

Technical Memorandum

То:	Duane J. Martin, P.E., Town of West Hartford
From:	Matt Gamache, P.E., CDM Smith
Date:	March 10, 2023
Subject:	Groundwater Evaluation Along Linbrook Road

This technical memo (TM) describes the work completed to evaluate groundwater in the neighborhood west of Trout Brook that includes Montclair Drive, Linbrook Road, and Linnard Road. This scope of services was initiated in January 2022.

Background

A preliminary review of historic maps, topography, groundwater elevation data, and soil borings was completed and documented in the June 2020 report titled *Drainage System Evaluations in the Trout Brook Watershed* (CDM Smith, 2020) to provide some context for recent instances of apparent groundwater seepage into basements and yards in the neighborhood situated to the west of Trout Brook, including Montclair Drive, Linbrook Road, and Linnard Road. The objective of this review was to determine if high groundwater levels are expected in this neighborhood and to better understand potential next steps to take to lessen the impacts of high groundwater in the future.

The neighborhood is bound on the east, west, and north by Trout Brook and the south by Linnard Road is depicted and outlined in **Figure 1**. Trout Brook flows west to east, meandering to the north along the curve of Montclair Drive before joining with a northerly tributary and flowing south before joining up with the Park River (South Branch). Historic maps available from the USGS/ERSI's Living Atlas (https://livingatlas.arcgis.com) show this to be case since at least 1928. However, the USGS's Living Atlas contains two maps prior to that date, one in 1906 and one in 1892 that show the Noyes River (present in 1892/1906) oriented differently from Trout Brook (not present in 1892/1906), with the river flowing across present-day Montclair Drive, Linbrook Road, and Linnard Road as shown in the inset in Figure 1.

The Noyes River, which does not appear on modern maps was described as follows in a 1916 USGS Water Supply paper (Gregory and Ellis, 1916):

"The drainage finds its way into the Connecticut River through Park River. Neither of these streams passes through West Hartford, but Park River is formed by the junction of Noyes River, which lies wholly within the town, and Hog River and South Fork, which lies across the northeast and southeast corners, respectively. Trout Brook receives all the drainage



> from the west half of the town and enters Noyes River about 1 mile north of West Hartford Center. The drainage of the east half is divided among Noyes River, South Fork, and Hog River. Noyes River joins South Fork in the southeast corner of the town."

Based on this information, it can be inferred that the neighborhood was once within the fluvial portion of the river system, from which it could be inferred that groundwater seepage within this area is not unexpected.

Ground surface topography data (2016 lidar DEM) used for the project were reviewed in the context of potential groundwater seepage. Five-foot topographic contours (NGVD29 datum) are shown in Figure 1 for the neighborhood, which sits in a regional topographic low. Ground surface elevations near boring B-E, just north of Linbrook Road are just over 105 feet, and decline to the east towards Trout Brook, which is shown to be at 75 feet. Ground surface elevations at the eastern intersection of Linbrook Road and Montclair Drive (near boring B-A) are approximately 95 feet.

Soil boring data provided by The Metropolitan District (District or MDC) included thirteen soil borings that were drilled along Montclair Drive in 2011 (Figure 1). The boring logs are provided in **Appendix A**. Each boring shows a similar profile, with shallow fill materials or sand overlying lower permeability materials on top of rock. Thicknesses of each soil unit varies from boring to boring.

In the June 2020 report a stepwise list of tasks were proposed to investigate the eastern portion of Linbrook Road and use the information collected there to draw inferences about the potential for groundwater lowering throughout the neighborhood. These tasks were performed under this scope of work and summarized as follows.

Well and Piezometer Installation

Four groundwater monitoring well/piezometer pairs were installed by the drilling contractor Geosearch, Inc. in February 2022. They are located along the eastern portion of Linbrook Road from Montclair Drive to the end of the road near Trout Brook and adjacent to the banks of Trout Brook, east of the end of Linbrook Road. Each well pair had a "shallow" (S) and "deep" (D) well/ piezometer installed to better understand vertical head gradients along Linbrook Road. The well pairs were labeled MW1, MW2, MW3, and PZ4, from west to east, and are shown in plan view and on cross section A-A' in **Figure 2**.

Well construction and boring logs for each well/piezometer are included in **Appendix B**. The logs generally showed a topmost layer of fine gravel and/or sand extending to 4-7 feet below ground surface (bgs), depending on the well. Beneath that lies a layer of clay and/or silt sitting on top of till or rock. For the purposes of this study, both the clay/silt layer and underlying till/rock are considered low permeability and low transmissivity and are included in the Clay/Silt zone shown in



the cross section. Water table lowering solutions would therefore be focused on the top 4-7 feet of soil where the higher permeability soils were observed. Cross section A-A' shown in Figure 2 includes the wells, their well screens (with S and D indicated at the well screen for each well in the monitoring well pair), an interpretation of the well logs, and an interpreted subsurface showing the shallow, higher permeability zone characterized by sand/gravel and fill, and the deeper, lower permeability zone characterized by clay/silt, till and rock. These interpretations are included in the screening level groundwater model described below. The February 2022 water table is also approximated on cross section A-A' in Figure 2. Based on these data, the water table is predominantly situated within the clay/silt unit, beneath the higher permeability sand/gravel unit, which means that the shallow sand/gravel unit is above the water table, in the unsaturated or vadose zone under these conditions.

Water Level Measurements

Depth to water measurements were taken at all eight wells on February 11th, February 22nd, and May 5th. The May 5th measurements were added to the project plan to determine if spring 2022 water levels differed from winter 2022 water levels. Depth to water measurements were converted to groundwater elevations (NGVD29) by subtracting the depth to water from the ground surface elevation. These data are included in **Table 1** and described in more detail below for each well pair.

	Ground	Screened	February	11, 2022	February	22, 2022	May 5, 2022		
Well	Surface Elevation (Feet)	Depth (Feet BGS)	Depth to Water (Feet)	Water Level Elevation (Feet)	Depth to Water (Feet)	Water Level Elevation (Feet)	Depth to Water (Feet)	Water Level Elevation (Feet)	
MW1S	93	3 – 8	7.53	85.5	6.93	86.1	4.42	88.6	
MW1D	93	12 – 17	8.82	84.2	9.90	83.1	9.81	83.2	
MW2S	90	3 – 8	2.65	87.4	4.13	85.9	5.88	84.1	
MW2D	90	23 – 28	7.23	82.8	7.17	82.8	6.99	83.0	
MW3S	86	2 - 10	6.77	79.2	6.75	79.3	6.91	79.1	
MW3D	86	15 – 25	7.49	78.5	7.41	78.6	7.71	78.3	
PZ4S	80	5 – 10	4.93	75.1	4.46	75.5	3.91	76.1	
PZ4D	80	15 – 25	5.02	75.0	4.77	75.2	6.85	73.2	

Table 1 Well Information and Water Level Data

MW1 water levels exhibit a downward gradient between the S and the D depths, with higher groundwater elevations present at the S well in May (88.6 feet) than during the winter measurements. Water level elevations were relatively consistent at the D depth over the three measurements dates.



MW2 water levels also exhibit a downward gradient between the S and D depths, but water level elevations were lower in May at the S depth than in February. Similar to MW1D, MW2D showed relatively consistent water level elevations over the three measurement dates.

MW3 water levels exhibit a downward gradient between the S and D depths, though less pronounced than at MW1 or MW2. This is not unexpected as the well is closer to the local discharge point into Trout Brook. Water level elevations in this well pair remained relatively consistent over the three measurement dates.

PZ4 water levels showed very little vertical head gradients in February and a downward vertical head gradient in May. Groundwater elevations were relatively consistent across the three measurement dates at the S depth and dropped by 2 feet between February and May at the D depth.

The distance between MW1 and PZ4 is approximately 500 feet, between which a February and May gradient of 0.02 feet/foot (10.5 feet / 500 feet) and 0.03 feet/foot (12.5 feet / 500 feet), respectively, was observed in the S depth wells. In the D depth wells, the gradients were 0.02 feet/foot (8.6 feet / 500 feet) and 0.02 feet/foot (10.0 feet / 500 feet), in February and May, respectively. Groundwater flow is towards, and discharging to, Trout Brook.

It is surmised from these data that March-May 2022 rainfall was not sufficient to significantly increase water level elevations at these wells relative to what was measured in February 2022. Upon review of monthly precipitation totals from Hartford-Brainard Airport, the 11.0 inches that fell between February-April 2022 was relatively consistent with previous years' totals, which averaged 10.1 inches over these three months between 2018 and 2021.

These eight wells are permanently installed and can be measured in the future to better understand changes in groundwater elevations across different seasons and following large storms. Should understanding the response of groundwater elevations over the course of a large storm be sought, automatic water level recorders could be installed one or more wells. The data collected from these recorders can be collected to whatever time interval is desired.

Slug Testing

Slug testing was conducted on February 22, 2022 at MW1D, MW2D, MW3D, and PZ4D. One falling head (slug dropped into well) and rising head (slug removed from well) test was conducted at each well/piezometer, measuring the displacement over time of the piezometric head within each well, automatically recorded at 0.25 second intervals.

The slug test data were analyzed using the AQTESOLV software platform. Displacement over time data were plotted in AQTESOLV and hydraulic conductivity values were estimated for each test using the Bouwer-Rice solution. The results of the slug testing analyses are summarized in **Table 2**.



Well	Test	Method	Hydraulic Conductivity (ft/day)				
MW1D	Falling	Bouwer-Rice	1.09				
MW1D	Rising	Bouwer-Rice	1.03				
MW2D	Falling	Bouwer-Rice	6.85				
MW2D	Rising	Bouwer-Rice	14.57				
MW3D	Falling	Bouwer-Rice	0.07				
MW3D	Rising	Bouwer-Rice	0.07				
PZ4D	Falling	Bouwer-Rice	0.05				
PZ4D	Rising	Bouwer-Rice	0.04				

Table 2 Hydraulic Conductivity Estimates from February 22, 2022 Slug Testing

Examination of the slug test results show the following:

- Horizontal hydraulic conductivities from MW1D, MW3D, and PZ4D are low, representative of the clay/silt materials that they are screened across.
- MW2D has higher estimated hydraulic conductivity, due to the presence of "coarse to fine sand" between 25 and 29 feet bgs, situated beneath 20 feet of clay/silt.
- Hydraulic conductivity estimates of the shallow sand/gravel layer could not be made because this layer was in the vadose zone (above the water table) at the time of the slug testing.

Overall, the clay/silt unit has low permeability and does not readily transmit water.

Screening Level Groundwater Model

A 3-dimensional screening level groundwater model (SLGM) was used to simulate current conditions and potential groundwater lowering alternatives within the study area. The SLGM had the following characteristics:

- The model domain spans the entire watershed upstream of Trout Brook at Beachland Park, for a total of 17.5 square miles. The model domain along with the computational grid mesh are shown in the bottom panel of **Figure 3**. The model grid mesh within the study area is shown in the top panel of Figure 3.
- Ground surface in the SLGM was interpolated from the topographic contours.
- The SLGM contains two layers.



- The model grid spacing varies between approximately 30 feet within the study area around Linbrook road and 500 feet outside of the study area, as shown in Figure 3.
- All model simulations are run in steady-state, which assumes conditions do not change with time.

The SLGM was constructed and run using DYNFLOW. DYNFLOW is a fully three-dimensional, finite element groundwater flow model code. This code has been developed over the past 40 years and has been applied to over 200 groundwater modeling studies within the United States. The DYNFLOW code has been reviewed and tested by the International Groundwater Modeling Center (IGWMC) (IGWMC 1985, van der Heijde 2000) and has been extensively tested and documented by CDM Smith.

Model features were refined in the study area, including:

- The elevation of the bottom of the sand/gravel unit (and consequently the top of the clay/silt unit) was estimated based on boring logs taken from the thirteen soil borings drilled along Montclair Drive in 2011 along with the boring logs from MW1, MW2, MW3, and PZ4 as part of this study. The contact elevation between these two units was interpolated between borings. While this interpolation utilizes the available data appropriately, there may be instances where the contact between these two units is higher or lower than what was interpolated. A higher contact elevation would reduce the transmissivity at that location, which could result in localized seepage of groundwater to the surface.
- The hydraulic conductivity of the clay/silt layer was set to 0.05-1.0 ft/day, based on the slugtest-derived hydraulic conductivities presented above, as well as trial-and-error matching of simulated and measured 2022 groundwater elevations.
- Recharge and the hydraulic conductivity of the sand/gravel layer were determined by trialand-error matching of simulated and measured 2022 groundwater elevations. Values used to match February 2022 conditions were 10 inches per year of recharge and 25 ft/day hydraulic conductivity within the sand/gravel layer.

Simulated groundwater elevations were checked locally against the water level elevation measurements taken at the newly installed monitoring wells and regionally to those measured at the USGS monitoring well located on the University of Saint Joseph's campus (included on the bottom panel of Figure 3 for reference). Data for this monitoring well (ID number 414535072445501 CT-WH 130) are available on the USGS National Water Information System (NWIS) website. The simulated and measured groundwater elevations are shown in **Table 3**. Simulated 1-foot groundwater elevation contours representing the water table are shown in plan



view in the vicinity of the study area in **Figure 4**. This simulation represents February 2022 conditions.

An additional simulation was run to represent higher groundwater conditions for the purposes of screening groundwater lowering scenarios. This was done by increasing recharge and keeping the rest of the model inputs unchanged. The result is a higher water table, situated close to ground surface and within the sand/gravel layer. Figure 4 shows the simulated water tables for both baseline conditions and high groundwater conditions on cross section A-A'. To date, we do not have groundwater elevation data to support a water table as high as what is simulated in this scenario. However, these conditions are anecdotally consistent with reports of groundwater seepage to the surface within the study area during wet seasons.

Well	Measured Groundwater Elevation (ft)	Date(s)	Simulated Groundwater Elevation (ft)			
MW1S	86.1	2/22/2022	86.5			
MW1D	83.1	2/22/2022	86.5			
MW2S	85.9	2/22/2022	84.6			
MW2D	82.8	2/22/2022	84.5			
MW3S	79.3	2/22/2022	78.8			
MW3D	78.6	2/22/2022	78.7			
PZ4S	75.5	2/22/2022	75.6			
PZ4D	75.2	2/22/2022	75.5			
USGS Well	104.1	Average of 9 Measurements between 9/28/2006 and 9/17/2018	104.8			

Table 3 Simulated Groundwater Elevation Comparison

Under these higher groundwater conditions, there's potential for groundwater lowering via a perforated groundwater drain pipe. This pipe would be situated at the bottom of the sand/gravel unit, would collect groundwater when the water table rises into the sand/gravel unit, and would discharge the collected groundwater to Trout Brook. Two groundwater lowering scenarios were simulated to estimate the magnitude and extent of groundwater lowering within the study area. The details of the two scenarios (Scenario 1 and Scenario 2) are described below.

Scenario 1

In Scenario 1 an approximately 340 foot long perforated drain pipe is simulated between MW2 and Trout Brook at an approximate slope of 0.002 feet/foot, assuming a discharge invert elevation of 77 feet. The approximate location of the drain pipe is shown in plan view and on cross section A-A' in **Figure 5**. The model was run using the high groundwater conditions inputs with the drainpipe in



place. Contours of groundwater elevation change (decline due to the presence of the drain pipe) are also included in plan view on Figure 5. The simulated water table for Scenario 1 is shown in cross section A-A' on Figure 5 as well.

The 0.5-foot contour covers all of the houses on the section of Linbrook Road east of Montclair Drive. The maximum potential water table lowering in Scenario 1 is approximately 4 feet and there is potential to lower the water table by 1-2 feet beneath the houses and yards situated along Linbrook Road. Under February 2022 conditions this drain pipe would not lower the water table, which was situated predominantly within the clay/silt unit. As this unit does not readily transmit water, a drain pipe installed into it would not be effective.

Scenario 2

In Scenario 2 an approximately 540 foot long perforated drain pipe is simulated between MW1 and Trout Brook at an approximate slope of 0.003 feet/foot, assuming a discharge invert elevation of 77 feet. This pipe receives flow from a 340 foot long perforated drainpipe simulated along Montclair Drive between MW1 and Brookfield Road at a slope of 0.001 feet/foot.

The approximate locations of the drainpipes are shown in plan view and cross section B-B' in **Figure 6**. The model was run using the high groundwater conditions inputs with the drainpipes in place. Contours of groundwater elevation change (decline due to the presence of the drainpipe) are shown in Figure 6, along with cross section B-B' showing the lowered water table. The 0.5-foot contour covers a larger portion of the neighborhood than in Scenario 1, with a maximum potential water table lowering of approximately 5 feet. There is potential to lower the water table by 1-2 feet beneath the houses and yards situated along Linbrook Road As noted above, under February 2022 conditions this drain pipe would not lower the water table, which was situated predominantly within the clay/silt unit. As this unit does not readily transmit water, a drain pipe installed into it would not be effective.

Potential Synergies with Proposed Drainage Pipe Layouts

Potential synergies between the proposed layouts of the drainage pipes and where perforated drain pipes could be placed to provide some water table control in the neighborhood around Linbrook Road were examined. The profiles of the drain pipes were compared to the estimated contacts between the sandy soils near the surface and the deeper, clay/silt layer, as determined from boring logs taken from both the newly installed groundwater monitoring wells and previously taken boreholes. As noted above, perforated drain pipes would be installed in the sandy soils, preferably just above the transition to the clay/silt materials.

Figure 7 shows the profile of the proposed drain pipe along Linbrook Road, crossing Montclair Drive, turning south and discharging approximately 800 feet from the end of Linbrook Road. The elevations of the top of the clay/silt layer are marked with red circles in three locations: at MW1,



MW3, and where the pipe discharges to Trout Brook. These markings are connected with a line, representing the estimated contact between the sandy and clay/sit materials between the points. In Figure 7, the proposed drain pipe is situated within the clay/silt materials between Montclair Drive and nearly the end of Linbrook Drive. The drain pipe is situated within the sandy materials at the end of Linbrook road and throughout the 800 foot stretch to the discharge.

Figure 8 includes the same comparison along Montclair Drive between the intersection with Brookfield Road and the proposed discharge to Trout Brook. Similar to what was observed in Figure 7, the proposed drain pipes shown are partially situated within the clay/silt materials and partially within the sandy materials.

Figure 9 shows the same comparison along Linnard Road. In this case, the proposed drainage pipe is situated within the sandy materials for the entire stretch from Montclair Drive to the discharge point. However, there are fewer boring logs in this area (only B-L is nearby) so the estimated contact between the sand and clay/silt materials is more uncertain.

It is anticipated that more information, including the location of other utilities, will be incorporated into this analysis during the final design phase, with the intention of installing perforated drains in these areas where feasible.

Summary and Recommendations

The work completed as part of this contract and documented in this TM has provided information on the current conditions of groundwater and subsurface materials along Linbrook Road, east of Montclair Drive. Model simulations incorporating the data collected from the site have provided insights into the potential for groundwater lowering during high groundwater conditions. The following was learned or verified as part of this study:

The installation of 8 monitoring wells along Linbrook Road between Montclair Drive and Trout Brook provided data on the groundwater elevation, depth to groundwater, horizontal flow gradients, and vertical gradients in this area, which has been sensitive to high groundwater conditions in the past. These wells are permanent and can be used to collect additional data as needed (either by periodic manual measurements or continuously through the deployment of automatic data collectors) in the future. All three rounds of groundwater elevation measurements produced relatively consistent results, and showed that the shallow, sand/gravel unit to be predominantly within the vadose zone. Prior to the installation of these wells, the closest monitoring well to the study area was the USGS monitoring well at the University of Saint Joseph, 0.6 miles to the northeast.



- Boring logs associated with the new monitoring wells were used to supplement existing stratigraphic interpretations based on soil borings drilled along Montclair Drive in 2011. These new boring logs were the first taken east of Montclair drive and improve the understanding of the thickness of the sand/gravel unit where groundwater lowering could occur.
- Slug testing confirmed the relatively low transmissivity of the clay/silt unit situated beneath the shallow sand/gravel. This clay/silt unit is not expected to readily transmit water and is therefore not recommended for groundwater lowering. Based on the data collected, the water table was situated within, or just above, this unit during February and May.
- Two model scenarios were run to estimate the potential for groundwater lowering via perforated groundwater drain pipes installed along Linbrook Road and Montclair Drive within the sand/gravel unit. Simulation results indicated that while the groundwater could only be lowered to the bottom of the shallow sand/gravel unit, there is potential to lower the water table by 1-2 feet beneath the houses and yards situated along Linbrook Road.
- The model, which incorporates the data collected in this study and represents current conditions relatively well, can be used in the future, as needed, to test additional scenarios.

Based on these findings, the following is recommended:

- The feasibility and cost of installing perforated groundwater drain pipes associated with scenarios 1 and 2 should be examined. It is expected that these pipes would be installed concurrently with planned storm drain replacement work to save on cost and minimize neighborhood disruption. Alternatively, the planned storm drains can be converted to perforated pipes and upsized slightly (approximately 6 inches larger in diameter) to accommodate the additional flows associated with the groundwater.
- The vertical placement of the drain pipes in the model were based on the interpreted contact between the sand/gravel unit and the clay/silt unit, as well as an assumed discharge elevation to Trout Brook. It is recommended that the discharge elevation be field verified.
- High groundwater conditions, with the water table very close to ground surface and the potential for seepage to occur, were not evident at the monitoring wells in February or May when the groundwater measurements were taken. It is recommended that additional rounds of water level elevations be taken when higher groundwater and/or seepage to the surface is reported in the future. On these occasions, it is recommended that the water surface stage of Trout Brook be documented (via photograph of the banks of the brook) as well.



In order to better understand the time varying response of the water table to storm events, it
is recommended that data be collected automatically via transducer at one of the monitoring
wells. MW3S is likely the best choice, based on its relative position along Linbrook Road.

References

CDM Smith (2020). Drainage System Evaluations in the Trout Brook Watershed.

- Gregory, Herbert E., and Ellis, Arthur J. (1916). *Ground water in the Hartford, Stamford, Salisbury, Willimantic and Saybrook areas, Connecticut.* State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut.
- International Ground Water Modeling Center (1985). *Review of DYNFLOW and DYNTRACK Groundwater Simulation Computer Codes*. Report of Findings by Paul K.M. van der Heijde for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. IGWMC 85-17
- van der Heijde, Paul K.M. (1999). *DYNFLOW Version 5.18: Testing and Evaluation of Code Performance.*



Comments Received January 6, 2023 with Responses

1. How was the "model extent" shown on Figure 3 established outside of the area where MDC borings and CDM Smith monitoring wells were performed/installed? If an area outside the study area needed to be investigated would additional subsurface testing be required to verify model?

Response: The screening level model was created to cover the entire watershed upstream of Trout Brook at Beachland Park, for a total of 17.5 square miles. It uses ground surface elevation data to establish the top of the model, boundary conditions to set the groundwater outflow conditions, and makes broad assumptions about the aquifer thickness and hydraulic properties outside of the site. It uses one regional well to verify that simulated heads are reasonable outside of the site. The intention of making the model this big is to use 'natural' boundary conditions, with the understanding that any detailed analysis outside of our study area would require additional data and model refinements.

2. What is the functional difference between deep and shallow wells in the well pairs? How separated are they? What explains the difference in groundwater elevation if they are at the same location? Is the boundary between the sand/gravel and clay/silt driving this?

While the term 'water level elevation' is used in the memo, a more accurate term is 'piezometric head'. Pressure differences within an aquifer cause the water level at one depth horizon to be different from those at other depth horizons. In the case of our measurements, the shallow screens produced higher piezometric heads than the deeper screens at all wells, with the magnitude of that difference decreasing near Trout Brook. As noted in the comment, while there are likely several reasons for this, the contrast in permeability between the sand/gravel unit and the clay/silt unit is a factor.

3. Has there been any additional readings taken since memo was issued?

No.

4. It could be useful if we could take our own readings as conditions warrant. How would we do these ourselves (manual/automatic)?

Yes, this would be useful to continue to develop an understanding of things, particularly when flooding happens again. The process requires use of a water level recorder, but is otherwise straight forward. Please let us know if CDM Smith can assist with the initial round or rounds of measurements and/or advise on how to rent or buy the instrument.

5. It could be useful for us to have the clay/silt layer "TIN" for use in future drainage designs in the future. Is this available in a format we can import into CAD and use as a surface?



It can be, but we would want to clip it to only the areas where we have data.

6. Are we able to use and update the groundwater model and run the simulation ourselves?

In theory yes, there's no restrictions to using the software and it runs on a standard computer. However, unless you have staff who have some experience in groundwater modeling, the training and oversight costs could be greater than the costs to have CDM Smith make periodic updates and simulations for you.

7. Within the study area, were basement floor elevations taken for comparison against model results?

No.

8. What is the horizontal zone of influence for the perforated pipes?

The zone of influence will depend on the depth of the pipes, which unit it is in, and the water table elevation. Figures 5 and 6 show the extent of the area where the water table is lowered by at least 0.5 feet for Scenarios 1 and 2.

9. Where should the perforated pipes be located within the Right of Way? Or is the location to be wherever it can fit given adjacent utilities?

I suspect the location will be limited by where it can fit.

10. What are the perforated pipe diameters?

If these perforated pipes are to be installed to replace existing drain pipes (as part of the upsizing recommendations) then we expect the pipes to be 6 inches larger than the planned solid pipe recommendations.

11. Can private property owners connect drainage pipes to the perforated pipes? Is there enough capacity to accept the private property flow?

Yes, there should be enough capacity because these flows were already factored into the new pipe sizes. Please note that they will likely need to pump into the drains.













Figure 7 – Profile Along Linbrook Road



Figure 8 – Profile Along Montclair Drive



Figure 9 – Profile Along Linnard Road



Appendix A

Boring Logs from 2011 Along Montclair Drive





Friday, 18 March 2011

Jessica Coelho The Metropolitan District 555 Main Street Hartford, CT 06142

Re: Soil Borings Montclair Drive, West Hartford, CT

.

Dear Jessica,

Enclosed is the SITElog® Report for the work completed at the above referenced site.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to serve you. We hope the work our company has performed exceeded your expectations and that you are pleased. If so, recommending us to your associates would be appreciated.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact us at (203) 490-4777.

We look forward to working with you again in the near future.

Visit us on the web! www.site-llc.com

Sincerely, SITE, LLC

fohn A. BeAngelia, fr. John A. DeAngelis, Jr. Managing Member



The Metropolitan District

Montclair Drive, West Hartford, CT

Thursday, 3 March 2011



Sub-surface Investigations, Technology + Experience

Soil Borings * Rock Coring * Concrete Coring * Monitor Wells * Geoprobe * Recovery Wells * SITELog Reports



Sub-surface Investigations, Technology + Experience

Soll Borings * Rock Coring * Concrete Coring * Monitor Wells * Geoprobe * Recovery Wells * SITELog Reports



Sub-surface Investigations, Technology + Experience

Soil Borings * Rock Coring * Concrete Coring * Monitor Wells * Geoprobe * Recovery Wells * SITELog Reports







]. DeAngelis, III

Helper Name:

Silty Sand

Sond

Gravel Cobble

Ti//

Rock Water

SPT

Riser Bentonite

Screen

Curb Box

descriptions and boundaries are not guaranteed.

Sub-surface Investigations, Technology + Experience

Soil Borings * Rock Coring * Concrete Coring * Monitor Wells * Geoprobe * Recovery Wells * SITELog Reports

		÷1				LLG			Client:		THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT 555 MAIN STREET HARTFORD, CT 06142					100.000 (Jan 1
									Project	132	Montalair Drive West Hertford C	1996) (persona M		14355/473		S8031
			8 	ub-s	urfe	08			Date:	' nha turi Sina	Thursday, 3 March 2011	-				
)I(chn	olog	<u>y</u> @	£		Water:		5'-0"					
		וו	the second s	10.000	man	œœ			Ground	Elev.						
		J					ב		Project	Manager:	Jessica Coelha	<u>Con</u>	itract	#2	(009)	-19
	(203) 490-47	177	63	Land	caste	r Dr	ive,	Bea	icon Fa	lls Co	nnecticut 06403 www.site-llc.com SITElog® Repor			В) 🔤	B
	Depth			Blo	ws per 6	8	Meisture		Changes	Color	DESCRIPTION OF FINDINGS	General		Na	Pen.	Ro:
	<u>1' to 3'</u>		11	6	4	5	Damp		0.25	ы	ASPHALT (3" thick)]		1	24"	16"
						L			0.58	ሟ	STONE (Oiled?)]				
									1.50	og	SAND, little Processed Basalt Stone	FAL				
										l.rb/tn	SILT, little Clay					
5'	5' to 7'		2	2	3	2	Wet		5.50	(1) biand in an			Conversion of the local distribution of the	2	24"	16"
					ļ				5.75	d.br	SAND m/w Silt, Pebbles	<u> </u>	- N 2020			
				_	ļ					rb	CLAY, some Silt	1				
				 								1				
	101 101			<u> </u>								1				
10'	10' to 12'		0		1		Wet			rb/gy	CLAY varved w/Silt	FINES		3	24"	24 ¹¹
ļ																
										rb	CLAY varved w/Silty Clay					
							Į									
							Į		<u>14.00</u>							
15'	15' to 17'		5	6	7	7	Damp			rb	SILT, little Pebble-Gravel, trace Clay			4	24"	23"
												пц				
									17.00							ļ
-											End of Exploration @ 17.00					
~							ľ									<u> </u>
~												[
ŀ																<u> </u>
ŀ				<u> </u>								***				
ŀ				<u> </u>						:		-				
251							{					1				
~~							{					1				
ł							{					11000		$ \square$		
														\square		
ł												-		\vdash		
30														\vdash		
ľ												641)Mari				
ŀ																_
ŀ												1				
ŀ						<u> </u>						1				
35'																
ł																
ŀ					\vdash									\vdash		
, h	VEV LIL	lact	m. at	74.0		, 4	****				aller Reasons and the first of the second	1				
	NE7 DI-D.	AR A	n - NN	g_i	y - grey	- <i>T</i> N -	iun 1	0-1	15170Fan	ye 00	unveruruwn og-onvergrey aaark Ilight I/w-layered with m/w-mixed	with				
														GP S	Coor:	



DISCLAIMER: Some GPS coord,

Sub-surface Investigations, Technology + Experience Soil Borings * Rock Coring * Concrete Coring * Monitor Wells * Geoprobe * Recovery Wells * SITELog Reports



139

134

11

n.

6-A

53

ڀ ل

538 [

_ ≞_

3

2.25" H.S.A. DISCLAIMER: Some GPS coord, descriptions and boundaries are not guaranteed.

Hammer Wgt:

140# CKE Auto

Sampler:

Cosing

2" O.D. Lymac

Water

5PT

Riser Bentonite

Screen

Curb Box





descriptions and boundaries are not guaranteed.





not guaranteed



boundaries are not guaranteed.



not guaranteed.

	S.I			LLC		Client:		THE METROPOLITAN DISTRIC 555 MAIN STREET HARTFORD, CT 06142	CT				
						Project	85	Montclair Drive, West Harti	ford. CT		820226543	NEAD ORDE	20040441645
	S Day	ub-s testi	urfa gati	CE ODB		Date:		Thursday, 3 March 2011					
	De la companya de la	chn	olog	70		Water:		None					
		Editor.	Hieme	50	177	Ground	Elev.;			-1-			
					1	Project	Hanager:	, and the second s	Jessica Coelho	Contrac	t #2	(){) ^c	1-19
	(203) 490-4777 63	Lanc	caste	r Dri	ive, Be	eacon Fa	lls Co	nnecticut 06403 www.site-llc.com 5	ITElog® Report		B]	H
	Depth	Blor	ws рет б	H	Moisture	Changes	Color	DESCRIPTION OF FINDINGS		General	Na	Pen.	Rec.
	1' to 3'	10	8	7	Damp	0.21	Ъl	ASPHALT (2½" thick)		100 A	1	24"	3"
						0.54	ы	STONE (Oiled)		HLL			
						1.25	og	STONE (Processed Basalt), little Sand					1
							rb	SILT & SAND, some Weathered Siltstone	Frags.,				
5	5' to 7' 4	8	9	29	Moist			trace Clay		TILL 📓	2	24"	22"
						6.50							
ļ							rb	SILTSTONE					
										loci 🛛			
10'	10' to 10'-2" 50/2"				Dry	10.42	******			X	3	2"	$2^{\prime\prime}$
_ [Presidente and a second se		Auger Refusal @ 10.42					
[
15'													
- [Ī							
1													
Į													
1													
20"													
[
l													
		_											
l													
25'													
					·								
ļ													
30'													
ļ													
ļ						1000							
ļ													
35'						1 1							
	KEY bl-block w-whi	ite g,	y - grey	tn-	tan ro	- rust/orang	e ob-	alive/brown og-olive/grey ddark llight l/w-kayered i	with m/w-mixed w	vith	605	<i>C</i>	



descriptions and boundaries are nat guaranteed.



Sub-surface Investigations, Technology + Experience Soll Borings * Rock Coring * Concrete Coring * Monitor Wells * Geoprobe * Recovery Wells * SITELog Reports

n

Sampler:

Casino

2.25" H.S.A.

Some GPS coord. descriptions and boundaries are

not guaranteed.

2" 0.0. Lynac

Curb Box

Riser Bentonite

Screen

DISCLAIMER:

ŧ

85

n

5







not guaranteed.



not guaranteed.



descriptions and boundaries are not guaranteed.

MATERIALS TESTING	A CONTRACTOR OF THE REAL OF TH			4	
Client:	Site, LLC 63 Lancaster Drive Beacon Falls, CT 06403 Montclair Drive West Hartford, CT Project # 11005	Report #: Date WO#	001 03/11/11		
Sample: Sampled By: Inspector	Mudstone/Shale Stone Core Client, John DeAngelis Core samples were supplied by client	Lab #:	10358		

CONCRETE CORE SAMPLES COMPRESSION TEST

PROCEDURE: The submitted samples were tested dry

Core #	Dia.	Original	Length	L/D Potio	Area sq.	Max.	P.S.I	L/D	Comp.
	men.	Inch.	Inch.	Katio	Inch	lbs.		Factor	Strength Psi
BF	1.87	8.50	3.53	1.89	2.75	17370	6320	1.00	6320
BJ-1	1.87	5.75	2.85	1.52	2.75	22570	8210	0.96	7880
BJ-2	1.87	4.50	2.85	1.52	2.75	31380	11410	0.96	10950

Reported To: Site, LLC

Submitted By: MT Group, LLC



The above data is the property of the client. No reproduction of the above data without the sole permission of MT Group, LLC MT Group, LLC accepts no liability for work executed by others.

.

35A Plains Industrial Rd • Wallingford, CT 06492 • Tel: 203-949-7733 • Fax: 203-949-7735

NY Corporate	Hopelawn, NJ	•	MT Group	•	Dover, DE	•	Neffs, PA
631-815-1900	732-725-6177				302-677-0818		610-767-3006



Sub-surface Investigations, Technology + Experience Soil Borings * Rock Coring * Concrete Coring * Monitor Wells * Geoprobe * Recovery Wells * SITELog Reports



Sub-surface Investigations, Technology + Experience Soil Borings * Rock Coring * Concrete Coring * Monitor Wells * Geoprobe * Recovery Wells * SITELog Reports Appendix B

Well Construction and Boring Logs from MW1, MW2, MW3, and PZ4



Sheet 1 of 2



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

Client: Town of West Hartford, CT Project Location: Linbrook Road

Drilling Contractor: Geosearch, Inc

Drilling Method/Rig: Drive & Wash/CME 55LC Drillers: P. McClenahan, C. Stamas Drilling Date: Start: 2/3/2022 End: 2/3/2022 Logged By: D. Roth Field Screening Instrument: PID Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609

Surface Elevation (ft.): 93.00

MONITORING

WELL DETAIL

MW-1D

Top of PVC Riser Elevation (ft.): 92.69 Total Depth (ft.): 20

Depth to Initial Water Level (ft. BGS): 8.82

Development Method: Surge and Purge via Whale Pump

Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description	Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail	
				A	SPHAL	T(0-0.8') ASPHALT (0.8-2') No sample colled airknife/vac to 2' BGS.			To <u>93.0</u> 0	Protective Casing p of Riser @ 92.69 ft. <u>Ground Surface</u> (0-1') Concrete pad with 8" diameter roadbox
НА	S-1	0.0	NA	6/6	ML	(2-2.5') Moist to wet, bro clay, trace fine sand. (2.5-4) No sample collec to 4' BGS.	wn, SILT, little			
HA	S-2	0.0	NA	6/6	CL-ML	(4-4.5') Moist to wet, ligh CLAYEY SILT. (4.5-6') No sample colled airknife/vac to 6' BGS.	t brown, 		 - <u>88.0</u> - 5 -	(1-9') #2 Silica Sand
	S-3	0.0	NA	6/6	CL-ML	(6-6.5') Moist to wet, ligh CLAYEY SILT. (6.5-14') Terminate airkr BGS. Drive temporary st ID) and rollerbit (3.785'')	it brown, ife/vac at 6.5' teel casing (4" to 14' BGS.			
EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS DRILLING METHODS: SAMPLING TYPES: HSA Hollow Stem Auger AS SSA Solid Stem Auger CS HA Hand Auger BX AR Air Rotary NX DTR Dual Tube Rotary GP FR Foam Rotary SS MR Mud Rotary ST ST Schelby Tube CT Cable Tool DTC Drill Through Casing							BGS= Below Gr PID= Photoioniz ID= Inside Diam Depth to initial v development MW-1D was ins Ground surface	round S zation I neter vater le talled i and to	RE Surface Detector evel reco n the sa p of PV	EMARKS Divided on 2/11/2022 prior to well me borehole as MW-1S C riser elevations are approximate

CDM Smith



MONITORING WELL DETAIL ^{MW-1D}

Clie Pro	ent: To ject Lo	wn of W cation:	/est Ha Linbro	artford, o ok Roa	CT d	CT Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study d Project Number: 268609							
Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description	Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail				
								_ <u>83.0</u> _ 10	(9-11') Medium Bentonite Chips				
									(11-17') #2 Silica Sand				
SS	S-4	0.0	5 15 36 18	24/16	CLG	(14-16') Top 6": Wet, hard, light brown, SILT & CLAY, trace fine sand. Bottom 10": Wet, very dense, red-brown, coarse to fine GRAVEL (weathered rock), some coarse to fine sand, little silt and clay.		 - <u>78.0</u> - 15	(12-17') 2" (.01") Slot Schedule 40 PVC Screen				
SS	S-5	0.0	9 14 39 50/0"	24/0		(16-18') No Recovery	<u></u>		Bottom of Well at 2000 17' BGS 00200				
						(18-20') Advance rollerbit (3.785") to refusal at 20' BGS. Borehole collapsed 18-20' BGS. End of Exploration at 20' BGS		 - <u>73.0</u> -	(17-20') Slough Backfill				
								- <u>- 25</u> - 					

Sheet 1 of 1



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

Client: Town of West Hartford, CT Project Location: Linbrook Road

Drilling Contractor: Geosearch, Inc

Drilling Method/Rig: Drive & Wash/CME 55LC Drillers: P. McClenahan, C. Stamas Drilling Date: Start: 2/3/2022 End: 2/3/2022 Logged By: D. Roth Field Screening Instrument: PID Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609

Surface Elevation (ft.): 93.00

MONITORING

WELL DETAIL

MW-1S

Top of PVC Riser Elevation (ft.): 92.73 Total Depth (ft.): 8

Depth to Initial Water Level (ft. BGS): 7.72

Development Method: Surge and Purge via Whale Pump

Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description		Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail
HA	S-1	0.0	NA	A:	SPHAL	T(0-0.8') ASPHALT (0.8-2') No sample collec (2-2.5') Moist to wet, bro	cted.		To <u>93.0</u> 	Protective Casing o of Riser @ 92.73 ft. <u>Ground Surface</u> (0-1') Concrete (1-8') #2 Silica Sand
HA	S-2 S-3	0.0	NA	6/6	CL-ML	(2.5-4') No sample collect (4-4.5') Moist to wet, ligh CLAYEY SILT. (4.5-6') No sample collect (6-6.5') Moist to wet, ligh CLAYEY SILT. (6.5-8') No sample collect	cted.		 - <u>88.0</u> - 	(3-8') 1" (.01") Slot Schedule 40 PVC Screen
S.GPJ CDM_MA.GDT 5/27/22						End of Exploration at 8'	BGS.		 - <u>83.0</u> - - <u>10</u> -	Bottom of Well at 8' BGS
EEBE MW LOG LINBROOK RD MW LOG	LING METH - Hollow - Solid S - Hand J - Air Ro - Air Ro - Air Ra - Dual T - Foam - Mud R - Revers - Cable - Jetting - Driving - Driving	N OF A	BBRE SAM AS CS BX BX NX GP HP SS ST WS OTH AGS	VIATIONS PUING TYPES: Auger/Grab Sample California Sampler 1.5" Rock Core 2.1" Rock Core Geoprobe Hydro Punch Split Spoon Shelby Tube Wash Sample ER: Above Ground Surface	BGS= Below Gr PID= Photoioniz ID= Inside Diam Depth to initial v development MW-1S was ins Ground surface	round S ration I neter vater le talled i and to	RE Surface Detector evel recconn the sa p of PV0	EMARKS orded on 2/11/2022 prior to well me borehole as MW-1D C riser elevations are approximate av PG Date: 05/25/22		

Sheet 1 of 2



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

Client: Town of West Hartford, CT

Project Location: Linbrook Road

Drilling Contractor: Geosearch, Inc

Drilling Method/Rig: Drive & Wash/CME 55LC Drillers: P. McClenahan, C. Stamas Drilling Date: Start: 2/3/2022 End: 2/3/2022 Logged By: D. Roth Field Screening Instrument: PID Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609

Surface Elevation (ft.): 90.00

MONITORING

WELL DETAIL

MW-2D

Top of PVC Riser Elevation (ft.): 89.67 Total Depth (ft.): 31

Depth to Initial Water Level (ft. BGS): 7.23

Development Method: Surge and Purge via Whale Pump

Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description		Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail
S.GPU CDM_MA.GDT 5/27/22 SS SS	S-1 S-2 S-3 S-4	0.0	NA NA WOH 2 2 1 2 2 1	A: 6/6 24/18 24/16	GW CL-ML CL-ML	T(0-0.7') ASPHALT (0.7-2') No sample collect airknife/vac to 2' BGS. (2-2.5') Dry, brown to ligit coarse to fine GRAVEL, fine sand, little silt. (2.5-4') No sample collect airknife/vac to 4' BGS. (4-4.5') Wet, light-brown (4.5-6') No sample collect airknife/vac to 6' BGS. T 6' BGS. Drive temporary (D) and rollerbit (3.785'') (6-8') Wet, very soft, red CLAY. (8-10') Wet, very soft, re & CLAY. (10-14') Advance rollerbit BGS.	cted, ht-brown, some coarse to cted, , CLAYEY SILT. cted, erminate vac at vsteel casing (4" to 6' BGS. -brown, SILT & d-brown, SILT		To 90.0 0 -	Protective Casing p of Riser @ 89.67 ft. <u>Ground Surface</u> (0-1') Concrete pad with 8" diameter roadbox (1-18') #2 Silica Sand
BEEBE MW LOG LINBROOK RD MW LO HSA SHAR H R R RC T T D D T D D L T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	LING METH - Hollow - Solid S - Hand / - Air Ro - Air Ha - Dual T - Foam - Mud R - Revers - Cable - Jetting - Driving - Driving	EXPLA HODS: v Stem Auger Auger Auger Tube Rotary Rotary Rotary se Circulatic Tool J Anrough Casi	NATIO ^{ar}	N OF A	BBRE SAM AS CS BX CS BX ST ST ST AGS	VIATIONS IPLING TYPES: Auger/Grab Sample California Sampler 1.5" Rock Core 2.1" Rock Core Geoprobe Hydro Punch Split Spoon Shelby Tube Wash Sample HER: Above Ground Surface	BGS= Below Gr PID= Photoionia ID= Inside Diarr Depth to initial v development MW-2D was ins Ground surface Reviewed by:	round S zation I neter water le stalled i and to N.Ca	RE Surface Detector evel reco in the sa p of PV astongu	MARKS MARKS orded on 2/11/2022 prior to well me borehole as MW-2S C riser elevations are approximate may, PG Date: 05/25/22

CDM Smith



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

MONITORING WELL DETAIL ^{MW-2D}

Clie Pro	ent: To ject Lo	own of W ocation:	/est Ha Linbro	artford, ook Roa	CT d	Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609						
Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description	Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail			
SS	S-5	0.0	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/20	CL-ML	(14-16') Wet, very soft, red-brown, SILT & CLAY. (16-19') Advance rollerbit (3.785") to 19' BGS.		_ <u>75.0</u> _ 				
SS	S-6	0.0	WOH 2 2 3	24/17	CL-ML	(19-21') Top 11": Wet, very soft to medium stiff, red-brown, SILT & CLAY. Bottom 6": Wet, very soft, red-brown, SILT & CLAY to CLAYEY SILT, little fine sand, trace fine gravel. (21-25') Advance rollerbit (3.785") to 25' BGS.		 20 -	(18-22') Medium Bentonite Chips			
									(22-30') #2 Silica Sand			
SS	S-7	0.0	13 12 12 12 12	24/12	SW	(25-27') Top 3" Wet, medium dense, red-brown, coarse to fine SAND, little medium to fine gravel and silt. Middle 6": Wet, stiff, red-brown, SILT, little fine gravel.		25	(23-28') 2" (.01") Slot Schedule 40 PVC Screen			
SS	S-8	0.0	12 10 8 5	24/11	SW	Bottom 3 [°] : Wet, medium dense, red-brown, coarse to fine SAND, little (27-29') Wet, medium dense, light-brown, coarse to fine SAND, some silt. (30-31') Advance rollerbit (3.785") to 31' BGS. Borehole collapsed from 28-31' BGS. End of Exploration at 31' BGS.		 - <u>60.0</u> - 	Bottom of Well at 28' BGS (28-31') Slough Backfill			
								 - <u>55.0</u> 				
								 - <u>50.0</u> - 				

Sheet 1 of 1



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

Client: Town of West Hartford, CT Project Location: Linbrook Road

Drilling Contractor: Geosearch, Inc

Drilling Method/Rig: Drive & Wash/CME 55LC Drillers: P. McClenahan, C. Stamas Drilling Date: Start: 2/3/2022 End: 2/3/2022 Logged By: D. Roth Field Screening Instrument: PID Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609

Surface Elevation (ft.): 90.00

MONITORING

WELL DETAIL

MW-2S

Top of PVC Riser Elevation (ft.): 89.25 Total Depth (ft.): 8

Depth to Initial Water Level (ft. BGS): 2.65

Development Method: Surge and Purge via Whale Pump

Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description			<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail
НА	S-1	0.0		A:	SPHAL	T(0-0.7') ASPHALT (0.7-2') No sample collec (2-2.5') Dry, brown to lig coarse to fine GRAVEL, fine sand, little silt.	cted.		To <u>90.0</u> 	Protective Casing p of Riser @ 89.25 ft. Ground Surface (0-1') Concrete (1-8') #2 Silica Sand
HA	S-2 S-3	0.0	WOH WOH 2 2	6/6 24/18	CL-ML	(2.5-4') No sample collect (4-4.5') Wet, light-brown (4.5-6') No sample collect (6-8') Wet, very soft, red CLAY.	cted.		 <u>- 5</u> -	(3-8') 1" (.01") Slot Schedule 40 PVC Screen Bottom of Well at 8' BGS
RILAAN FOO FLAND OF LAND OF LA	LING METI - Hollow - Solid 3 - Hand 1 - Air Ro - Air Ha - Dual 1 - Foam - Rever - Rever - Rever - Cable - Jetting - Driving	EXPLA FODS: Stem Auger Auger tary Wotary totary totary totary totary	NATIO or	N OF A	BBRE SAX AS CBX SX BXX GPP SS SX GPP SS SX SX SX SX SX SX SX SX SX SX SX SX	VIATIONS IPLING TYPES: - Auger/Grab Sample - California Sampler - 1.5" Rock Core - 2.1" Rock Core - Geoprobe - Hydro Punch - Split Spoon - Shelby Tube - Wash Sample IER: - Above Ground Surface	BGS= Below Gr PID= Photoioniz ID= Inside Diam Depth to initial v development MW-2S was ins Ground surface	round S zation I neter vater le talled i and to	RE Surface Detector evel reco	EMARKS orded on 2/11/2022 prior to well me borehole as MW-2D C riser elevations are approximate

Sheet 1 of 2

CDM Smith CDM Smith 75 State Street Suite 701

ç

Boston, MA 02109

Client: Town of West Hartford, CT Project Location: Linbrook Road

Drilling Contractor: Geosearch, Inc

Drilling Method/Rig: HSA/CME 55LC Drillers: P. McClenahan, C. Stamas Drilling Date: Start: 2/2/2022 End: 2/2/2022 Logged By: D. Roth Field Screening Instrument: PID Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609

Surface Elevation (ft.): 86.00

MONITORING

WELL DETAIL

MW-3D

Top of PVC Riser Elevation (ft.): 85.46 Total Depth (ft.): 27

Depth to Initial Water Level (ft. BGS): 7.49

Development Method: Surge and Purge via Whale Pump

Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description		Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail
				A	SPHAI	_T(0-0.8') ASPHALT			To <u>86.0</u> 0	Protective Casing p of Riser @ 85.46 ft. <u>Ground Surface</u>
						(0.8-2') No sample collec airknife/vac to 2' BGS.	 cted,			(0-1') Concrete pad with 8" diameter roadbox
HA	S-1	0.0	NA	6/6	GW	(2-2.5') Dry, brown to lig coarse to fine GRAVEL, fine sand, little silt. (2.5-4') No sample collec airknife/vac to 4' BGS.	nt-brown, some coarse to _/ / cted,/	:		
HA	S-2	0.0	NA	6/6	CL-ML	(4-4.5') Wet, light brown (4.5-6') No sample colled airknife/vac to 6' BGS. T 6' BGS. Advance HSA (4 BGS.	CLAYEY SILT. cted, erminate vac at 4.25" ID) to 6'		- <u>81.0</u> - <u>5</u>	(1-11') #2 Silica Sand
SS	S-3	0.0	WOH 3 15/3"	24/8	SW-SN	1 (6-8') Top 2": Moist to we CLAYEY SILT, trace fine Bottom 6": Moist, red-bro dense, coarse to fine SA	ət, stiff, ə gravel. own, very ND, some silt.			
						(8-10') Advance HSA (4. BGS.	25" ID) to 10"		76.0	
DRILI HSA SSA	LING METI - Hollow - Solid S	EXPLA HODS: V Stem Auge Stem Auger	NATIO ar	N OF A	BBRE SAN AS CS	EVIATIONS IPLING TYPES: - Auger/Grab Sample - California Sampler	BGS= Below Gr	ound	RE Surface	MARKS
HA HA AR DTR DTR CT T JET D	 Gold C Hand J Air Ra Dual T Foam Mud R Reven Cable Jetting Driving 	Auger tary mmer Tube Rotary Rotary Rotary Se Circulatic Tool	on		BX BX GP HP SS ST WS OTH AGS	Standaring Genipher 1.5" Rock Core 2.1" Rock Core Geoprobe Hydro Punch Split Spoon Shelby Tube Wash Sample EER: S - Above Ground Surface	PID= Photoioniz ID= Inside Diam Depth to initial w development MW-3D was ins Ground surface	ation I leter vater le talled i and to	Detector evel reco n the sa p of PV	orded on 2/11/2022 prior to well me borehole as MW-3S C riser elevations are approximate
DTC	- Drill Ti	nrough Casi	ng				Reviewed by:	N.Ca	istongu	ay, PG Date: 05/25/22

CDM Smith



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

MONITORING WELL DETAIL ^{MW-3D}

Clie Pro	ent: To ject Lo	wn of W cation:	/est Ha Linbro	artford, ok Roa	CT Id	Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609						
Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description	Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.) 76.0	Well Construction Detail			
SS	S-4	0.0	1 1 2 1	24/18	CL-ML	(10-12') Wet, brown to grey, very soft, SILT & CLAY.		10				
						(12-15') Advance HSA (4.25" ID) to 15' BGS.			(11-13') Medium Bentonite Chips			
SS	S-5	0.0	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/18	CL-ML	(15-17') Wet, brown to grey, very soft, SILT & CLAY, little fine sand. FeO staining in bottom 2".		- <u>15</u>	(13-25') #2 Silica			
						(17-20') Advance HSA (4.25" ID) to 20' BGS.						
SS	S-6	0.0	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/20	CL-ML	(20-22') Wet, red-brown, very soft, SILT & CLAY.		20				
MA.GDT 5/27/22						(22-25') Advance HSA (4.25" ID) to 25' BGS.			(15-25') 2" (.01") Slot Schedule 40 PVC Screen			
K RD MW LOGS.GPJ CDM SS	S-7	0.0	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/20	CL-ML	(25-27') Wet, red-brown, very soft, SILT & CLAY. End of Exploration at 27' BGS.		<u>61.0</u> 25 	Bottom of Well at 25' BGS (25-27') Slough Post			
Beebe MW Log Linbroc								 56.0				

Sheet 1 of 1

CDM Smith CDM Smith 75 State Street Suite 701

8

Boston, MA 02109

Client: Town of West Hartford, CT Project Location: Linbrook Road

Drilling Contractor: Geosearch, Inc

Drilling Method/Rig: HSA/CME 55LC Drillers: P. McClenahan, C. Stamas Drilling Date: Start: 2/2/2022 End: 2/2/2022 Logged By: D. Roth Field Screening Instrument: PID Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609

Surface Elevation (ft.): 86.00

MONITORING

WELL DETAIL

MW-3S

Top of PVC Riser Elevation (ft.): 85.75 Total Depth (ft.): 10

Depth to Initial Water Level (ft. BGS): 6.77

Development Method: Surge and Purge via Whale Pump

Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description			<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail
НА	S-1	0.0	NA	A\$ 6/6	SPHAI	T(0-0.8') ASPHALT (0.8-2') No sample collec (2-2.5') Dry, brown to ligt corase to fine GRAVEL, \fine sand, little silt. (2.5-4') No sample collec			To <u>86.0</u> 	Protective Casing p of Riser @ 85.75 ft. <u>Ground Surface</u> (0-1') Concrete (1-1.5') Medium Bentonite Chips
HA	S-2	0.0	NA	6/6	CL-ML	(4-4.5') Wet, light brown, (4.5-6') No sample collec	CLAYEY SILT.		 _ <u>81.0</u> _ 5	Sand
ss	S-3	0.0	WOH 3 15/3"	24/8	\$W-SN	I (6-8') Top 2": Moist to we CLAYEY SILT, trace fine Bottom 6": Moist, red-bro dense, coarse to fine SA	et, stiff, e gravel. own, very ND, some silt.			(2-10') 2" (.01") Slot Schedule 40 PVC Screen
						(8-10') No sample collec	EEG.		 _ <u>76.0</u> _ _10	Bottom of Well at 10' BGS
EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS DRILLING METHODS: SAMPLING TYPES: HSA Hollow Stem Auger AS Auger/Grab Sample SSA Solid Stem Auger CS California Sampler HA Hand Auger BX 1.5" Rock Core AR Air Rotary NX 2.1" Rock Core AH Air Hammer GP Geoprobe DTR Dual Tube Rotary HP Hydro Punch FR Foam Rotary ST Shelby Tube RC Reverse Circulation WS WS and Sample CT Cable Tool OTHER: JET Jetting JET Jetting AGS Above Ground D Driving Surface Surface							BGS= Below Gr PID= Photoioniz ID= Inside Diam Depth to initial v development MW-3S was ins Ground surface Reviewed bv:	round S zation I neter vater le talled i and to N.Ca	RE Surface Detector evel reco n the sa p of PV	MARKS brded on 2/11/2022 prior to well me borehole as MW-3D C riser elevations are approximate ay, PG Date: 05/25/22

Sheet 1 of 2



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

Client: Town of West Hartford, CT Project Location: Linbrook Road

Drilling Contractor: Geosearch, Inc

Drilling Method/Rig: HSA/CME 55LC Drillers: P. McClenahan, C. Stamas Drilling Date: Start: 2/2/2022 End: 2/2/2022 Logged By: D. Roth/N. Castonguay Field Screening Instrument: PID

MONITORING WELL DETAIL ^{MW-4D}

Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609

Surface Elevation (ft.): 80.00

Top of PVC Riser Elevation (ft.): 79.52 Total Depth (ft.): 34

Depth to Initial Water Level (ft. BGS): 5.02

Development Method: Surge and Purge via Whale Pump

Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description		Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail
									To 80.0	Protective Casing o of Riser @ 79.52 ft. Ground Surface
SS	S-1	NM	16 15 11 11	24/24	SP-SN	 (0-2') Top 3": Dry, mediu light-brown, fine SAND & organic material. Bottom 21": Dry, mediun red-rown, fine SAND & S 	im dense, & SILT, trace n dense, SILT, little		0	(0-1') Concrete pad with 8" diameter roadbox
SS	S-2	NM	7 6 9 7	24/14	SW	coarse to medium sand, fine gravel. (2-4') Top 7": Dry, mediu red-brown, fine SAND, s	trace coarse to // um dense, ome silt, trace			
SS	S-3	NM	5 9 5 3	24/17	SW	 Ine gravel. Bottom 7": Dry, medium \red-brown, coarse to fine (4-6') Dry to moist, medi red-brown, coarse to fine 	dense, / = SAND um dense, = SAND, some		<u>75.0</u>	(1-11') #2 Silica Sand
SS	S-4	NM	1 1 1 1	24/24	CL-ML	 silt, little fine gravel. (6-8') Top 5": Dry to mois red-brown, coarse to fine silt, little fine gravel. Bottom 19": Wet very set 	st, very loose, e SAND, some			
SS	S-5	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/22	CL-ML	red-brown, SILT & CLAY (Perched water table ~ 7 (8-10') Wet, very soft, lig red-brown, SILT & CLAY	ft BGS		 _ <u>70.0</u> _	
<u>A_MA.GDT 5/2</u> SS	S-6	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/17	CL-ML	(10-12') Wet, very soft, li red-brown, SILT & CLAY	ight-grey to		10 	
SS SPJ CDV	S-7	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/24	CL-ML	(12-14') Wet, very soft, li red-brown, SILT & CLAY	ght-grey to			(11-13') Medium Bentonite Chips
ILIA SEEBE WW LOG LINBROOK RD WW L DHSSA AAH TR RC T H DT D D T AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA	LING METH - Hollow - Solid S - Hand / - Air Ro - Air Ra - Dual T - Foam - Mud R - Revers - Cable - Jetting - Drill Th	EXPLA HODS: v Stem Auger Stem Auger tary mmer ube Rotary Rotary Rotary se Circulatio Tool J anrough Casi	NATIO er in	N OF A	BBRE SAM AS CS BX NX GP HP SS ST SS OTH AGS	VIATIONS VIATIONS VILING TYPES: - Auger/Grab Sample - California Sampler - 1.5" Rock Core - 2.1" Rock Core - Geoprobe - Hydro Punch - Split Spoon - Shelby Tube - Wash Sample Vash Sample Vash Sample Vash Sample Vash Sample Vash Sample	BGS= Below Gr PID= Photoioniz ID= Inside Diam NM= Not Measu Depth to initial w development MW-4D was insi Ground surface Reviewed bv:	ound S ation I eter ired vater le talled i and to N.Ca	RE Surface Detector evel reco n the sa p of PV0 stongu	MARKS orded on 2/11/2022 prior to well me borehole as MW-4S C riser elevations are approximate ay, PG Date: 05/25/22

CDM Smith



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

MONITORING WELL DETAIL ^{MW-4D}

	Clie	nt: To	wn of W	/est Ha	artford,	СТ	Project Name:	Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study					
	Pro	ject Lo	cation:	Linbro	ok Roa	d	Project Numbe						
-	Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description	Graphic Log	Elev. Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail			
	ss	S-8	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/22	CL-ML	(14-16') Wet, very soft, light-grey to red-brown, SILT & CLAY.		- <u>65.0</u> - 15 -				
	SS	S-9	NM	WOH WOH WOH 2	24/24	CL-ML	(16-18') Wet, very soft, light-grey to red-brown, SILT & CLAY.			(13-34') #2 Silica Sand			
	SS	S-10	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/24	CL-ML	(18-20') Wet, very soft, light-grey to red-brown, SILT & CLAY.						
	SS	S-11	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/24	CL-ML	(20-22') Wet, very soft, light-grey to red-brown, SILT & CLAY.		<u>- 20</u>	(15-25') 2" (.01") Slot Schedule 40 PVC Screen			
	SS	S-12	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/24	CL-ML	(22-24') Wet, very soft, light-grey to red-brown, SILT & CLAY.						
	SS	S-13	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/24	CL-ML	(24-26') Wet, very soft, light-grey to red-brown, SILT & CLAY.		- <u>55.0</u> - <u>25</u> -	Bottom of Well at 25' BGS			
	SS	S-14	NM	2 2 3 2	24/24	CL-ML	(26-28') Wet, medium stiff, light-grey to red-brown, SILT & CLAY.						
	SS	S-15	NM	WOH WOH WOH 3	24/14	CL-ML	(28-30') Top 12": Wet, very soft, red-brown, SILT & CLAY. Bottom 2": Wet, very soft, red-brown, SILT, some clay.		50.0				
	SS	S-16	NM	2 4 9 10	24/15	CL-ML	(30-32') Wet, medium stiff, red-brown, SILT, some to little clay.						
3DT 5/27/22	SS	S-17	NM	10 12 36 36	24/12	CL-ML	(32-34') Wet, very dense, red-brown, fine SAND & SILT, some clay, little to trace fine gravel & coarse sand (TILL).						
PJ CDM_MA.							End of Exploration 34' BGS.		- <u>45.0</u> - <u>45.0</u> - <u>35</u> -	Bottom of Borehole at 34' BGS			
D MW LOGS.G													
LINBROOK RI													
EEBE MW LOG									- <u>40.0</u> 				

Sheet 1 of 1



75 State Street Suite 701 Boston, MA 02109

Client: Town of West Hartford, CT Project Location: Linbrook Road

Drilling Contractor: Geosearch, Inc

Drilling Method/Rig: HSA/CME 55LC Drillers: P. McClenahan, C. Stamas Drilling Date: Start: 2/2/2022 End: 2/2/2022 Logged By: D. Roth/N. Castonguay Field Screening Instrument: PID MONITORING WELL DETAIL ^{MW-4S}

> Project Name: Linbrook Road Area Groundwater Study Project Number: 268609

Surface Elevation (ft.): 80.00

Top of PVC Riser Elevation (ft.): 79.21 Total Depth (ft.): 10

Depth to Initial Water Level (ft. BGS): 4.93

Development Method: Surge and Purge via Whale Pump

Sample Type	Sample Number	Field Instrument Reading (ppm)	Blows per 6 Inches	Sample Recovery (inches)	Stratum Designation	Material Description		Graphic Log	<u>Elev.</u> Depth (ft.)	Well Construction Detail
			16		SP-SN	I (0-2') Top 3": Dry, mediu	ım dense,		To <u>80.0</u> 0	Protective Casing p of Riser @ 79.21 ft. <u>Ground Surface</u>
SS	S-1	NM	15 11 11	24/24		light-brown, fine SAND & organic material. Bottom 21": Dry, mediun red-rown, fine SAND & S coarse to medium sand	& SILT, trace n dense, SILT, little			(0 1) Concient
SS	S-2	NM	7 6 9 7	24/14	SW	(2-4') Top 7": Dry, mediu (2-4') Top 7": Dry, mediu red-brown, fine SAND, s fine gravel.	indense, ome silt, trace		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(3-10') #2 Silica
SS	S-3	NM	5 9 5 3	24/17	SW	(4-6') Dry to moist, medium (4-6') Dry to moist, medi red-brown, coarse to fine silt, little fine gravel.	e SAND. um dense, SAND, some		<u>75.0</u>	Sand
SS	S-4	NM	1 1 1 1	24/24	CL-ML	(6-8') Top 5": Dry to mois red-brown, coarse to fine silt, little fine gravel. Bottom 19": Wet, very so red-brown, SILT & CLAY Borphed water table ~ 2	st, very loose, SAND, some oft, light grey to			(5-10') 2" (.01") Slot Schedule 40 PVC Screen
MA.GDT 5/27/22 S	S-5	NM	WOH WOH WOH WOH	24/22	CL-ML	(8-10) Wet, very soft, lig red-brown, SILT & CLAY	ht-grey to		70.0	
OGS.GPJ CDM						End of Exploration at 10	BGS.		10 ⁻	Bottom of Well at 10' BGS
REEBE MW LOG LINBROOK RD MW LU DHSSA ARH LR RC L D D T D D D D D L D D C D D C D D C D D C D D C D D C D D C D D C D D C D	LING METI - Hollow - Solid S - Hand J - Air Ro - Air Ha - Dual T - Foam - Mud R - Reven - Cable - Jetting - Drill Ti	EXPLA HODS: Stem Auger Auger tary mmer ube Rotary Rotary se Circulatic Tool	NATIO er on ng	N OF A	BBRE SAM AS CS BX BX ST SS ST SS ST AGS	VIATIONS PILING TYPES: Auger/Grab Sample California Sampler 1.5" Rock Core Geoprobe Hydro Punch Split Spoon Shelby Tube Wash Sample ER: Above Ground Surface	BGS= Below Gr PID= Photoioniz ID= Inside Diam NM= Not Measu Depth to initial w development MW-4S was insi Ground surface Reviewed bv:	ound S cation I leter ired vater le talled i and to N.Ca	RE Surface Detector evel reco n the sa p of PV	EMARKS orded on 2/11/2022 prior to well me borehole as MW-4D C riser elevations are approximate av. PG Date: 05/25/22