				DRILLER: Garry Moyers				SURFACE ELEVATION: 1210 ft	
							) J KIG (ach Botam)		
CLIENI: WCA of Oklahoma, LLC						R. Ander	son		
PRO	IECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00			CONTRACTO	Engine	ering	NORTHING: 183891.08	
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 2150425.85	
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	NG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	r/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 23.4	49 fbgs
	START DATE: 3/1	2/2020		BOR	ING DIAMETE	R: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 1183.7 ft	
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	3/2020		WELL DIAMETER: 2"				WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/16/2020	
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	ECOVERY (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
		brown, wet at 24'	Cont.	30-35	-	5		10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40 PVC sreen Installed depth = 35' bgs End Cap Switched to Wash Rotary at 35 ft bgs	
- - - 45 —	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; reddish brown with thin gray	SPT	41-42. 5	35,50/ 6"	1	-		_ 1165  
		interbedded sandstones	SPT	46-47. 5	50/2"	ן"			
-	Sandstone	Sandstone; red to tan, competent, dry	SPT	51-52. 5	50/2"	0			 1155 
55 — _ _ _	Silty Clay	Silty Clay, reddish brown with thinly bedded light gray silt seams	SPT	56-56. 5	50/5"	5"		TD Drilled 56.5' bgs	 1150 
- 60 —	-								

	S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	PZ-3		SHEET NUA	ABER: 1 of 2
		11219	P Richardson Drive			DDUU				0.0.6
North Little Rock. AR				DRILLER: Garry Moyers				TOC FLEVATION: 1 198.9 ft		
CLIENT: WCA of Oklahoma. LLC					DRILLING		uger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56 fbas	
PROJECT NAME: Northeast C&D Landfill					DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ander	son	LOCATION:	- Ŭ
PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00							Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183913	8.5
PRC	JEC	LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma		0		Consu	Itants, Inc.		
<u> </u>		STAPT DATE. 3 / 1	ert Fowler			NG METHOD: 5	Sample	er/Split Spoon /4.25"	WATER ELEVEL: 25.58 fbgs	
		FINISH DATE: 3/1	8/2020		DOK	WELL DIAMETE	: <u>R: 0.25</u> :R: 2"	/4.25	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/25/2020	
DE	ртн	, ,	,	Sample	Sample	Blow	VERY I)		, , ,	, ELEVATION
(F	T)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Туре	Depth	Counts	LECO LECO	CONSTRUCTION	DRILLING NOTES	(FT)
0			Silty Clay, dark						Stick Up (3.62 ft) Protective Cover Concrete Pad	  1200 
	_	Cilty Class	brown with	SPT	0-1.5	1,2,5	1.5		(Approximately 6")	
	_		rootlets						Portland/Bentonite	_
	_		brown	Cont.	1.5-5		3		surface to 20 ft bas	—
	_								Bentonite pellet seal	
5		Clay	brown, stiff			-			from 20 ft bgs to 23	
	_			Shelby	5-7.				ft bgs	—
	_	··· <u>···</u> ····	Sandy Clay;			-			Sand filter pack	_
	_	''Samalu Claur	reddish brown	SPT	7.5-9	7,7,13	1.5		trom 23 tt to 35 tt	-
	_		rootlets. high	Cont.	9-10.		1		593	- 1190
10	_		clay content	SPT	10-11.	677	1.5			_
15				Cont.	5 11.5-1 5		3.5			  1185 
	_			SPT	15.25-	50/2"	2"		2 in dia. Sch. 40 PVC soild riser from	_
				Cont.	16.75- 20		3		0 - 25 ft bgs	  1180
20				SPT	20-21.	32,50/	1			_
		Sand	Sand; reddish brown to orange, fine to medium grained, some	Cont.	21.5-2 5		3	- 2 <u>5.5</u> 8		  1175
25			gravels	SPT	25-26. 5	50/6"	4"			_
30				Cont.	26.5-3 0		3		Backfilled boring 35	  1170
30	_			SPT	30-31. 5	50/3"	3"		ft to total depth (56.5 ft bgs)	_
THE BOL TRA	THE STRATIFICATION LINES REPRESENT APPROXIMATE BOUNDARY LINES BETWEEN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: ACTUAL TRANSITIONS MAY BE GRADUAL									

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO .:	PZ-3		SHEET NU/	MBER: 2 of 2
11219 Richardson Drive					ווופט	P. Garry	Movers		
North Little Rock, AR						G: CME-:	55 Rig	TOC ELEVATION: 1 202.5 ft	
CLIENT: WCA of Oklahoma, LLC				DRILLING	METHOD: A	uger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56 fbgs	
PROJECT NAME: Northeast C&D Landfill				DRILLING	CONTRACTC	R:Ander	son	LOCATION:	
PROJ	ECT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engine	ering	NORTHING: 183913	3.5
PROJEC	T LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma		CAAADUIN		Consu	ITANTS, INC.	EASTING: 2149229.41	
GEOLOGIST: Robert Fowler						2.8 25"	r/Split Spoon /4 25"	WATER ELEVATION: 1173.33 ft	
FINISH DATE: 3/18/2020					WELL DIAMETE	R: 2"	/	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/25/2020	
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	(ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
-			Cont.	32-35.		2		10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40 PVC sreen	_ 1165
35 —			SPT	35-36.	50/3"	3"		Wet at 30.5' bgs Installed depth =	_
  40								35' bgs End Cap Switched to Wash Rotary at 35 ft bgs	  1160 
_		-	SPT	41-42. 5	50/2"	2"			_
_ 45 — _	Silty Clay	Silty Clay; reddish brown to brown with thin							— 1155 —
_	Siny city	interbedded sandstone – layering	SPT	46-47. 5	50/2"	2"			_
		, .							— 1150 —
			SPT	51-52. 5	50/3"	3"			_
_ 55 —								TD Drilled 56' bgs	— 1145 —
-			SPT	56-57. 5	50/2"	2"			-
- - 60 —	-								-   1140 
5	CS EI	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO .:	PZ-4		SHEET NUM	ABER: 1 of 2
----------	------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	----------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------
	11219	Richardson Drive							5 2 4
	Nort	h Little Rock, AR				<u>G.CMF-</u>	<u>7 Moyers</u> 55 Ria	TOC ELEVATION: 117	5.3 ft 8.3 ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING		uaer/W	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 35 f	bas
PRO.	JECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ander	rson	LOCATION:	- Ŭ
PROJEC	CT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engine	NORTHING: 183891	.08	
PROJECT	LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 214859	4.06
G	EOLOGIST: ROD	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	NG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon		o tbgs
FI FI	NISH DATE: $3/4$	/2020		BOK	WELL DIAMETE	: <u>K: 8.25</u> :R· 2"	/4.25	WATER LEEVATION: 117	/2020
		/ 2020				2			/ 2020
(FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOV (ff)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
								Stick Up (3.01 ft) Protective Cover	1210 
0	Sandy Clay	Sandy Clay; reddish brown to orange	Cont.	0-5		20		Concrete Pad (Approximately 6") Portland/Bentonite grout from ground surface to 2 ft bgs Bentonite pellet seal from 2 ft bgs to 4 ft	 1205 
		Sand; reddish brown to	Cont. (Bulk 5-10)	5-10.		20		bgs 2 in dia. Sch. 40 PVC soild riser from 0 - 5 ft bgs Sand filter pack	 1200  
	Sand	orange, Saturated at 5' bgs, Coarse grained transitioning to fine grained at 12'	Cont.	10-15.		13		from 4 ft to 15 ft bgs Wet at 6' bgs 10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40 PVC sreen End Cap	 1195 
			Cont.	15-20		40		Installed depth = 15' bgs	1190 
20 —		_		20-21.	42,	33			
		Silty Clay;	Cont.	5 21.5-2 5	50/4"	57			
25 —	Silty Clay	with thin light gray seams.	SPT	25-26. 5	50/2"	11			-  -
		hard							1180
30 — 		-	SPT	30-31. 5	50/2"	11	-	Backfilled boring 15 ft to total depth (35.5 ft bas)	_

SCS ENGINEERS	LOG OF BORING NO.: <b>PZ-4</b>	SHEET NUMBER: 2 of 2	
11219 Richardson Drive	DPILLED Garry Moyors	SUPEACE FLEVATION 1175 2 ft	
North Little Rock, AR	DRILLING RIG: CME-55 Rig	TOC ELEVATION: 1178.3 ft	
CLIENT: WCA of Oklahoma, LLC	DRILLING METHOD: Auger/Wash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 35 fbgs	
PROJECT NAME: Northeast C&D Landfill	DRILLING CONTRACTOR: Anderson	LOCATION:	
PROJECT NUMBER: 16219107.00	Engineering	NORTHING: 183891.08	
PROJECT LOCATION: Spencer, Oklahoma	Consultants, Inc.	WATER LEVEL: 4.96 fbac	
START DATE: 3/4/2020	BORING DIAMETER 8 25" /4 25"	WATER ELEVATION: 1170.36 ft	
FINISH DATE: 3/4/2020	WELL DIAMETER: 2"	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/9/2020	
DEPTH (FT) LITHOLOGY LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION Sample Type	Sample Blow O E MONITORING WELL Depth Counts O CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES (FT)	
35 Clayey Sand Glayey Sand Clayey Sand Clayey Sand with course grained sand	35-36. <u>50/3"</u> 11	TD Drilled 35.5' bgs	
THE STRATIFICATION LINES REPRESENT APPROXIMATE			

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	PZ-5		SHEET NUM	1BER: 1 of 2
	11219	P Richardson Drive				R.Garry	Movers	SURFACE FLEVATION: 117	6.3 ft
	Nor	th Little Rock, AR			DRILLING RI	G: CME-	55 Rig	TOC ELEVATION: 117	9.5 ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLINC	METHOD: A	uger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 35 f	bgs
PRO	DJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill			CONTRACTC	R: Ander	rson	LOCATION:	17
PROJECT	LIOCATION: Spe	ncer. Oklahoma		_		Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 214868	. 17 8.62
TROJEC	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	NG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	r/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 9.74	fbgs
	START DATE: 3/1	8/2020		BOR	ING DIAMETE	R: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 116	6.54 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	9/2020			WELL DIAMETE	:R: 2"		WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2.	5/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVER (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
_									1180
_								STICK UP (3.18 TT) Protective Cover	_
-									_
o —		Silty Clay, dark						Concrete Pad	_
-		brown, rootlets	SPT	0-1.5	1,2,2	1		(Approximately 6")	— 1175
-								arout from around	_
	Silty Clay	Silty Clay;	Cont.	1.5-5		3		surface to 5 ft bgs	_
		brown, trace medium to fine						2 in dia. Sch. 40	_
5 —		gravels						PVC soild riser from	_
								0 - 10 ft bgs	— 1170
		Clayey Silt;	Cont.	5-10.		2		Bentonite pellet seal	_
		brown, some rootlets, wet at					9.74	bas	_
10 —		7' bgs						Wet at 7' bgs	_
<u> </u>			SPT	10-11.	50/4"	3"		Attempted Shelby at	
_								10', no recovery	
_		Sand; reddish	Cont	11.5-1		2		from 7 ft to 20 ft bas	_
	<b>C</b> 1	brown to	com	5				······································	_
15 —	Sand	grained, trace						10 ft of 2 in dia	_
		silts						0.010 slot. Sch. 40	— 1160
			Cont.	15-20.		4		PVC sreen	_
			com	10 20					_
								End Cap	_
20 —			SPT	20-21.	16,50/	/"		Installed depth =	_
_			511	5	2"	-	- 20 20 1	20' bgs	— 1155
				21.5-2					_
			Cont.	5		2			_
25 —					_				_
									-
_		Reddish brown							1150
_	Silty Clay	layers, trace	Cont.	25-30.		2			
		amounts of sand							
30 —				30.21				ft to total depth (35	
			SPT	5	50/3"	3"		ft bgs)	- 1145
THE									
BOUND	ANFICATION LINE	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: A	CTUAL						
TRANSI	IONS MAY BE GR	ADUAL							

TRANSITIONS MAY BE GRADUAL

1101	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.	PZ-5		SHEET NU/	ABER: 2 of 2
_	9 Richardson Drive			DDUU				
No	th little Rock AR				<u>tR:Garry</u>	Moyers		6.3 tt
						DD KIG	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 35 fbgs	
	LA of Okianoma, LLC				NP. Ander	son Kotary		
PROJECT NUMBER: 16	219107.00			COMMACIC	Enaine	erina	NORTHING: 183888	3.17
PROJECT LOCATION: Sp	encer, Oklahoma		-		Consul	EASTING: 214868	88.62	
GEOLOGIST: Rol	pert Fowler		SAMPLI	NG METHOD:	5' Sample	WATER LEVEL: 9.74	1 fbgs	
START DATE: 3/	18/2020		BOR	ING DIAMET	ER: 8.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 116	6.54 ft	
FINISH DATE: 3/	19/2020			WELL DIAMET	ER: 2"		WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/2	5/2020
DEPTH (FT) LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ff)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
35		Cont.	31.5-3 5	_	3.5		TD Drilled 35' bgs	

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	PZ-6		SHEET NU/	MBER: 1 of 2
	11219	9 Richardson Drive			ווומס				14 2 ft
	Nor	th Little Rock, AR				<u>:k:Garry</u> G•CMF-/	55 Ria	TOC ELEVATION: 119	9.5 ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING	G METHOD: A	uger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56	fbgs
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ander	son	LOCATION:	
PRO.	ECT NUMBER: 162	219107.00		_		Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183260.11	
PROJEC	CEOLOCIST: Pob	encer, Oklahoma		C A AADI IN			ITANTS, INC.	WATER LEVEL 18 S	33.30 87 fbac
	START DATE: 3/1	0/2020		BOR		-R: 8.25"	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 117	7.45 ft
	FINISH DATE: 3/1	0/2020		, JON	WELL DIAMETI	R: 2"	/	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/1	2/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVERY (ff)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
_									1200
_	_							Stick Up (3.17 ft)	—
-	_							Protective Cover	_
o —					-			Concrete Pad	
-	Silty Clay	brown with						(Approximately 6")	1105
-		rootlets	Cont.	0.5		-			
-			(BUIK 2-5)	0-5		5			_
-								Portland /Bentonite	_
5 —								grout from ground	_
								surface to 26 ft bgs	— 1190
	Clay	Clay; reddish	Cont.	5-10.		3			_
-	Cidy	brown							_
-								2 in dia. Sch. 40	—
10 -								PVC soild riser from	
								0 - 28.87 ft bgs	— 1185
_			Cont.	10-15.		3			
_									—
15 —	4				-				_
-			Cont.	15-16		1			
-	-				-				
-	-		<b>C</b> .	17.00			18.8		
-			Conf.	17-20		1.5			_
20 —									_
									1175
-	-		Cont.	20-25		0.5			_
-	-								_
-									_
25 —		Clayey Sand; reddish brown							—
-	Clayey Sand	to orange, fine						Bentonite pellet seal	— 1170
		grained	Cont.	25-30		3		from 26 ft bgs to	_
_								28.87 tt bgs	
30 —					1			0.010 slot. Sch. 40	
<b>–</b>								PVC sreen	
<u> </u>									1165
	RATIFICATION LINE	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE							
TRANS	TIONS MAY BE GR	ADUAL							

SCS	EN	GINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	PZ-6		SHEET NUA	ABER: 2 of 2
	11219 R	lichardson Drive				RGarry	Movers	SURFACE FLEVATION: 1.1.0	6.3.ft
	North	Little Rock, AR			DRILLING RI	G: CME-:	55 Rig	TOC ELEVATION: 119	9.5 ft
CLIE	ENT: WCA	of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING	METHOD: A	uger/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 56 fbgs	
PROJECT NA	ME: Northe	ast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ander	LOCATION:		
PROJECT NUME	BER: 16219	107.00		_		Engine	NORTHING: 183260	).11	
PROJECT LOCATIO	ON: Spence	<u>er, Oklahoma</u>		CAMDUN			Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 214900	00.00 07 fb air
START DA	ATF- 3/10/	2020			NG DIAMETE	20.825"	r/Split Spoon // 25"	WATER ELEVATION: 117	7.45 ft
FINISH DA	ATE: 3/10/	2020			WELL DIAMETE	R: 2"	/	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/1	2/2020
DEPTH (FT) LITHO	LOGY LI	THOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	(ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
35 — — —		-	Cont.	30-35		3		Sand filter pack from 28.5 ft to 38.87 ft bgs Saturated at 30' bgs	-  -  -  - 
40 —								End Cap Installed depth = 38.87' bgs	- - -
		Silty Clay; reddish brown	SPT	41-42. 5	50/3"	3"		Switched to Wash Rotary at 40 ft bgs	1155 
45	Clay	with orange and light gray mottling, hard, dry						Backfilled boring	_
		_	SPT	46-47. 5	50/2"	2"		38.87 ft to total depth (56 ft bgs)	— 1150 — —
50	lstone	Sandstone; reddish brown							
		to tan	SPT	51-52. 5	50/2"	2"			— 1145 —
	Clay	Silty Clay, reddish brown to brown with some gray silt seams						TD Drilled 56' bgs	_ _ _
			SPT	56-56. 5	50/2"	1"			1140 
60									

S	CS E	NGINEE	RS	LOG OF B	ORING NO.:	PZ-7		SHEET NU	MBER: 1 of 2
	1121	9 Richardson Drive			וווסח	PiGaro	Movers		9 0 ft
	Nor	th Little Rock, AR				G: CME-:	55 Ria	TOC ELEVATION: 1 20	0.9 11 01.6 ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING	METHOD: A	uger/W	Vash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 66	fbgs
PR	OJECT NAME: Nor	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ander	rson	LOCATION:	-
PRO.	JECT NUMBER: 162	219107.00		Engineering				NORTHING: 18373	1.02
PROJEC	CT LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma						EASTING: 21478	50.91
	GEOLOGIST: ROD	perf Fowler			NG METHOD: 5	ວັSample :D. 0. 25"	er/Split Spoon /4.25"	WATER ELEVEL: 39.4	41 fbgs
	FINISH DATE: 3/2	26/2020		DOK	WELL DIAMETE	:R: 2"	/4.23	WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/3	0/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	ECOVERY (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
						~			
-								Stick Up (2.73 ft)	
-								Protective Cover	1000
	_							Concrete Devel	1200
		Silty Clay; dark	SPT	0-1.5	1.1.2	1.5		(Approximately 6")	_
-		brown with rootlets			.,.,=				_
_	Silty Clay	Silty Clay;	Cont.	1.5-5		3			1195
5 —		reddish brown							
-		to brown	SPT	5-6.5	4,4,8	1.5			_
-			Bulk	6-8.				2 in dia 5ch 10	_
-			Cont	6 5-10		3		PVC soild riser from	_
-			Com.	0.5-10				0 - 39 ft bgs	— 1190
10 —		Sandy Clay:		10-11				Portland /Bontonito	_
-	Sandy Clay	orange to	SPT	5	2,2,3	1.5		arout from around	_
-	**	reddish brown	Shalby	11.5-1				surface to 34.5 ft	_
-		-		3.5	_			bgs	_
-			Cont.	13.5-1		1.5			— 1185
15 —			CDT	15-16.	5 4 1 2	1.5			_
-	-		JFI	5	5,4,12	1.5			_
-				1 4 5 0					_
-			Cont.	16.5-2 0		2			1100
-		Clayey Sand;							- 1180
20 —	Clayey Sand	to tan, fine	SPT	20-21.	8,14,1	1			_
		grained		5	5				_
				21 5-2					
_			Cont.	5		1			1175
25 —									
<u> </u>		Silty Class	SPT	25-26.	22,50/	1			
_	Silty Clay	reddish brown		5	4				_
_		to brown, hard		26.5-3					_
_	····	-	Cont.	0		3			1170
30 —	·······				-				_
-									_
<u> </u>									
THE ST	RATIFICATION LINE		CTUAL						
TRANS	ITIONS MAY BE GR	ADUAL	CIUAL						

S	CS EI	NGINEE	RS	log of b	ORING NO.:	PZ-7		SHEET NUA	ABER: 2 of 2
	11219	P Richardson Drive							004
	Nort	h Little Rock, AR				<u>.k:Garry</u> G.CMF-'	55 Ria	TOC FLEVATION: 1 20	0.9 ft 1.6 ft
	CLIENT: WC	A of Oklahoma, LLC		DRILLING		uaer/W	/ash Rotary	WELL DEPTH COMPLETION: 66 f	bas
PRC	JECT NAME: Nort	theast C&D Landfill		DRILLING	CONTRACTO	R:Ander	rson	LOCATION:	- 0 -
PROJE	CT NUMBER: 162	19107.00				Engine	eering	NORTHING: 183731	.02
PROJECT	LOCATION: Spe	ncer, Oklahoma				Consu	Itants, Inc.	EASTING: 214786	50.91
	GEOLOGIST: Rob	ert Fowler		SAMPLIN	IG METHOD: 5	5' Sample	er/Split Spoon	WATER LEVEL: 39.4	1 fbgs
	START DATE: 3/2	6/2020		BOR		<u>R: 8.25</u>	/4.25"	WATER ELEVATION: 115	9.5 tt
	INISH DATE: 3/2	0/2020				≿		WATER LEVEL DATE: 3/3	0/2020
DEPTH (FT)	LITHOLOGY	LITHOLOGY DESCRIPTION	Sample Type	Sample Depth	Blow Counts	RECOVEI (ft)	MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION	MONITORING WELL DESCRIPTION/ DRILLING NOTES	ELEVATION (FT)
	Sandy Clay	Sandy Clay; reddish brown to orange, fine grained, slight	Cont.	30-35.		2		Bentonite pellet seal	1165
35 —		moisture, not saturated	SPT	35-36. 5	20,50/ 3"	8"		from 34.5 ft bgs to 37.5 ft bgs	_
	Sandstone	Sandstone;	Cont.	36.5-4 0		3	39.4i	10 ft of 2 in dia, 0.010 slot, Sch. 40 PVC sreen	1160
40 —		to dark brown to dark brown, hard competant	SPT	40-41. 5	50/6"	6"		Sand filter pack from 37.5 ft to 49 ft	_
		Clayey Sand; reddish brown,	Cont.	41.5-4 5		6"		bgs Wet at 40' bgs	1155
4J 	Clayey Sand	fine grained, Wet at 40 ft	SPT	45-46. 5	32,50/ 2"	8"			_
 50 —		bys	Cont.	46.5-5 1				Installed depth = 49' bgs End Cap	1150 
		_	SPT	51-52. 5	50/2"	2"			
55 — 								Backfilled boring 49	1145 
		Silty Clay; reddish brown with light gray	SPT	56-57. 5	50/2"	2"		ft to total depth (50 ft bgs)	_
60	Silty Clay	silty seams and thin interbedded sandstones							1140 
_			SPT	61-62. 5	50/3"	3"			
65 —									1135
			SPT	66-66. 5	50/3"	2"		TD Drilled 66' bgs	
THE STRA BOUNDA TRANSIT	ATIFICATION LINES ARY LINES BETWEE IONS MAY BE GRI	S REPRESENT APPROXIMATE EN SOIL AND ROCK TYPES: AG ADUAL	CTUAL	/					





Appendix C

**Geophysical Logs** 





Century-

NE LANDFILL MIDWEST CITY EB-1

Repleteration replet

夏

20 100

30

EVE

111 111

All South

NOTITING INCOMPANY IN NUMBER OF A DESCRIPTION OF A DESCRI

DORINANT HE LANDPHLI BID T BID

MILL IN CONTRACT I

BP1 CHIDART \$28

100

1111

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2 REMARKS 3	MUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP DIRC STOPPED	CASING TYPE FLUID DYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID DISCOSITY FLUID PH	CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING 0 D	FURST READING	DATE DEPTH DRILLER	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV PERM DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL 2Z-1 WELL EXT FIELD COMPTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COMPTRY USA APINO.	Centur WIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING TH N-182844.43	000	SURFACE H2O 8.35	39,35	40	34/16/20 11/Z	NIA PT	COMPARY WELL EXT FIELD COUNTY STATE COUNTY APINO UNIO ID LOCATION LATITUDE LOCATION LICATION	, Br
RU 2 0' PVC, GL E 2100429-36 ELV		LEVOAL	233	233	11	Elevations ( DF N GL N	NE LANDFILL PZ-1 OKLANDMA OK OK OK SECTION: NIA VISA	M 7
3.1 FT V:1213.84							NA BIRSINGO	IE LAND IDWEST PZ-1
				+	+	Other Services	RANGE NIA	CITY





١	1:60, G	AMMA - CONDUCTIVITY	PZ-1	04/16/20	
		LOG PARAMETERS			
	MATRIX DENSITY : 2.71	NEUTRON MATRIX : LIMESTONE	MAT	RIX DELTA T : 49	
	MAGNETIC DECL : 0	ELECT. CUTOFF : 99999	BIT	SIZE : 4.0 IN	
	PRESENTATION : 9512 N	E LANDFILL - MIDWEST CITY.0 - 04/1	7/2020DISF	PLAY7_JL59	

	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-1 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002	11:27 2	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	8	[CPS]	Default		Default	







1:60, G	AMMA - CONDUCTIVITY	PZ-2	04/16/20	
	LOG PARAMETERS			
MATRIX DENSITY : 2.71	NEUTRON MATRIX : LIMESTONE	MATRI	X DELTA T: 49	
MAGNETIC DECL : 0	ELECT. CUTOFF : 99999	BIT SE	ZE : 4.0 IN	
PRESENTATION : 9512_N	E LANDFILL - MIDWEST CITY.0 - 04/17/2	020 DISPL	AY7_JL59	

	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	UMBER 7	PZ-2 04/16/20 ERSION 2002 47	11:47	STAND	RD	RESPONSE [CPS		
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2	
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335	
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107	
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39,500	132.600	26556	31296	
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000		
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default		

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	RAN @ MEAS TEMP RAN @ MEAS TEMP RANE @ MEAS TEMP RANE @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING TYPE FLUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID VISCOSITY	FIRST READING LAST READING BIT SIZE CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING - LOGGER CASING - LOGGER	DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV. PERM. DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL VELL PZ-3 VELL EXT FIELD COUNTRY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTRY USA APINO,	Centur WIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING 1 N 183913.5	000 1 1 1	SURFACE H2O 8/35	4.0	04/16/20 12 33.80 30.79	NA F	COMPANY WELL EXT FIELD FIELD STATE COUNTRY STATE COUNTRY APINO LIOCATION LATITUDE LONGITUDE LONGITUDE	in the second
E 2149229 41		LEVGAL	233233	E1 E1	KB KB DF QL	NE LANDER PZ-3 OKLAHOMA OK USA USA SECTION N NIA NIA	
GL 3.62 FT ELV 1198 91					NIA NIA NIA	L TOWNER	MIDW
					EEE	IP NIA	EST 2-3
					Other Services	RANDE NA	







ŝ	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-3 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002	0 12:11 2	STAND	ARD	RESPONSE [CPS]	
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39,500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	<b>D</b>	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	В	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2 REMARKS 2	NUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING THICKNESS CASING TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID DENSITY FLUID VISCOSITY	DATE DEPTH LOGGER DEPTH LOGGER FIRST READING LAST READING BIT SIZE CASING - DRILLER CASING - DOGGER CASING O.D.	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV. PERM. DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL 9Z-4 FIELD COUNTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTY USA API NO.	Centur WIRELINE SERVI
R HECK LOGGING 1 N:183242.8	60.00 11 11 11	SURFACE H2O 8.35	04/16/20 1: 15.42 12.65 4.0 15.42	NIA F	COMPANY WELL WELL EXT FIELD FIELD STATE COUNTRY API NO. UNIO ID LOCATION LATITUDE LOCATION LATITUDE LOCATION	Yag'
THRU 2.0" PVC 7 E:2148594.0		LB/GAL	-25 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 25 21 21 21 25 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21	T DF	NE LANDFIL PZ-4 OKLAHOMA OK USA USA USA SECTION: N N/A N/A N/A	
, GL 3.01 FT 8 ELV:1175.3				NIA NIA NIA	L A TOWNSH	MIDW
2				223	IP: N/A	AND PZ-4
				Other Services:	RANGE NIA	CITY





1:60, G	AMMA - CONDUCTIVITY	PZ-4	04/16/2	20	
	LOG PARAMETERS				
MATRIX DENSITY : 2.71	NEUTRON MATRIX : LIMESTONE	MAT	TRIX DELTA	T: 49	
MAGNETIC DECL : 0	ELECT. CUTOFF : 99999	BIT	SIZE	: 4.0 IN	
PRESENTATION : 9512_M	E LANDFILL - MIDWEST CITY.0 04/1	7/2020DIS	PLAY7_JL59	)	

	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL NI	IBRATION OA TM V JMBER 7	PZ-4 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002 47	0 11:05 2	STAND	ARD	RESPON	ISE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	FLUID PH MUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING TYPE FLUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID VISCOSITY	BIT SIZE CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING O.D.	DATE DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER FIRST READING LAST READING	PERMAVENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV PERM. DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL P2-5 WELL ST FIELD COUNTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTRY USA API NO.	Centur WIRELINE SERV
R.HECK LOGGING TH N.183868.17	686 777	SURFACE H2O 8.35	4,0 19.75	04/16/20 12 3 19.75 17.26	NIA FT	COMPANY WELL EXT FIELD COUNTY STATE COUNTRY APINO LOCATION LOCATION LOCATION LOCATION LOCATION	, est
IRU 2.0" PVC, E:2148688.62		LENGAL	ZIJZ	피피피피	Elevations DF GL	NE LANDFILL P2-5 OKLAHOMA OK OK USA USA USA USA NIA NIA NIA	_
GL 3 18 FT ELV: 1176 28					NIA	TOWNSHIP	
					Other Services. FT	NIA RANGE NIA	NDFILL ST CITY Z-5





1:60, G	AMMA - CONDUCTIVITY	PZ-5	04/16/20
	LOG PARAMETERS		
MATRIX DENSITY : 2.71	NEUTRON MATRIX : LIMESTONE	MAT	RIX DELTA T: 49
MAGNETIC DECL : 0	ELECT. CUTOFF : 99999	BIT	SIZE : 4.0 IN
PRESENTATION : 9512_N	E LANDFILL - MIDWEST CITY.0 - 04/1	7/2020DISF	PLAY7_JL59

	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-5 04/16/20 /ERSION 2003 47	12:30	STANDARD RESPON			ISE [CPS]	
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2	
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335	
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107	
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39,500	132.600	26556	31296	
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	Ū.	0.350		0.000		
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	B	[CPS]	Default		Default		

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	MUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	ELUID DEVSITY	CASING - UKILLER CASING - LOOGER CASING O.D.	LAST READING	DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER FIRST READING	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV. PERM. DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL PZ-0 WELL DY FIELD NA COUNTY DILAHOMA STATE OK COUNTY USA APINO,
R HECK LOGGING TH N: 183260 11	000 1 1 1	SURFACE H20 8.35	90.00	4.0	35.86 35.86	NA 17	
E 2149653 39		LEVENT	233	23	333	Developer OF GL	HELANDPILL PZ-6 NUA OKLAHOMA USA USA USA USA NUA NUA
GL 3.17 FT ELV 1198 32						NIA	
						FT Other Services	Z-6





۱	1:60, G	AMMA - CONDUCTIVITY	PZ-6	04/16/20	
		LOG PARAMETERS			
	MATRIX DENSITY : 2.71	NEUTRON MATRIX : LIMESTONE	MAT	TRIX DELTA T : 49	
	MAGNETIC DECL : 0	ELECT. CUTOFF : 99999	BIT	SIZE : 4.0 IN	
	PRESENTATION : 9512 N	E LANDFILL - MIDWEST CITY.0 - 04/12	7/2020DIS	PLAY7 JL59	

1	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-6 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002 '47	09:16 2	STAND	ARD	RESPONSE [CPS]	
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1,000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	NUD SOURCE BM @ MEAS TEMP BMC @ MEAS TEMP BMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING THICKNESS CASING TYPE TUDO TYPE TUDO DENSITY TUDO VISCOBITY	CASHG - DRILLER CASHG - LOGGER CASHG 0 D	DEPTH LOGGER FIRST READING LAST READING	DATE DEPTH DRILER	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MÉASURED FROM LOG MÉASURED FROM ELEV. PERM. DATUM	COMPANY NE LA WELL EXT FIELD COUNTY OKLAN STATE OK COUNTRY USA API ND.	NDFILL	Centur VIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING T N 183731.0	000	SURFACE H20 \$35	40.41	46 32	49 41	102 P	LOCATION LATITUDE LONGITUDE	COMPANY WELL EXT FIELD COUNTY STATE COUNTRY APINO. UNIO ID	, See
2 E 2147860.8		TROAT	2 3 3 3	z a a a	137	T GL	BECTION N NA NA NA	NE LANDPIL PZ-7 OK USA	1.5
GL 273 F						NUA NUA	IA TOWNS		MIDW
64						222	HP: MA		AND PZ-7
						Other Services	RANGE NIA		CITY







	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	UNBER 7	PZ-7 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002 47	2 10:37	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	(API-GR)	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	MUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING THICKNESS CASING TYPE FLUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID VISCOSITY	CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING O.D	DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER FIRST READING LAST READING	DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV. PERM DATUM DATE	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL PZ-3 WELL EXT FIELD INA COUNTRY ORLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTRY USA API NO.	Centur WIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING T N 182862.6	000 דייר	SURFACE H2O 8.35	24.90	23.05	GL TC NIA F	COMPANY WELL EXT FIELD COUNTRY STATE COUNTRY API NO UNIC ID LOCATION LATITUDE LOCATION	18,
HRU 2.0" PVC 3 E 2149748.4		LEVGAL	8 <u>1</u> 1	2 3 3 3 3 3	Elevation KB DF GL	NE LANDFI PZ-8 NIA OKLAHOMA OKLAHOMA USA USA NIA NIA NIA	
GL 3.00 FT ELV 12.04					NIA NIA NIA	1.	MIDW
					333	IP. N/A	AND PZ-8
					Other Services:	RANGE NA	. CITA







	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-8 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002 47	09:33	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2 REMARKS 2	MUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING THICKNESS CASING TYPE FLUID DYNE FLUID VISCOSITY FLUID PHICOSITY	CASING - LOGGER CASING 0.D	BIT SUE	FIRST READING	DATE DEPTH DRILLER	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV PERM DATUM	COMPANY NE LA WELL PZ-8 WELL EXT FIELD COUNTY OKLAI STATE OK COUNTRY USA API NO.	NDFILL HOMA				Centur WIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING 1 N, 163332.0	606 111	SURFACE H2O 8.35	40.14	40	01110	40,72	NIA F	LOCATION LATITUDE LONGITUDE DISPLAY7_4	APINO ID	STATE	WELL EXT	COMPANY	, in the second
THRU 2 0" PVC 6 E-2147672 1		LENGAL	213	2	333	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	T OL	NUA NUA NUA NUA		- OK		NE LANDFIL	
GL 2.78 FT 8 ELV.1203.							NUA NUA NUA	A TOWNS				-	MIDW
28							333	IP NIA					AND EST PZ-9
							Other Services	RANGE NIA					CITY







	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	UMBER 7	PZ-9 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002 /47	10:18	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690,000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39,500	132,600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

Appendix D

Century Borehole Geophysical Report

# REPORT OF GEOPHYSICAL LOGS MIDWEST CITY LANDFILL, OKLAHOMA FOR SCS ENGINEERS

PERFORMED BY CENTURY WIRELINE SERVICES APRIL 16, 2020

#### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to summarize the methods employed and present the data from the geophysical logs that were run for SCS Engineers at the Midwest Landfill site. Ten geotechnical wells were logged with one of Century's digital logging tools (see attached product description sheets). The purposes of the logging activities were as an aid to a geo-technical investigation of the potential landfill site.

# FIELD LOGGING ACTIVITIES

Field logging activities were conducted during the time period of April 16, 2020. Field logging was conducted by Mr. Richard Heck, of Century Geophysical Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma. Geophysical logs included: natural gamma and electromagnetic-induction, i.e. conductivity.

# **GEOPHYSICAL LOG TYPES**

#### Natural Gamma

The natural gamma log is the recording of a scintillation counter or detector to the natural radiation emitted by naturally occurring formations, or materials placed in the well bore annulus (bentonite seals, grout, sand or gravel pack).

The standard unit of measurement is the "API gamma ray unit" which is defined as "1/100 of the radiation level of typical mid-continent shale". The gamma ray API standard is a model at the University of Houston.

Clay materials, such as shale, bentonite, and even some concrete have a relatively high gamma radiation level from approximately 75 to 125 API units. Sands, limestones, dolomites have relatively low gamma readings of 15 to 30 API units. Of course, mixtures such as shaly sands, sandy shale or gravels, can have any level between the sand and shale levels, depending on the proportions and types of components in the mixture. The diameter of investigation of the gamma ray system will depend on the bulk density of the material surrounding the detector. In the usual sedimentary environment (density 2.2 to 2.6 grams per cubic centimeter, g/cc) the diameter is approximately 3 feet for 90% of the signal. In low-density formations, such as coal (1.3 g/cc) this diameter is increased to about 5 feet, while in dense formations such as a dolomite (2.8 g/cc) the diameter is about 2 feet. A gamma ray log is quite often used to correlate different tool runs to assure proper depth alignment.

#### **Electromagnetic-Induction**

This three-coil slim hole induction tool was designed to provide conductivity and converted resistivity logs in open boreholes or PVC/plastic cased holes with casing sizes 2 inches are greater. The probe measures the rock conductivity in borings and wells within a zone of 10 to 50 inches from the well, but is not sensitive to the borehole fluid, casing or grouting materials.

The tool can be used in air filled holes to measure the conductivity response and is corrected for skin effect.

Electromagnetic-induction logs record the electrical conductivity or resistivity of the rocks and water surrounding the borehole. Electrical conductivity and resistivity are affected by the porosity, permeability and clay content of the rocks and by the dissolved-solids concentration of the water within the rocks.

# SUMMARY OF GEOPHYSICAL DATA

The gamma ray log indicates variable response (0-150 API units), indicating some interbedded and moderately clean sand zones, and higher response from clay type materials. The conductivity response is mostly related to the dissolved salts and permeability of the pore spaces of the material. The calculated resistivity log indicates Clays/Shales are to the left, Sandstones to the right.

On the next page is the typical response of your holes in this landfill. This is the log of the deepest hole drilled, EB-1.



# INTERPRETATIONAL PLOTS

Natural Gamma and Electromagnetic Conductivity. 1:60 Plot Ratio, Vertical Scale at 5 feet per inch

### DISCLAIMER

Century assures that efforts are made to provide calibrated and accurate measuring Devices. Quality control and other procedures are methods employed to provide accurate instrumentation to gather information. However, any interpretation of such information by Century employees, or other individuals (whether made directly from logs or by electronic data processing from actual or digitized log data) or any recommendations based upon such interpretations are opinions based upon inferences from electrical or other measurements and empirical factors and assumptions, which inferences are not necessarily infallible, and with respect to which wireline log analysts may differ. In addition such measurements may be affected by unknown conditions within the borehole or surrounding formation, causing such measurements to be invalid or speculative. Accordingly, in no event should any such interpretation or recommendation from such information be relied upon as the sole basis for any drilling, completion, treatment or production of a well, or development of a mine, or a decision concerning any procedure involving the safety of any persons or equipment.

Prepared By:

Richard Heck Senior Engineer 7-20-20







5TANDARD Point1 Point2 1,000 340,000 0,000 890,000 39,500 132,600 0,350 Default

(AP1-GR) [MMHO/M] [DEG-F] [] [CP3]

12348

ICPS

Point1 0.000 54845 26556 0.000 Default Point2 335 91107 31296

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2 REMARKS 3	MUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP DIRC STOPPED	CASING TYPE ELUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID DISCOSITY FLUID PH	CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING 0 D	PRAST READING LAST READING BIT SIZE	DATE DEPTH DRILLER	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV PERM DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL RZ-1 WELL EXT FIELD STATE OR COMPANY USA APINO
R HECK LOGGING T N-182844.40	000	SURFACE H20 8.35	36.96	4.0	39.35	10 P	
HRU 2 01 PVC 3 E 2150429 34		LEVOAL	233	2333	11	Elevator XB DF GL	NELMIDFIL P2-1 OKLAHOMA USA USA NIA NIA NIA
GL 3.1 FT						NIA NIA	MIDW
64						223	PZ-1
						Other Services	







	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-1 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002	) 11:27 2	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
÷.	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690,000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	8	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	MUD SQURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING THICKNESS CASING TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID DENSITY FLUID DENSITY	CASING - LOGGER	CASING - DRILLER	LAST READING	DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV. PERM. DATUM	CO WE FIE CO ST/ CO	MPANY NE LA LL PZ-2 LL EXT LD UNTY OKLA ATE OK UNTRY USA I NO.	NDFIL	L				WIRELINE SERV	Centur
R HECK LOGGING 1 N 183881.0	000	SURFACE H20 8.35		35.12	-	04/10/20 1 35.12 32.30	1999 1997	DISPLAY7_J	LOCATION	UNIO ID	COUNTRY	STATE	FIELD	COMPANY	ICES	
0 E 2150425 85		LENGAL	2.7	33	2 2 3	147 17	Elevations KB DF GL	58	NUA NUA NUA		USA.	OK I	CHAT ALCOUR	FZ-2		-
SL 2.78 FT ELV:1207.19							NIA P		TOWNSHIP						ΡZ	NE LAN
							Cither Servic		UA RAVGE N						2	IDFILL ST CITY







	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	LIBRATION	PZ-2 04/16/20 ERSION 2002 47	11:47	STAND	RD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	RAN & MEAS TEMP RAN & MEAS TEMP RANF @ MEAS TEMP RANC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING TYPE CASING TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID DENSITY FLUID VISCOSITY	LAST READING BIT SIZE CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING - DGGER CASING TO D	DATE DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER	PERMANENT DATUM ORL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV, PERM, DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL VELL PZ-3 VELL EXT FIELD COUNTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTRY USA API NO,	Centur WRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING T N 183913.5	005 777	SURFACE 1420 8.35	4.0	04/16/20 12 33.80 30.79	NIA F	COMPANY WELL WELL FIELD COUNTY STATE COUNTRY APINO UNID ID LOCATION LATITUDE LONGITUDE	, est
E 2149229 41		LEVGAL	233233	म् म	Elevatian NB DF OL	NE LANDFIL PZ-3 OKLAHOMA OX OX USA USA SECTION: N NIA NIA NIA	
GL 3.62 FT ELV.1198 9					NIA NIA NIA	1.	MIDW
					333	HP NA	PZ-3
					Other Services:	RANDE NIA	







	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-3 04/16/20 /ERSION 2003 47	0 12:11	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39,500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	ġ .	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	B	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2 REMARKS 2	AND SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING THICKNESS CASING TYPE FLUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID DENSITY	BIT SIZE CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING O.D.	DATE DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER PIRST READING LAST READING	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV. PERM. DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL PZ-4 WELL EXT FIELD COUNTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTY USA API NO.	Centur MIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING 1 N:183242.8	000 11 11 11	SURFACE H2O 8,35	4,0 15,42	04/16/20 1 15.42 12.65	NA F	COMPANY WELL FELD FOUNTRY STATE COUNTRY API NO. UNIQ ID LOCATION LATITUDE LOCATION LATITUDE LOCATION	, international and a second
THRU 2.0" PVC 7 E:2148594.0		LB/GAL	ਣ ਸ਼ੁਸ਼ੁਣ	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Elevation KB DF GL	NE LANDFIL P2-4 OKLAHOMA OK USA USA SECTION: N NIA NIA NIA	
, GL 3.01 FT 6 ELV:1175.3					NIA NIA NIA	L IA TOWNSH	MIDW
10					피피피	IP: N/A	EST Z-4
					Other Services.	RANGE NIA	CITY





1:60, G	AMMA - CONDUCTIVITY	PZ-4	04/16/	20
	LOG PARAMETERS			
MATRIX DENSITY : 2.71	NEUTRON MATRIX : LIMESTONE	MA	TRIX DELT	AT: 49
MAGNETIC DECL : 0	ELECT. CUTOFF : 99999	BIT	SIZE	: 4.0 IN
PRESENTATION : 9512_N	E LANDFILL - MIDWEST CITY.0 - 04/1	7/2020DIS	PLAY7_JLS	i9

	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-4 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002 47	0 11:05 2	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	D	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	MUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	FLUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID VISCOSITY	DATE DEFTH DRILLER DEFTH LOGGER FIRST READING LAST READING BIT SIZE CASING - DRILLER CASING - DRILLER CASING - D	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV. PERM. DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL PZ-5 WELLEXT FIELD COUNTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTRY USA API NO:	Centur WIRELINE SERV
R,HECK LOGGING TH N.183888.17	000 11 11	SURFACE H20 8,35	04/16/20 12:3 19,75 17:26 4,0 19.75	GL GL TC NIA FT	COMPANY WELL EXT FIELD COUNTRY STATE COUNTRY APINO UNIO ID LOCATION LATITUDE LONGITUDE	18°
RU 2 0" PVC, E 2148688.62		LENGAL	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	Elevations KB GL	NE LANDFILI P2-5 OKLAHOMA OK OK USA USA USA USA NIA NIA NIA	
GL 3 18 FT ELV: 1176 28				NIA F	A TOWNSHIP N	NE LAN MIDWES PZ
				Other Services	UN RANGE NIA	ST CITY





1:60, G	AMMA - CONDUCTIVITY	PZ-5	04/16/20
	LOG PARAMETERS		
MATRIX DENSITY : 2.71	NEUTRON MATRIX : LIMESTONE	MAT	RIX DELTA T : 49
MAGNETIC DECL : 0	ELECT. CUTOFF : 99999	BIT	SIZE : 4.0 IN
PRESENTATION : 9512_N	E LANDFILL - MIDWEST CITY.0 04/1	7/2020DISF	PLAY7_JL59

	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-5 04/16/20 /ERSION 2003 47	0 12:30 2	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39,500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	Ū.	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2 REMARKS 3	AND SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING TYPE FLUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID VISCOSITY	BIT SIZE CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOQGER CASING O D	DATE DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LODGER FIRST READING LAST READING	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV. PERM. DATUM	COMPANY NE LANOFILL WELL PZ-4 WELL CT FIELD NA COUNTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTY USA API NO.	Centur WIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING T N. 163260 T	000	SURFACE H20 8.35	38.66	04/19/20 05 36 66 35 66	NA TOP	COMPANY WELL EXT HIELD COUNTRY API NO UNIQ ID LOCATION LOCATION LOCATION	188
HRU 2 0" PVO E 2110653 30		LENGAL	8138	3333	Devetor KB OF GL	NE LANDPL PZ-4 NIA OKLAHOMA OKLAHOMA OKLAHOMA SECTION N NIA NIA NIA	
GL 3.17 FT ELV.1190					NIA	A TOWNS	MIDW
14					EEE	ap NA	EST OPZ-6
					ther Services	RANGE NUA	SIT IF





1:60, 0	SAMMA - CONDUCTIVITY	PZ-6	04/16/20	
	LOG PARAMETERS			
MATRIX DENSITY : 2.71	NEUTRON MATRIX : LIMESTONE	MA	TRIX DELTA T : 49	
MAGNETIC DECL : 0	ELECT. CUTOFF : 99999	BIT	SIZE : 4.0 IN	
PRESENTATION : 9512	NE LANDFILL - MIDWEST CITY.0 - 04/1	7/2020DIS	PLAY7_JL59	

	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-6 04/16/20 /ERSION 2002 47	09:16	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Pointi	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1,000	340,000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2 REMARKS 3	MUD SOURCE PM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASHG TYPE CASHG TYPE FLUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID MISCOSITY	CASING - LOGGER	BIT SIZE	DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER FIRST READING	ELEV PERM DATUM	DRI MEASURED FROM	COMPANY NE LA WELL PZ7 WELL EXT FIELD COUNTY OKLAN STATE OK COUNTRY USA API ND.	NDFILL KOMA			Centur MIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING T N 183731.0	000	SURFACE H20 5.25	10.01	8.0	49 41 46 32	NA P	9.9	LOCATION LATITUDE LONGITUDE	COUNTRY API NO. UNIO ID	FIELD COUNTY STATE	COMPANY WELL EXT	A.
11RU 2.0" PVC 2 E 2147860.8		TROAT	2 3)	22	1222	T AL	Bevallor	BECTION N NUA NUA NUA NUA	USA	OKLAHOMA	HE LANDITL P2-7	
GL 273 FT 1 ELV 1201 6						NUA	10.4	A TOWNS			2	MIDW
1						33	2	UP: NIA				AND PZ-7
							Other Services	RANGE NA				CITY







	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	IBRATION	PZ-7 04/16/20 /ERSION 2003 47	0 10:37 2	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	(API-GR)	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39.500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	B	[CPS]	Default		Default	

RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2	RM @ MEAS TEMP RM @ MEAS TEMP RMF @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	AST FRANKS AST FRANKS CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING - LOGGER CASING THICKNESS CASING THICKNESS CASING THICKNESS CASING TYPE FUID DYSCOSITY FUID DYSCOSITY	PERMANENT DATUM DRI, MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV PERM DATUM DATE DEPTH OFFILER DEPTH LOGGER	COMPANY NE LANDFILL WELL P2-8 FIELD INA COUNTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK COUNTY USA API NO.	Centur WIRELINE SERV
R HECK LOGGING 1 N 182862.6	000 11 11 11	4.0 24.90 SURFACE H2O 8.35	GL GL TC NUA F 24.90 23.05	CONPANY WELL EXT FIELD SCOUNTY STATE COUNTRY APPINO UNIC AD LOCATION LATITUDE LOCATION LOCATION	18 F
1HRU 2.0" EVC		EBGAL	FT Elevation	NE LANDFIL PZ-8 NUA OKLAHOMA OKLAHOMA OKLAHOMA NUA NUA NUA NUA	
GL-3.00 F			NIA NIA NIA NIA	L .	MIDW
97			고고고	HIP NIA	AND IEST PZ-8
			Other Services:	RANGE NIA	CITY







	TOOL CALIBRATION PZ-8 04/16/20 09:33 TOOL 9510A TM VERSION 2002 SERIAL NUMBER 747				STANDARD		RESPONSE [CPS]	
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690.000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39,500	132.600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	0	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	в	[CPS]	Default		Default	
RECORDED BY REMARKS 1 REMARKS 2 REMARKS 3	MUD SOURCE RM @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP RMC @ MEAS TEMP CIRC STOPPED	CASING THE AVERAGE CASING THE FLUID TYPE FLUID DENSITY FLUID DENSITY FLUID VISCOSITY	CASING - DRILLER CASING - LOGGER CASING 0.0	DATE DEPTH DRILLER DEPTH LOGGER FIRST READING LAST READING	PERMANENT DATUM DRL MEASURED FROM LOG MEASURED FROM ELEV PERM DATUM	COMPANY NE LANDFILL VELL PZ-4 WELL EXT FIELD COUNTY OKLAHOMA STATE OK DOWTRY USA API HO	Centur WIRELINE SERV	
----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	
R HECK LOGGING T N 163332.0	606 11 11 11	SURFACE H2O 8.35	40,72	04/16/20 10 40/72 37/15	NA F	COMPANY WELL EXT FIELD COUNTRY STATE COUNTRY API NO UNIC ID LOCATION LATITUDE LOCATION	1 al	
HRU 2.0" PVC 5 E-2147672.10		LINGAL	2332	3333	T DF	NE LANDFIL PZ-9 OKLAHOMA OK OK OK USA USA SECTION N NUA NUA		
GL 278 F					NUA NUA NUA	r A towns	MIDW	
28					333	HIP NO.	AND PZ-9	
					Other Services	RANGE MA		







	TOOL CAL TOOL 951 SERIAL N	UMBER 7	PZ-9 04/16/20 /ERSION 2003 '47	10:18 2	STAND	ARD	RESPON	SE [CPS]
	DATE	TIME	SENSOR		Point1	Point2	Point1	Point2
1	Apr15,20	11:32:25	GAMMA	[API-GR]	1.000	340.000	0.000	335
2	Apr15,20	13:32:19	AP-COND	[MMHO/M]	0.000	690,000	54845	91107
3	Sep25,14	13:19:22	TEMP	[DEG-F]	39,500	132,600	26556	31296
4	Sep25,14	13:26:21	A	n .	0.350		0.000	
5	Mar27,03	10:28:37	В	[CPS]	Default		Default	

# Appendix E

## **Geotechnical Laboratory Results**



10205 W ROCKWOOD ROAD LITTLE ROCK, AR 72204 (501) 455-4545 3217 NEIL CIRCLE JONESBORO, AR 72401 (870) 932-3700 620 E 3RD STREET HOPE, AR 71801 (501) 515-4654

# **Memorandum**

<u>May 27, 2020</u>

- TO: MR. DAN MCCULLOUGH, P.G. SCS Engineers DMcCullough@scsengineers.com
- FROM: MR. SCOTT W. ANDERSON, R.E.P., P.E. PRINCIPAL ENGINEER/PRESIDENT AECIGEO@COMCAST.NET
- RE: LAB TEST RESULTS WCA – NORTHEAST C&D LANDFILL SPENCER, OKLAHOMA AECI JOB NO. 15775

Dan,

Attached herein are the requested laboratory test results for the project referenced above. The testing included classification testing of all bulk samples per ODEQ guidelines. Additionally, testing requested by Ms. Basak Gulec, PhD, P.E. via her email on May 5, 2020 was performed. It should be noted that we are still holding nine 3" Shelby tubes that no testing has been assigned on. We will hold all samples an additional 60 days in the event other testing is required.

Let me know if we can be of further assistance.

Very truly yours,

Scott W. Anderson, R.E.P., P.E. Principal Engineer

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

## MOISTURE CONTENT DETERMINATION ASTM D 2216

<b>Project:</b> WCA NO	RTHEAST C	& D LAN	IDFILL		Pro	ject No.:	5/9/2020
Location: SPENCE	R, OKLAHON	ΛA			Dat	te:	05/09/20
		MOIS	TURE CO	NTENT			
Sample Number	EB2;4'-8'	EB3;0'-3'	EB3;10'-14'	EB3;25'-27'	EB4;10'-12'	EB6:0'-5'	EB6:20'-25'
Tare Number	B2	Z	775	B5	ACH	10	MS-2
Tare + Wet Soil (g)	182.3	159.1	159.9	194.8	178.1	172.7	212.2
Tare + Dry Soil (g)	168.2	138.0	140.9	183.2	158.6	146.7	176.1
Tare (g)	10.2	12.2	10.5	10.8	10.3	9.9	9.7
Water (g)	14.1	21.1	19.0	11.6	19.5	26.0	36.1
Dry Soil (g)	158.0	125.8	130.4	172.4	148.3	136.8	166.4
Water Content (%)	8.9	16.8	14.6	6.7	13.1	19.0	21.7
		MOIS	TURE CON	NTENT			
Sample Number	EB7;5'-10' E	B8;15'-20'	EB9;5'-8'	PZ1;10'-13'	PZ2;2'-5'	PZ2;15'-17'	PZ4:5'-10'
Tare Number	SS#	777	SMD	B10	AI	773	11
Tare + Wet Soil (g)	183.3	189.6	167.7	191.1	176.5	150.3	178.5
Tare + Dry Soil (g)	157.8	178.8	147.0	172.4	160.6	138.5	148.7
Tare (g)	10.4	10.2	9.9	10.3	12.0	10.5	10.0
Water (g)	25.5	10.8	20.7	18.7	15.9	11.8	29.8
Dry Soil (g)	147.4	168.6	137.1	162.1	148.6	128.0	138.7
Water Content (%)	17.3	6.4	15.1	11.5	10.7	9.2	21.5
		MOIS	TURE CON	VTENT			
Sample Number	PZ5;0'-5'	PZ6;2'-5'	PZ7;6'-8'				
Tare Number	SMS	BC1	C1				
Tare + Wet Soil (g)	205.9	196.3	195.3				
Tare + Dry Soil (g)	177.3	169.0	167.1				
Tare (g)	16.8	14.1	13.9				
Water (g)	28.6	27.3	28.2				
Dry Soil (g)	160.5	154.9	153.2				
Water Content (%)	17.8	17.6	18.4				

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

## CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: EB2

**DEPTH:** 4'-8'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN & BROWN SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL)

LIQUID LIMIT,	PLASTIC LIMIT	, AND PLASTICITY INDEX OF SOIL TM D 4318	S
LIQUID LIMI DETERMINATI	T ON	PLASTIC LIMIT DETERMINATIO	r P <b>N</b>
TARE NO.	81F	TARE NO.	74
NUMBER OF BLOWS	21	TARE + WET SOIL (g)	17.91
TARE + WET SOIL (g)	19.21	TARE + DRY SOIL (g)	16.74
TARE + DRY SOIL (g)	16.42	TARE (g)	8.01
TARE (g)	6.78	DRY SOIL (g)	8.73
WATER (g)	2.79	WATER (g)	1.17
DRY SOIL (g)	9.64	WATER CONTENT (%)	13.40
WATER CONTENT (%)	28.9	PLASTIC LIMIT	13
	28	and the second se	

LIQUID LIMIT: 28

#### **PLASTIC LIMIT: 13**

PLASTICITY INDEX: 15

#### PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140

Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams)	Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	Percent Retained	Percent Finer	Specification	
1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#4	0.4	0.4	0	100	N/A	
#10	0.7	1.1	0	100	N/A	
#40	35.2	36.3	7	93	N/A	
#200	186.6	222.9	40.9	59.1	N/A	
Original San	nple Weight:	545.0				

Percent Gravel:0.1Percent Sand:40.8Percent Silt/Clay:59.1

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS):

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

#### CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

**PROJECT:** WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: EB3

**DEPTH:** 0'-3'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN LEAN CLAY W/ SAND (CL)

LIQUID LIMIT, PLASTIC LIMIT, AND PLASTICITY INDEX OF SOILS ASTM D 4318 LIQUID LIMIT DETERMINATION TARE NO. FAJ VUMBER OF BLOWS 29 TARE + WET SOIL (g) 24.82 TARE + DRY SOIL (g) 20.55 TARE (g) 8.18 WATER (g) 4.27 DRY SOIL (g) 12.37 WATER (g) 12.37 WATER CONTENT (%) 34.5 IQUID LIMIT 35 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 17 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 10 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 15 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 17 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PLASTIC LIMIT 16 PL							-	
LIQUID LIMIT DETERMINATION         FAJ         TARE NO.         FAJ           NUMBER OF BLOWS         29         TARE NO.         48           TARE + WET SOIL (g)         24.82         TARE + WET SOIL (g)         17.66           TARE + DRY SOIL (g)         20.55         TARE + DRY SOIL (g)         8.00           TARE (g)         8.18         WATER (g)         8.01           WATER (g)         4.27         WATER (g)         1.27           WATER CONTENT (%)         34.5         UATER CONTENT (%)         15.14           LIQUID LIMIT         35         PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         15           LIQUID LIMIT:         35         PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         15           Version of Retained Retained Retained Retained Retained Finer Specification           1.5"         0.0         0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.0         0.0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.0         0.0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.4         0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.4         0         100         N/A           4/4         1.4         1.4         0         100         N/A	LI	QUID LIMIT,		IIT, AND PLA ASTM D 4318	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS		
TARE NO.       FAJ       TARE NO.       48         NUMBER OF BLOWS       29       TARE + WET SOIL (g)       17.66         TARE + DRY SOIL (g)       20.55       TARE + DRY SOIL (g)       16.39         TARE (g)       8.18       WATER (g)       8.00         WATER (g)       4.27       WATER (g)       12.37         WATER CONTENT (%)       34.5       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         PLASTIC IMIT: 15       PLASTIC IMIT: 15         PLASTIC IMIT: 15       PLASTIC IMIT: 15         Sieve       Weight       Weight         or       Retained       Percent       Percent         Sieve       (Grams)       Retained       Percent         (Grams)       Retained       Percent       Specification         1.5"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         #44       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Wol	D	LIQUID LIMI ETERMINATI	r <u>ON</u>		1	PLASTIC LIMIT		
NUMBER OF BLOWS       29       TARE + WET SOIL (g)       17.66         TARE + WET SOIL (g)       24.82       TARE + DRY SOIL (g)       16.39         TARE + DRY SOIL (g)       8.18       B.00       DRY SOIL (g)       8.39         WATER (g)       4.27       WATER (g)       12.37         DRY SOIL (g)       12.37       WATER (g)       1.27         DRY SOIL (g)       12.37       WATER (g)       1.27         WATER CONTENT (%)       34.5       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT: 15       PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         EVENTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS         ASTM D 422 / D 1140         Cummulative         Weight         or Retained       Percent       Percent         Steve Weight       0.0       0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weig	TARE NO.		FAJ		TARE NO.		48	
TARE + WET SOIL (g)       24.82       TARE + DRY SOIL (g)       16.39         TARE + DRY SOIL (g)       20.55         TARE (g)       8.18         WATER (g)       4.27         WATER (g)       12.37         WATER (g)       12.37         WATER CONTENT (%)       34.5         LIQUID LIMIT       35         PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         PLASTICITY INDEX: 20         Output         Sieve Weight or Retained Retained Retained Percent Percent         Screen (Grams)       (Grams)         (Grams)       Retained         Attended         100         1.5         93         N/A         Or 0       0.0         1.5         Screen (Grams)       (Grams)       Retained         93       N/A         #44       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #44       1.4<	NUMBER OF I	UMBER OF BLOWS			TARE + WE	T SOIL (g)	17.66	
TARE + DRY SOIL (g)       20.55       TARE (g)       8.00         TARE (g)       8.18       DRY SOIL (g)       8.39         WATER (g)       4.27       WATER (g)       1.27         DRY SOIL (g)       12.37       WATER CONTENT (%)       15.14         VATER CONTENT (%)       34.5       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT: 15       15         PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140         Cummulative         Sieve Weight or Retained Retained Percent Percent         Screen (Grams)       (Grams)       Retained       Finer       Specification         1.5"       0.0       0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6	TARE + WET S	SOIL (g)	24.82		TARE + DR	( SOIL (g)	16.39	
TARE (g)       8.18       DRY SOIL (g)       8.39         WATER (g)       4.27       WATER (g)       1.27         DRY SOIL (g)       12.37       WATER CONTENT (%)       15.14         PLASTIC LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT: 15       PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         Cummulative         Sieve Weight or Retained Retained Retained Percent Percent Screen (Grams)       Retained Percent Percent Specification         1.5"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         44       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #44       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6	TARE + DRY S	SOIL (g)	20.55		TARE (g)		8.00	
WATER (g)       4.27       WATER (g)       1.27         DRY SOIL (g)       12.37       WATER CONTENT (%)       15.14         VATER CONTENT (%)       34.5       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140         Cummulative         Sereen (Grams)       (Grams)       Retained       Percent       Percent         1.5"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         #4       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6	TARE (g)		8.18		DRY SOIL (	3)	8.39	
DRY SOL (g)       12.37       WATER CONTENT (%)       15.14         WATER CONTENT (%)       34.5       PLASTIC LIMIT       15         LIQUID LIMIT       35       PLASTIC LIMIT: 15       15         LIQUID LIMIT:       35       PLASTIC LIMIT: 15       15         PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140         Cummulative         Sieve       Weight       Percent       Percent         or       Retained       Retained       Percent       Specification         1.5"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         #44       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6	WATER (g)		4.27		WATER (g)		1.27	
WATER CONTENT (%)         34.5 35         PLASTIC LIMIT         15           LIQUID LIMIT         35         PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         15           LIQUID LIMIT:         35         PLASTIC LIMIT: 15         15           PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140         20         16           Cummulative Weight or Retained Retained Percent Percent Screen (Grams)         Percent         Percent           1.5"         0.0         0.0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.0         0.0         100         N/A           #44         1.4         1.4         0         100         N/A           #10         1.0         2.4         0         100         N/A           #40         35.5         37.9         7         93         N/A           #200         109.3         147.2         28.5         71.5         N/A           Original Sample Weight:         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6	DRY SOIL (g)		12.37		WATER CO	NTENT (%)	15.14	
LIQUID LIMIT         35           LIQUID LIMIT:         35           PLASTIC LIMIT:         15           PLASTICITY INDEX:         20           PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140           Cummulative           Sieve         Weight (Grams)         Percent         Percent           Screen         (Grams)         Retained         Finer         Specification           1.5"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           #44         1.4         1.4         0         100         N/A           #40         35.5         37.9         7         93         N/A           #200         109.3         147.2         28.5         71.5         N/A           Original Sample Weight:         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6	WATER CONT	ENT (%)	34.5	A	PLASTIC LI	MIT	15	
LIQUID LIMIT: 35 PLASTIC LIMIT: 15 PLASTICITY INDEX: 20 PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140 Cummulative Veight Retained Percent Percent Screen (Grams) Retained Finer Specification 1.5" 0.0 0.0 0 100 N/A 3/4" 0.0 0.0 0 100 N/A #4 1.4 1.4 0 100 N/A #4 1.4 1.4 0 100 N/A #40 35.5 37.9 7 93 N/A #40 35.5 37.9 7 93 N/A #40 35.5 37.9 7 93 N/A #200 109.3 147.2 28.5 71.5 N/A Driginal Sample Weight: 515.6			35					
PLASTICITY INDEX: 20         PLASTICITY INDEX: 20         PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140         Cummulative Weight or Retained Retained Percent Percent Screen (Grams)       Percent (Grams)       Percent         1.5"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         #4       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #10       1.0       2.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Driginal Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6		35		PI A	STIC LIMIT	15		
Sieve     Weight     Or       Retained     Percent       Screen     (Grams)       (Grams)     Retained       1.5"     0.0       1.5"     0.0       1.5"     0.0       1.5"     0.0       1.6"     0.0       1.1.0     2.4       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0     1.0       1.1.0 </th <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>20</th> <th></th> <th></th>					20			
PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140         Cummulative Weight or Retained Screen (Grams)       Percent Percent Retained       Percent (Grams)       Percent Retained       Percent Finer       Specification         1.5"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         #44       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #10       1.0       2.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6			LAUNG		20			
PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140         Cummulative Weight or Retained Retained Percent Percent (Grams)       Percent Percent         Sieve or Retained       Weight (Grams)       Percent       Percent         1.5"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         #4       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #10       1.0       2.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Driginal Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6								
Sieve or         Weight Retained (Grams)         Percent Retained         Percent Finer         Specification           1.5"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           #4         1.4         1.4         0         100         N/A           #10         1.0         2.4         0         100         N/A           #40         35.5         37.9         7         93         N/A           #200         109.3         147.2         28.5         71.5         N/A           Percent Gravel:         0.3         28.3         28.3         28.3         28.3			PARTICLE SI AST	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1	IS OF SOIL 140	S		
Sieve or         Weight Retained (Grams)         Weight Retained (Grams)         Percent Retained         Percent Finer         Specification           1.5"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           #4         1.4         1.4         0         100         N/A           #10         1.0         2.4         0         100         N/A           #40         35.5         37.9         7         93         N/A           #200         109.3         147.2         28.5         71.5         N/A           Original Sample Weight:         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6			Cummulative					
or         Retained (Grams)         Retained (Grams)         Percent Retained         Percent Finer         Specification           1.5"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           #4         1.4         1.4         0         100         N/A           #10         1.0         2.4         0         100         N/A           #40         35.5         37.9         7         93         N/A           #200         109.3         147.2         28.5         71.5         N/A           Original Sample Weight:         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6	Sieve	Weight	Weight					
Screen         (Grams)         (Grams)         Retained         Finer         Specification           1.5"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           3/4"         0.0         0.0         0         100         N/A           #4         1.4         1.4         0         100         N/A           #10         1.0         2.4         0         100         N/A           #40         35.5         37.9         7         93         N/A           #200         109.3         147.2         28.5         71.5         N/A           Original Sample Weight:         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6         515.6	or	Retained	Retained	Percent	Percent			
1.5"       0.0       0.0       0       100       N/A         3/4"       0.0       0       100       N/A         #4       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #10       1.0       2.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Driginal Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6	Screen	(Grams)	(Grams)	Retained	Finer	Specification		
3/4"       0.0       0.0       100       N/A         #4       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #10       1.0       2.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Driginal Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6	1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A		
#4       1.4       1.4       0       100       N/A         #10       1.0       2.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6	3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A		
#10       1.0       2.4       0       100       N/A         #40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6         Percent Gravel:       0.3       0.3       515.6       515.6	#4	1.4	1.4	0	100	N/A		
#40       35.5       37.9       7       93       N/A         #200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6       515.6       515.6       515.6         Percent Gravel:       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3       0.3	#10	1.0	2.4	0	100	N/A		
#200       109.3       147.2       28.5       71.5       N/A         Original Sample Weight:       515.6         Percent Gravel:       0.3         Percent Sand:       28.3         Percent Silt/Clay:       71.5	#40	35.5	37.9	7	93	N/A		
Original Sample Weight:     515.6       Percent Gravel:     0.3       Percent Sand:     28.3       Percent Silt/Clay:     71.5	#200	109.3	147.2	28.5	71.5	N/A		
Percent Gravel: 0.3 Percent Sand: 28.3 Percent Silt/Clay: 71.5	Original Samp	ole Weight:	515.6					
Percent Sand: 28.3 Percent Silt/Clay: 71.5	Percent Gravel:	0.3						
Percent Silt/Clay: 71.5	Percent Sand:	28.3						
	Percent Silt/Cla	v: 71.5						

#### UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS):

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

#### CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

-

SAMPLE NO.: EB3

**DEPTH:** 10'-14'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL)

		ASTIC LIMI	STM D 4318		IDEA OF SUILS	
LIC <u>DET</u>	QUID LIMIT		PLASTIC LIMIT DETERMINATION			
TARE NO.		65		TARE NO.		63
NUMBER OF BLC	ows	25		TARE + WE	T SOIL (g)	18.45
TARE + WET SOI	L (g)	18.16		TARE + DR	(SOIL (g)	17.17
TARE + DRY SOIL (g) TARE (g)		15.73	TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g)			8.26
		7.79			8.91	
WATER (g)		2.43	WATER (g)			1.28
DRY SOIL (g)		7.94		WATER CONTENT (%)		14.37
WATER CONTEN	Т (%)	30.6	PLASTIC LIMIT		MIT	14
		31				
LIQUID LIMIT: 3	1		PLA	STIC LIMIT:	14	
		PLASTIC	TY INDEX:	16		
	PA	RTICLE SIZ	E ANAL VS		<u> </u>	
		ASTN	I D 422 / D 1	140	5	
Sieve N	C Veight	ummulative Weight Retained	Percent	Porcont		
	etamed	Netaineu	FCIUCIIL	reicent		

ог	Retained	Retained	Percent	Percent		
Screen	(Grams)	(Grams)	Retained	Finer	Specification	
1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#4	0.2	0.2	0	100	N/A	
#10	3.0	3.2	1	99	N/A	
#40	80.8	84.0	16	84	N/A	
#200	144.7	228.7	43.0	57.0	N/A	
Original San	nple Weight:	532.2				
-						

Percent Gravel:0.0Percent Sand:42.9Percent Silt/Clay:57.0

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS):

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

## **CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487**

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

**JOB NO.:** 15775 **DATE:** 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: EB3

DEPTH: 25'-27'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN POORLY GRADED SAND W/ SILT (SP-SM)

LIC	QUID LIMIT,	PLASTIC LIM	IT, AND PL/ STM D 4318	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	
DE	LIQUID LIMI TERMINATI	T ON			PLASTIC LIMIT	
TARE NO. NUMBER OF E TARE + WET S TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	BLOWS OIL (g) OIL (g) ENT (%)	CNBD		TARE NO. TARE + WE TARE + DR) TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII	T SOIL (g) Y SOIL (g) g) NTENT (%) MIT	CNBD
LIQUID LIMIT:	CNBD		PLA	STIC LIMIT:	CNBD	
		PARTICLE SIZ	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1	IS OF SOIL	S	
		Cummulative				
Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams)	Weight Retained (Grams)	Percent Retained	Percent Finer	Specification	
1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#4	5.5	5.5	1	99	N/A	
#10	26.6	32.1	6	94	N/A	
#40	317.0	349.1	62	38	N/A	
#200	159.7	508.8	89.8	10.2	N/A	
<b>Original Samp</b>	le Weight:	566.4				
Percent Gravel:	1.0					
Percent Sand: 88.9						
Percent Sand:	00.9					

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS): SP-SM

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

#### **CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487** (UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

**PROJECT:** WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

**JOB NO.:** 15775 **DATE:** 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: EB4

DEPTH: 10'-12'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION. REDDISH BROWNI SILTY SAND (SM)

	IQUID LIMIT,		IIT, AND PLA ASTM D 4318	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	
_	LIQUID LIMIT DETERMINATIO	n DN	-	1	PLASTIC LIMIT	
TARE NO. NUMBER OF TARE + WET TARE + DRY TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CON LIQUID LIMI	F BLOWS F SOIL (g) 7 SOIL (g) NTENT (%) T	CNBD		TARE NO. TARE + WE TARE + DR TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LI	T SOIL (g) 7 SOIL (g) g) NTENT (%) MIT	CNBD
LIQUID LIMI	T: CNBD			STIC LIMIT:	CNBD	
		PARTICLE SI		IS OF SOIL	S	
		PARTICLE SI AST	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1	IS OF SOIL 140	S	
Sieve	Weight	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1	IS OF SOIL 140	S	
Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams)	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer	S Specification	
Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100	S Specification N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4"	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100	S Specification N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 2.2	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 0.0	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 1	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 99	S Specification N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 3.2 0.0	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 6.8 7.7	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 1	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 99 99 99	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 3.2 0.9 272 1	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 6.8 7.7 279.8	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 1 1 52 1	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 99 99 99 99 47 9	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Sam	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 3.2 0.9 272.1 hple Weight:	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 6.8 7.7 279.8 537.3	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 1 1 52.1	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 99 99 99 99 47.9	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Sam Percent Grave Percent Sand	Weight Retained (Grams)           0.0           0.0           3.6           3.2           0.9           272.1           mple Weight:           el:         0.7           :         51.4           elay:         47.9	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.6 6.8 7.7 279.8 537.3	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 1 1 1 52.1	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 99 99 99 99 47.9	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

#### CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: EB6

**DEPTH:** 0'-5'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN & BROWN SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL)

L		, PLASTIC LIMI A	T, AND PLA STM D 4318	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	
	LIQUID LIMI DETERMINAT	T ION		Ī	PLASTIC LIMIT	
TARE NO. NUMBER OF TARE + WET TARE + DRY TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CON LIQUID LIMI	F BLOWS F SOIL (g) F SOIL (g) ITENT (%)	LTB 24 24.43 20.39 6.86 4.04 13.53 29.9 <b>30</b>		TARE NO. TARE + WE TARE + DR TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LI	T SOIL (g) ( SOIL (g) ]) NTENT (%) MIT	97 18.02 16.73 8.23 8.50 1.29 15.18 <b>15</b>
LIQUID LIMI	Г: 30	PLASTIC	PLA TY INDEX:	<b>ASTIC LIMIT:</b> 15	15	
		PARTICLE SIZ	E ANALYS 1 D 422 / D 1	IS OF SOIL 140	S	
Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams)	Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	Percent Retained	Percent Finer	Specification	
1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#4	0.9	0.9	0	100	N/A	
#10	1.2	2.1	0	100	N/A	
#40	30.4	32.5	6	94	N/A	
#200	195.9	228.4	42.4	57.6	N/A	
<b>Original Sam</b>	ple Weight:	538.7				

Original Sample weight:

Percent Gravel:0.2Percent Sand:42.2Percent Silt/Clay:57.6

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS):

CL

LITTLE ROCK A JONESBORO A HOPE

#### **CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487**

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

**JOB NO.:** 15775 **DATE:** 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: EB6

DEPTH: 20'-25'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN POORLY GRADED SAND W/ SILT (SP-SM)

LIC		, PLASTIC LIMI A	T, AND PL STM D 4318	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	8
۱ DE	LIQUID LIM	IT ION		PLASTIC LIMIT DETERMINATION		
TARE NO. NUMBER OF B TARE + WET S TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONTI LIQUID LIMIT	LOWS OIL (g) OIL (g) ENT (%)	CNBD		TARE NO. TARE + WE TARE + DR TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER (g) WATER CO PLASTIC LI	T SOIL (g) Y SOIL (g) g) NTENT (%) MIT	CNBD
LIQUID LIMIT:	CNBD	PLASTIC	PL/ TY INDEX:	ASTIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST	CNBD FIC	
Sieve or	Weight Retained	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained	E ANALYS 1 D 422 / D 1 Percent	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent	S	

Screen	(Grams)	(Grams)	Retained	Finer	Specification	
1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#4	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#10	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#40	19.4	19.4	4	96	N/A	
#200	475.4	494.8	93.0	7.0	N/A	
<b>Original Sam</b>	nple Weight:	532.2				

## Original Sample weight:

0.0 Percent Gravel: Percent Sand: 93.0 7.0 Percent Silt/Clay:

#### UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS): SP-SM

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

#### CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

**PROJECT:** WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: EB7

**DEPTH:** 5'-10'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN & BROWN SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL)

LIQUID LIMIT,	PLASTIC LIMIT, A	AND PLASTICITY INDEX OF SOIL I D 4318	S
LIQUID LIMI DETERMINATI	r ON	PLASTIC LIMIT <u>DETERMINATIO</u>	<u>N</u>
TARE NO.	430	TARE NO.	XA
NUMBER OF BLOWS	21	TARE + WET SOIL (g)	18.13
TARE + WET SOIL (g)	24.08	TARE + DRY SOIL (g)	16.78
TARE + DRY SOIL (g)	19.93	TARE (g)	8.01
TARE (g)	6.94	DRY SOIL (g)	8.77
WATER (g)	4.15	WATER (g)	1.35
DRY SOIL (g)	12.99	WATER CONTENT (%)	15.39
WATER CONTENT (%)	31.9	PLASTIC LIMIT	15
	31		
LIQUID LIMIT: 31		PLASTIC LIMIT: 15	

PLASTICITY INDEX: 16

#### PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS OF SOILS ASTM D 422 / D 1140

Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams)	Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	Percent Retained	Percent Finer	Specification	
1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#4	1.7	1.7	0	100	N/A	
#10	1.3	3.0	1	99	N/A	
#40	22.6	25.6	5	95	N/A	
#200	136.9	162.5	31.3	68.7	N/A	
Original Samp	le Weight:	518.6				
Percent Gravel:	0.3					

Percent Sand: 31.0 Percent Silt/Clay: 68.7

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS):

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

## CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

**JOB NO.:** 15775

**DATE:** 05/11/20

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

SAMPLE NO.: EB8

**DEPTH:** 15'-20'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN SILTY SAND (SM)

LI		, PLASTIC LIM	IIT, AND PL	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	
D	LIQUID LIM	IT ION			PLASTIC LIMIT	
TARE NO. NUMBER OF I TARE + WET S TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	BLOWS SOIL (g) SOIL (g) FENT (%)	CNBD		TARE NO. TARE + WE TARE + DR TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER (g) WATER CO PLASTIC LI	T SOIL (g) Y SOIL (g) g) NTENT (%) MIT	CNBD
LIQUID LIMIT:	CNBD	PLASTIC	PL/ ITY INDEX:	ASTIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST	CNBD FIC	
Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams)	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	ZE ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained	IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer	S	
1.5" 3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A N/A	

0

1

17

58.1

 #40
 92.3
 97.3

 #200
 233.2
 330.5

 Original Sample Weight:
 569.0

 Percent Gravel:
 0.4

 Percent Sand:
 57.7

2.2

2.8

Percent Silt/Clay: 41.9

#4

#10

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS):

2.2

5.0

100

99

83

41.9

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

LITTLE ROCK & JONESBORO & HOPE

## CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

**PROJECT:** WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: EB9

**DEPTH:** 5'-8'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN & BROWN SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL)

LIC DETE TARE NO. NUMBER OF BLC TARE + WET SOI TARE + DRY SOI TARE (g) NATER (g) NATER (g) NATER CONTEN LIQUID LIMIT	QUID LIMI ERMINATI DWS IL (g) L (g) IT (%)	T 18 28 19.18 17.16 8.16 2.02 9.00 22.4 23 PLASTIC	PLA TY INDEX:	TARE NO. TARE + WET TARE + DRY TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: 8	PLASTIC LIMIT DETERMINATION T SOIL (g) ( SOIL (g) 3) NTENT (%) MIT 15	76 17.54 16.31 7.84 8.47 1.23 14.52 <b>15</b>
TARE NO. NUMBER OF BLC TARE + WET SOI TARE + DRY SOI TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONTEN LIQUID LIMIT	DWS IL (g) L (g) IT (%) 23	18 28 19.18 17.16 8.16 2.02 9.00 22.4 <b>23</b>	PLA TY INDEX:	TARE NO. TARE + WET TARE + DRY TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: 8	T SOIL (g) ( SOIL (g) 3) NTENT (%) MIT 15	76 17.54 16.31 7.84 8.47 1.23 14.52 <b>15</b>
LIQUID LIMIT: 2	3	PLASTIC	PLA TY INDEX:	STIC LIMIT: 8	15	
		PLASTICI	TY INDEX:	8		
		PARTICLE SIZ		IS OF SOIL	S	
Sieve V or R	Weight etained	ASTN Cummulative Weight Retained	Percent	Percent	On a sift a stimu	
Screen ((	Grams)	(Grams)	Retained	Finer	Specification	
1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
3/4 #A	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A N/A	
#4 #10	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A N/A	
#10	14.5	0.0	3	07	N/A	
#200	255.2	270.5	49 4	50.6	N/A	
Original Sample	Weight:	547.6	-10.7	00.0	11// \	
Percent Gravel: Percent Sand: Percent Silt/Clay:	0.0 49.4 50.6					

ANDERSON ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC. LITTLE ROCK & JONESBORO & HOPE

## CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

**PROJECT:** WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: PZ1

**DEPTH:** 10'-13'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN SANDY SILT (ML)

DI	LIQUID LIMIT	r ON		ſ	PLASTIC LIMIT	
TARE NO. NUMBER OF E TARE + WET S TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	BLOWS SOIL (g) SOIL (g) ENT (%)	CNBD		TARE NO. TARE + WE TARE + DR TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LI	T SOIL (g) 7 SOIL (g) 3) NTENT (%) MIT	CNBD
LIQUID LIMIT:	CNBD	PLASTIC	PLA	STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST	CNBD	
Sieve	Weight Retained	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained	E ANALYSI I D 422 / D 1 ⁻¹ Percent	S OF SOIL 140 Percent	S	
Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams)	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	E ANALYSI I D 422 / D 1 ⁻ Percent Retained	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer	S Specification	
Sieve or Screen 1.5"	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	E ANALYSI I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100	S Specification N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4"	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	<b>E ANALYS</b> I D 422 / D 1 ⁴ Percent Retained 0 0	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100	S Specification N/A N/A	
<b>Sieve</b> or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.4	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.4	<b>E ANALYSI</b> I D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0	<b>S OF SOIL</b> <b>140</b> <b>Percent</b> <b>Finer</b> 100 100 100	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.4 0.7	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.4 1.1	E ANALYSI I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 100	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.4 0.7 35.2	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.4 1.1 36.3	E ANALYSI I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 7	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 93	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.4 0.7 35.2 186.6	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.4 1.1 36.3 222.9	<b>E ANALYSI</b> I D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 7 40.9	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 93 59.1	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.4 0.7 35.2 186.6 ole Weight:	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.4 1.1 36.3 222.9 545.0	<b>E ANALYSI</b> <b>A D 422 / D 1</b> <b>Percent</b> <b>Retained</b> 0 0 0 0 0 7 40.9	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 93 59.1	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel:	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.4 0.7 35.2 186.6 Die Weight: 0.1	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.4 1.1 36.3 222.9 545.0	<b>E ANALYSI</b> I D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 7 40.9	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 93 59.1	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel: Percent Sand:	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.4 0.7 35.2 186.6 Die Weight: 0.1 40.8	PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.4 1.1 36.3 222.9 545.0	<b>E ANALYSI</b> <b>D 422 / D 1</b> <b>Percent</b> <b>Retained</b> 0 0 0 0 0 7 40.9	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 93 59.1	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

## CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

SAMPLE NO.: PZ2

**DEPTH:** 2'-5'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: BROWN & REDDISH BROWN SANDY SILTY CLAY (CL-ML)

						_
D	LIQUID LIMIT	n ON		Ī	PLASTIC LIMIT	
TARE NO. NUMBER OF I TARE + WET S TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	BLOWS SOIL (g) SOIL (g) FENT (%)	MC 23 20.36 17.98 7.85 2.38 10.13 23.5 <b>23</b>		TARE NO. TARE + WE TARE + DR TARE (g) DRY SOIL (g WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII	T SOIL (g) 7 SOIL (g) 3) NTENT (%) MIT	56 18.18 16.75 8.04 8.71 1.43 16.42 <b>16</b>
LIQUID LIMIT:	23		PLA	STIC LIMIT:	16	
		PLASTIC		7		
		PARTICLE SI AST	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ⁴	S OF SOIL	S	
Sieve	Weight	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ⁴	IS OF SOIL	S	
Sieve or Screen	Weight Retained (Grams)	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ⁻⁴ Percent Retained	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer	Specification	
Sieve or Screen 1.5"	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ⁻⁴ Percent Retained 0	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100	S Specification N/A	
<b>Sieve</b> or Screen 1.5" 3/4"	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ⁻⁴ Percent Retained 0 0	<b>S OF SOIL</b> <b>140</b> <b>Percent</b> <b>Finer</b> 100 100	S Specification N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ² Percent Retained 0 0 1	<b>S OF SOIL</b> <b>140</b> <b>Percent</b> <b>Finer</b> 100 100 99	S Specification N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3 2.6	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3 5.9 0.0	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ⁻⁴ Percent Retained 0 1 1 1	<b>Percent</b> <b>Finer</b> 100 100 99 99	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3 2.6 17.1 244.8	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 3.3 5.9 23.0 267.8	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1* Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 4 4	<b>Percent</b> <b>Finer</b> 100 100 99 99 96 51.4	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Same	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3 2.6 17.1 244.8 ble Weight:	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 3.3 5.9 23.0 23.0 267.8 550.8	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 14 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 4 48.6	<b>Percent</b> <b>Finer</b> 100 100 99 99 96 51.4	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3 2.6 17.1 244.8 ble Weight:	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 3.3 5.9 23.0 267.8 550.8	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 14 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 4 4 48.6	S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 99 99 99 96 51.4	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel: Percent Sand:	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3 2.6 17.1 244.8 ble Weight: : 0.6 48.0	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 3.3 5.9 23.0 267.8 550.8	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 4 4 48.6	<b>S OF SOIL</b> <b>140</b> <b>Percent</b> <b>Finer</b> 100 100 99 99 96 51.4	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel: Percent Silt/Cla	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3 2.6 17.1 244.8 De Weight: : 0.6 48.0 w: 51.4	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 3.3 5.9 23.0 267.8 550.8	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 14 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 4 4 48.6	S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 99 99 96 51.4	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel: Percent Sand: Percent Silt/Cla	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 3.3 2.6 17.1 244.8 ble Weight: : 0.6 48.0 by: 51.4	PARTICLE SI AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 3.3 5.9 23.0 267.8 550.8	ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 14 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 4 4 48.6	<b>S OF SOIL</b> <b>140</b> <b>Percent</b> <b>Finer</b> 100 100 99 99 96 51.4	S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	

ANDERSON ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC. LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

# CLASSIEICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING DURDOSES

SAMPLE NO.:	P72					
DEDTH.	15'-17'					
MATERIAL DE	SCRIPTION:	REDDISH BRO	WN SILTY SA	ND (SM)		
LIC		, PLASTIC LIM	IT, AND PLA	STICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	
		Т			PLASTIC LIMIT	
DE	TERMINATI	ON	Contract of the		DETERMINATION	
TARE NO.			-	TARE NO.		
				TARE + WE	T SOIL (g)	
TAKE T WET 3	OIL (g)				r 3012 (g)	
TARE + DRY S	(J)			DRY SOIL (	g)	
TARE + DRY S TARE (g)						
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g)				WATER (g)		
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g)	<b></b>			WATER (g) WATER COI	NTENT (%)	
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	ENT (%) CNBD	CNBD PLASTIC	PLA ITY INDEX:	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	ENT (%) CNBD	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ AST	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST NON-PLAST	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	ENT (%) CNBD	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTR Cummulative	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1/	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT:	ENT (%) CNBD	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTR Cummulative Weight	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST S OF SOIL	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT: Sieve or	ENT (%) CNBD Weight Retained (Grams)	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTR Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC Specification	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT: Sieve or Screen 1.5"	ENT (%) CNBD Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S S S S N/A	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT: Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4"	ENT (%) CNBD Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S S S S S N/A N/A	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT: Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4	ENT (%) CNBD Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTR Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST IS OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD CIC S S S S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT: Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40	ENT (%) CNBD Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTR Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S S S S S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200	ENT (%) CNBD Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 12 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 1 66 6	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 100 99	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT: Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp	ENT (%) CNBD CNBD Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTR Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 1 66.6	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 99 33.4	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S S S S S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT: Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp	ENT (%) CNBD Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTR Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA ITY INDEX: ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 12 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 1 66.6	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LII STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 100 33.4	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S S S S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	CNBD
TARE + DRY S TARE (g) WATER (g) DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT: Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel: Percent Sand:	ENT (%) CNBD Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	CNBD PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ AST Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 12 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 1 66.6	WATER (g) WATER COI PLASTIC LI STIC LIMIT: NON-PLAST S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 99 33.4	NTENT (%) MIT CNBD FIC S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	CNBD

LITTLE ROCK 🔺 JONESBORO 🔺 HOPE

## CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

SAMPLE NO.: PZ4

**DEPTH:** 5'-10'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN CLAYEY SAND (SC)

L	IQUID LIMIT	, PLASTIC LIN	IIT, AND PLA ASTM D 4318	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	
	LIQUID LIM	IT ION	-	I	PLASTIC LIMIT	
TARE NO.		17		TARE NO.		33
NUMBER OF	BLOWS	24	-	TARE + WE	T SOIL (g)	17.92
TARE + WET	「SOIL (g)	24.27		TARE + DR	SOIL (g)	16.68
TARE + DRY	SOIL (g)	20.98		TARE (g)		8.42
TARE (g)		7.92		DRY SOIL (	<b>j</b> )	8.26
WATER (g)		3.29		WATER (g)		1.24
DRY SOIL (g	)	13.06		WATER CO	NTENT (%)	15.01
WATER CON	NTENT (%)	25.2	1	PLASTIC LI	MIT	15
LIQUID LIMI	T (	25		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		PARTICLE SI		IS OF SOIL	S	
		ASI	M U 422 / U 1	140		
0.		Cummulative				
Sleve	Weight	weight	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>		
or	Retained	Retained	Percent	Percent	•	
Screen	(Grams)	(Grams)	Retained	Finer	Specification	-
1.5"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
3/4"	0.0	0.0	0	100	N/A	
#4	0.5	0.5	0	100	N/A	
#10	20.9	21.4	3	97	N/A	
#40	239.0	260.4	34	66	N/A	

Original Sample Weight:

230.1

#200

Percent Gravel:0.1Percent Sand:64.3Percent Silt/Clay:35.6

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS):

490.5

762.0

35.6

N/A

Geotechnical Engineering – Environmental Assessments – Quality Control of Construction Materials

64.4

ANDERSON ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC. LITTLE ROCK & JONESBORO & HOPE

## CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

PROJECT: W	/CA NORTH	EAST C & D LAN	DFILL		JOB NO.:	15775
LOCATION: S	PENCER. O	KLAHOMA			DATE:	05/11/2
	D75					
SAMPLE NU.:	PZ0					
DEPTH:	0'-5'					
SOURCE:	BULK					
MATERIAL DE	SCRIPTION	: BROWN & RED	DISH BROW	IN SANDY LE	EAN CLAY (CL)	
LIQ		, PLASTIC LIMI A	T, AND PL	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	
		IT			PLASTIC LIMIT	
DE	TERMINAT	ION		1	DETERMINATION	
TARE NO.		68A		TARE NO.		67
NUMBER OF B	BLOWS	23		TARE + WE	T SOIL (g)	18.05
TARE + WET S	OIL (g)	20.02		TARE + DR	r SOIL (g)	16.65
TARE + DRY S	OIL (g)	17.55		TARE (g)		7.57
TARE (g)		8.09		DRY SOIL (	g)	9.08
WATER (g)		2.47		WATER (g)		1.40
		9.46		WATER CO	NTENT (%)	15.42
DRY SOIL (g)						
WATER CONT	ENT (%)	26.1		PLASTIC LI	МІТ	15
URY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	ENT (%) 	26.1 26 PLASTIC	PLA ITY INDEX:	ASTIC LIMIT:	MIT 15	15
URY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	ENT (%) 26	26.1 26 PLASTIC	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS	IS OF SOIL	MIT 15 S	15
URY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	ENT (%) 26	26.1 26 PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1	IS OF SOIL	MIT 15 S	15
DRY SOIL (g) WATER CONT LIQUID LIMIT	ENT (%) 26	26.1 26 PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1	ASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL	MIT 15 S	15
Sieve	ENT (%) 26 Weight	26.1 26 PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Datain and	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1	IS OF SOIL	MIT 15 S	15
Sieve	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained	26.1 26 PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grome)	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS M D 422 / D 1 Percent Potainad	PLASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent	MIT 15 S	15
Sieve or Screen	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams)	26.1 26 PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained	PLASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer	MIT 15 S Specification	15
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4"	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	26.1 26 PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0	PLASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100	MIT 15 S Specification N/A N/A	15
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 2 3	26.1 26 PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 2 3	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0	PLASTIC LI ASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100	MIT 15 S S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A	15
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 5.6	26.1 26 PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 2.3 7.9	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 1	PLASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 99	MIT 15 S S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	15
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 5.6 50.7	26.1 26 PLASTIC PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 7.9 58.6	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 1 1 11	PLASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 99 89	MIT 15 S S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	15
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 5.6 50.7 133.7	26.1 26 PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 7.9 58.6 192.3	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS A D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 11 36.4	PLASTIC LI STIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 99 89 63.6	MIT 15 S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	15
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #200 Original Samp	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 5.6 50.7 133.7 Ie Weight:	26.1 26 PLASTIC PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 7.9 58.6 192.3 528.4	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS A D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 1 1 11 36.4	PLASTIC LI ASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 99 89 63.6	MIT 15 S S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	15
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel:	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 5.6 50.7 133.7 Ie Weight: 0.4	26.1 26 PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 7.9 58.6 192.3 528.4	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS A D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 1 1 11 36.4	PLASTIC LI ASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 99 89 63.6	MIT 15 S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel: Percent Sand:	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 5.6 50.7 133.7 Ie Weight: 0.4 36.0 0.0	26.1 26 PLASTIC PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 7.9 58.6 192.3 528.4	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 1 1 11 36.4	PLASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 99 89 63.6	MIT 15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	15
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel: Percent Sand: Percent Silt/Clay	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 2.3 5.6 50.7 133.7 Ie Weight: 0.4 36.0 y: 63.6	26.1 26 PLASTIC PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 7.9 58.6 192.3 528.4	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 1 1 11 36.4	PLASTIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 99 89 63.6	MIT 15 S S S N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #200 Original Samp Percent Gravel: Percent Sand: Percent Silt/Clay	ENT (%) 26 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 5.6 50.7 133.7 Ie Weight: 0.4 36.0 y: 63.6	26.1 26 PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 2.3 7.9 58.6 192.3 528.4	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS A D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 1 1 11 36.4	PLASTIC LI STIC LIMIT: 10 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 99 89 63.6	MIT 15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	

## CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

	WCA NORTH	EAST C & D LAN	DFILL		JOB NO.:	15775
	SPENCER, OI	KLAHOMA			DATE:	05/11/2
	, D76					
	. PZ0					
DEPTH:	2'-5'					
SOURCE:	BULK					
MATERIAL D	ESCRIPTION	REDDISH BRO	WN & BROW	/N SANDY LE	AN CLAY (CL)	
LI		, PLASTIC LIMI	T, AND PLA	ASTICITY IN	IDEX OF SOILS	
		Т			PLASTIC LIMIT	
	ETERMINAT	ION		<u>[</u>	DETERMINATION	
TARE NO.		024		TARE NO.		75
NUMBER OF	BLOWS	21		TARE + WE	T SOIL (g)	17.66
TARE + WET	SOIL (g)	22.05		TARE + DR	r SOIL (g)	16.38
	SOIL (g)	17.90		IARE (g)	_1	7.99
IARE (g)		6.93		DRY SOIL ((	3)	8.39
WAIER (g)		4.15		WATER (g)		1.28
WATER CON	TENT (%)	37.8		PLASTIC LI	MIENI (70) MIT	15.20
		37.0		FLASTIC LI		15
		•				
LIQUID LIMIT	: 37	PI ASTICI		STIC LIMIT:	15	
LIQUID LIMIT	: 37	PLASTIC	PLA ITY INDEX:	STIC LIMIT: 22	15	
LIQUID LIMIT	: 37	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS 1 D 422 / D 1	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140	15 S	
LIQUID LIMIT	: 37	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140	15 S	
LIQUID LIMIT	: 37 Weight	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS 1 D 422 / D 1	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL 140	15 S	
LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT Sieve or	: 37 Weight Retained	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTA Cummulative Weight Retained	PLA ITY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent	15 S	
Sieve or Screen	: 37 Weight Retained (Grams)	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer	15 S Specification	
Sieve or Screen 1.5"	Weight Retained (Grams)	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100	15 S Specification	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4"	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100	15 S Specification N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4	<b>Weight</b> <b>Retained</b> (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100	15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A	
LIQUID LIMIT LIQUID LIMIT Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40	<b>Weight</b> <b>Retained</b> (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 0	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 04	15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200	<b>Weight</b> <b>Retained</b> (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 94 68.8	15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Sam	<b>Weight</b> <b>Retained</b> (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 31.2	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 94 68.8	15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #200 Original Sam	<b>Weight</b> <b>Retained</b> (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 31.2	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 94 68.8	15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Sam Percent Gravel Percent Sand:	Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 31.2	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 94 68.8	15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Sam Percent Gravel Percent Sand: Percent Silt/Cla	Weight Retained (Grams)         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.10         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.10         0.2         129.2         ple Weight:         1:       0.0         31.2         ay:       68.8	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA TY INDEX: E ANALYS D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 31.2	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 94 68.8	15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200 Original Sam Percent Grave Percent Sand: Percent Silt/Cla	Weight Retained (Grams)         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.12         129.2         129.2         129.2         129.2         129.2         129.2         129.2         12         12         0.0         31.2         ay:         68.8         OIL CLASS	PLASTICI PARTICLE SIZ ASTM Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	PLA TY INDEX: ZE ANALYS I D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 31.2	STIC LIMIT: 22 IS OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 94 68.8	15 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	

LITTLE ROCK & JONESBORO & HOPE

#### CLASSIFICATION OF SOILS FOR ENGINEERING PURPOSES ASTM D 2487

(UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL

JOB NO.: 15775 DATE: 05/11/20

LOCATION: SPENCER, OKLAHOMA

SAMPLE NO.: PZ7

**DEPTH:** 6'-8'

SOURCE: BULK

MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: REDDISH BROWN & BROWN LEAN CLAY W/ SAND (CL)

		A				
ļ	LIQUID LIMIT	r ON		<u>[</u>	PLASTIC LIMIT	
TARE NO.		008	-	TARE NO.		GI
NUMBER OF	BLOWS	24		TARE + WE	T SOIL (g)	16.94
FARE + WET	SOIL (g)	25.66		TARE + DR	(SOIL (g)	15.70
FARE + DRY	SOIL (g)	21.37		TARE (g)		7.76
ΓARE (g)		8.06	Name and	DRY SOIL (g	g)	7.94
NATER (g)		4.29		WATER (g)		1.24
ORY SOIL (g)	)	13.31		WATER CO	NTENT (%)	15.62
NATER CON	TENT (%)	32.2		PLASTIC LI	MIT	16
	r	32				
IQUID LIMI1.	Г: 32	PLASTIC	PLA ITY INDEX:	STIC LIMIT: 16	16	
IQUID LIMIT	Γ: 32	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI VI D 422 / D 1	STIC LIMIT: 16 IS OF SOIL: 140	16 S	
Sieve or	F: 32 Weight Retained	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI Cummulative Weight Retained	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ⁴ Percent	STIC LIMIT: 16 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent	16 S	
Sieve or Screen	F: 32 Weight Retained (Grams)	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams)	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 ⁴ Percent Retained	STIC LIMIT: 16 IS OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer	16 S Specification	
Sieve or Screen 1.5"	F: 32 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0	STIC LIMIT: 16 S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100	16 S Specification N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4"	F: 32 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTIC Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0	STIC LIMIT: 16 S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100	16 S Specification N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4	<b>Weight</b> <b>Retained</b> (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0	STIC LIMIT: 16 S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100	16 S Specification N/A N/A N/A	
LIQUID LIMIT Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10	T: 32 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.2	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.2	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0	STIC LIMIT: 16 S OF SOIL: 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100	16 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
<b>Sieve</b> or <b>Screen</b> 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40	T: 32 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.2 20.4	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.2 20.6	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 17 Percent Retained 0 0 0 4	STIC LIMIT: 16 S OF SOIL 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 96	16 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
Sieve or Screen 1.5" 3/4" #4 #10 #40 #200	T: 32 Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.2 20.4 123.8	PLASTIC PARTICLE SIZ ASTI Cummulative Weight Retained (Grams) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.2 20.6 144.4	PLA ITY INDEX: ZE ANALYSI M D 422 / D 1 Percent Retained 0 0 0 0 0 4 28.0	<b>STIC LIMIT:</b> 16 <b>S OF SOIL</b> 140 Percent Finer 100 100 100 100 100 96 72.0	16 S Specification N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	

 Percent Gravel:
 0.0

 Percent Sand:
 28.0

 Percent Silt/Clay:
 72.0

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION (USCS):



## **PROCTOR COMPACTION TEST**

Project: Location: Source: WCA NORTHEAST C & D LANDFILL SPENCER, OKLAHOMA EB7;5'-10' Date: 05/11/20 AECI Job No.: 15775

**Sample Description:** 

REDDISH BROWN & BROWN SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL)





	COEI AST	FFICIENT OF PE (CONSTANT H M D 5084 - FLEX	RMEABILITY HEAD) IBLE WALL			
Project:	WCA NORTHE	AST C & D LANDFI	Project No.:	15775		
Location:	SPENCER, OKL	AHOMA		Date:	5'-10' NA	
Sample No.:	EB7			Sample Depth:		
Son Description: Elevation:	NA	BROWN & BROW	N SANDY LEAN	CLAY (CL) Lift No.:		
		CLASSIFICATIO	N DATA			
Liquid Limit:	31	-	No. 4 Sieve:	100%		
Plastic Limit:	15	-	No. 40 Sieve:	95%		
USCS Classificatio	on: CL					
USCS Classificatio	on: CL cy: 95.2	PHYSICAL PROP	PERTIES			
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densit	on: CL cy: 95.2	PHYSICAL PROP	PERTIES Diamet	er, Cm	7.11	
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch	on: CL 	PHYSICAL PROP	PERTIES Diamet Height,	er, Cm	7.11 7.11	
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch	on: CL cy: 95.2 	PHYSICAL PROP 0 0 6	PERTIES Diamet Height, Area So	er, Cm Cm q. Cm	7.11 7.11 39.73	
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densite Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inc	on: CL y: 95.2 	PHYSICAL PROP 0 0 6 4 3	PERTIES Diamet Height, Area So Volume Eat. SP	er, Cm Cm q. Cm e, Cubic Cm	7.11 7.11 39.73 . 282.58	
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inc Initial Wt., Gram Water Content.	on: CL cy: 95.2 	<b>PHYSICAL PROF</b> 0 0 6 4 3 0	PERTIES Diamet Height, Area So Volume Est. SP Void P	er, Cm , Cm q. Cm e, Cubic Cm . GR atio	7.11 7.11 39.73 . 282.58 2.67 0.5317	
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densite Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inc Initial Wt., Gram Water Content Wet Unit Wt., PCF	on: CL ty: 95.2 	PHYSICAL PROP 0 0 6 4 3 0 2	PERTIES Diamet Height, Area So Volum Est. SP Void R Water J	er, Cm Cm q. Cm e, Cubic Cm . GR atio Head:	7.11 7.11 39.73 . 282.58 2.67 0.5317	
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inc Initial Wt., Gram Water Content Water Content Wet Unit Wt., PCF Dry Unit Wt., PCF	on: CL cy: 95.2 	PHYSICAL PROP 0 0 6 4 3 0 2 8	PERTIES Diamet Height, Area So Volumo Est. SP Void R Water I Cm.	rer, Cm , Cm q. Cm e, Cubic Cm . GR atio Head:	7.11 7.11 39.73 . 282.58 2.67 0.5317 . 140.68	
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inc Initial Wt., Gram Water Content Water Content Wet Unit Wt., PCF Dry Unit Wt., PCF	on: CL cy: 95.2 	PHYSICAL PROP 0 0 6 4 3 0 2 8	PERTIES Diamet Height, Area So Volumo Est. SP Void R Water I Cm. Ft	eer, Cm , Cm q. Cm e, Cubic Cm . GR atio Head:	7.11 7.11 39.73 . 282.58 2.67 0.5317 . 140.68 4.62	
USCS Classification Percent Dry Densite Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inc Initial Wt., Gram Water Content Water Content Wet Unit Wt., PCF Dry Unit Wt., PCF	on: CL ty: 95.2 	PHYSICAL PROP 0 0 6 4 3 0 2 8 8 TEMP. ++ (RT)	PERTIES Diamet Height, Area So Voluma Est. SP Void R Water I Cm. Ft HEAD PRESS psi (h)	rer, Cm , Cm q. Cm e, Cubic Cm . GR atio Head: FLOW ML (Q)	7.11 7.11 39.73 . 282.58 2.67 0.5317 . 140.68 4.62 K20 CM./SEC	

Project:       WCA NORTHEAST C & D I         Location:       SPENCER, OKLAHOMA         Sample No.:       EB6         Soil Description:       REDDISH BROWN POORLY         Elevation:       NA         PHYSICAI         Diameter, Inch       2.500         Height, Inch       1.875         Area, Square Inch	M D 5084 ANDFILI Y GRADE	4 Projec Date: Samp D SAND W Lift N RTIES Diameter, C	ct No.: le Depth: / SILT (SF lo.:	15775 05/12/20 20'-25' P-SM) NA	
Project:WCA NORTHEAST C & D ILocation:SPENCER, OKLAHOMASample No.:EB6Soil Description:REDDISH BROWN POORLYElevation:NAPHYSICAIDiameter, Inch2.500Height, Inch1.875Area, Square Inch4.91Volume, Cubic Inch9.20	ANDFILI Y GRADE L <b>PROPE</b>	Date: Date: Samp D SAND W. Lift N RTIES Diameter, C	ct No.: le Depth: / SILT (SF lo.:	15775 05/12/20 20'-25' ?-SM) NA	
PHYSICA Diameter, Inch	L PROPE	RTIES Diameter, C			
Diameter, Inch2.500Height, Inch1.875Area, Square Inch4.91Volume, Cubic Inch9.20		Diameter, C	-		
Initial Wt., Gram	HEAD START (hi)	Height, Cm Area Sq. Cr Volume, Cr Burette Are Est. SP. GR Void Ratio. HEAD END (hf)	Cm mubic Cm va, Sq. Cm S hi/hf		6.3 4.7 31.6 150.8 1.6 2.6 0.590 K20* CM./SEC
2 21.5 0.970	191.1	147.4	1.2968	0.2599	5.06E-04

		COEFFIC ( ⁽ ASTM I	CIENT OF PE CONSTANT I D 5084 - FLEX	RMEABILITY HEAD) XIBLE WALL	<u></u>		
Project: Location: Sample No.:	WCA SPEN PZ6	A NORTHEAST VCER, OKLAHO	C & D LANDF DMA	Project No.: Date: Sample Depth:	15775 07/23/20 2'-5'		
Soil Description: Elevation:	NA	REDDISH BRO	OWN & BROW	N SANDY LEAN	N CLAY (CL) Lift No.:	NA	
		CL	ASSIFICATIO	N DATA		_	
Liquid Limit: Plastic Limit: PI:	37 15 22		-	No. 4 Sieve: No. 40 Sieve: No. 200 Sieve:	100% 94% 69%		
	n.	CL			4		
USCS Classificatio							
Percent Dry Densit	y:	95.1 <b>PH</b>	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES			
Diameter, Inch	y:	95.1 PH . 2.800	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES Diame	eter, Cm	7.11	
DSCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch	y:	95.1 PH . 2.800 . 2.800	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES Diame Heigh	eter, Cm	7.11 7.11	
USCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch	y:	95.1 PH . 2.800 . 2.800 . 6.16	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES Diame Heigh Area S	eter, Cm t, Cm 5q. Cm	7.11 7.11 39.73	
USCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Incl	y:	95.1 <b>PH</b> 2.800 2.800 6.16 . 17.24	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES Diame Heigh Area S Volum	eter, Cm t, Cm 5q. Cm he, Cubic Cm	7.11 7.11 39.73 282.58	
USCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inci Initial Wt., Gram	y:	95.1 <b>PH</b> 2.800 2.800 6.16 17.24 566.2	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES Diame Heigh Area S Volum Est. Sl	eter, Cm t, Cm 5q. Cm te, Cubic Cm P. GR	7.11 7.11 39.73 282.58 . 2.67	
USCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inc. Initial Wt., Gram Water Content	y:	95.1 PH 2.800 2.800 6.16 17.24 566.2 17.3	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES Diame Heigh Area S Volum Est. SI Void I	eter, Cm t, Cm 5q. Cm he, Cubic Cm P. GR Ratio	7.11 7.11 39.73 282.58 . 2.67 0.5625	
USCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inci Initial Wt., Gram Water Content Wet Unit Wt., PCF	y:	95.1 PH 2.800 2.800 6.16 17.24 566.2 17.3 125.1	YSICAL PROI	PERTIES Diame Heigh Area S Volum Est. SI Void H Water	eter, Cm t, Cm 5q. Cm te, Cubic Cm P. GR Ratio Head:	7.11 7.11 39.73 282.58 . 2.67 0.5625	
USCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inci Initial Wt., Gram Water Content Water Content Wet Unit Wt., PCF.	y:	95.1 PH 2.800 2.800 6.16 17.24 566.2 17.3 125.1 106.6	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES Diame Heigh Area S Volum Est. SI Void F Water Cm	eter, Cm t, Cm Sq. Cm Sq. Cubic Cm P. GR Ratio Head:	7.11 7.11 39.73 282.58 . 2.67 0.5625 140.68	
USCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Incl Initial Wt., Gram Water Content Water Content Wet Unit Wt., PCF.	y:	95.1 PH 2.800 2.800 6.16 17.24 566.2 17.3 125.1 106.6	YSICAL PRO	PERTIES Diame Heigh Area S Volum Est. SI Void H Water Cm Ft	eter, Cm t, Cm Gq. Cm he, Cubic Cm P. GR Ratio Head:	7.11 7.11 39.73 282.58 2.67 0.5625 140.68 4.62	
USCS Classificatio Percent Dry Densit Diameter, Inch Height, Inch Area, Square Inch Volume, Cubic Inci Initial Wt., Gram Water Content Water Content Wet Unit Wt., PCF. Dry Unit Wt., PCF.	y:	95.1 PH 2.800 2.800 6.16 17.24 566.2 17.3 125.1 106.6 WATER DEG.,C	YSICAL PRO TEMP. ++ (RT)	PERTIES Diame Heigh Area S Volum Est. SI Void H Water Cm Ft HEAD PRESS psi (h)	eter, Cm t, Cm Gq. Cm te, Cubic Cm P. GR Ratio Head: FLOW ML (Q)	7.11 7.11 39.73 282.58 2.67 0.5625 140.68 4.62 K20 CM./SEC	

	COE	FFICIENT (FALL AST	OF PER JING HE M D 508	MEABILI' AD) 4	ГҮ		
Project:	WCA NORTHE	AST C & D I	LANDFILI	L <b>Proje</b>	ct No.:	15775	
Location:	SPENCER, OKI	LAHOMA		Date:		07/23/20	
Sample No.:	PZ4			Samp	le Depth:	5'-10'	
Soll Description: Elevation:	NA	WN CLAYE	Y SAND (	SC) Lift N	lo.:	NA	
		PHYSICA	L PROPE	RTIES		_	
Diameter, Inch	2.500			Diameter, (	Cm		6.3
Height, Inch	1.875			Height, Crr	1		4.7
Area, Square Inch	4.91			Area Sq. C	m	••••	31.6
Volume, Cubic Inc	h 9.20			Volume, C	ubic Cm		150.8
Initial Wt., Gram				Burette Are	ea, Sq. Cm.		1.6
Water Content	22.6			Est. SP. GI	L		2.6
Wet Unit Wt., PCF	····· 140.9			Void Ratio			0.445
TIME, MIN. (T)	WATER DEG., C	TEMP. ++ (Rt)	HEAD START (hi)	HEAD END (hf)	hi/hf	ln hi/hf	K20* CM./SEC
925	21.0	0.980	191.1	178.8	1.0688	0.0665	2.83E-07

Appendix F

AQTESOLV Analysis Graphs


































