

Via email 05/02/2018

Good morning Maureen,

Please let the Standing Advisory Committee know that we worked with Carly Guillory with SDCI to confirm that these are the references in the MIMP and EIS that pertain to Groundwater.

1. The FEIS briefly summarizes this 1988 report (Hart Crowser) as follows (pp. 3.9-2 –3.9-3):

3.9.1.2 Groundwater

A Geotechnical Engineering Design Report was prepared in February 1988 (Hart Crowser 1988) prior to the construction of the East Tower. The purpose was to assess subsurface site conditions, to assist the structural engineer in establishing foundation design criteria, and to provide geotechnical recommendations related to design and construction. Three hollow-stem auger borings were drilled to depths ranging from 60 to 70 feet below the street level. The borings disclosed somewhat variable soil conditions, including glacial till overlying silty, fine sand. Groundwater was encountered at an elevation of approximately 300 to 305 feet (approximately 35 to 50 feet below the surface). According to URS geotechnical engineer Martin McCabe (PE), the Cherry Hill area is generally underlain by shallow glacial till (i.e., unsorted sediment with content that varies from clays to mixtures of clay, sand, gravel and boulders). There are likely areas of perched groundwater, where there are pockets of groundwater that have rock or clay under them that prevents the groundwater from draining. Construction can affect the groundwater by compacting soil which can force groundwater to the surface or to another location, or by opening new channels in what was previously an impermeable layer.

2. Regarding future development:

A geotechnical report would be prepared for each future site-specific building, and submitted as part of the MUP application. The report would identify subsurface soil and groundwater conditions and would include measures for mitigating any identified impacts (FEIS p. 3.9-13).

See also MIMP condition #65.

We have previously submitted the Shannon & Wilson 2017 Geotechnical Report along with their letter of explanation. Both items are reattached here for the committees convenience as well as the 1988 Crowser Report.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Mikel Hansen, Sabey