



DESIGN STANDARDS	ו כז דויס עריס אר אר איז	ر م
2013	ALUMINUM PEDESTRIAN/BICTCLE I	5 R





	ANCHOR BOLT TABLE							
CACE	CTRUCTURE	DIMENSIONS			ANCHOR			
TYPE		"A" Edge Dist.	"B" Edge Dist.	"C" Embedment	C.I.P Hex Head Bolt	Adhesive Anchor	SIZE	
Ι	Unreinforced Concrete	6"	1'-2"	9"	10½"	11"	7∕8" Ø	
IIa	Reinforced Concrete	4"	4"	9"	10½"	11"	7∕8" Ø	
IIb	Gravity Wall Index No. 6011	$4^{1}/_{2}^{"}$	3½" @ top	1'-0" *	1'-1½"	1'-2"	7⁄8"Ø	
III	Step Cheekwall	$4^{1}/2^{"}$	4½"	9"	10½"	11"	7∕8" Ø	

PASSERO ASSOCIATES engineering architecture www.passero.com **BID SET** Stamp: Client: City of Fernandina Beach 204 Ash St. Fernandina Beach, Florida, 32034 Passero Associates 4730 Casa Cola Way, Suite 200 (904) 757-610 Fax: (904) 757-610 t. Augustine, FL 32095 Certificate of Authorization # 3428 Principal-in-Charge Andrew M. Holesko, C.M. Christopher Nardone, AIA Project Manager Designed by Emily Bredestege No. Date By Description UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THESE DRAWING IS IN VIOLATION OF FLORID ADMINISTRATIVE CODE 61G15-27.001 AND FLORIDA STATUTES 471.033(1). THESE PLANS ARE COPYRIGHT PROTECTED \bigcirc FDOT ALUMINUM RAILING DETAILS Amelia River Waterfront Stabilization Parking Lots C & D Town/City: Fernandina Beach State: Florida County: Nassau 99000047.0095 Drawing No. C4-5 April 26, 2021

RAILING

INDEX NO. 862

SHEET

NO.

8

NOTES: 1. Shop Drawings are i
2. Work with Specificat
3. <u>Materials:</u>
A. Pan Head Set Sci R. Raco Ristos and
D. Dase Places and C. Structural Pine T
D. End Rails 90° ben
MEMBER
Posts
Rails
Rail Joint/Splice
Handrails Joint/Spli
Handrails Handrail Suppo
E. Galvanized Steel a. Hex Head Bolt. b. Adhesive Ancho c. Hex Nuts: ASTM d. Flat Washers: .
F. Aluminum Shims: ,
G. Bearing Pads: Pla
<i>4. <u>Fabrication</u>:</i> <i>A. Place expansion j B. Field splices are handling; but top C. Continuity field s D. Corners and chan terminated at ad j E. For curved longit <i>F. For changes in ta</i> of the corner, not</i>
5. <u>Handrails are reguir</u>
A. Grades Steeper th B. Three or more st
6. Cutting of reinforcin

required.

ation 515.

crews: Aluminum Alloy 2024–74 or 7075–773 or Stainless Steel (SS) Type 316 or 18–8 Alloy. Cap Plates: ASTM B209, Alloy 6061-T6

Tube and Bars: ASTM B221 or ASTM B429, Alloy 6061-T6

ends and corner bends with a maximum 4 foot spacing: Alloy 6063-T5 is permitted.

RAILING MEMBER DIMENSIONS TABLE						
	DESIGNATION	OUTSIDE DIMENSION	WALL THICKNESS			
	2" NPS (Sch. 40)	2.375"	0.154"			
	2" NPS (Sch. 40)	2.375"	0.154"			
Sleeves	1½" NPS (Sch. 40)	1.900"	0.145"			
ice Sleeves	1" NPS (Sch. 40) 1.50 0Dx0.125 Wall	1.315" 1.500"	0.133" 0.125"			
5	1½" NPS (Sch. 40)	1.900"	0.145"			
ort Bar	1" Ø Round Bar	1.000"	N/A			

Fasteners:

Its: ASTM A 307 Type 1 or ASTM F1554 Grade 36 nors: ASTM F1554 Grade 36 fully threaded rods M A563 ASTM F436

ASTM B209, Alloy 6061

lain, Fabric Reinforced, or Fabric Laminated meeting requirements of Specifications 515 & 932.

n joints at a maximum of 30'-0"spacing re similar to the expansion joint detail and may be approved by the Engineer to facilitate op rail must be continuous across a minimum of two posts. I splice (Detail "E"); only use to make the railing continuous for unforeseen field adjustments hanges in tangential longitudinal alignment may be made continuous with a 9" bend radius or adjoining sections with a standard end hoop when handrails are not required. gitudinal alignments, shop bend top and bottom rails and handrails to match the alignment radius. tangential longitudinal alignmet from the standard bottom rails and handrails to match the alignment radius. tangential longitudinal alignment greater than 45°, position posts a maximum of 2'-0" each side not at the corner apex.

nired and must be continuous at landings for:

than 5% steps

ing steel is permitted for post installed anchor bolts.

PIPE GUIDERAIL (ALUMINUM)

	PASSERO ASSOCIATES engineering architecture
	www.passero.com BID SET
	Stamp:
	Client:
	City of Fernandina Beach 204 Ash St. Fernandina Beach, Florida, 32034
	Passero Associates4730 Casa Cola Way, Suite 200(904) 757-6106\$4730 Casa Cola Way, Suite 200(904) 757-6106\$5t. Augustine, FL 32095Fax: (904) 757-6107Certificate of Authorization # 3428Principal-in-ChargeAndrew M. Holesko, C.M.Project ManagerChristopher Nardone, AIADesigned byEmily Bredestege
	No. Date By Description
	UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THESE DRAWING IS IN VIOLATION OF FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE 61G15-27.001 AND FLORIDA STATUTES 471.033(1). THESE PLANS ARE COPYRIGHT PROTECTED ©
	GUIDERAIL (ALUMINUM)
	Amelia River Waterfront Stabilization Parking Lots C & D Town/City: Fernandina Beach County: Nassau State: Florida
515-070 1 of 5	Project No. 9900047.0095
	Drawing No. C4-6
	Date May 10, 2021























wing name: F: \PASSERO\FHB\99000047.0095 FHB Waterfront\Airport\C7-01_UTIL.dwg C7-3 May 07, 2021 3:25pm by: EBredes

ing name: F: \PASSER0\FHB\99000047.0095 FHB Waterfront\Airport\C7-01_UTIL.dwg C7-4 May 07, 2021 3:25pm by: EBredesteg

PART 6 APPENDIX

SITE INVESTIGATION REPORTS

ECS Florida, LLC

Geotechnical Engineering Report

FHB Riverfront

Front Street Fernandina Beach, Florida

ECS Project Number 35:29978

March 31, 2020

"Setting the Standard for Service"

Geotechnical • Construction Materials • Environmental • Facilities

March 31, 2020

Mr. Christopher Nardone, AIA Passero Associates, LLC 4730 Casa Cola Way Suite 200 St. Augustine, Florida 32095

> ECS Project No. 35:29978 Client ID: MK04

Reference: Geotechnical Engineering Report FHB Riverfront Front Street Fernandina Beach, Florida

Dear Mr. Nardone:

ECS Florida, LLC. (ECS) has completed the subsurface exploration, laboratory testing, and geotechnical engineering analyses for the above-referenced project. Our services were performed in general accordance with our Proposal No. 35:16306, dated January 24, 2020. This report presents our understanding of the geotechnical aspects of the project, the results of the field exploration and laboratory testing conducted, and our design and construction recommendations.

It has been our pleasure to be of service to Passero Associates, LLC during the design phase of this project. We would appreciate the opportunity to remain involved during the continuation of the design phase, and we would like to provide our services during construction phase operations as well to verify the assumptions of subsurface conditions made for this report. Should you have any questions concerning the information contained in this report, or if we can be of further assistance to you, please contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

ECS Florida, LLC.

Chris M. Egan, P.E. Senior Project Manager Registered, Florida No. 79645 <u>CEgan@ecslimited.com</u>

David W. Spangler, P.E. **Principal Engineer** Registered Florida No. 58770 DSpangler@ecslimited.com

Distribution: Mr. Christopher Nardone, AIA – Passero Associates, LLC

1 pdf

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 General	2
1.2 Scope of Services	2
1.3 Authorization	2
2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION	3
2.1 Project Location	3
2.2 Site Conditions	3
2.3 Project Description	3
3.0 FIELD EXPLORATION AND LABORATORY TESTING	4
3.1 Field Exploration Program	4
3.1.1 SPT Borings	4
3.1.2 Test Pits	4
3.2 Laboratory Testing	4
4.0 SUBSURFACE CHARACTERIZATION	6
4.1 Subsurface Stratigraphy	6
4.2 Measured Groundwater Level	6
4.3 Exploration Behind The Bulkhead Wall By Test Pits And Geophysical Survey	6
5.0 DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS	8
5.1 General	8
5.2 Sheet pile Design parameters	8
6.0 CLOSING 1	0

FIGURES

Site Location Plan
Field Exploration Plan
Test Pit and Geophysical Location Plan

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Field Operations

Subsurface Soil Profiles Soil Boring Logs Field Exploration Procedures Key to Soil Classification

Appendix B – Laboratory Testing

Laboratory Testing Summary Laboratory Test Procedures

Appendix C – Test Pits Photographs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following summarizes the main findings of the exploration, particularly those that may have a cost impact on the planned development. Further, our principal recommendations are summarized. Information gleaned from the executive summary should not be utilized in lieu of reading the entire geotechnical report.

- The borings generally encountered very loose to medium dense sandy material (SP, SC) and to a lesser extent clay (CH) to depths of approximately 12 feet below existing grades underlain by very loose to loose sand (SP, SP-SC, SC) and very soft to stiff clay (CH) to depths of approximately 40 feet below grade. Below depths of approximately 40 feet, the borings encountered loose to very dense sands (SP, SP-SC, SC) to the boring termination depths of 60 feet.
- The test pits performed behind the existing bulkhead wall exposed the concrete cap and a portion of the back of the double tee. However, due to site constraints and safety concerns the back of the existing bulkhead wall was not exposed.
- A geophysical survey consisting of electromagnetic techniques was utilized to locate the tieback anchors. The anchors were located at an approximate spacing of 15 feet along the wall and were mapped between depths of 6 feet and 15 feet below existing ground surface.
- The planned bulkhead wall may be designed utilizing the design parameters included in the tables in Section 5.2 of the report.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 GENERAL

The purpose of this study was to provide geotechnical information for the design of a new bulkhead wall along the Amelia River. The recommendations developed for this report are based on project information supplied by Passero Associates, LLC. This report contains the results of our subsurface explorations and laboratory testing programs, site characterization, engineering analyses, and recommendations for the design and construction of the planned bulkhead wall.

1.2 SCOPE OF SERVICES

To obtain the necessary geotechnical information required for design of the new wall, five soil test borings were performed at locations selected by Structures International and approved by Passero Associates, LLC. A laboratory-testing program was also implemented to characterize the physical and engineering properties of the subsurface soils.

This report discusses our exploratory and testing procedures, presents our findings and evaluations and includes the following.

- A brief review and description of our field and laboratory test procedures and the results of testing conducted.
- A review of surface topographical features and site conditions.
- A review of area and site geologic conditions.
- A review of subsurface soil stratigraphy with pertinent available physical properties.
- Final copies of our soil test boring logs.
- Photographs of the test pit excavations.
- Recommendations for landside soil parameters for bulkhead wall design.

1.3 AUTHORIZATION

Our services were provided in accordance with our Proposal No. 16306, dated January 24, 2020, and the Subconsultant Agreement between Passero Associates and ECS Florida, LLC dated January 29, 2020.

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located along the west side of Front Street and along the east side of the Amelia River in Fernandina Beach, Florida. The site extends along the bulkhead wall west of Front Street from approximately Beech Street north to Broome Street. The general site location is shown on Figure 1.

2.2 SITE CONDITIONS

At the time of our exploration, the site was developed with an existing bulkhead wall along the Amelia River. The southern portion of the site is a parking area for a boat ramp and surface cover primarily consists of gravel and landscaped areas. The central portion of the site is an at grade asphalt parking lot with a restaurant supported on pile foundations over the River. The northern portion of the site was primarily cleared and appeared like it may have been used as a lay-down yard and surface cover consisted primarily of sands. A site survey was not available to our office at the time of this report preparation. However based on our observations, we understand that the site generally slopes downward to the north. Surface water (outside of the Amelia River) was not observed near planned structural areas at the time of our exploration.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

You provided project information via several discussions. We were provided with a copy of an aerial photograph showing the proposed boring locations and depths. We understand the proposed construction includes a new bulkhead wall between approximately Cedar Street and Broome Street. We were not provided with the final wall design but we understand that the wall with either be steel sheetpiles or concrete construction.

If actual project information varies from these conditions, then the recommendations in this report may need to be re-evaluated. We should be contacted if any of the above project information is incorrect so that we may reevaluate our recommendations.

3.0 FIELD EXPLORATION AND LABORATORY TESTING

3.1 FIELD EXPLORATION PROGRAM

We performed a field exploration between February 19, 2020 and February 26, 2020. The approximate boring locations are indicated on the attached Field Exploration Plan (Figure 2). Our personnel determined the boring and test pit locations using our handheld GPS units. The boring and test pit locations on the referenced Field Exploration Plan should be considered accurate only to the degree implied by the method of measurement used.

3.1.1 SPT Borings

We located and performed five Standard Penetration Test (SPT) borings, drilled to depths of approximately 60 feet below the existing ground surface, in general accordance with the methodology outlined in ASTM D 1586 to explore the subsurface conditions adjacent to the bulkhead wall. Split-spoon soil samples recovered during performance of the borings were visually classified in the field and representative portions of the samples were transported to our laboratory for further evaluation. A summary of the field procedures is included in Appendix A.

3.1.2 Test Pits

A test pit exploration was performed on February 25, 2020. The approximate test pit locations are indicated on the attached Test Pit and Geophysical Location Plan (Figure 3). Three test pits were performed in areas adjacent to the existing bulkhead wall to explore the condition of the wall. The test pit locations were determined in the field based on existing site features. The test pit locations on the referenced Field Exploration Plan should be considered accurate only to the degree implied by the method of measurement used.

Test pits, having a width of about 3 feet to 4 feet, were excavated using a rubber tired-excavator. The test pit excavation allowed the field representative to visually observe the subsurface conditions within the depth of excavation. At the completion of our exploration, the test pits were backfilled and tamped with the bucket on the excavator. Sample photographs of our encountered conditions are presented in Appendix C of this report.

3.2 LABORATORY TESTING

The laboratory testing performed by ECS for this project consisted of selected tests performed on samples obtained during our field exploration operations. The following paragraphs briefly discuss the results of the completed laboratory testing program.

An experienced geotechnical engineer visually classified each soil sample from the test borings on the basis of texture and plasticity in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) in general accordance with ASTM D 2488. A Key to the Soil Classification System is included in Appendix A.

Selected samples of the soils encountered during the field exploration were subjected to quantitative laboratory testing to better define the composition of the soils encountered and to provide data for correlation to their anticipated strength and compressibility characteristics. The laboratory testing determined the percent fines, moisture, and organic contents of selected soil

samples. The results of the laboratory testing are shown in the Laboratory Testing Summary included in Appendix B. Also, these results are shown on the Subsurface Soil Profiles and on the Log of Boring records at the respective depths from which the tested samples were recovered.

4.0 SUBSURFACE CHARACTERIZATION

A graphical presentation of the generalized subsurface conditions and detailed boring records are included in Appendix A. It should be understood that the soil conditions will vary between the boring locations. The following table summarizes the soil conditions encountered.

4.1 SUBSURFACE STRATIGRAPHY

Approximate Depth Range (ft)	Stratum	Description	Ranges of SPT ⁽¹⁾ N-values (bpf)
0 to 12	I	Very Loose to Medium Dense Sand (SP) and Clayey Sand (SC) or Stiff CLAY with Sand (CH)	2 to 20
12 to 40	Ш	Very Loose to Loose Sand with Clay (SP-SC) and Clayey Sand (SC) or Very Soft to Soft CLAY (CH)	WOH ⁽²⁾ to 7
40 to 60	111	Medium Dense to Very Dense Sand (SP), Sand with Clay (SP- SC), Clayey Sand (SC) or Very Stiff Clay (CH) 20 to	

Notes: (1) Standard Penetration Test

(2) Weight of Hammer was used to advance the sampler

(3) 91 blows with 10 inches of sampler penetration

As an exception, Borings B-3 and B-4 encountered varying amounts of concrete, brick, and gravel debris in the Stratum I material.

4.2 MEASURED GROUNDWATER LEVEL

Groundwater was recorded at the time of drilling at depths of approximately 5 feet below the existing ground surface. We note that groundwater levels will fluctuate due to tidal fluctuations, seasonal climatic variations, surface water runoff patterns, construction operations, and other interrelated factors. We note that based on published data, tidal fluctuations on the order of 5 feet to 6 feet occur in the Amelia River in the vicinity of the project site. The groundwater depth at each boring location is noted on the Subsurface Soil Profiles and on the Log of Boring records.

4.3 EXPLORATION BEHIND THE BULKHEAD WALL BY TEST PITS AND GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY

A geophysical survey was performed by GeoView, Inc. to locate the tiebacks of the existing bulkhead wall. The geophysical survey consisted of electromagnetic techniques to determine the location of metallic surfaces behind the bulkhead wall. In general, tiebacks were located approximately spaced 15 feet laterally at depths ranging between approximately 6 feet and 15 feet below existing ground surface. The vertical location of the tiebacks is more difficult to determine with electromagnetic surveying and therefore the actual depths of the tiebacks may vary from the reported depths. The results of the geophysical survey are presented on Figure 3 of this report.

Test pits were also excavated behind the existing bulkhead wall to further evaluate the conditions. Test pits were located in areas of suspected tieback anchors and excavated to depths of approximately 7 feet below existing grades. The test pits performed behind the existing bulkhead wall exposed the concrete cap and a portion of the back of the double tee. The soils encountered during our excavations were generally consistent with the soil borings and encountered sands with varying amounts of debris that consisted of concrete fragments and rebar fragments. However, due to site constraints and safety concerns the back of the existing bulkhead wall and tieback anchors were not exposed during our exploration.

It was noted the test pits were backfilled on a day when it was raining. The following day, we returned to finish filling in the test pits and grading the surface sands, and portions of the backfill nearest the concrete cap had washed through and left voids in the backfilled areas. The direction of these voids appeared to traverse towards the existing wall. Thus, suggesting that the backfilled soils washed through the bulkhead wall.

5.0 DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 GENERAL

Our geotechnical engineering evaluation of the site and subsurface conditions at the property, with respect to the planned construction and our recommendations for site preparation and foundation support, are based on (1) our site observations, (2) the field and laboratory test data obtained, (3) our understanding of the project information and structural conditions as presented in this report, and (4) our experience with similar soil and loading conditions.

If the stated structural or grading conditions are incorrect, or should the location of the structure or pavement areas be changed, please contact us so that we can review our recommendations. Also, the discovery of any site or subsurface conditions during construction that deviate from the data obtained during this geotechnical exploration should also be reported to us for our evaluation.

The recommendations in the subsequent sections of this report present design and construction techniques that are appropriate for the planned construction. We recommend that ECS be provided the opportunity to review the foundation plans and earthwork specifications to verify that our recommendations have been properly interpreted and implemented.

5.2 SHEET PILE DESIGN PARAMETERS

Based on the subsurface information obtained from the soil borings, we recommend the soil parameters listed in the tables following be used in designing the wall. The soil parameters provided in the tables were based on our interpretation of the N-values obtained from the SPT borings. The table includes soil description/classification, strength parameters (cohesion, phi angles and interactive friction angle between soil and wall), and total unit weight.

Depth	USCS	Total Unit Weight, γ _{SAT} (pcf)*	Internal Friction Angle, Ф	Cohesion, c (ksf)	Friction Angle between Soil and Steel Sheet Pile	Adhesion (ksf)	Ka	K _p
0-12	SP, SP-SC, SC	110	30	0	17		0.33	3.00
12-42	SP-SC, SC	95	26	0	14		0.39	2.56
42-47	SP-SC	110	30	0	17		0.33	3.00
47-52	СН	120	0	2.5		1.0	1.00	1.00
52-57	SP-SC	128	36	0	17		0.26	3.85
57-60	SP	120	32	0	17		0.49	2.04

Fable 5.2.1: Soil Parameters	for Bulkhead Wall	Design (Boring B-1)
-------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------

*Effective Unit Weight = Total Unit Weight – 62.4pcf (Below the Water Table)

Depth	USCS	Total Unit Weight, Υ _{SAT} (pcf)*	Internal Friction Angle, φ	Cohesion, c (ksf)	Friction Angle between Soil and Steel Sheet Pile	Adhesion (ksf)	Ka	K _p
0-4	SP	115	32	0	17		0.49	2.04
4-6	СН	110	0	0.8		0.6	1.00	1.00
6-17	SP	105	29	0	17		0.35	2.88
17-22	SC	95	26	0	14		0.39	2.56
22-32	СН	110	0	0.5		0.5	1.00	1.00
32-37	SP	100	28	0	14		0.36	2.77
37-47	СН	110	0	0.8		0.6	1.00	1.00
47-52	SP	125	36	0	17		0.26	3.85
52-57	SP	130	38	0	17		0.24	4.20
57-60	SC	127	36	0	17		0.26	3.85

Table	5.2	2: Soil	Parameters	for	Bulkhead	Wall	Design	(Boring	B-2
Table	J.Z.	2. 301	rarameters	101	Duikiieau	vvan	Design	מווויסט	5 0-21

*Effective Unit Weight = Total Unit Weight – 62.4pcf (Below the Water Table)

Table 5.2.3: Soil Parameters for Bulkhead Wall Design (Borings B-3 and B-4)

Depth	USCS	Total Unit Weight, Υ _{SAT} (pcf)*	Internal Friction Angle, φ	Cohesion, c (ksf)	Friction Angle between Soil and Steel Sheet Pile	Adhesion (ksf)	Ka	Kp
0-17	SP, SC	100	28	0	17		0.36	2.77
17-37	SC, CH	95	0	0.1		0.1	1.00	1.00
37-42	SP-SC, SC	100	29	0	17		0.35	2.88
42-60	SP, SP-SC	125	36	0	17		0.26	3.85

*Effective Unit Weight = Total Unit Weight – 62.4pcf (Below the Water Table)

Table 5.2.4: Soil Parameters for	for Bulkhead	Wall Design	(Boring B-5)
----------------------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

Depth	USCS	Total Unit Weight, Υsaτ (pcf)*	Internal Friction Angle, φ	Cohesion, c (ksf)	Friction Angle between Soil and Steel Sheet Pile	Adhesion (ksf)	Ka	K _p
0-12	SP	105	30	0	17		0.33	3.00
12-47	SC, CH	95	0	0.1		0.1	1.00	1.00
47-57	SP	135	38	0	17		0.24	4.20
57-60	SP	125	34	0	17		0.28	3.54

*Effective Unit Weight = Total Unit Weight – 62.4pcf (Below the Water Table)

6.0 CLOSING

Our geotechnical exploration has been performed, our findings obtained, and our recommendations prepared, in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering principles and practices. ECS is not responsible for any independent conclusions, interpretation, opinions, or recommendations made by others based on the data contained in this report.

Our scope of services was intended to evaluate the soil conditions within the zone of soil influenced by the wall system. Our scope of services does not address geologic conditions, such as sinkholes or soil conditions existing below the depth of the soil borings.

If any of the project description information discussed in this report is inaccurate, either due to our interpretation of the documents provided or site or design changes that may occur later, ECS should be contacted immediately in order that we can review the report in light of the changes and provide additional or alternate recommendations as may be required to reflect the proposed construction.

We recommend that ECS be allowed to review the project's plans and specifications pertaining to our work so that we may ascertain consistency of those plans/specifications with the intent of the geotechnical report.

Field observations, monitoring, and quality assurance testing during earthwork and foundation installation are an extension of and integral to the geotechnical design recommendation. We recommend that the owner retain these quality assurance services and that ECS be allowed to continue our involvement throughout these critical phases of construction to provide general consultation as issues arise. ECS is not responsible for the conclusions, opinions, or recommendations of others based on the data in this report.

FIGURES

Figure 1 – Site Location Plan

Figure 2 – Field Exploration Plan

Figure 3 Test Pit and Geo physical Location Plan

