Chicopee, Hampden County, MA USACE Section 408 Request

River Mills at Chicopee Falls Site Redevelopment

June 2017

River Mills at Chicopee Falls Site Redevelopment

Prepared for:

City of Chicopee Office of Community Development 38 Center Street Chicopee, Massachusetts 01013

BETA Project No. 5100



1 Springfield Street Suite 4 Chicopee, MA 01013 413.331.5326 www.BETA-Inc.com

USACE Section 408 Request

Chicopee, Hampden County, MA *River Mills at Chicopee Falls Site Redevelopment*

Prepared by:BETA GROUP, INC.Prepared for:US Army Corps of Engineers, New England District

June 2017



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On behalf of the City of Chicopee, BETA Group, Inc. (BETA) has prepared this United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 408 request to allow for the placement of backfill along an earthen levee on a portion of the Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project easement in order to facilitate future redevelopment of the former Uniroyal and Facemate properties.

The City will not be using federally-owned property for any of these activities. The entire project will be constructed on property owned by the City. The flood control works were designed and constructed by the USACE for locations along the Chicopee and Connecticut Rivers in the City of Chicopee in response to floods in the 1930s and 1950s. The USACE was responsible for the design and construction of the levees, while the City provided all of the lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction. A permanent easement to the levee was provided to the City by the US Rubber Company in 1965 and the City subsequently acquired the former Uniroyal property (formerly US Rubber) and former Facemate property. Information on the real estate ownership, along with survey plans and deed references is provided in Section 2.1.7 and Appendix D.

The City of Chicopee has prepared a redevelopment plan for the former manufacturing complex. This project represents a significant economic opportunity for the City to meet its redevelopment goals for the site. An endorsement of the project from the City is included as Appendix B.

The fill will be supplied by importing excess construction fill from regional construction projects. BETA has prepared a Fill Management Plan (FMP) in support of the filling activities. The City anticipates that this plan will be reviewed and approved by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). Key excerpts from the FMP, related to the fill procedures, acceptance criteria, and quality control are provided in Section 3.0.

The fill will be placed and compacted so as to raise the elevation of the project site to the height of the flood control levee and to re-grade the entire site for future redevelopment. <u>Abandoned Site buildings</u> <u>located on the lower elevations have either been demolished or future demolition is planned</u>. As the <u>levee was installed on this portion of the property to protect these abandoned buildings, it is the City's</u> <u>opinion that this alteration will not impair the usefulness of the USACE flood control project (including the projects authorized purpose).</u>

A Slope Stability Analysis in support of the project was completed in September 2016 (Appendix C).



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exe	Executive Summaryi				
1.0	Project Description1				
1	.1 Chicopee Falls Flood Control System Description2				
2.0	Purpose, Need and Scope for the Proposed Action4				
	2.1.1 Project Purpose				
	2.1.2 Project Need/City Endorsement4				
	2.1.3 Description of Proposed Alteration5				
	2.1.4 Technical Analysis and Design5				
	2.1.5 Authorization Pursuant of Section 10/404/1035				
	2.1.6 Section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 19705				
	2.1.7 Property Ownership/Real Estate Requirements				
	2.1.8 Hydrologic and Hydraulic System Performance Analysis				
	2.1.8.1 Slope Stability Analysis7				
	2.1.9 Environmental Compliance				
	2.1.10 Real Estate Requirements				
	2.1.11 Executive Order 11988 Considerations				
	2.1.12 Requester Review Plan Requirement				
	2.1.13 Levee Operation and Maintenance9				
3.0	Fill Material Handling and Placement9				
3	.1 Fill Management Plan9				
	3.1.1 Initial Screening Requirements10				
	3.1.2 Field Screening Requirements10				
	3.1.3 Soil Handling and Placement11				
	3.1.4 Grading and Filling Plan11				
3	.2 Reporting				
4.0	Implementation Schedule12				

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	igure 1. Project Locus				
Figure 2.	Figure 2. Chicopee Flood Control (From BEC report)				
Figure 3	Site Fill Management Plan w/ propery lines, deed references and fill areas				
Figure 4	Former Uniroyal Parcel Fill Area and Utility Plan				



Figure 5 Former Facemate Parcel Fill Area and Utility Plan

Figure 6 Proposed Fill Area Cross Section A-A'



LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix A:Excerpts of FEMA Accreditation Report, Chicopee Falls Flood Control System, November
2010, Baystate Environmental Consultants
- Appendix B: City of Chicopee Endorsement
- Appendix C: Slope Stability Analysis, O'Reilly, Talbot & Okun, September 2016
- Appendix D: Easement from Hampden Registry of Deeds and survey plans
- Appendix E: Environmental Assessment, BETA, November 2016



1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Chicopee proposes to place backfill along a portion of the Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project easement and adjacent upland areas in order to facilitate future redevelopment of the River Mills and Chicopee Falls redevelopment site. The former Facemate and Uniroyal Tire Complex properties are located adjacent to the Chicopee River in Chicopee, Massachusetts (Locus Map – Figure 1). The site is bounded by the Chicopee River and the Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project on the west, Oak Street to the north, Grove Street and West Main Street to the east and Front Street to the southeast.



Figure 1. Project Locus

Former Uniroyal Site

The former Uniroyal Site was originally developed during the late 1800s. In 1870, the property was used as a lumber yard by the Chicopee Manufacturing Company. From 1896 to 1898 the property was owned by the Spaulding and Pepper Company, which manufactured bicycle tires. The Fisk Rubber Company, which later changed its name to United States Rubber Company and then to Uniroyal, Inc., manufactured bicycle, automobile and truck tires and adhesives from 1898 to 1981.

Uniroyal, Inc. closed its plant in 1980 and sold the property to the Facemate Corporation in 1981. Facemate leased portions of the Uniroyal buildings to various companies for manufacturing, printing, machine shops, office, storage and health care facilities. Several buildings on the site have been demolished to date.



Former Facemate Site

Between 1823 and 1915, the former Facemate property and much of the surrounding area was owned by the Chicopee Manufacturing Company. During this time, the property was used for the manufacture and processing of cotton cloth. In 1915, Johnson & Johnson Services, Inc. purchased the property, and continued the production of cotton cloth. Circa 1977, the Property was purchased by the Facemate Corporation which produced finished cotton and synthetic cloth at the Property. In 2003, Facemate filed for bankruptcy and was forced to shut down due to bank foreclosure proceedings. The property had been vacant since 2003. The City of Chicopee acquired ownership of the property in 2010 for the non-payment of taxes, and subsequently conducted assessment and remediation activities subdivided the former Facemate property into three separate lots for re-development: Lot 1, Senior Center Parcel (Lot 2) and Lot 4. The activities proposed under this submittal are to occur on Lot 1, located on the southern portion of the former Facemate property abutting the former Uniroyal property.

1.1 CHICOPEE FALLS FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

Flood control works were designed and constructed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for locations along the Chicopee and Connecticut Rivers in the City of Chicopee (City) in response to floods in the 1930s and 1950s. Construction along the Connecticut River and the North and

South Banks of the Chicopee River was conducted in a series of construction contracts initiated in 1938 and completed in 1942, collectively known as the Chicopee Local Protection Project (CLPP).

The Flood Control Works in the City of Chicopee was constructed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in four separate systems (the Plainfield Street Flood Control System, the South Bank Chicopee River Flood Control System, the Willimansett Flood Control System, and the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System).

This project will be completed along a portion of an earthen levee associated with the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System. On behalf of the City of Chicopee, Baystate Environmental Consultants (BEC) prepared a FEMA accreditation report for the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in 2010. The purpose of the report was for submittal to FEMA for their use in establishing risk zones for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) maps and document compliance with the minimum design, operation, and maintenance standards for levee systems established in 44 CFR 65.10. This included an embankment, foundation and stability analysis. Excerpts of the BEC report are included in Appendix A.







Riprap slope protection on the riverside and a toe drain on the landside were constructed on the levee. According to the BEC report, the typical cross section consists of compacted random fill on the landside with compacted impervious soil on the riverside with an impervious foundation cutoff. The Oak Street Pumping Station was built into the levee at Station 49+15. Two gate valves with catwalk access are located in this segment in close proximity to the pumping station. One was an intake for the now defunct U.S. Rubber Company facility with associated improvements, while the other is an outlet from the Oak Street Pumping Station.

This project includes a portion of the segment of earthen levee that extends from Station 25+45 to Station 54+15 (See Figure 2 from the BEC report below). A typical cross section of the levee is provided in Appendix A.



Figure 2. Chicopee Falls System, from BEC Report



2.0 PURPOSE, NEED AND SCOPE FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

2.1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE

The purpose of the project is to provide the City of Chicopee a site suitable for redevelopment of the former Uniroyal/Facemate property and to eliminate long term operating and maintenance costs for a portion of the Chicopee Falls flood control levee drainage system as the vacant buildings at the lower elevations have been or are in the process of being demolished.

2.1.2 PROJECT NEED/CITY ENDORSEMENT



A Photo of the flood control levee and former Uniroyal Building 8 footprint (Summer 2016).

The City of Chicopee has prepared a redevelopment plan for the former manufacturing complex in Chicopee Falls. In order to further the redevelopment of the former Uniroyal/Facemate portion of the complex the City needs to generate revenue to prepare the site for future redevelopment in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

The importation of excess construction fill from the region will enable the City to raise the site elevation and provide future developers a suitable site.

In addition, the City is incurring ongoing operation and maintenance costs for the Chicopee Falls flood control levee storm drainage system adjacent to the site. Placement of fill adjacent to the levee will enable the abandonment of the existing storm drainage system and eliminate the ongoing O&M costs.

Finally, there is a recognized need for suitable sites in the region where excess construction fill can be properly disposed. The Project site represents an opportunity to develop such a site, suitably managed and properly constructed to fulfill both the regional need for disposal sites and meet the City's redevelopment goals for the site. An endorsement of the project from the City is included as Appendix



2.1.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ALTERATION

The scope of work (SOW) will affect two areas:

Former Uniroyal Site

This proposed fill area is located on the northwestern portion of the former Uniroyal Property, located at 154 Grove Street in Chicopee, Massachusetts. The proposed SOW will affect the lower tier of the former Uniroyal Site, which is abutted to the east by Site buildings and a railroad spur and to the west by the levee associated with the Chicopee Falls flood control dike along the Chicopee River. The topography of the lower tier slopes downward sharply towards the Chicopee River; the elevation of the lower tier is approximately seventeen (17) feet below the top of the flood control levee.

Former Facemate Site

The proposed SOW will affect the lower elevation areas along the southern portion of Lot 1 on the former Facemate property, located at 5 West Main Street. The topography of this area slopes downward in an area where a former building was located. The elevation of this area is approximately ten (10) feet below the top of the flood control levee.

These two areas are shown on the Backfill Management Plan provided as Figure 3.

2.1.4 TECHNICAL ANALYSIS AND DESIGN

Excess construction fill will be imported from construction sites in the area. The fill will be placed and compacted so as to raise the elevation of the Project site to the height of the flood control levee and to grade the entire site for future redevelopment. <u>Abandoned Site buildings located in the lower tier of the former Uniroyal property have either been demolished or future demolition is planned. As the levee was installed on this portion of the property to protect these abandoned buildings, it is the City's opinion that this alteration will not impair the usefulness of the USACE flood control project (including the projects authorized purpose).</u>

In September 2016, a Slope Stability Analysis was completed. This study is described in Section 2.1.8 and included as Appendix C. A Site plan indicating the fill area, property boundaries and a cross section of the proposed fill area is attached as Figures 3 through 6.

2.1.5 AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT OF SECTION 10/404/103

The City is not pursuing authorization pursuant to Sections 10/404/103. There are no Navigable Waters or Waters of the United States that will be affected by the proposed project. Further, the proposed project does not involve the transportation of dredged material to a designated ocean disposal site.

2.1.6 Section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970

As described on federal register.gov (Guidelines for Carrying Out Section 221(a)(4) of the Flood Control Act of 1970, as Amended):

• Section 221 is a comprehensive authority that addresses the affording of credit for the value of in-kind contributions provided by a non-Federal sponsor toward its required cost share (excluding the required 5 percent cash for structural flood damage reduction projects and the



additional 10 percent cash payment over 30 years for navigation projects) if those in-kind contributions are determined to be integral to a study or project.

• The types of in-kind contributions eligible for credit include planning activities (including data collection and other services needed for a feasibility study); design related to construction; and construction (including management; mitigation; and construction materials and services).

Credit under Section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended, or other law or approval under Section 204(f) of the WRDA 1986 will not be sought.

2.1.7 PROPERTY OWNERSHIP/REAL ESTATE REQUIREMENTS

The project does not involve any federally owned property. The project will be totally constructed on property owned by the City. As described in the BEC report, the flood control project was a "cooperative Federal/City effort, the USACE was responsible for the design and construction of the levees, while the City provided all of the lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction. The City also agreed to maintain and operate the flood control works after completion, in accordance with federally prescribed regulations. These requirements are detailed in the Code of Federal Regulations, 33 CFR 208.10 which is entitled, "Local flood protection works; maintenance and operation of structures and facilities".

A permanent easement to the levee was granted to the City by the US Rubber Company in 1965. A copy of the easement recorded in the Hampden County Registry of Deeds is provided in Appendix D. The City acquired the former Uniroyal property (formerly US Rubber) and former Facemate property in 2009. A 2009 survey plan of the Chicopee Flood Control Works (by Heritage Surveys, Inc.) is also provided in Appendix D. The Heritage survey plan depicts the former Uniroyal and Facemate properties including the easement, property boundaries, levee and provides associated deed references. The location of the easement and utilities in reference to the proposed fill areas are provided as Figure 3 through 5. Any future conveyance by the City of all or any relevant portion of the subject property would retain an easement to the City to the easement areas as shown on survey plans provided in Appendix D.

2.1.8 Hydrologic and Hydraulic System Performance Analysis

A Massachusetts-registered Professional Engineer, Michael J. Talbot of O'Reilly, Talbot and Okun (OTO), conducted a slope stability analysis for the Uniroyal Filling project to evaluate the potential impacts of the project. The OTO work included review of previous plans and reports prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Baystate Environmental Consultants (BEC), stability analyses of the proposed conditions, and preparation of a report (See Appendix C).

The OTO slope stability analysis was based on information provided in the following documents:

- Plan titled "Topographic Plan of Land in Chicopee, Massachusetts, Surveyed for The City of Chicopee" by Heritage Surveys, Inc., dated December 12, 2009;
- Plan set titled "Connecticut River Flood Control Project, Chicopee Falls, Mass" prepared by Green Engineering Affiliates, Inc. for the U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England, dated April 1963;
- Design memorandum titled "Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project, Design Memorandum No. 5" by the U.S. Army Engineering Division, New England, dated March 1963;
- "FEMA Accreditation Report, Chicopee Falls Flood Control System" by Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc., dated November 2010; and



• "Design and Construction of Levees Engineering Manual"- EM 1110-2-1913, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, dated April 2000.

The information obtained from these sources that were used in their evaluation included the following:

- Details on levee construction;
- Design flood elevations and river levels;
- Existing ground surface topography;
- Subsurface information; and
- Soil properties.

2.1.8.1 SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS

Slope stability was evaluated by OTO using the SLOPE/W computer program using the Spencer method. The SLOPE/W program performs a limit equilibrium analysis using various analytical methods to determine the factor of safety and the critical failure surface. The Spencer method, which assumes that the resultant interslice forces have constant slope through the sliding mass, was chosen per USACE guidance.

The slope stability for typical design conditions of the work area was evaluated using a limit equilibrium analyses. The Spencer Method determines the critical failure surface and the minimum factor of safety. Levee slope stability was analyzed for critical design condition as described in the USACE *Design and Construction of Levees*, EM 1110-2- 1913, namely under normal, 100 year flood conditions, and rapid drawdown. For these analyses, only failure into the river side was considered, since the placement of fill

on the landward side increases the resistance to failures in that direction.

Results

the USACE design In manual, the recommended minimum factor of safety for rapid drawdown is between 1.0 to 1.2, and the recommended minimum factor of safety for long term (steady seepage) is 1.4. OTO used a value of 1.4 for normal water conditions as a specific factor of safety for normal conditions was not provided in the USACE design manual. OTO concluded that the computed factors of safety for the proposed conditions met or exceeded the required minimums specified above. Additionally, values computed by OTO were similar to those computed by BEC. Based upon their evaluation, OTO concluded that the proposed fill will likely have little effect on the stability of the levee.

To limit the buildup of hydrostatic pressures against the landside of the levee, OTO



recommended that a drainage layer be placed between the landside slope and proposed construction fill. The drainage layer should consist of a minimum of one foot of crushed stone wrapped in a non-woven geotextile fabric and be tied into the existing toe drain.

A typical drainage detail from the OTO is shown to the right. The OTO report is included as Appendix C.

2.1.9 Environmental Compliance

To comply with NEPA, the planning and decision-making process for actions proposed by Federal agencies involves a study of other relevant environmental statutes and regulations. The NEPA process, however, does not replace procedural or substantive requirements of other environmental statutes and regulations. It addresses them collectively in the form of an EA or EIS, which enables the decision maker to have a comprehensive view of major environmental issues and requirements associated with the proposed action. According to CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1500.2), the requirements of NEPA must be integrated "with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law or by agency so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively."

BETA group prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to examine potential effects of the proposed action and No Action alternative on resource areas including land use; air quality; noise; geology and soils; water resources; biological resources; cultural resources; socioeconomics and environmental justice; utility infrastructure; and hazardous and toxic materials/wastes. This EA is included as Appendix E

2.1.10 REAL ESTATE REQUIREMENTS

See Section 2.1.7.

2.1.11 EXECUTIVE ORDER 11988 CONSIDERATIONS

Executive Order 11988 requires federal agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of flood plains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative.

Compliance: The Proposed Action would not affect the 1% Annual Chance floodplain or the Regulatory Floodway associated with the Chicopee River adjacent to the site. The Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project borders the project site to the west and confines the floodplain and floodway in the project area. The project complies with the Executive Order.

2.1.12 REQUESTER REVIEW PLAN REQUIREMENT

Per EC 1165-2-214, a Type II independent external peer review (IEPR) shall be conducted on design and construction activities for any project where potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life (public safety). The reviews shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health, safety, and welfare. This applies to new projects and to the major repair, rehabilitation, replacement, or modification of existing facilities.

Other factors to consider for conducting a Type II review of a project or components of a project are:

a. The project involves the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains



precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices;

- b. The project design requires redundancy, resiliency, and robustness:
 - Redundancy is the duplication of critical components of a system with the intention of increasing reliability of the system, usually in the case of a backup or failsafe.
 - Resiliency is the ability to avoid, minimize, withstand, and recover from the effects of adversity, whether natural or manmade, under all circumstances of use.
 - Robustness is the ability of a system to continue to operate correctly across a wide range of operational conditions (the wider the range of conditions, the more robust the system), with minimal damage, alteration or loss of functionality, and to fail gracefully outside of that range.
- c. The project has unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; for example, significant project features accomplished using the Design-Build or Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) delivery systems.

If the district determines, by following the procedures of EC 1165-2-214, that a Type TII IEPR is required, the City will be required to submit a Type II IEPR review Plan. The City believes, based upon the nature of the project and the findings of the stability analysis that the project does not pose a significant threat to human life or safety.

2.1.13 Levee Operation and Maintenance

Until the City obtains approvals from the USACE for modifications, all current operation and maintenance activities and required inspections related to the levee and Oak Street pumping station will be adhered to.

3.0 FILL MATERIAL HANDLING AND PLACEMENT

3.1 FILL MANAGEMENT PLAN

BETA has prepared a Fill Management Plan (FMP) in support of the filling activities at the former Uniroyal and Facemate Sites. Key excerpts from the FMP, related to the fill procedures, proposed fill acceptance criteria, and quality control are provided below.

The purpose of the FMP is to formalize the fill management/acceptance process in order to meet the applicable soil re-use requirements and to give Generators a sufficient level of comfort that their material is being handled appropriately. The City's LSP (Alan Hanscom, BETA Group, Inc.), in coordination with LSPs/QEPs at Generator sites, is responsible for reviewing fill characterization data so that only fill meeting acceptance standards and approved under this FMP are brought to the proposed fill areas.

Soils may be accepted for re-use from properties that are Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) Disposal Sites, as defined in 310 CMR 40.0006, and from properties that are not MCP Disposal Sites so long as they meet the screening requirements. It is estimated that approximately 100,000 cubic yards (150,000 tons) of soil of acceptable chemical and physical quality will be needed to bring the site to required grade for development. Upon completion of the filling and remedial activities, an Activity and



Use Limitation (AUL) will be implemented in connection with Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) and Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA) cleanup work being undertaken at the former Uniroyal Site by Michelin North America, Inc..

3.1.1 INITIAL SCREENING REQUIREMENTS

All soils considered acceptable for use must meet the following initial criteria:

- Soils, including certain sediments, must not contain any hazardous waste, as defined under RCRA Subtitle D and the Massachusetts Hazardous Waste Regulations (310 CMR 30.000). Soils are considered to contain a hazardous waste when, if generated, they exhibit one or more characteristics of a hazardous waste (toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity or reactivity) or if they contain a listed hazardous waste;
- Soils must not include large stones (cobbles or boulders), masonry, stumps, asphalt, or waste material, including but not limited to lumber, bricks, plaster, wire, lath, paper, cardboard, pipe, tires, ashes, refrigerators, motor vehicles, or associated parts. Soils with a high percentage of organic matter will not be accepted; and,
- Soils must not meet the MCP definition of "Contaminated Soil" or "Remediation Waste", as defined in 310 CMR 40.0006. Specifically, the concentrations of analytes in soil must be below the MCP Reportable Concentrations in Soil applicable to the generation site.

3.1.2 FIELD SCREENING REQUIREMENTS

The following criteria are applicable to all soils proposed for re-use, regardless of whether they were generated from an MCP Disposal Site.

- Field screening results of soil headspace from representative samples must not exhibit an average reading of Total Organic Vapors (TOV) in the jar headspace exceeding five parts per million by volume (ppmv) due to constituents attributable to volatile compounds. If screening has not been performed by the Generator, it may be performed at the staging areas on the former Uniroyal and Facemate properties by the Operator or Site LSP or another designated party as appropriate to verify certain loads. If screening results in exceedances of the criteria above, the load(s) will be rejected.
- The soil must not exhibit any visual staining, discolorations or olfactory odors indicative of OHM releases as demonstrated by the representative of the soil to be imported. Soils containing nuisance odors such as petroleum, chemicals, solvents, and/or organic material/hydrogen sulfide will be rejected.
- The soils must not contain any refuse or trash. Inert solid wastes that comprise less than 1% of the total volume will be permitted. The soil may contain ancillary non-coated or non-painted brick pieces or non-coated/stained or non-impregnated concrete pieces less than 6-inches diameter or cobbles/rock fragments less than 6-inches diameter if it is contained within certain fill soils in very small quantities. This material must be less than 50% of the fill material. If soils contain more than this amount, they must be designated as Asphalt, Brick, Concrete (ABC) material. Loads received that contain more than the acceptable amount of solid debris will be rejected and sent back to its origin at the Generator's cost.



Soil may contain naturally deposited silt and clay and a certain portion of naturally occurring organic content and moisture since drainage of the soil can occur on EU-7 and Lot 1 while it is being stored, blended, and re-worked as supervised by the Operator. The physical quality will be reviewed by the Operator and soil will be placed in accordance with the soil blending plan for final disposition.

3.1.3 SOIL HANDLING AND PLACEMENT

In general, material will be accepted between 7:00 am and 5:00 pm Monday through Friday. Material may be accepted after these hours or on weekends with coordination with City.

Once the truck is weighed, the driver will proceed to the Site staging area. The access road for both proposed fill areas is located adjacent to the intersection of Oak Street and West Main Street, as shown on Figure 3.

The Site Operator will collect the MSR or BOL from the driver, record the name of the trucking company, verify the source of the material against the "approved list", and visually inspect the contents of the trucks for unacceptable fill materials and any visual or olfactory evidence of contamination, including nuisance odors. If the fill does not contain unacceptable material and there is no visual or olfactory evidence of contamination, it will be directed to the area for off- loading. Otherwise, it will be rejected. The Generator of the rejected material will be notified immediately not to ship any additional fill to the Site until the source of the unacceptable fill is identified and corrective action taken to prevent future problems. In addition, the Generator must remove the rejected material off-site at the Generator's expense.

The City's Representative will maintain a daily log of the following activities:

- Identification of the truck transporting fill material;
- Weight and source of material for each truck;
- > Physical characteristic and results of headspace screening if any for each truck; and
- Location of the fill placed

3.1.4 GRADING AND FILLING PLAN

Prior to filling operations, a survey of both fill areas will be conducted to determine existing surface elevations, to establish a benchmark for elevation reference, and to determine the final elevations for the fill material and the cap. Utility poles with overhead utility lines will need to be removed and the electric lines will need to be relocated, likely in an underground conduit, outside the proposed fill area.

During filling activities, surface elevations will be surveyed on a quarterly basis to monitor the progress of fill operations, and to adjust operations as needed.

Final elevations will be surveyed at the completion of filling activities, and after construction of the final cap. These elevations will be used to create record drawings of the fill areas upon completion of the project, including plan and section views of the backfill area and cap.

Manholes associated with the interceptor drain are present in the proposed fill area. These manholes will be raised in elevation to meet the proposed grade at the Site.



3.2 REPORTING

The City's LSP will prepare an inspection report documenting the findings of each inspection, including laboratory analytical results, and will submit each report on a quarterly basis to the MassDEP and the City of Chicopee Health Department. The report will include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- > Details regarding the filling activities compared to the requirements of this FMP;
- > Any deviations from this FMP, and any corrective actions taken by the City;
- A table summarizing the quantities of fill received and placed since the last report, and a summary of the number of truck loads and quantity of fill materials rejected;
- > A table summarizing the analytical results of soil samples collected during the inspections; and
- > Copies of the laboratory analytical reports, including the chain of custody documentation.

In addition to the above requirements, each report will be signed by the LSP and will include the following certification signed by the LSP, and an authorized City representative:

I certify under penalty of law that I have personally examined and am familiar with the information submitted in this document and all attachments and that, based on my inquiry of those individuals immediately responsible for obtaining the information. I believe that the information is true, accurate and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties, both civil and criminal, for submitting false information.

4.0 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

An implementation schedule for the project is provided below.



Task #	Task	SubTask	Comment/Description Stat	atus
Permit	tting Tasks			
-	Stormwater Management	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)	SWPPP to be developed and implemented to control and manage storm water runoff during Phase I and Phase II backfill operations	
		Install Stormwater Controls	Likely stormwater controls to include temporary settling basin with forebay, straw wattles, and slit fence	
		Periodic Inspections	Following installation, monthly inspections of the stormwater management controls will be conducted to verify stormwater controls are effective	
2	MassDEP Permitting to allow for acceptance of material	Fill Management Plan (FMP) Preparation	Update the Fill Management Plan (FMP), including procedures to stage, characterize and manage incoming material. FMP to be submitted to MasSDEP for comment and approval	
			MassDEP Review PeriodApproval vs ACO?	
			Address MassDEP comments on the FMP	
Phase	I - Backfill Operations in areas outside Flood Control Ease	ement		
3	Material Acceptance and Placement	Site Preparation	Set up weight scale, staging area(s)	
			Install markers indicating location of flood control easement and utilities. No backfill to be placed within flood control easement during Phase I	
		Bid Document Preparation	Prepare City RFP to accept material	
		Material Submittal Review	Review material profiles and analytical submittals to verify that the soil, sediment and/or ABC materials meet the requirements of the FMP and conditions required by the MassDEP	
		Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC)	As material comes in, it will be inspected in accordance with requirements of the FMP to verify it is consistent with the material profile provided by the generator	
		Material Placement	Material placed in proposed fill area following completion of OA/OC procedures	
Phase	II - Backfilling on Flood Control Easement			
4	Army Corp Permitting	NEPA EA	Prepare and submit NEPA EA to Army Corps for review	
		408 filing	Submit 408 filing for approval of modification and alteration of Army Corps Project	
			ACDE Review Periodestimated at 6-8 weeks	
			Address Comments by Army Corps on EA and Section 408 Application	
Ľ	Endinomina Dacian for Backfill Anorations			
>		Drainage Design	Drainage system to be installed along the landward side of the levee in the fill area and connected to the existing interceptor drain	
		Utility Relocation	Overhead electric lines are present within the proposed fill area. Utility poles will removed and the electric lines will be relocated, possibly in an underground conduit, outside the proposed fill area	
		Utility Relocation	Manholes associated with the interceptor drain are present in the proposed fill area. These manholes will be raised up approx. 12 feet due to proposed fill placement	
		Contract Documents	Contract document to be prepared for relocation of utilities and manhole modifications	
		Contract Documents	Contract documents for installation of drainage system in fill placement area	
9	Phase II Material Acceptance and Placement	Material Acceptance and Placement	Following same procedures for acceptance and placement of material used during Phase I of the Backfill Operations	
l				

FIGURES









Jan. 25, 2017

APPENDIX A – Excerpts of FEMA Accreditation Report, BEC, Nov 2010

FEMA Accreditation Report Chicopee Falls Flood Control System Chicopee, Massachusetts

November, 2010





Prepared by: Baystate Environmental Consultants , Inc. 1350 Main Street, Suite 1400 Springfield, MA 01103 413-726-2100

FEMA ACCREDITATION REPORT CHICOPEE FALLS FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTR	ODUCTION	
	1.1	PURPOSE AND STANDARD OF CARE ······	2
	1.2	LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM ••••••	3
	1.3	REPORT LIMITATIONS	6
	1.4	AUTHORIZATION	8
2.	LEVI	EE SYSTEM EVALUATION	
	2.1	STATEMENT OF LEVEE SYSTEM EVALUATION	10
	2.2	RESIDUAL RISK & PUBLIC SAFETY	12
3.	Engi	NEER'S OPINIONS OF DESIGN CRITERIA	
	3.1	EVALUATION OF FREEBOARD.	14
	3.2	EVALUATION OF CLOSURES	15
	3.3	EVALUATION OF EMBANKMENT PROTECTION	16
	3.4	EVALUATION OF EMBANKMENT FOUNDATION AND STABILITY	17
	3.5	EVALUATION OF SETTLEMENT	19
	3.6	EVALUATION OF INTERIOR FLOODING	20
	3.7	EVALUATION OF OTHER DESIGN CRITERIA (STRUCTURAL)	21
4.	Engi	NEER'S OPINION OF OPERATION PLANS & CRITERIA	24
5.	Engi	NEER'S OPINION OF MAINTENANCE PLANS & CRITERIA	27
6.	As B	UILT PLANS	29

APPENDICES

A-1 44 CFR 65.10 & 44 CFR 65.2

- A-2 BEC CONTRACT AND SCOPE OF SERVICES
- A-3 GEOTECHNICAL DATA AND LABORATORY ANALYSES

A-4 ENGINEERING CALCULATIONS AND COMPUTER MODELING

- A-4.1 FREEBOARD
- A-4.2 CLOSURES
- A-4.3 EMBANKMENT PROTECTION
- A-4.4 EMBANKMENT & FOUNDATION SEEPAGE & STABILITY
- A-4.5 SETTLEMENT
- A-4.6 INTERIOR FLOODING
- A-4.7 OTHER DESIGN CRITERIA (STRUCTURAL)
- A-5 AS-BUILT PLANS
- A-6 CITY OF CHICOPEE OPERATION & MAINTENANCE MANUAL (BOUND SEPARATELY)

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND STANDARD OF CARE

The purpose of this report is to compile and present engineering opinions, survey documentation and analyses of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in Chicopee, Massachusetts to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for their sole use in establishing risk zones for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) maps. Use of this report or the opinions and findings in the report in whole or in part by any other party, or for any other project or purpose is not intended nor authorized and may lead to inappropriate conclusions. Reliance upon the information presented in this report by any other party other than FEMA, without Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc. (BEC) prior written permission shall be at that other party's sole risk and without any liability to BEC.

The findings, opinions and conclusions contained herein are based on the work conducted as part of the contracted scope of services undertaken pursuant to contractual terms with the City and reflect professional judgment. These findings and conclusions must be considered not as scientific or engineering certainties, but rather as professional opinions and judgments built upon the limited data gathered during the course of the work. To understand how these opinions were developed, and to understand the intended use of the report, the report must be read in its entirety including the stated limitations.

The Code of Federal Regulations, Title 44 Part 65 addresses "Identification and Mapping of Special Hazard Areas" within which is Paragraph 65.10, "Mapping of areas protected by levee systems". This report is intended to document compliance with the minimum design, operation, and maintenance standards for levee systems established in 44 CFR 65.10, a copy of which is appended to this report.

This report opines that the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System meets the minimum criteria for design, operation and maintenance as established in 44 CFR 65.10 during a one-percent annual chance flood as determined by FEMA and issued in April, 2009, within the preliminary Flood Insurance Study and Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Hampden County, Massachusetts which includes all of the City of Chicopee. It must be noted that the one-percent annual chance flood is used by FEMA only as a flood insurance criterion.

1.2 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

The Flood Control Works in the City of Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts was constructed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in four separate systems, namely the Plainfield Street Flood Control System, the South Bank Chicopee River Flood Control System, the Willimansett Flood Control System, and the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System. In total, the Flood Control Works within the City consists of 25,820 linear feet of earthen levee, 7,500 linear feet of flood control walls, eight pumping stations, three cast-in-place concrete closure structures, and various appurtenant drainage features. Figure 1 is a locus plan of the four systems in Chicopee. Although all four systems do share a common Operation and Maintenance Manual, each system is physically independent from one another. As such, individual Accreditation Reports have been prepared for each system.

The Chicopee Falls Flood Control System consists of two segments of cast-in-place concrete flood walls and two segments of earthen levee, extending along the southern bank of the Chicopee River from the Deady Memorial Bridge to higher ground at a railroad, for a total length of 5,002 linear feet. USACE plans for this section are dated 1963. In addition, two stormwater pumping stations were constructed: the Main Street Pumping Station and the Oak Street Pumping Station. Following is a description of the system based upon the USACE plans and other available information.

From the Deady Bridge at Station 4+13, a segment of cast-in-place cantilever concrete wall extends westerly (downstream) for 557 linear feet to Station 9+70. The first $400\pm$ feet of wall is founded directly on ledge with rock anchors, while the last 157 feet is founded on earth. The exposed wall height is approximately 20 feet on both the landside and riverside. A perforated pipe toe drain surrounded by stone and filter sand was installed adjacent to the wall footing on the landward side from Station 6+80 to the downstream end of the wall. Stone slope protection was installed on the riverside of the wall starting at Station 5+90 and continues to the earthen levee slope protection, which begins at Station 9+70.

An earthen levee was constructed from Station 9+70 to Station 16+82 for a length of 712 feet, including riprap slope protection on the riverside and a perforated pipe toe drain surrounded with stone and filter sand along the bottom of the levee slope on the landside. The typical levee cross section consists of compacted random fill on the landside and compacted impervious soil on the riverside, including an impervious foundation cutoff. The top of levee is approximately 17 feet higher than the landside grading.

A second segment of cast-in-place cantilever concrete floodwall extends from Station 16+82 to Station 25+45 for a length of 863 feet. This wall segment is located on the inside of a bend of the Chicopee River where flow direction turns approximately 90 degrees from westerly to southerly. This entire segment of wall is founded directly on ledge, and a perforated pipe toe drain surrounded by stone and filter sand was installed adjacent to the wall footing on the landside. Riprap slope protection was installed on the riverside. The wall stem has an exposure of approximately 16 feet on the landside and 20 feet facing the river. The Main Street Pumping Station was constructed into the wall at Station 24+20.

A second segment of earthen levee extends 2,870 linear feet from Station 25+45 to Station 54+15. Riprap slope protection on the riverside and a toe drain on the landside were also constructed. The typical cross section consists of compacted random fill on the landside with compacted impervious soil on the riverside with an impervious foundation cutoff. The Oak Street Pumping Station was built into the levee at Station 49+15. Two gate valves with catwalk access are located in this segment in close proximity to the pumping station. One was an intake for the now defunct U.S. Rubber Company facility with associated improvements, while the other is an outlet from the Oak Street Pumping Station. A new downstream pressure drain is also shown on the USACE plans downstream from the pumping station near Station 52+50.

A collector drain line was constructed on the landside of the system from Station 7+00 to the Main Street Pumping Station and also from Station 34+70 to the Main Street Pumping Station. A second drainage line that discharges to the Oak Street Pumping Station was also built adjacent to the levee toe on the landside from Station 39+00 to Station 51+20. The USACE constructed a pressure drain with an inlet upstream of the Deady Bridge at the Chicopee River Falls gatehouse to an outlet through the levee at Station 36+10. The pressure line was controlled by various sluice gates and appears to have provided process water to various manufacturing facilities within the area protected by the Chicopee Falls system. The USACE plans indicate that the section of the drain from the gatehouse to the manhole at Station 3+00 was only temporary and was to be removed when the process water line was no longer needed. A bypass was also constructed that tied the pressure drain into the collector drain at Station 39+00.

The Chicopee Falls Flood Control System also included the relocation and/or widening of a $3,700\pm$ ft segment of the Chicopee River. From approximately Sta. 30+17 to $52+00\pm$, the river was relocated from east to west by excavation of the western (right) bank to an elevation of 75.0 ft (Mean Sea Level Datum) with a newly constructed bank rising on a 1 on 2 slope to a 15-ft wide shelf at elevation 81.0. The eastern (left) bank was filled in association with construction of the earthen levee. Three storm drain outfalls discharging at the right bank were modified to accommodate the relocated riverbank. From Sta. $52+00\pm$ to a point approximately 1,330 ft downstream of the end of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control Works, the channel was widened by excavation of the western (right) bank to an elevation of 75.0 ft (Mean Sea Level Datum) with a newly constructed bank rising on a 1 on 2 slope to a 15-ft wide shelf at elevation 81.0. The elevation increases from the shelf at a 1 on 2.5 slope until meeting natural high ground. No alterations were made to the eastern (left) bank downstream of the end of the levee.

During a visual inspection of current conditions along this system and based upon a comparison to prior documents, a number of changes were noted to have taken place since the original construction by the Corps of Engineers. Although not intended to be a complete listing, identified changes include:

1) The Oak Street and Main Street Pumping Stations were upgraded in a contract by the City in approximately 1999. All work was approved by USACE according to the City. Under that contract the roofs were replaced. New fuel tanks were installed to meet standards for spill prevention.

- 2) The Deady Memorial Bridge over the Chicopee River was rebuilt and the last concrete floodwall panel adjacent to and connecting with the bridge abutment appears to have been reconstructed.
- 3) The USACE plans indicate that the section of the former industrial water intake (leading to the pressure flow process water line) in the Deady Bridge area from the gatehouse to the manhole at Station 3+00 was only temporary and was to be removed when the process water line was no longer needed. According to the City, the line has reportedly been abandoned and is understood to be closed.
- 4) Storm drainage has been installed at the rebuilt Deady Memorial Bridge with manholes at the corners of the southern abutment connected to a pipe installed along the riverside face of the flood control wall. A small concrete wall was constructed in front of the floodwall and the storm drain pipe installed between the two walls at a shallow depth with the pipe partially exposed. The pipe is corrugated metal approximately 30 inches in diameter and visually terminates at a concrete (thrust) block cast against the floodwall on the riverside near Station 6+50. It is surmised that the drain line turns perpendicular to the wall at this concrete block and discharges to the river.
- 5) A power line was installed with a vertical riser on the riverside face of the floodwall near Station 6+75.
- 6) A hydropower generating facility was built on the riverside of the floodwall with an intake at the Chicopee Falls.
- 7) A gravel vehicle access drive to the power generating facility was installed near Station 10+00. An access way on the landside from Main Street ramps up to the top of the levee, crosses over to the riverside, turns parallel to the river and slopes downward in front of the upstream floodwall. The drive has a locked gate on the landside of the levee.
- 8) Access to the Oak Street Pumping Station is no longer possible through the closed U.S. Rubber Company plant site. A gravel vehicle access drive has been constructed from the right of way near Station 10+00 along the landward toe of slope to the Main Street Pumping Station. The gravel drive continues toward the Oak Street Pumping Station including a paved ramp from the landside toe at Station 35+50 to Station 36+25. Thereafter, the access drive is along the top of levee to a turnaround at the downstream limit of the levee.
- 9) The industrial water intake for the former U.S. Rubber Company plant near the Oak Street Pumping Station has been closed since the factory stopped operation and is exercised annually by the City.





Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc. 296 North Main Street, East Longmeadow, MA MassGIS Orthophoto (2005) obtained from MASS GIS, Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA).
1.3 REPORT LIMITATIONS

- 1. This Report has been prepared for the exclusive use by FEMA for specific application to the accreditation of these flood control works for their sole purpose of establishing risk zones for the National Flood Insurance Program, in accordance with generally accepted engineering practices. No other warranty, express or implied, is made.
- 2. This Report has been prepared for the purpose of allowing the City of Chicopee, MA to fulfill its responsibility to provide data and documentation to FEMA demonstrating that the flood control system meets the criteria within 44 CFR 65.10. This Report is a compliance determination by Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc. (BEC) and is not a determination of how the flood control works will perform in an actual flood event.
- 3. The observations described in this Report were made under the conditions stated. The opinions, conclusions and results presented in the Report were based solely on the services described, and not on scientific tasks or procedures beyond the scope of described services or the time constraints of the project.
- 4. In preparing this Report, BEC has relied on certain information provided by the City of Chicopee as well as Federal, state, and local officials and other parties referenced. BEC has also relied on certain information contained in the files of the City as well as Federal, state, and local officials and other parties which were available to BEC at the time of the analysis. Although there may have been some degree of overlap in the information provided by these various sources, BEC did not attempt to independently verify the accuracy or completeness of all information reviewed or received during the course of this work.
- 5. In reviewing this Report, it should be realized that the reported existing conditions of the various components of the flood control system are based on observations of field conditions during the course of the evaluation along with data made available to BEC. The observations of conditions in the field reflect only the situation present at the specific moment in time the observations were made, under the specific conditions present.
- 6. It is important to note that the condition of any flood control system depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions, and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the present condition of the flood control system will continue to represent the condition of the flood control system at some point in the future. Only through continued care and inspection can there be any chance that unsafe conditions or increased risk may be detected.
- 7. BEC based any hydraulic analyses on existing conditions, site plans made available to BEC as of the date of this Report, prior hydraulic studies completed by others and made available, or upon field reconnaissance. In the event that any changes in the nature,

design or location of the flood control system, its appurtenant structures, or drainage areas contributing to the pumping stations are planned, the conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report shall not be considered valid unless the changes are reviewed and conclusions of this Report are modified or verified by BEC. Any BEC hydrologic analyses presented herein are for the rainfall volumes and distributions stated herein. For storm or riverine flood conditions other than those analyzed, the response of the flood control works and pumping stations has not been evaluated.

- 8. Relative to subsurface conditions, the generalized soil profiles provided in this Report and on our subsurface exploration logs are intended only to convey trends in subsurface conditions. The boundaries between strata are approximate and idealized, and were based on our assessment of subsurface conditions. The composition of strata, and the transitions between strata, may be more variable and more complex than indicated. For more specific information on soil conditions at a specific location, refer to the exploration logs. Actual subsurface conditions are likely more complex than indicated in the Report. Mathematical modeling is, by its very nature, a simplification of actual conditions. In constructing the model, point specific data was generalized and extrapolated across the study area. In addition, in areas where field data was not available, professional judgment, based on experiences and regional information, was relied upon to construct the model.
- 9. Water level readings have been made in test holes and monitoring wells at the specified times and under the stated conditions. These data have been reviewed and interpretations have been made in this Report. However, fluctuations in the level of the groundwater occur due to temporal or spatial variations in areal recharge rates, soil heterogeneities, the presence of subsurface utilities, and/or natural or artificially induced perturbations. The observed water table may be other than indicated in the Report.
- 10. Our services did not include an assessment of the presence of oil or hazardous materials at the property. Consequently we did not consider the potential impacts (if any) that contaminants in soil or groundwater may have on construction activities, or the use of structures on the property.
- 11. Observations or opinions regarding foundation drainage, waterproofing, and moisture control address the conventional geotechnical aspects of seepage control. These recommendations may not preclude an environment that allows the infestation of mold or other biological pollutants.

1.4 AUTHORIZATION

On May 23, 2007 the City of Chicopee entered into a contract for professional services with BEC relative to the City's Flood Control Works. This contract was subsequently amended on September 9, 2009, to include the work task to, "conduct an engineering evaluation of the flood control works and prepare data and documentation for the City to submit to FEMA for accreditation to demonstrate the flood control works meets the requirement of the National Flood Insurance Program as per current Code of Federal Regulations, (44 CFR Section 65.10)". A copy of the original contract with terms and conditions as well as a copy of the September 9, 2009 amendment are appended to this report. This report concludes this work task as related to the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System and is subject to the terms and conditions of the amended contract.

SECTION 2

LEVEE SYSTEM EVALUATION

2.1 STATEMENT OF LEVEE SYSTEM EVALUATION Date of Statement: November 12, 2010

This Statement of Levee System Evaluation is made solely to the U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for the purpose of obtaining accreditation of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in the City of Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts, one of four separate systems owned, operated and maintained by the City. Reliance upon this Statement by any other party without written authorization from the signatory is at such other party's sole risk and without any liability to BEC or the signatory.

This Statement is made in accordance with the requirements stated in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 44 – Emergency Management and Assistance, Part 65 – Identification and Mapping of Special Hazard Areas (10-1-07 Edition). The meaning and context of the term "certification", is derived from the definition provided in 44 CFR 65.2 (b), which states:

For the purpose of this part, a certification by a registered professional engineer or other party does not constitute a warranty or guarantee of performance, expressed, or implied. Certification of data is a statement that the data is accurate to the best of certifier's knowledge. Certification of analyses is a statement that the analyses have been performed correctly and in accordance with sound engineering practices. Certification of structural works is a statement that the works are designed in accordance with sound engineering. Certification of "as-built" conditions is a statement that the structure(s) has been built according to the plans being certified, is in place, and is fully functioning.

"Sound engineering practices" are defined by the signatory as performed in a manner consistent with the degree of skill and care ordinarily exercised by members of the engineering profession currently practicing in the same locality under similar conditions.

Analyses have been limited to the "Base flood" test condition only, to be utilized by FEMA to establish risk zone determinations under the NFIP. For the purposes of this Statement, the "Base flood" is defined by FEMA as the one-percent annual chance flood, documented in the Flood Insurance Study, Hampden County, Massachusetts and Incorporated Areas, Volume 1, 2 and 3 and dated "Preliminary, April 30, 2009".

"As-built" is defined as and limited by the signatory to those visual attributes which could be observed, mapped and documented on the enclosed topographic survey and the field investigations documented in this report. BEC did not observe nor document the original construction of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System or subsequent construction activities and use of the "As-built" plans other than for general informational purposes is at the user's sole risk.

"Fully functional" is defined by the signatory as the physical conditions as of the Date of Statement.

This Statement applies solely to the development of National Flood Insurance Program insurance rates and is not a representation that any accredited levee will provide for the safety, health, and welfare of the public.

In accordance with 44 CFR 65.2 (b) and as supported by the information contained within this report, this is to state that:

- DATA The data presented within this submission is accurate to the best of the signatory's knowledge.
- ANALYSES The analyses have been performed correctly and in accordance with sound engineering practices.
- STRUCTURAL WORKS The works are designed in accordance with sound engineering practices to provide protection from the base flood.
- "AS-BUILT" CONDITION The structure(s) has been built according to the plans, is in place, and is fully functional to the best of the signatory's knowledge.

This Statement is provided in accordance and consistent with the definitions provided in 44 CFR 65.2(b) and further per the definitions and limitations described within this report and the subsequent Engineer's Opinions, mapping and documentation.

Harry R. Jones, P.E. Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc. 296 North Main Street East Longmeadow, MA 01028



Date: Nov. 12, 2010

2.2 RESIDUAL RISK AND PUBLIC SAFETY

Under the NFIP, levee certification is a prerequisite for receiving levee accreditation from FEMA. With an accredited levee, areas which would otherwise be subject to flooding by the one-percent annual chance flood event will be designated as Zone X or moderate risk zone, as opposed to Zone A or high risk zone. The single and only purpose for this report is a determination of compliance with 44 CFR 65.10, and as such, a distinction must be emphasized between this report's purpose and the issue of public safety.

Risk is the product of the probability of an event's occurrence and the consequences or damages related thereof. FEMA has established a uniform probability factor of onepercent for the annual chance flood event as the means of determining flood insurance rates on a national basis. Since FEMA applies this same probability to a site with nominal or low consequences as well as to those sites with a severe or high consequence, the degree of risk varies and is not uniformly applied to all flood control systems. At the Chicopee Falls system, significant loss of lives and property could result. Thus, a significant public safety risk remains associated with the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System regardless of any designation under the NFIP. The Chicopee Falls system may reduce the probability of flooding but it does not eliminate the risk.

The Chicopee River has a long history of severe flooding events that have impacted the vicinity of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System. The flooding events of September, 1938 and August, 1955 directly led to the USACE's construction of the Chicopee Falls system. According to the December, 1962 Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project Design Memorandum No. 2 by the USACE, the maximum flood of record on the Chicopee River had a peak discharge of 45,200 CFS in September, 1938, as recorded in Springfield. The report also noted that the Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project was designed for a flood discharge of 70,000 CFS at Chicopee Falls. The current FEMA Flood Insurance Study documents the estimated flood discharge for the one-percent annual chance flood (100-year) event to be 62,000 CFS. From a numerical perspective, this accreditation documents the performance of this system when subjected to an annual chance flood peak flow rate which is just over 70% of the documented flood of record flow rate and only 45% of that in the original USACE design.

SECTION 3

ENGINEER'S OPINIONS OF DESIGN CRITERIA

3.1 EVALUATION OF FREEBOARD - 44 CFR 65.10(b)(1)

This minimum design standard as stated in 44 CFR 65.10(b)(1) specifies the following:

1.) Riverine levees must provide a minimum freeboard of three feet above the watersurface level of the base flood (one-percent annual chance flood).

2.) An additional one foot above the minimum is required within 100 feet in either side of structures (such as bridges) riverward of the levee or wherever the flow is constricted.

3.) An additional one-half foot above the minimum at the upstream end of the levee, tapering to not less than the minimum at the downstream end of the levee, is also required.

To verify this design standard, a system profile was prepared and is reproduced in the attached Appendix A-4.1. The system extends from the Deady Bridge downstream 5,002 feet to higher ground at a railroad embankment. Actual field spot elevations along the top of the system were obtained by Heritage Surveys, Inc. in October-November, 2009 taken at an approximate five hundred foot interval and are reproduced on the "As-Built" drawings, dated December, 2009. The top of system is illustrated on the profile as a solid black line with spot elevations indicated. The base flood profile information was obtained from the Preliminary Flood Insurance Study, Hampden County, Massachusetts, FIS #25013CV001, April, 2009 and is represented as a blue line on the system profile.

The freeboard criteria are also illustrated on the profile in red shading, Criteria One being a uniform three feet above the base flood elevation. Criteria Two applies at the Deady Bridge site. Criteria Three is additive to Criteria One and Two and is also illustrated in red. At all locations along the Chicopee Falls system, the top of wall or top of levee elevations are higher than the base flood elevations plus the applicable freeboard criteria.

It is the opinion of this professional engineer that the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in Chicopee, Massachusetts meets the 44 CFR 65.10(b)(1) freeboard requirements for the base (one-percent annual chance) flood.

Opinion offered by:

Thomas E. Jenkins, P.E. BEC, Inc. 296 North Main Street East Longmeadow, MA 01028



FEMA Accreditation Report Chicopee, MA

3.2 EVALUATION OF CLOSURES - 44 CFR 65.10(b)(2)

This minimum design standard as stated in 44 CFR 65.10(b)(2) specifies the following:

All openings must be provided with closure devices that are structural parts of the system during operation and design according to sound engineering practice.

To verify this design standard, a closures report was prepared including a matrix of Flood System Penetrations Summary which is reproduced in Appendix A-4.2. All documented openings passing through the Chicopee Falls system outlet to the Chicopee River. In addition to the discharge lines from the Main Street and Oak Street Pumping Stations, four penetrations identified in the USACE plans were field verified. One is a pressure drain controlled by a sluice gate located upstream near West Main Street that is operated and maintained by the City. Another is the discharge pipe from a single grated basin located at the crest of the levee, well above the one-percent chance flood elevation. The third opening is a prior industrial intake line closed by a gate valve that is now operated and maintained by the City. Last is a pressure drain pipe from a storm drain system located well above the one-percent chance annual flood elevation.

Both pumping stations have outfalls that discharge by gravity flow during normal river flow events. During high flow conditions, gates are closed on the gravity discharge lines and interior flows are diverted to the pumping stations which then pump drainage flows to the river. Each pump is protected against backflow in the event that it may not be in operation at any time during river flooding. All gates and valves are maintained and operated by the City.

It is the opinion of this professional engineer that the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in Chicopee, Massachusetts meets the 44 CFR 65.10(b)(2) closures requirements for the base flood (one-percent annual chance flood).

Opinion offered by:

Nathaniel Y. Arai, P.E. BEC, Inc. 296 North Main Street East Longmeadow, MA 01028



(Seal and Date)

3.3 EVALUATION OF EMBANKMENT PROTECTION - 44CFR65.10(b)(3)

This minimum design standard as stated in 44 CFR 65.10(b)(3) specifies the following:

Engineering analyses must be submitted that demonstrate that no appreciable erosion of the levee embankment can be expected during the base flood, as a result of either currents or waves, and that anticipated erosion will not result in failure of the levee embankment or foundation directly or indirectly through reduction of the seepage path and subsequent instability. The factors to be addressed in such analyses include, but are not limited to: Expected flow velocities (especially in constricted areas); expected wind and wave action; ice loading; impact of debris; slope protection techniques; duration of flooding at various stages and velocities; embankment and foundation materials; levee alignment, bends, and transitions; and levee side slopes.

To verify this design standard, an Embankment Protection Analysis, Chicopee Falls Flood Control System was prepared, dated October 2010. A copy of this analysis is reproduced in the attached Appendix A-4.3. The analysis was performed in accordance with applicable methods and guidelines in the USACE Engineering Manual on Hydraulic Design of Flood Control Channels (EM 1110-2-1601, Change 1, 30 Jun 94), USACE Coastal Engineering Manual, Part II (EM 1110-2-1100, Change 2, 1 August 2008), and the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service (USDA SCS) Handbook of Channel Design for Soil and Water Conservation (TP-61, 1954).

The side slope flow velocities at various cross sections of the Chicopee River along the reach of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System were below the acceptable velocities for riprap slope protection as present and thus the riprap protection is adequate. In the area where riprap is not present, the floodwall is founded directly on ledge with rock anchors, thus any erosion of the embankment in this area is unlikely to cause failure of the floodwall. Wind and wave action was based upon wave height determined at this site to be 1.6 feet. The available freeboard for the base flood is approximately 7.1 feet thus indicating that overtopping and related erosion and failure is not expected to occur. Average channel velocities are such that it is not expected that any impacts of ice or debris will cause significant damage to the system.

It is the opinion of this professional engineer that the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in Chicopee, Massachusetts meets the 44 CFR 65.10(b)(3) embankment protection requirements for the base (one-percent annual chance) flood.

Opinion offered by:

Rosalie T. Starvish, P.E. BEC, Inc. 296 North Main Street East Longmeadow, MA 01028



(Seal and Date)

BEC, Inc. November 2010

<u>3.4 EVALUATION OF EMBANKMENT AND FOUNDATION STABILITY</u> - 44 CFR 65.10(b)(4)

This minimum design standard as stated in 44 CFR 65.10(b)(4) specifies the following:

Engineering analyses that evaluate levee embankment stability must be submitted. The analyses provided shall evaluate expected seepage during loading conditions associated with the base flood and shall demonstrate that seepage into or through the levee foundation and embankment will not jeopardize embankment or foundation stability. An alternative analysis demonstrating that the levee is designed and constructed for stability against loading conditions for Case IV as defined in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) manual, "Design and Construction of Levees" (EM 1110-2-1913, Chapter 6, Section II), may be used. The factors that shall be addressed in the analyses include: Depth of flooding, duration of flooding, embankment geometry and length of seepage path at critical location, embankment and foundation materials, embankment compaction, penetration, other design factors affecting seepage (such as drainage layers), and other design factors affecting embankment and foundation stability (such as berms).

To verify this design standard, seepage was evaluated by creating typical levee crosssections based upon recent topographic survey information, recent boring logs, historical boring logs (USACE pre-construction borings), laboratory data, empirical correlations from SPT N-value data and engineering literature. These parameters were input into SEEP/W 2007, a two-dimensional finite element seepage modeling software created by GEO-SLOPE International, Ltd. Models were analyzed with and without the toe-drain to analyze additional load cases that could impact seepage through the levee. Flow and exit gradients were computed within the toe drain and at the landside toe of the levee and were all below the limiting gradient of 0.5 per US Army Corps Technical Letter ETL 110-2-569 *Design Guidance for Levee Underseepage* for Normal and 100 Year Flood elevations.

The parent SEEP/W model was incorporated into SLOPE/W, a two-dimensional finite element slope stability modeling software created by GEO-SLOPE International, Ltd. with additional parameters including unit weight, strength and internal friction angle based upon laboratory data and empirical correlations from SPT N-value data and engineering literature. Factors of Safety against slope failure on the landside and riverside were analyzed under normal and 100 flood (steady-state and sudden drawdown conditions).

Based upon our slope stability evaluation of the Chicopee Falls levee, it is our opinion that the levee is in compliance with 44 CFR 65.10 (4). Summary sheets showing computed factors of safety for the various loading conditions and for each cross-section can be found in Appendix A-4.4.

A qualitative liquefaction analysis was performed on the Chicopee Falls Levee to evaluate whether the levee exhibited certain characteristics that would make it more susceptible to liquefaction (i.e. soil samples with high N-values and high fines contents are generally not as susceptible to liquefaction as loose, clean sands with low fines contents). It is our opinion that based upon the qualitative liquefaction analysis, a more in-depth quantitative analysis was not required.

It is the opinion of this professional engineer that the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in Chicopee, Massachusetts meets the 44 CFR 65.10(b)(4) embankment and foundation requirements for the base flood (one-percent annual chance flood).

Opinion offered by:

Anders B. Bjarngard, P.E. GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. 1 Edgewater Drive Norwood, MA 02062



(Seal and Date)

3.5 EVALUATION OF SETTLEMENT - 44 CFR 65.10(b)(5)

This minimum design standard as stated in 44 CFR 65.10(b)(5) specifies the following:

Engineering analyses must be submitted that assess the potential and magnitude of future losses of freeboard as a result of levee settlement and demonstrate that freeboard will be maintained within the minimum standards set forth in paragraph (b)(1) of this section. This analysis must address embankment loads, compressibility of embankment soils, compressibility of foundation soils, age of the levee system, and construction compaction methods. In addition detailed settlement analysis using procedures such as those described in the COE manual, "Soil Mechanics Design-Settlement Analysis" (EM 1100-2-1904) must be submitted.

To verify this design standard, primary and secondary settlement of the varved foundation soils were estimated using one-dimensional consolidation theory, empirical correlations and published literature, as well as GZA's recent boring and survey information. Consolidation of granular soils was considered to occur immediately and to have been accounted for during the construction of the levee. Settlement analysis was conducted in general accordance with EM 1110-1-1904 *Settlement Analysis*, published by the USACE, dated September 30, 1990.

Primary settlement was estimated at approximately 3 inches, 90% of which was estimated to have been completed by 1964. Since end of primary consolidation, an estimated one-half inch of secondary settlement has occurred, resulting in a total of about 3.5 inches since construction. Approximately ¼ to ½ inch of secondary settlement (also known as creep) is expected to occur over the next 50-100 years.

Based upon our settlement evaluation of the Chicopee Falls Levee, it is our opinion that the levee is in compliance with 44 CFR 65.10(b)(5) and that freeboard has not sufficiently been affected by resulting post-construction settlement. Any increase in fill or loading above the USACE record drawings and recent survey by Heritage Survey renders this opinion null and void.

It is the opinion of this professional engineer that the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in Chicopee, Massachusetts meets the 44 CFR 65.10(b)(5) settlement requirements for the base flood (one-percent annual chance flood).

Opinion offered by:

Anders B. Bjarngard, P.E. GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. 1 Edgewater Drive Norwood, MA 02062



(Seal and Date)

3.6 EVALUATION OF INTERIOR FLOODING - 44CFR65.10(b)(6)

This minimum design standard as stated in 44 CFR 65.10(b)(6) specifies the following:

An analysis must be submitted that identifies the source(s) of such flooding, the extent of the flooded area, and, if the average depth is greater than one foot, the water-surface elevation(s) of the base flood. This analysis must be based on the joint probability of interior and exterior flooding and the capacity of facilities (such as drainage lines and pumps) for evacuating interior floodwaters.

To verify this design standard, an Interior Flooding Analysis, Chicopee Falls Flood Control System was prepared, dated May, 2010 and submitted to FEMA for review and acceptance under the technical appeal process. A copy of this analysis along with the appeal resolution letter from FEMA dated July 19, 2010 are reproduced in the attached Appendix A-4.6. The analysis was conducted in accordance with the USACE's Engineering Circular on Certification of Levee Systems (EC 1110-2-6067) and their Engineer Manual, Hydrologic Analysis of Interior Areas (EM 1110-2-1413). The Coincident Frequency Method was utilized for this analysis due to the relative independence of the exterior (i.e., river flooding) event to the interior (localized flooding) event.

A total area of 16 acres drains to the Main Street Pumping Station and 15 acres drains to the Oak Street Pumping Station based upon information provided by the City and existing topographic mapping from the digital elevation model provided by FEMA which in turn was based upon a Light Detection and Ranging(LiDAR) survey. The discharge rates of the pumping stations were based upon the original pump test curves provided by the manufacturer of the installed pumps. The Chicopee River Stage Frequency curves were developed from USGS gage data at Indian Orchard, Springfield which had a record period of 82 years.

The Coincident Frequency Analysis concluded that the one-percent chance interior flooding elevation was lower than the lowest ground surface elevation within the Main Street and the Oak Street Pumping Station drainage areas and therefore there is no interior flooding associated with the base flood at the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System.

It is the opinion of this professional engineer that the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System in Chicopee, Massachusetts meets the 44 CFR 65.10(b)(6) interior drainage requirements for the base flood.

Opinion offered by:

Rosalie T. Starvish, P.E. BEC, Inc. 296 North Main Street East Longmeadow, MA 01028



<u>3.7 EVALUATION OF OTHER DESIGN CRITERIA (STRUCTURAL) -</u> <u>44CFR65.10(b)(7)</u>

This minimum design standard as stated in 44CFR65.10(b)(7) specifies the following:

In unique situations, such as those where the levee system has relatively high vulnerability, FEMA may require that other design criteria and analyses be submitted to show that the levees provide adequate protection. In such situations, sound engineering practice will be the standard on which FEMA will base its determinations. FEMA will also provide the rationale for requiring this additional information.

To the best of our knowledge FEMA has not identified other design criteria in need of evaluation for the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System. However it is the signatory's opinion that a structural evaluation of the flood protection walls was warranted. The objectives of our structural evaluation were to determine, with reasonable certainty, that the structures meet current design standards and are in a suitable condition to perform as intended and therefore meet the requirements of 44CFR65.10(b)(7). This evaluation of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System floodwalls was accomplished by visiting the site and viewing the structures; reviewing available original design drawings, Construction Drawings, calculations, and previous inspection reports; evaluating recently collected site data; and performing structural calculations in accordance with current design standards.

Guidance in the performance of our structural evaluation was taken from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Draft Technical Letter No. 1110-570, *Certification of Levee Systems for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)*, 12 September 2007. Parameters used in our calculations included the existing available design and construction documentation and data obtained from recently completed topographic surveys, subsurface exploration programs, laboratory testing and hydraulic analyses.

Our structural engineers visited the subject site on December 17, 2009. They walked the length of the system to visually observe the condition of the exposed portions of the flood wall.

Our structural engineers reviewed the original design documents in order to determine the assumed loading conditions and to review how the structural elements were designed. The result of the original analysis was compared to the current USACE guidance to verify that the structures meet current design requirements specified in the following documents:

- 1. USACE Manual EM 1110-2-2100 Stability Analysis of Concrete Structures.
- 2. USACE Manual EM 1110-2-2104 Strength Design for Reinforced Concrete Hydraulic Structures.
- 3. USACE Manual EM 1110-2-2502 Retaining and Flood Walls.

A total of 11 different wall sections have been evaluated using methods prescribed in USACE Manual EM 1110-2-2502 *Retaining and Flood Walls*. Our engineers evaluated each section for the load condition resulting from the one-percent-annual chance flood as required by FEMA Regulations 44 CFR 65.10. The floodwalls were evaluated for sliding stability, overturning stability, foundation soil bearing capacity and strength and serviceability of the structural members. A presentation of our analyses, methods and results can be found in Appendix A-4.7.

Based on our observations, the floodwalls appear to be constructed as indicated in the Record Drawings and to be structurally sound. The results of our analyses indicate that, as originally designed, the structures meet current design standards for the base flood event.

It is the opinion of this professional engineer that the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System floodwalls meet the requirements of 44CFR65.10(b)(7) for the base flood (one-percent annual chance flood).

Opinion offered by Dino D. Fiscaletti, P.E. GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. 530 Broadway Providence, RI 02909



SECTION 4

ENGINEER'S OPINION OF OPERATION PLANS AND CRITERIA

4. ENGINEER'S OPINION OF OPERATION PLANS AND CRITERIA

Operation of the Chicopee Falls Flood Protection System levee embankment, floodwalls, pump stations, and penetrations is the responsibility of the Chicopee Department of Public Works as detailed in the appended Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Manual, Chicopee and Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, Local Protection Projects, Connecticut and Chicopee Rivers, October, 2010. This document was officially adopted by the City Council as the Operations and Maintenance Manual for all flood protection systems in the City of Chicopee, MA.

In BEC's opinion, this operation plan as detailed in the O&M Manual:

- Establishes all operation activities are under the jurisdiction of the City of Chicopee Department of Public Works;
- For Closures: Documents the flood warning system used to trigger emergency operation activities and demonstrates that sufficient flood warning time exists for the completed operation of all closure structures, including necessary sealing, before flood waters reach the base of the closure; a formal plan of operation including specific actions and assignments of responsibility by individual name or title, and provisions for periodic operation, at not less than one-year intervals, of the closure structure for testing and training purposes;
- For Interior Drainage Systems: Documents the flood warning system used to trigger emergency operation activities and demonstrates that sufficient flood warning time exists to permit activation of mechanized portions of the drainage system, a formal plan of operation including specific actions and assignments of responsibility by individual name or title; provision for manual backup for the activation of automatic systems, and provisions for periodic inspection of interior drainage systems and periodic operation of any mechanized portions for testing and training purposes with no more than one year lapse between either the inspections or the operations.

Other operating plans and criteria to ensure that adequate protection is provided in specific situations have not been identified by FEMA to the knowledge of BEC.

In accordance with the definitions and limitations set forth in 44 CFR 65.2(b), it is the opinion of this professional engineer that this O&M Manual meets the minimum operation requirements specified in 44 CFR 65.10(c).

Opinion offered by:

Rosalie T. Starvish, P.E. BEC, Inc. 296 North Main Street East Longmeadow, MA 01028



(Seal and Date)

SECTION 5

ENGINEER'S OPINION OF MAINTENANCE PLANS AND CRITERIA

5. ENGINEER'S OPINION OF MAINTENANCE PLANS AND CRITERIA

Maintenance of the Chicopee Falls Flood Protection System levee embankment, floodwalls, pump stations, and penetrations is the responsibility of the Chicopee Department of Public Works as detailed in the appended Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Manual, Chicopee and Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts Local Protection Projects, Connecticut and Chicopee Rivers, October, 2010. This document was officially adopted by the City Council as the Operations and Maintenance Manual for all flood protection systems in the City of Chicopee, MA.

In BEC's opinion, this maintenance plan as detailed in the O&M Manual:

- Establishes that all maintenance activities are under the jurisdiction of the City of Chicopee Department of Public Works;
- Documents the formal procedures that ensures that the stability, height, and overall integrity of the levee and its associated structures and system are maintained;
- Specifies the maintenance activities to be performed, the frequency of their performance, and the person by name or title responsible for their performance.

In accordance with the definitions and limitations set forth in 44 CFR 65.2(b), it is the opinion of this professional engineer that this O&M Manual meets the minimum maintenance requirements specified in 44 CFR 65.10(d).

Opinion offered by:

Rosalie R. Starvish, P.E. BEC, Inc. 296 North Main Street East Longmeadow, MA 01028



(Seal and Date)

SECTION 6

AS BUILT PLANS

SECTION 6. AS BUILT PLANS

44CFR65.10(e), titled "Certification requirements" includes the statement, "Also, certified asbuilt plans of the levee must be submitted." Also within 44CFR65.2, titled "Definitions" is the statement, "Certification of "as-built" conditions is a statement that the structure(s) has been built according to the plans being certified, is in place, and is fully functioning." In response to these requirements a topographic survey of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System was prepared based upon aerial photography and supplemented with ground surveys performed from May, 2008 through September, 2009. "As-built" is defined as and limited to those visual attributes which could be observed and documented. BEC did not observe nor document the original construction of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System or that of subsequent construction activities and use of the "As-built" plans other than for general informational purposes is at the user's sole risk.

The five sheet plan set of topographic mapping is enclosed within this report in Appendix A-5. Plans are titled "Chicopee Falls System, Chicopee Flood Control Works, Chicopee, MA", dated December 12, 2009 and stamped by a MA Licensed Land Surveyor.

APPENDIX A-3

GEOTECHNICAL DATA AND LABORATORY ANALYSES

GEOTECHNICAL DATA CHICOPEE FALLS FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

CHICOPEE FLOOD CONTROL WORKS CITY OF CHICOPEE HAMPDEN COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS





November, 2010

GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	BACKGROUND	.1
3	EXISTING CONDITIONS	.1
4	SUBSURFACE EXPLORATIONS	.2
	4.1 PREVIOUS EXPLORATIONS	2
	4.2 RECENT EXPLORATIONS	2
	4.3 BORINGS	3
5	LABORATORY ANALYSIS	4
6	SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS	4
	6.1 SOILS	4
	6.2 GROUNDWATER	5

<u>Tables</u> Table 1. Geotechnical Laboratory Testing Summary

Figures

Figure 1: Chicopee Falls Levee Sys	stem Locus
------------------------------------	------------

Figure 2: Exploration Location Plan

Appendices

Section A-3.1. Historic USACE Logs

Section A-3.2. Recent Boring Logs

Section A-3.3. Geotechnical Laboratory Results

GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. Engineers and Scientists

August 19, 2010 File No. 15.0702100.50

INTRODUCTION:

GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. (GZA) is pleased to submit this geotechnical data report for the Chicopee Falls Levee of the Chicopee Flood Control Works in Chicopee, Massachusetts. This report presents the results of field and laboratory programs completed as part of our geotechnical study. Conclusions and recommendations relative to levee seepage and stability analysis will be provided separately. Please note that this report is subject to the limitations provided in Section 1.3. Elevations included in this report are referenced to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88). Please note that many original U.S. Army Corps. of Engineers project plans and documentation are in the Means Sea Level datum, approximately 0.7 feet above the NAVD 88 datum in the Chicopee local area. (MSL-0.7'=NAVD 88)

BACKGROUND

GZA's understanding of the project is based on our work at the site, discussions with the City of Chicopee Department of Public Works, and the following project documents:

- A drawing set entitled "Chicopee Falls, Chicopee River, Massachusetts," prepared by Green Engineering Affiliates, Inc., Boston, MA for the U.S Army Engineer Division, Waltham, MA, dated April 1963, sheets 1-63;
- A design memorandum entitled, "Chicopee Falls, Local Protection Project, Chicopee River, Massachusetts, Design Memorandum No. 5, Embankments and Foundations," prepared by the U.S Army Engineer Division, New England Waltham, MA, dated March 1963, 16 pp;
- A five sheet plan set of topographic mapping prepared by Heritage Surveys, Inc. dated December 12, 2009 and entitled "Topographic Plan of Land in Chicopee, Massachusetts, Surveyed for the City of Chicopee.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

In response to significant flooding events in the 1930s and 1950s, flood control works were designed and constructed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for locations along the Chicopee and Connecticut Rivers in the City of Chicopee (City). Construction along the Connecticut River and the North and South Banks of the Chicopee River was conducted in a series of construction contracts initiated in 1938 and completed in 1942, collectively known as the Chicopee Local Protection Project (CLPP).



1 Edgewater Drive Norwood Massachusetts 02062 Ph: 781-278-3700 FAX 781-278-5701 http://www.gza.com In total, the Chicopee Flood Control Works (CFCW) consists of 25,820 linear feet of earthen levee, 7,500 linear feet of flood control walls, eight pump stations, three cast-inplace concrete closure structures, and various appurtenant drainage features. The CFCW was constructed in four separate systems, namely the Plainfield Street system, the South Bank Chicopee River system, the Willimansett system, and the Chicopee Falls system. The Chicopee Falls system is shown on Figure 1, consisting of improved embankment and concrete floodwall from Station 0+00 at the Deady Memorial Bridge to high ground near Front Street at Station 54+15.

As a cooperative Federal/City effort, the USACE was responsible for the design and construction, while the City provided all of the lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction. The City also agreed to maintain and operate the flood control works after completion, in accordance with federally prescribed regulations. These requirements are detailed in the Code of Federal Regulations, 33 CFR 208.10 which is entitled, "Local flood protection works; maintenance and operation of structures and facilities".

SUBSURFACE EXPLORATIONS

The subsurface explorations presented herein include borings from previous subsurface investigations by the USACE (designated by "BH") prior to construction, as well as the program of recent subsurface explorations performed for this project. The previous and recent subsurface explorations are described below.

Previous Explorations

In addition to the recent explorations, our study included the review of subsurface explorations and data from previous subsurface evaluations performed prior to the levee's construction.

Subsurface conditions from record drawings were used to supplement the current geotechnical evaluation and provide confirmation on levee and flood wall foundation soils. These test boring locations and exploration logs from the previous study are included in Section A-3.1. Soil samples were classified using the USACE Providence District Soil Classification System which corresponds to a soil unit number and grain size distribution. The previous borings generally encountered fill over fluvial sands, silts and gravels (often noted as till) underlain by red shale (and occasionally conglomerate and sandstone). Varved soils were identified on previous USACE boring logs in the vicinity of Station 50+00 and further south.

Recent Explorations

The subsurface exploration program performed for this project consisted of 11 borings which are described below. Borings were completed using the rotary (drive and wash) method with cased techniques in general accordance with our Comprehensive Work Plan dated December 29, 2009 and accepted by the USACE in a letter dated January 7,

2010, applicable ASTM and USACE standards and observed fulltime by GZA personnel. Standard Penetration Tests (SPTs) and split spoon sampling were generally performed continuously in the upper 8 feet of the borings, and at 5-foot intervals thereafter. Representative soil samples were collected from the split spoon samples and stored in jars for later review and laboratory testing. Boreholes were tremie-grouted with a bentonite/cement grout upon completion. Logs of the recently performed borings are included in Section A-3.2 and the approximate boring locations are shown on Figures 2 through 5.

Borings

Eleven test borings were performed between January 6, 2009 and February 4, 2010 at the Chicopee Falls levee section (CF-1 through CF-11) by A&A Test Boring of South Windsor, CT using a Diedrich D-120 all-terrain drill rig, and were observed by GZA personnel. Borings were generally spaced 500 linear feet apart along the top of the levee and at transitions between earth embankment and flood wall sections. Completed boring depths ranged between 20 and 80 feet below ground surface.

LABORATORY ANALYSES

GZA performed thirteen laboratory gradation analyses and one percent organics test from recovered soil samples along the Chicopee Falls Levee in accordance with applicable ASTM Standards D422 and D2974. The geotechnical laboratory test results are included in Section A-3.3, and summarized on Table 1.

SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

Ground surface elevations on the landside of the Chicopee Falls were generally between 89 and 92 feet (NAVD 88), slightly higher west of Station 10 (rising up to El. 95) and slightly lower alongside the former Facemate property (sloping down to El. 84). Riverside toe elevations range from approximately El. 82 at the east end to approximately El. 78 at the west end. Top of levee/floodwall elevations of the Chicopee Falls system ranged between El. 110 and El. 99, decreasing in elevation with increasing Station (NAVD 88).

Soils

Brief soil descriptions are provided below. Detailed information about subsurface conditions based on recent and historical borings, as well as assumed parameters for unit weight, hydraulic conductivity and internal friction angle can be found in the attached summary sheets and analysis profiles located in Appendix A-4.4 of the FEMA Accreditation report.

 $\underline{\text{Fill}}$ – Four to thirty-seven feet of fill, consisting of dense to very dense, fine to coarse SAND, with little to some fine to coarse gravel and trace to some Silt and trace amounts of loose to medium fine to coarse sand and Silt, with occasional

trace amounts of brick, ash, wood, plastic and organics. Average fill thickness was around 25 feet, with the smallest amount of fill occurring near the Deady Memorial Bridge where rock elevation is closest to the ground surface. Bottom of fill elevations generally seemed to correspond to the river elevation, where loose blow counts and losses of washwater were occasionally observed.

USACE drawings identify multiple fill zones consisting of compacted impervious fill and compacted random fill in the typical levee sections. These two soil types are also specified in the Chicopee Falls Design Memo. Compacted impervious fill "is a well graded gravelly, silty, clayey sand (SM-SC) with at least 20% passing the No. 200 sieve" (USACE, 9). Compacted random fill can consist of "any granular materials which contain no organic or decaying matter, are essentially non-plastic in nature, and contain no gravel sizes larger than 2/3 the allowable life thickness will be usable" (USACE, 10). No distinction between these soil types was observed in the borings as would be expected based on the geometry shown on the USACE drawings. Laboratory gradations were performed on both sample types and plotted against USACE Design Memo gradations. Sample gradations from the zones classified as either random or impervious were found to satisfy both gradation curves. It is GZA's opinion that the levee was likely constructed of the more conservative compacted impervious fill to simplify construction, or based on availability, while satisfying design requirements.

<u>Sand and Gravel/Till</u> – A very dense brown to red-brown, fine to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt was observed beneath the fill except in boring CF-9. Top of Sand and Gravel/Till elevations ranged between 82 and 86 at Stations 10+00 and 16+70 (dipping briefly to El. 74 at Station 13+30) decreasing to El. 60 at Station 60.5 and 65 at Stations 44+60 and 50+00, respectively.

<u>Varved Silt/Clay</u> – Hard, brown, varved soils were encountered in boring CF-11 at Station 50+00, approximately 22.5 feet in thickness (also noted in the design memo). Field torvane measurements of shear strength on recovered split-spoon samples ranged from 0.65 to 1.45 tons per square foot. Pocket penetrometer readings ranged from 3.25 to over 4 tons per square foot.

<u>Weathered Rock/Sandstone Bedrock</u> – Red-brown Sandstone with occasional Shale zones was encountered below the Fill in borings CF-1 and CF-9, the Varved Silt/Clay in boring CF-11 and below the Sand and Gravel/Till in the remaining borings (except for CF-7 which was terminated prior to encountering bedrock). In general the top of rock decreases in elevation from upstream (El. 89 in CF-1) to downstream (El. 20 in CF-11). The bedrock generally increased in quality with depth, ranging from completely weathered to slightly weathered with RQD values (defined as the sum of lengths over 4" divided by the total run length) as high as 72 percent.

Groundwater

Groundwater levels were measured during performance of the test borings and generally seemed to correspond with the approximate river elevation at the test boring location, with average elevation ranging between Elevation 82 and 83 NAVD88. This data is similar to data collected prior to construction (varying date). No observation wells or piezometers were installed. River elevation data for both the Chicopee and Connecticut Rivers are recorded daily by City Flood Control. In conversations with the Flood Control Foreman, Ernest Laflamme, an electronic database of river levels is also maintained and updated yearly.

Note that fluctuations in the groundwater levels will occur due to variations in season, precipitation, temperature, river level, impacts from existing utilities, and other factors different than those existing at the time of the explorations.

TABLE

Chicopee Flood Control Works GZA Project No. 15.0702100.50 Chicopee Falls Levee - Geotechnical Laboratory Testing Summary

							Percent By Weight:								
								Fines							
Boring	Sample	Station ⁽¹⁾	Depth (ft.)	Elevation ⁽²⁾	USACE ⁽³⁾	Stratum ⁽⁴⁾	Gravel	Sand	Silt Cl	ay W	VC ⁽⁵⁾	LL	PL	PI	Comments
CF-3	S-2	13+30 LC	3	104	Cpt. Imp. Fill	Fill	15	54	31						
CF-3	S-5	13+30 LC	11	96	Cpt. Rdm. Fill	Fill	27	54	19						
CF-3	S-7	13+30 LC	21	86	Cpt. Rdm. Fill	Fill	25	60	15						
CF-3	S-9	13+30 LC	28	79	-	Fill	13	72	15						5.4% Organic
CF-5	S-2	13+30 RC	3	104	Cpt. Imp. Fill	Fill	21	51	28						
CF-5	S-5	13+30 RC	11	96	Cpt. Rdm. Fill	Fill	32	45	22						
CF-5	S-11	13+30 RC	29	78	Cpt. Rdm. Fill	Fill	11	74	15						
CF-6	S-5	25+50 RC	11	93	Cpt. Imp. Fill	Fill	15	60	25						
CF-7	S-5	30+00 RC	11	91			19	53	28						
CF-7	S-12	30+00 RC	36	66	Till	S+G	53	37	10						
CF-11	S-3	50+00 RC	5	94	Cpt. Imp. Fill	Fill	11	63	26						
CF-11	S-5	50+00 RC	11	88	Cpt. Rdm. Fill	Fill	18	59	24						
CF-11	S-13	50+00 RC	32	67	Cpt. Imp. Fill	Fill	10	62	28						

1. Stationing is approximate. "RC" = Riverside Crest, "LC" = Landside Crest

2. Elevations referenced to the NAVD88 datum and are in the text.

3. "USACE" refers to stratum description from typical levee sections in record drawings or Design Memo by U.S. Army Engineers.

"Imp. Blkt." = Impervious Blanket, "Perv. Mat." = Pervious Material

4. "S+G" = Sand and Gravel, "Varved" = Varved Silt and Clay, N/A = Not Analyzed

5. WC = Water Content, LL = Liquid Limit, PL = Plastic Limit, PI = Plasticity Index, Tv = Torvane, readings in tons/square foot.

6. All tests conducted in general accordance with applicable ASTM Standards D2216, D4318, 2974, and D422.

FIGURES



296 North Main Street, East Longmeadow, MA

MassGIS Orthophoto (2005) obtained from MASS GIS, Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA).




6-30-2010

MERIDIAN OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM 1983 DATUM

SURVEYOR'S NOTES:

1. TOPOGRAPHIC DATA SHOWN HEREON IS BASED UPON AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY TAKEN DURING APRIL, 2008. PHOTOGRAPHY AND MAPPING WERE PERFORMED BY COL-EAST, INC. OF NORTH ADAMS, MA AND SUPPLEMENTED WITH GROUND SURVEYS PERFORMED BY HERITAGE SURVEYS, INC. FROM MAY, 2008 THROUGH SEPTEMBER, 2009.

2. FOR REFERENCE TO BOUNDARY LINE AND EASEMENTS SEE A PLAN PREPARED BY HERITAGE SURVEYS, INC. TITLED "PLAN OF FLOOD CONTROL AND DIKE EASEMENT IN CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS SURVEYED FOR THE CITY OF CHICOPEE", DATED JUNE 15, 2009, SHEETS 1 THROUGH 4.

3. UNDERGROUND UTILITY LOCATIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED UPON SURFACE FEATURES AS LOCATED BY SURVEY AND AVAILABLE RECORD DATA, AND ARE APPROXIMATE. ACTUAL LOCATIONS SHOULD BE VERIFIED WITH THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY AND/OR MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT PRIOR TO FINAL DESIGN AND/OR CONSTRUCTION.

4. LOCATION OF FLOOD WALL AND DIKE BASELINES SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE BASED UPON PLANS PREPARED BY THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR CHICOPEE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL DATED APPLL, 1963. NO MONUMENTATION OF BASELINES WAS FOUND AND IS HISTORICAL ONLY.

5. TOP OF CONCRETE FLOOD WALL AND CENTERLINE DIKE GRADES IN BOLD TYPE ARE FIELD LOCATED BY SURVEY AND ARE NOT THE RESULT OF AERIAL MAPPING.



+ 2.884.000N

800E





SURVEYOR'S NOTES:

1. TOPOGRAPHIC DATA SHOWN HEREON IS BASED UPON AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY TAKEN DURING APRIL, 2008. PHOTOGRAPHY AND MAPPING WERE PERFORMED BY COL-EAST, INC. OF NORTH ADAMS, MA AND SUPPLEMENTED WITH GROUND SURVEYS PERFORMED BY HERITAGE SURVEYS, INC. FROM MAY, 2008 THROUGH SEPTEMBER, 2009.

2. FOR REFERENCE TO BOUNDARY LINE AND EASEMENTS SEE A PLAN PREPARED BY HERITAGE SURVEYS, INC. TITLED "PLAN OF FLOOD CONTROL AND DIKE EASEMENT IN CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS SURVEYED FOR THE CITY OF

CHICOPEE", DATED JUNE 15, 2009, SHEETS 1 THROUGH 4.

3. UNDERGROUND UTILITY LOCATIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED UPON SURFACE FEATURES AS LOCATED BY SURVEY AND AVAILABLE RECORD DATA, AND ARE APPROXIMATE. ACTUAL LOCATIONS SHOULD BE VERIFIED WITH THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY AND/OR MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT PRIOR TO FINAL DESIGN AND/OR CONSTRUCTION AND/OR CONSTRUCTION.

4. LOCATION OF FLOOD WALL AND DIKE BASELINES SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE BASED UPON PLANS PREPARED BY THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR CHICOPEE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL DATED APRIL, 1963. NO MONUMENTATION OF BASELINES WAS FOUND AND IS HISTORICAL ONLY.

5. TOP OF CONCRETE FLOOD WALL AND CENTERLINE DIKE GRADES IN BOLD TYPE ARE FIELD LOCATED BY SURVEY AND ARE NOT THE RESULT OF AERIAL MAPPING.





SECTION A-3.2

RECENT BORING LOGS (CF-1 THROUGH CF-11)

		GZ	ZA .	_			CHICOPEE	FALLS LE	VEE		Borin	g No.:	CI	-6
Ľ	1	Ge Eng	oEnviron gineers an	mental, I Ind Scientis	nc. ts	CF	HICOPEE, N	1ASSACHU	SETTS		Page:	$\frac{1}{15}$	_ of _	2
• •••				rilling LLC			A				Chec	k:_	DME	<u>30.00</u>
Con	tractor	:	A&A D	austine	,		Auger/	Sampler		GROI			סואס	\$
Loa	ged by		R.	House			HSA/Steel	<u>S.S</u> .	Date	Tim	<u>e De</u> p	th Ca	sing	Stat
Date	Start/	- Finish:_	1-18	3-10 / 1-19	9-10	I.D.: _	2-1/4"/4"	2" O.D.	See	Note	3.			
Bori	ng Loc	ation:		See Plan		Hammer Wt.:	300 lbs.	140 lb.	1/18/10	154	5 17	" 4	40'	45 mi
GS I	Elev.: _	103'±	i Dat	um: <u>N</u>	AVD88	_ Hammer Fall:	24"		1/19/10	071	5 23	' 4	10'	15.5 ho
		Sam	nple Infor	mation		Other:		NX Core	-					
Ę		_			Casima					Ľ	2 F(nuinmen	t Inst	alled
Dep	No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Blows/ Ft.	Descript	Sample tion & Classifi	cation	Stratum Desc.	Remarl		Juipinen		uncu
1-	S-1	24/4	0-2	31-22 18-11		S-1: Dense, brov and fine to coars	wn, fine to coar se GRAVEL, tra	se SAND ace Silt, trace	FILL	1	,	I	None	
2- 3-	S-2	24/12	2-4	11-21 22-18		Piece of Gravel S-2: Dense, brov	observed in spo wn, fine to coar	oon tip. se SAND,		3	3			
4-	S-3	24/16	4-6	17-22	33	Some line Grave	wn, fine to coar	se SAND						
5- 6-	S-4	24/18	6-8	19-22	54 59	S-4: Dense, brov	wn. fine to coar	se SAND.						
7- 8-			2.0	25-25	87	some fine to coa Ash	rse Gravel, tra	ce Silt, trace						
0- 9-					125 60									
10-	S-5	24/13	10-12	22-15	43	S-5: Brown, fine	to coarse SAN	D, some Silt,						
12-				15-25	87 72									
13-					65									
15-	S-6	24/12	15-17	22-23	63 67	S-6 [.] Verv dense	brown fine to	coarse						
16-	00	2	10 11	31-25	260	SAND, some fine Silt, trace Brick	e to coarse Gra	avel, some						
17-					272									
18-					119				10					
19-					65				SAND AND GRAVE					
20-	S-7	24/11	20-22	22-28	53	S-7: Very dense	, brown, fine to	coarse		4	.			
21 –				26-48	61	SAND, some fine	e to coarse Gra	avel, little Silt						
22-					64									
23-					70									
24 –					60									
25 -	<u> </u>	04/40	05 07	24.40	40	C On Manual and	brown for t	00015						
26-	-ర	24/13	20-21	31-42	49	S-o. very dense SAND, little fine	, brown, fine to to coarse Grav	el, little Silt						
27					57		-							
, 28					62									
207					70									
29									30'					
28 – 29 – R 2 R 2 R 2 R 2 R 2 R 2 S	 SPT (2. Boref rotary No gr drillin, Driller Shale 	conducted ole advar wash me oundwate g wash was roller bitte fragment	using "safe loced from 0 thods. Drilli r encounter ter to borel ed ahead p s present ir	ety" hamme to 4 feet be ing wash wa red prior to hole and ma rior to drivir n samples S	70 r and 2" di elow grade ater introd drilling wa- ay represe ng casing f S-9 and S-1	iameter split spoon sa e using 2 1/4" I.D. holl uced to borehole at 8 sh water being introd sh water derilling flu irom 20 to 40 feet. 10.	ampler. low stem augers. feet below grade uced to borehole id and may not b	Borehole advan to completion of at 8 feet below g e representative	30' ced 4 to 40 fee boring. rade. Groundw of actual grour	et below vater rea ndwater	/ grade with ading perfo conditions	1 4" flush ju rmed after	oint ca r introc	sing ar
Stratifi	cation lin		nt annrovim	ate hounder	hetwoon	soil types transitions a	nav be gradual - M	ater level reading	a have been me	da at tia	nes			
and un	ider cond	itions state	d. Fluctuati	ions of grour	ndwater ma	y occur due to other fa	actors than those p	resent at the time	measurements	were	Bori	ng No.: (CF-6	

CHICOPEE FALLS LEVEE CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

Boring No.: <u>CF-6</u> Page: <u>2</u> of <u>2</u> File No.: <u>15.0702100.50</u> Check: DMB

		San	ple Infori	mation					
Depth	No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Casing Blows/ Ft.	Sample Description & Classification	Stratum Desc.	Remarks	Equipment Installed
	S-9	24/13	30-32	51-33	63	S-9: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse	TILL	5	
31-				35-32	49	SAND, little fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt			
32-					62				
33-	-				61				
34-					121				
35-	S-10	17/14	35-36.5	31-57	68	S-10: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, little fine			
36-	-			100/5"	71	to coarse Gravel, little Silt			
37-					57				
38-					51				
39-	-				80				
40-	S-11	4/4	40-40.3	100/4"		S-11: Brown, completely weathered SHALE	40' SANDSTONE	-	
41-	CR-1	60/48	41-46	min/ft		CR-1: Soft to moderately hard, moderate to		6	
42-			_	6:00		very severely weathered, fine grained,			
43-	-			5:30		closely spaced, horizontal joints/fractures			
44-	-			8:15		RQD = 20%			
45-	-			8.00					
46-	CR-2	60/60	46-51	7.00		CR-2: Soft to moderately hard moderate to			
47-			10 01	10.00		severely weathered, fine grained, red-brown			
48-	-			4:30		spaced, horizontal to sub-horizontal		7	
49-	-			5:00		joints/fractures			
50-	-			5.15					-
51-	CR-3	60/60	51-56	3.15		CR-3: Soft to moderately hard moderately			
52-		00/00	0100	2.30		severe to slight weathering, medium			
53-	-			3.00		grained, red-brown to brown SANDSTONE with very close to closely spaced, horizontal			
54-				3.15		to vertical joints/fractures			
55-	-			3.00		Last 21": Dark brown in color			-
56-				0.00		End of Exploration at 56'	56'		
57-	-								
58-	-								
59-	-								
60-	-								-
61-									
62-	-								
63-	-								
64-	-								
R E M A R K S	 Times Driller Boreh theore 	s represer increase ole tremie etical.)	nt penetratio d penetratio e grouted to	on in minute on rate betw ground sur	s/foot. RC een 48 an face with :	ΩD = Rock Quality Deesignation. Id 49 feet. 2/3 tub (~30 gallons/tub) bentonite/cement grout upon	completion. (Appro	oximatel	y 20 gallons actual vs 28 gallons
Stratif and u made	ication line nder cond	es represe itions state	nt approxima ed. Fluctuation	ate boundary ons of groun	/ between s dwater ma	soil types, transitions may be gradual. Water level reading by occur due to other factors than those present at the time	s have been made a measurements were	at times e	Boring No.: CF-6

		G7	ZA			0	CHICOPEE	FALLS LE	VEE			Boring No	o.:CI	F-7
C	7L`	Ge	oEnviron	mental, I	nc.	CHI	COPEE, N	1ASSACHU	SETTS			Page:	1 of	2
		$\blacksquare + En_{i}$	smeers an	a scientis	13							File No.:	15.0702	100.50
Con	tractor	:	A&A Di	rilling, LLC	2		Auger/	Sampler				Check:	DIVIE	>
Fore	eman: _		A. Au	gustine			Casing	Campier	Data	GR	OUNE	WATER F	READING	S
Log	ged by				10	Type:	<u>HSA/Steel</u>	<u> </u>	Date	No	ime	Deptn	Casing	Stab
Date	e Start/	Finish:_	1-18	<u>9-10 / 1-20</u> Soo Plan	J-10	I.D.:	2-1/4 /4 300 lbs	<u> </u>	1/10/10	1	<u>555</u>	18'	38.5'	5 min
BOL	ING LOC	:ation 102	- Dat			Hammer Wt.:	24"	30"	1/20/10	0	<u>555</u> 715	21.5'	38.5'	15.3 hou
00		102 2		um. <u> </u>		Other:		NX Core			110	21.0	00.0	10.0 1100
_		San	ple Infor	mation										
pth		Pen./	Denth	Diama	Casing		Comula		Stratum		rks	Equip	ment Inst	alled
De	No.	Rec. (in.)	(Ft.)	(/6")	Blows/ Ft.	Descriptio	on & Classifi	cation	Desc.	1	Rema			
1—	S-1	24/12	0-2	37-23 11-14		S-1: Dense, brown and fine to coarse	n, fine to coar GRAVEL, litt	se SAND le Silt, trace	10.2' TOPSOIL FILL		1		None	
2-	0.0	0.4/0		00.00		Organics								
3-	S-2 S-2A	24/0 24/18	2-4 2-4	39-39 30-13		S-2: No sample re S-2A: Brown, fine Gravel, little Silt	to coarse SA	ND, little fine			4			
4— 5	S-3	24/12	4-6	8-17	35	S-3: Dense, brown	n to red-browr	n, fine to						
ე- 6-		0.4/47		40.00	43	little Silt								
7-	5-4	24/17	6-8	49-22	49 69	5-4: Dense, red-bi to coarse SAND, s	some fine to c	orown, fine coarse						
8-					79	Gravel, trace Slit,	тасе впск							
9-					10									
10_					64									
10	S-5	24/12	10-12	22-23	27	S-5: Brown, fine to	coarse SAN	D, some Silt,						
11-				27-20	37		Glaver							
12-					52									
13-					62									
14—					52						5			
15-	5-6	21/2	15-17	17-18	34	S-6: Dense red B	RICK some f	ine to coarse			Ŭ			
16-		27/2	10 17	17-34	00	Sand, trace Silt								
17—					29									
10	S-7	24/11	17-19	14-9	39	S-7: Medium dens	se, red-brown rse SAND an	to dark						
10-				12 17	55	little Silt, little Ash		a Braon,						
19-	S-8	24/7	19-21	16-14	36	S-8: Dense, brown	n, fine to coar	se SAND,						
20-				19-26	61	Ittle fine to coarse (possible wash)	Gravel, trace	Silt						
21—	S-9	24/6	21-23	51-71	68	(Piece of Gravel o	bserved in sp	oon tip.)	21' SAND AND					
22 –				40-29	90	S-9: Very dense, to SAND and fine to	prown, fine to coarse GRAN	coarse /EL. trace	(TILL)					
23-					105	Silt		, .1000						
24—					190									
25-					155									
20	S-10	24/8	25-27	35-47	39	S-10: Very dense,	red-brown, fi	ne to coarse			6			
26-	1			43-09	43	Piece of Gravel ob	oserved in spo	son tip.						
27 –					68		·							
28-					117									
29—					160									
R E M A R K S	 SPT of 2. Boreh casing No re No gr drilling Driller Driller 	conducting nole advar g and rota covery in oundwate g wash wa r noted ch r roller bitt	g using "saf ceed from 0 ry wash me sample S-2 r encounter ange in was ed ahead p	ety" hamm to 4 feet b tthods. Dri . Therefor ed prior to hole and m sh color fro rior to drivi	er and 2" d elow grade lling wash e sample S drilling was ay represe m brown to ng casing f	liameter split spoon sar e using 2 1/4" I.D. hollov water introduced to bor 5-2A redrove into side o sh water being introduc ant perched drilling fluid b black at 14.5 feet. Lo rom 25 to 38.5 feet. Sh	mpler. 7"x5" co w stem augers. rehole at 8 feet of borehole. wed to borehole and may not b ss of casing flui ale fragments of	bble removed fro Borehole advan below grade to c at 8 feet below g e representative id at 15 feet. observed in S-10	m top 1 foot. ced from 4 to 3 ompletion of bo rade. Groundw of actual groun and S-12.	38.5 oring vater idwa	feet be l. readir ter cor	elow grade w ng performed nditions.	vith 4" flush d after introc	joint luction of
and ur made.	nder cond	itions state	ed. Fluctuati	ons of grou	ndwater ma	ay occur due to other fact	ors than those p	resent at the time	measurements	were	9	Boring N	lo.: CF-7	

CHICOPEE FALLS LEVEE CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

 Boring No.:
 CF-7

 Page:
 2
 of
 2

 File No.:
 15.0702100.50
 Chaoky
 DMB

		San	nple Infor	mation					Check: DMB
Depth	No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Casing Blows/ Ft.	Sample Description & Classification	Stratum Desc.	Remarks	Equipment Installed
31-	S-11	9/1	30-30.8	73-100/3"	50 42	S-11: Brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL and fine to coarse SAND, little Silt (Piece of Gravel observed in spoon tip.)	SAND AND GRAVEL (TILL)	7	
ა∠ – ვვ_					69				
34—					80				
35-	0.40	04/44	05.07	10 10	117				
36-	5-12	24/11	35-37	42-40 40-66	40 60	5-12: Brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL and fine to coarse SAND, little Silt			
37 - 38 -					95				
39-					300/6"		38.5' SANDSTONE	-	
40- 41-	S-13 CR-1	1/1 54/50	39.9-40 40-44.5	100/1" 7:30		S-13: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace			
42-				4:30		Silt CR-1: Soft to moderately hard, moderately			
43-				5:30		to very severe weathering, fine grained, red-brown SANDSTONE with very close to			
44 —				9.00 5:45/6"		close, horizontal to vertical joints/fractures	44 5'		
45-				0.40/0		RQD = 0%	<u>, ,,,,</u>	8	
46-						End of Exploration at 44.5'			
47 —									
48-									
49—									
50-									
51-									
52-									
55 54 –									
55-									
56-									
57 —									
58-									
59—									
60-									
61-									
62-									
63-									
64-									
R E M A R K S	7. Mode 8. Boreh	rate to he	avy drill cha	atter from 30 ground sur	0 to 40 fee face with	t. Driller noted change in drilling effort at 38.5 feet. 2/3 tub (~30 gallons) bentonite/cement grout (approxing)	ately 23 gallons ad	ctual ve	s 23 gallons theoretical).
Stratifi and ur made.	ication line	es represe itions state	nt approxima ed. Fluctuati	ate boundary ons of grour	y between ndwater ma	soil types, transitions may be gradual. Water level reading ay occur due to other factors than those present at the time	s have been made a measurements were	it times e	Boring No.: CF-7

GeoEnv Enginee Al Inish: 101'± Sample I Pen./ Rec. (in.) 24/17 0 9/7 2-7	rironmental, I rs and Scientis A Drilling, LLC A Augustine R. House 1-20-10 / 1-2 See Plan Datum: Information pth Blows (/6") -2 9-19	nc. ts -10 AVD88 Casing Blows/	Type:	Auger/ Casing HSA/Steel 2-1/4"/3" 300 lbs. 24"	Sampler <u>S.S.</u> <u>2" O.D.</u> <u>140 lb.</u> <u>30"</u>	Date See 1/20/10 1/21/10 1/21/10	GROUNI Time Note 3. 1540 0730 1140	Page: File No.: _ Check: DWATER F Depth 13.5' 15'	1 of _ 15.07021 DME READINGS Casing 16'	2 100.50 3 S Stab 10 min.
At Linguite At	A. Drilling, LLC A. Augustine R. House 1-20-10 / 1-2° See Plan Datum: Information pth Blows t.) ·2 9-19	-10 AVD88 Casing Blows/	Type: I.D.: _ Hammer Wt.: _ Hammer Fall: _ Other: _	Auger/ Casing HSA/Steel 2-1/4"/3" 300 lbs. 24"	Sampler S.S. 2" O.D. 140 lb. 30"	Date See 1/20/10 1/21/10 1/21/10	GROUNI Time Note 3. 1540 0730 1140	File No.: _ Check: DWATER F Depth 13.5' 15'	15.07021 DME READINGS Casing	S S Stab 10 min.
A& ion: 101'± Sample Pen./ De Rec. (F (in.) (F 24/17 0 9/7 2-2	A. Drilling, LLC A. Augustine R. House 1-20-10 / 1-2' See Plan Datum:	-10 AVD88 Casing Blows/	Type: I.D.: Hammer Wt.: Hammer Fall: Other:	Auger/ Casing HSA/Steel 2-1/4"/3" 300 lbs. 24"	Sampler S.S. 2" O.D. 140 lb. 30"	Date See 1/20/10 1/21/10 1/21/10	GROUNI Time Note 3. 1540 0730 1140	Check:	Casing	S Stab
Image: Ample bit is an and a market in the sector of the sector	A. Augustine R. House 1-20-10 / 1-2' See Plan Datum:N Information pth Blows (/6") -2 9-19	-10 AVD88 Casing Blows/	Type: I.D.: Hammer Wt.: Hammer Fall: Other:	Casing HSA/Steel 2-1/4"/3" 300 lbs. 24"	Sampler S.S. 2" O.D. 140 lb. 30"	Date See 1/20/10 1/21/10 1/21/10	GROUNI Time Note 3. 1540 0730 1140	DWATER F Depth 13.5' 15'	Casing	S Stab
nish: 101'± Sample Pen./ Rec. (in.) 24/17 0 9/7 2-2 0/460 22	R. House 1-20-10 / 1-2' See Plan Datum:	-10 AVD88 Casing Blows/		HSA/Steel 2-1/4"/3" 300 lbs. 24"		Date See 1/20/10 1/21/10 1/21/10	Time Note 3. 1540 0730 1140	Depth 13.5' 15'	Casing 16'	Stab 10 min.
nish: 101'± Sample Pen./ Rec. (in.) 24/17 0 9/7 2-2 0/460 2	Blows t.) (/6") -2 9-19	AVD88 Casing Blows/	I.D.: _ Hammer Wt.: _ Hammer Fall: _ Other: _	<u>2-1/4"/3"</u> <u>300 lbs.</u> <u>24</u> "		See 1/20/10 1/21/10 1/21/10	Note 3. 1540 0730 1140	13.5' 15'	16'	10 min.
IO1: 101'± Sample Pen./ Rec. (in.) 24/17 9/7 2-7	See Plan Datum:	AVD88 Casing Blows/	Hammer Wt.: _ Hammer Fall: _ Other: _	24"	30"	1/21/10 1/21/10	0730 1140	13.5	10	TU min.
Sample Pen./ Rec. (in.) 24/17 9/7 2-7	pth Blows (/6") -2 9-19	Casing Blows/	Other:			1/21/10	1140	15		16 hours
Sample Pen./ Rec. (in.) De (F 24/17 0 9/7 2-7 24/40 2-7	pth t.) Blows (/6") -2 9-19	Casing Blows/				1/21/10/1		14'	37'	10 min
Pen./ Rec. (in.) De (F 24/17 0 9/7 2-1	pth t.) Blows (/6") -2 9-19	Casing Blows/					1110		01	10 1111
Percent (in.) De (in.) 24/17 0 9/7 2-2	pth Blows t.) (/6") -2 9-19	Blows/					ks	Equip	ment Inst	alled
24/17 0 9/7 2-:	-2 9-19	Ft.	Descript	Sample ion & Classific	cation	Stratum Desc.	Remar			
9/7 2-2	20-32		S-1: Top 6": Darl SAND, some fine trace Organics	k brown, fine to e to coarse Gra	coarse vel, little Silt,	0.5' TOPSOIL FILL	1 2		None	
	2.8 47-100/3	"	S-2: Brown, fine	to coarse SANI	D, little fine		3			
24/16 3	-5 23-30 41-62		to coarse Gravel Piece of Gravel i S-3: Very dense,	, trace Silt n spoon tip. brown to red-b	prown, fine to					
9/5 5-	5.8 31-100/3	38	little Silt S-4: Brown, fine coarse GRAVEL	to coarse SANI , trace Silt	D and fine to					-
24/16 7	-9 24-52 42-45	52 130	S-5: Very dense, coarse SAND, so Gravel, trace Brid	dark brown to ome Silt, little fir ck	gray, fine to ne to coarse					
		138								
24/6 10	-12 35-34 37-80	37 20	S-6: Very dense, SAND, some fine (Piece of Gravel	brown, fine to to coarse Gra observed in sp	coarse vel, little Silt oon tip.)					-
24/6 12	-14 18-28 17-15	32 48	S-7: Dense, brov SAND and fine to Silt, trace Brick	vn to yellow, fin o coarse GRAV	e to coarse EL, trace					
24/16 14	-16 20-19 19-32	22 53	S-8: Dense, brov some Silt, little fi	vn, fine to coars ne Gravel, trace	se SAND, e Brick					-
24/4 16	-18 10-11 5-3	13 20	S-9: Medium der SAND, little Silt, Brick, trace Cera	nse, brown, fine little fine Grave imic	to coarse I, trace					
24/6 18	-20 4-2 4-5	22 24	S-10: Top 3" Gra Bottom 3": Tan-b	ay ASH prown, fine SAN	ID, some Silt					
24/8 20	-22 6-7 9-13	14 20	S-11: Medium de SAND, little Silt	ense, tan, fine to	o medium					-
24/16 22	-24 8-22 51-39	33 73	S-12: Top 9": Ta little Silt Bottom 7": Brow	n, fine to mediu n to red-brown.	im SAND,	23' SAND AND GRAVEL				
24/13 25	-27 44-43	110 37	coarse SAND an trace Silt S-13: Very dense	d fine to coarse	e GRAVEL, brown, fine	(TILL)	4			-
	54-78	37 51	to coarse SAND, Gravel, little Silt	some fine to c	oarse					
		64								
	4/16 7 24/6 10 24/6 12 24/6 14 24/6 14 24/6 18 24/6 18 24/6 18 24/6 20 4/16 22 4/16 22 4/13 25 ducted using advanced fig y wash method water encoder	4/16 7-9 24-52 24/6 10-12 35-34 24/6 12-14 18-28 17-15 14/16 14-16 20-19 24/4 16-18 10-11 5-3 24/6 18-20 4-2 4-5 24/6 18-20 4-2 4-5 24/8 20-22 6-7 9-13 4/16 22-24 8-22 51-39 4/13 25-27 44-43 54-78 ducted using "safety" hamme advanced from 0 to 5 feet by y wash methods. Drilling was dwater encountered prior to 51-39	4/16 $7-9$ $24-52$ $42-45$ 38 52 130 $24/6$ $10-12$ $35-34$ $37-80$ 37 20 $24/6$ $12-14$ $18-28$ $17-15$ 32 48 $4/16$ $14-16$ $20-19$ $19-32$ 22 53 $24/4$ $16-18$ $10-11$ 13 $5-3$ 13 20 $24/6$ $18-20$ $4-2$ $4-5$ 24 $24/6$ $18-20$ $4-2$ $4-5$ 24 $24/6$ $18-20$ $4-2$ $9-13$ 20 $24/6$ $22-24$ $8-22$ $51-39$ 33 $4/16$ $22-24$ $8-22$ $51-39$ 37 73 $4/13$ $25-27$ $44-43$ $54-78$ 37 51 64 cducted using "safety" hammer and 2" d advanced from 0 to 5 feet below grade y wash methods. Drilling wash water in dudition for the same recountered prior to drilling wash water in driver and countered prior to drilling wash water in driver and countered prior to drilling wash water in	4/167-9 $24-52$ 38 S-4: Brown, fine coarse GRAVEL $4/16$ 7-9 $24-52$ 52 S-5: Very dense, coarse SAND, so Gravel, trace Brid $24/6$ 10-12 $35-34$ 37 S-6: Very dense, SAND, some fine (Piece of Gravel $24/6$ 12-1418-28 32 S-7: Dense, brow SAND and fine to SAND and fine to SAND and fine to Silt, trace Brick $4/16$ 14-16 $20-19$ 22 S-8: Dense, brow Some Silt, little fit $24/4$ 16-1810-1113 S-9: Medium der SAND, little Silt, Brick, trace Cera Bottom 3": Tan-b $24/6$ 18-20 $4-2$ 22 S-10: Top 3" Gra Bottom 3": Tan-b $24/6$ 20-22 $6-7$ 14 S-11: Medium de SAND, little Silt Bottom 7": Brown coarse SAND and trace Silt $4/16$ 22-24 $8-22$ 33 S-12: Top 9": Ta little Silt Bottom 7": Brown Gravel, little Silt $4/13$ 25-27 $44-43$ 37 S-13: Very dense to coarse SAND and trace Silt $4/13$ 25-27 $44-43$ 37 S-13: Very dense to coarse SAND and trace Silt $4/13$ 25-27 $44-43$ 37 S-13: Very dense to coarse SAND and trace Silt 51 64 42 42 43 44 51 Bottom 7": Brown Gravel, little Silt 44 51 Bottom 7": Do 10 51 Bottom 7": Do 10 44 45 42 42 44 44 44 44 42 42 44	4/167-924-52 $42-45$ 38 52 S-4: Brown, fine to coarse SANL coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt24/610-1235-34 $37-80$ 37 20 S-6: Very dense, dark brown to Gravel, trace Brick24/612-1418-28 $17-15$ 32 48 S-6: Very dense, brown, fine to SAND, some fine to coarse GRAV (Piece of Gravel observed in sp SAND and fine to coarse GRAV Silt, trace Brick24/612-1418-28 $17-15$ 32 48 S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fin SAND and fine to coarse GRAV Silt, trace Brick4/1614-1620-19 $19-32$ 22 53 S-8: Dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, little fine Gravel, trace24/416-1810-11 $19-32$ 53 S-9: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, little Silt, little fine Grave Brick, trace Ceramic24/618-204-2 $4-5$ 22 24 24/618-204-2 $4-5$ 2424/618-204-2 $4-5$ 2424/7622-248-22 $51-39$ 33 73 73 24/1622-248-22 $51-39$ 33 73 73 24/1622-248-22 $51-39$ 37 73 73 25-2744-43 $54-78$ 37 37 375-13: Very dense, brown to red- to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt4/1325-2744-43 $54-78$ 37 37 4/1425-2744-43 $54-78$ 37 37 4/1554-78 37 37 51 4/1624-27 $44-43$ 37 37 <	4/167-924-525254: Brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt4/167-924-5252S-5: Very dense, dark brown to gray, fine to coarse SAND, some Silt, little fine to coarse Gravel, trace Brick24/610-1235-3437S-6: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt (Piece of Gravel observed in spoon tip.)24/612-1418-2832S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt, trace Brick4/1614-1620-1922S-8: Dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some Silt, little fine Gravel, trace Brick4/1614-1620-1922S-8: Dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some Silt, little fine Gravel, trace Brick24/416-1810-1113S-9: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, little Silt, little fine Gravel, trace Brick, trace Ceramic24/618-204-222S-10: Top 3" Gray ASH Bottom 3": Tan-brown, fine SAND, some Silt24/820-226-714S-11: Medium dense, tan, fine to medium SAND, little Silt4/1622-248-2233S-12: Top 9": Tan, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt4/1725-2744-433751-3973Gravel, little Silt4/1325-2744-433751644/1325-2744-433751644/14644/15644/1621-2051-395164	4/167-924-5252S-4: Brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt4/167-924-5252S-5: Very dense, dark brown to gray, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Brick24/610-1235-3437S-6: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt (Piece of Gravel observed in spoon tip.)24/612-1418-2832S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse SAND, and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt, trace Brick24/612-1418-2832S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt, trace Brick24/614-1620-1922S-8: Dense, brown, fine to coarse Gravel, trace Brick, trace Ceramic24/618-204-222S-10: Top 3" Gray ASH Bottom 3": Tan-brown, fine SAND, some Silt24/820-226-714S-11: Medium dense, tan, fine to medium SAND, little Silt24/1622-248-2233 S-13: Po 9": Tan, fine to medium SAND, little Silt4/1825-2744-4337 S-13: Very dense, brown to red-brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt4/1325-2744-4337 S-13: Very dense, brown to red-brown, fine to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt4/1325-2744-4337 S-13: Very dense, brown to red-brown, fine to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt4/1425-2744-4337 S-13: Very dense, brown to red-brown, fine to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt4/1	4/16 7-9 24-52 38 S-4: Brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt 4/16 7-9 24-52 52 S-5: Very dense, dark brown to gray, fine to coarse Gravel, little fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt, little fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt S-6: Very dense, dark brown, fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt 24/6 10-12 35-34 37 S-6: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt 24/6 12-14 18-28 32 S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt, trace Brick 24/6 12-14 18-28 32 S-7: Dense, brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt, trace Brick 24/6 14-16 20-19 22 S-8: Dense, brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt, trace Brick 24/4 16-18 10-11 13 S-9: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some Silt 24/4 16-18 10-11 13 S-9: Medium dense, tan, fine to medium SAND, some Silt 24/4 16-18 10-11 33 S-12: Top 9": Tan, fine to medium SAND, some Silt 24/6 18-20 4-2 22 S-13: Very dense, brown to red-brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt S-13: Very dense, frow to red-brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt	4/167-924-5252S-3: Brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Sitt4/167-924-5252S-5: Very dense, dark brown to gray, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Sitt13013824/610-1235-3437S-6: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse Gravel, little Sitt2012012-1418-283224/612-1418-2832S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Sitk24/612-1418-2832S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse SAND, some Sitk, little fine Gravel, trace Brick4/1614-1620-1922S-8: Dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some Sitk, little fine Gravel, trace Brick24/416-1810-1113S-9: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some Sitt, little Sitt, little Sitt, little Sitt24/416-1810-1113S-9: Medium dense, trace Brick24/416-1810-1113S-9: Medium dense, trace Brick24/416-1810-1120S-11: Medium dense, tan, fine to medium SAND, some Sitt24/416-1810-1120S-11: Medium dense, tan, fine to medium SAND, little Sitt24/420-226-714S-11: Medium dense, torown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Sitt24/1622-248-2233S-12: Top 9": Tan, fine to medium SAND, little Sitt24/1325-2744-4337S-13: Very dense, brown to red-brown, fine to coarse Gravel, little Sitt24/1425-2744-4337S-13: Very den	38 S-4: Brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Sit. 4/16 7-9 24-52 52 S-5: Very dense, dark brown to gray, fine to coarse Gravel, little Sit (Piece of Gravel, trace Brick 24/6 10-12 35-34 37 S-6: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse Gravel, little Sit (Piece of Gravel observed in spoon tip.) 24/6 12-14 18-28 32 S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse Gravel, little Sit (Piece of Gravel observed in spoon tip.) 24/6 12-14 18-28 32 S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse Gravel, trace Brick 24/6 12-14 18-28 32 S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse Gravel, trace Brick 24/6 12-14 18-28 32 S-7: Dense, brown to yellow, fine to coarse Gravel, trace Brick 24/4 16-18 10-11 3 S-9: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse Gravel, trace Brick 24/4 16-18 10-11 3 S-9: Medium dense, tan, fine to medium SAND, some Silt 24/4 18-20 4-5 22 S-11: Medium dense, tan, fine to medium SAND, Ittle Silt 23 24/8 20-22 6-7 14 S-11: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse Gravel, Ittle Silt 24

CHICOPEE FALLS LEVEE CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

 Boring No.:
 CF-8

 Page:
 2
 of
 2

 File No.:
 15.0702100.50
 Check:
 DMB

		Sam	ple Infor	mation					CHECK: DIVID
Depth	No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Casing Blows/ Ft.	Sample Description & Classification	Stratum Desc.	Remarks	Equipment Installed
	S-14	14.5/9	30-31.2	38-129	20	S-14: Brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, some	SAND AND GRAVEL		
31-	1			100/2.5	25	The to coarse Sand, little Sht	(TILL)		
32-	1				46				
33-					117				
25					145				
36-	S-15	3/1	35-35.3	100/3"	58	S-15: Brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt			
37-					191		WEATHERED BEDROCK		
38-	S-16	1/1	38-38.1	100/1"		S-16: Red-brown, fine to coarse SAND and	38.1'	5	
39-						\fine to coarse GRAVEL (Weathered Rock)		6	
40-						End of Exploration at 38.1			-
41-	4								
42-	4								
43-	-								
44-	-								
45-	-								-
46-	-								
47-	-								
48-	-								
49-	-								
50-	-								-
51-	-								
52-	1								
53-	1								
54-	1								
55-	1								-
56-	1								
5/-	1								
- 00- - 00-									
									_
9 00 -									
5 63-	4								
5 64-	4								
	5. Driller	noted ch	ange in was	sh water col	or from br	own to red-brown at 38 feet possibly indicating change 2/3 tub bentonite/cement grout (~30 gallons/tub) upon (in material.	vimate	elv 20 gallons actual vs 19 gallons
	theore	etical.)	groutou to	ground our				annac	by 20 galorio dottal vo ro galorio
R K									
09:00									
Strati	fication line	es represe	nt approxima	ate boundary	/ between	soil types, transitions may be gradual. Water level readings	have been made at	times	
and u	Inder condi 9.	itions state	ea. ⊢luctuati	ons of groun	awater ma	ay occur due to other factors than those present at the time	measurements were		Boring No.: C⊦-8

		G2	ZA				CHICOPE	= FALLS LE	VEE		Boring N	o.:C	F-9
	7L`	Ge	oEnviron	mental, I d Scientis	nc. ts	CH	ICOPEE, N	MASSACHU	SETTS		Page:	<u>1</u> of .	2
											File No.:	15.0702 DMI	100.50 3
Cor	ntractor		A&A Dr	<u>illing, LLC</u>	C	_	Auger/	Sampler					
For	eman: _		<u>A. Au</u> R I	House			Casing	ss	Date	GROUN	DWATER F	Casing	S Stah
Dat	e Start/I	- Finish	1-21	-10 / 1-26	6-10	iype LD.:	2-1/4"/3"	2" O.D.	1/22/10	0715	2.5'	14'	15 hour
Bor	ing Loc	ation:	,	See Plan		Hammer Wt.: _	300 lbs.	140 lb.	1/22/10	1510	19.5'	50'	10 min
GS	Elev.: _	99'±	Dat	um:N	IAVD88	_ Hammer Fall: _	24"	30"	1/26/10	0720	21'	50'	3.5 day
		San	nple Infori	mation		Other: _			_ 1/26/10	1015	17.5'	60'	5 min.
th		Den (Casing					ks	Fauin	ment Inst	alled
Dep	No.	Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Blows/ Ft.	Descript	Sample ion & Classif	ication	Stratum Desc.	Remar			unou
1-	S-1	24/8	0-2	19-25 8-8		S-1: Top 1": Dark SAND, little fine t	brown, fine to o coarse Grav	o coarse vel, trace Silt,	0.5' ROADWAY MATERIAL FILL	12		None	
2- 3-	S-2	24/12	2-4	12-18 21-25		Bottom 7": Brown	n, fine to coars rse Gravel, tra	se SAND, ice Silt		3			
4-	0.0	04/7	4.0	40.00	40	S-2: Dense, brow some fine to coar	/n, fine to coa se Gravel, litt	rse SAND, le Silt					
5-	5-3	24/7	4-0	9-11	13	S-3: Dense, brow some fine to coar	n, fine to coa se Gravel, litt	rse SAND, le Silt					
6-	S-4	24/20	6-8	16-26	47	S-4: Top 13": Bro	own, fine to co	arse SAND,					
7-				20-18	60	Bottom 7": Tan to	e to coarse Gr	avel SAND, some					
8-	1				71	Silt							
9-	1				103								
10-	S-5	16/4	10-11.3	69-105 100/4"	14	S-5: Top 3": Tan	to brown, fine	SAND, some		4			
11-				100/4	14	Bottom 1": Brown							
12-					27	Piece of Gravel c	bserved in sp	oon tip.					
14					52								
15-	S-6	17/8	14-15.4	33-61 100/5"	27 44	S-6: Brown, fine to coarse Gravel,	to coarse SAN little Silt, trac	ID, some fine e Brick					
16-					39								
17-	-				30								
18-					37								
19-					40								
20-	S-7	24/13	20-22	27-50	38	S-7: Very dense,	brown to dark	k brown, fine					
21-	1			90-00	30	little Silt, trace Br	ick, trace Glas	ss, trace Fiber					
22-	1				28	(Piece of Gravel	observed in s	poon tip)					
∠3- 24]				21								
24 - 25					42								
26-	S-8	24/10	25-27	35-32 29-28	60 57	S-8: Very dense, SAND, little fine t	brown, fine to o coarse Grav	o coarse vel, little Silt					
27 –	S-9	24/11	27-29	32-31	96	S-9: Very dense,	brown, fine to	coarse					
28-	-			23-24	63	SAND, little fine t	o coarse Grav	vel, little Silt					
29-	S-10	24/9	29-31	21-24	59	S-10: Dense, bro	wn, fine to co	arse SAND,					
R E M A R K S	 SPT c Boreh and rc No gradrilling Driller 	conducted ole advar otary was oundwate g wash was roller bitt	l using "safe hoced from 0 h methods. rr encounter ater to boreh ed ahead pi	ety" hamme to 4 feet be Drilling wa ed prior to hole and m rior to drivir	er and 2" di elow grade ish water ir drilling was ay represe ng casing f	ameter split spoon sa using 2 1/4" I.D. hollo troduced to borehole sh water being introdu nt perched drilling flui rom 10 to 25 feet.	mpler. Cobbles ow stem augers at 8 feet below iced to borehole d and may not b	4"x4" 6x4" (2), ar Borehole advan grade to completi at 8 feet below g be representative	nd 8"x14" remov iced from 4 to 6 ion of boring. irade. Groundw of actual groun	ved from to 1 feet belo ater readio dwater co	op 6 inches. ow grade wit ng performed nditions.	h 3" flush jo d after introc	int casing duction of
	ication line	es represe	nt approxima	ate boundar	v hetween v	soil types transitions m	av be gradual. V	Notor loval randing	s have been may	la at timaa	1		

CHICOPEE FALLS LEVEE CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

CF-9 Boring No.: _ Page: _____ of ____ File No.: <u>15.0702100.50</u> Check: DMB

		San	ple Infor	mation			1		Check: DIMB
Depth	No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Casing Blows/ Ft.	Sample Description & Classification	Stratum Desc.	Remarks	Equipment Installed
				17-8		some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt	FILL		
31- 32-	S-11	24/6	31-33	44-31 16-11	34 67	S-11: Dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, some Silt			
33- 34-	S-12	24/3	33-35	11-10 6-5	48 37	S-12: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND, some Silt, little fine to coarse Gravel			
35- 36-	S-13	24/6	35-37	3-7 19-37	30 41	S-13: Top 2": Brown, fine to coarse SAND and SILT, little fine to coarse Gravel		5	
37-	S-14	6/6	37-37.5	100/6"	34	Bottom 4": Brown, tine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt S-14: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, little	37' TILL		
39-	-				189 310	Gravel, trace Silt (Piece of Gravel observed in spoon tip.)			
40-	S-15	4/1	40-40.3	100/4"	450 77	S-15: Brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, little Silt			
42-	-				111				
43-	-				74				
44-	-				112				
45-	S-16	10/4	45-45.8	105-100/4	82	S-16: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, some			-
46-	-				64	Silt, little fine Gravel			
47-	-				44				
48-	1				50				
49-	-				79				
50-	S-17	10/8	50-50.8	99-100/4"	83	S-17: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, some			-
51-	-				83	Silt, little fine Gravel			
52-	-				107				
53-	-				69				
54-	1				82				
55-	S-18	24/16	55-57	60-67	82	S-18: Very dense, brown, fine SAND and			
56-	1			72-39	54	SILT, trace fine Gravel			
57-					42				
58-	-				67		501	6	
59-	-				262		WEATHERED BEDROCK		
60- 61-	S-20 S-19	2/1 2/1	61-61.2 60-60.2	100/2" 100/2"	309/1"	S-20: Red-brown WEATHERED ROCK S-19: Red-brown WEATHERED ROCK	61.2'	7	-
62-	-					End of Exploration at 61.2			
63-	-								
64-	-								
	5. Driller 6. Driller 7. Boreh theore	roller bitt noted ch lole tremie etical.)	ed ahead p ange in dril e grouted to	rior to drivin ling effort at ground sur	g casing f 58.5 to 59 face with	rom 35 to 61 feet. Possible obstructions 37 to 40 feet. 9 feet. 1 tub bentonite/cement grout (~30 gallons/tub) upon co	mpletion. (Approxi	mately	30 gallons actual vs 30 gallons
Stratif and u	ication line	es represe itions state	nt approxim ed. Fluctuat	ate boundary ions of groun	between dwater ma	soil types, transitions may be gradual. Water level readings y occur due to other factors than those present at the time	s have been made at measurements were	times	Boring No.: CF-9

GeoEnvironmental, Inc. Engineers and Scientists CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS Page:1 Contractor: A&A Drilling, LLC File No: Check: Check: Date Start/Finish:1-26-10 / 2-1-10 A. Augustine Check: Check: Check: Date Start/Finish:1-26-10 / 2-1-10 Auger/ Check: Date Start/Finish:1-26-10 / 2-1-10 Dilling, LLC Check: Check: Date Start/Finish:1-26-10 / 2-1-10 Check: Date Start/Finish: 1-26-10 / 2-10 / 2-1-10 Dilling, LLC Check: Date Start/Finish: Date Start/Finish: 1/28/10 0740 18.5' GeoElev: 99 ± Datum: NAVD88 Hammer Wt:: 00 lbs. 140 lb. 1/27/10 0735 11' 1/28/10 0740 18.5' GeoElev: 99 ± Datum: NAVD88 Hammer Fall: Description & Classification Stratum		-10			
File No:	of	3			
	DMR	100.50			
Casing Casing CROUNDWATER RI Construction: Casing CROUNDWATER RI Date Start/Finish: Casing Casing Casing Casing Casing Casing Date start/Finish: 1:27:10 OT the perth Sorter the perth See Plan HSA/Steel S.S. Date Time Depth Boring Location: See Plan HSA/Steel S.S. Date Time Depth Blows Casing Sample Description & Classification NX Core Zirl/1/10 OT 2: 18' Sample Information Sample Description & Classification Stratum Stratum Stratum Sec Sample Information Sample Sample Description & Classification Stratum Stratum Stratum Stratum Stratum Stratum Ca					
The construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the construction in the construction is in the construction in the constructing is the construction. The construction is the construc	ADINGS) Stah			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	15'	16 hours			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	55' 1	16.5 hou			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	35'	2.5 days			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \hline \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	55'	45 min.			
DecPen./ Rec. (in.)Depth (Ft.)Blows (f")Casing Blows/ (f")Sample Description & ClassificationStratum Desc.Ver Ver Ver1S-124/20-26-13 16-16SSSSROADWAY (race Organics, trace Silt12S-224/82-45-7 12-15SSSSSNo., fine to coarse GRAVEL, little fine to coarse Sand, trace Organics, trace Silt0.9' MATERIAL FILL14S-324/104-68-15 10-2011 33SSSS35S24/176-823-23 28-1946 90S-4: Top 14": Brown to red-brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, little SiltIII6S-424/176-823-23 28-1946 90S-4: Top 14": Brown to red-brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, some Silt S-5: Very dense, gray-brown, fine SAND, some Silt S-5: Very dense, gray-brown, fine SAND, some Silt, trace fine GravelII10IIIIIII11IIIIIII11IIIIIII12IIIIIII14IIIIIII15IIIIIII16IIIIIII16III<					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		alled			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	None				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
6- S-4 24/17 6-8 23-23 46 S-4: Top 14": Brown to red-brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, some Silt 7- 8- S-5 24/10 8-10 34-33 39 Bottom 3": Gray, fine SAND, some Silt 9- 10- 147 21 21 44 4					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
	4				
3-					
S-6 24/10 15-17 73-68 32 S-6: Very dense, gray-brown, fine to coarse					
16 34 Brick					
20 S-7 24/12 20-22 41-46 72 S-7: Very dense, grav-brown to red-brown.					
36-21 fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse					
22 - 64 (Piece of gravel observed in spoon tip.)					
S-8 24/8 25-27 13-9 38 S-8: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse 9-8 SAND, some Silt, little fine Gravel					
S-9 24/10 27-29 3-5 46 S-9: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse					
28 49 SAIND, some Siit, little tine Gravel					
²⁹ S-10 24/6 29-31 7-22 60 S-10: Dense, brown to red-brown, fine to					
 1. SPT conducted using "safety" hammer and 2" diameter split spoon sampler. 2. Borehole advanced from 0 to 4 feet below grade using 2-1/4 I.D. hollow stem augers. Borehole advanced from 4 to 57 feet below grade with 3 and rotary wash methods. Drilling wash water introduced to borehole at 8 feet below grade to completion of boring. 3. No groundwater encountered prior to introduction of drilling wash water at 8 feet below grade. Groundwater readings above 18 feet likely percent and may not be representative of actual groundwater conditions. 4. Driller roller bitted ahead, prior to driving casing from 10 to 25 feet. 5. Additional groundwater readings were taken on 1/26/10 and 1/27/10 with minimal stablization periods. Groundwater was measured 6 feet below ground surface). Groundwater measured 18 feet below ground surface on 1/27/10 (casing 55 feet below ground surface). 	" flush join hed drill flu erched dril w ground s nd surface	nt casing uid and illing fluid surface e).			
Stratification lines represent approximate boundary between soil types, transitions may be gradual. Water level readings have been made at times					
and under conditions stated. Fluctuations of groundwater may occur due to other factors than those present at the time measurements were made.	.: CF-10				

GZ\

GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. *Engineers and Scientists*

CHICOPEE FALLS LEVEE CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

 Boring No.:
 CF-10

 Page:
 2
 of
 3

 File No.:
 15.0702100.50
 Check:
 DMB

			Sam	ple Infor	mation					CHECK. DIND
Denth		No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Casing Blows/ Ft.	Sample Description & Classification	Stratum Desc.	Remarks	Equipment Installed
					17-17	61	coarse SAND and fine to coarse Gravel,	FILL		
31	1-	S-11	10.5/5	31-31.9 ⁻	14-100/4.5	56	(Piece of gravel observed in spoon tip.)		6	
32	2					37	S-11: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, some			
33	3-					40	(Piece of gravel observed in spoon tip.)			
34	1-					76				
35	5-	S-12	24/8	35-37	30-42	61	S-12: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse			-
36	3-				55-49	40	SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt			
37	7-					59	(Piece of gravel observed in spoon tip.)			
38	3-					127		38.5'		
39	9-					193		GRAVEL (TILL)		
40)-	S-13	10/7	40-41.8	96-100/4"	120	S-13: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, some			-
41	1-					260	fine to coarse Gravel, trace Silt			
42	2-					275				
43	3-					350				
44	1-					440				
45	5-	S-14	10/7	45-45.8	73-100/4"	75	S-14: Brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine			-
46	5-					50	to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt			
47	7-					184				
48	3-					95				
49	9-					500				
50)-	S-15	6/2	50-50.5	125/6"	140	S-15: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, little fine			-
51	1-					67	to coarse Gravel, little Silt		7	
52	2-					68				
53	3-					63				
54	1-					134				
55	5-	S-16	6/5	55-55.5	110/6"	170	S-16: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, little fine			-
56	5-					500	to coarse Gravel, little Silt	56' WEATHERED	-	
57	7-							OTIVILL	8	
2 58	3-								9	
‰ 59 ⊢	9-	S-17	1/0	59.9-60	100/1"		S-17: No sample obtained. Shale fragments			
60 1 1)-	CR-1	60/54	60-65	10:00		in spoon tip. CR-1: Top 9": Soft, moderately severe to		10	-
년 61 전	1-				6:15		very severe weathering, medium grained,	61' SANDSTONE	11	
IZJ 62	2-				12:00		sub-horizontal, iron-oxide stained			
G 63	3-				9:45		joints/fractures Bottom 45": Medium, moderate to slightly			
64 PLLS.	1-				13:00		weathered, fine-grained, red-brown			
T02100.50 BORINGS CHICOPEE I	atific	 Shale Driller Casin Casin Driller O. Was Time 	fragment roller bitty g refusal a noted bri hwater bri es represe	s observed ed ahead, p at 57 feet. ef change i iefly change ent penetrat	in samples prior to drivir n washwate ed color to n ion in min/fc	S-10, S-1 ng casing er color fro nilky-gray bot. RQD	2 and S-13. from 51 to 57 feet. m brown to orange-brown around 58 feet. at 60.8 feet, turned to red-brown around 61.5 feet. = Rock Quality Designation.	s have been made a	t times	Perior No. 05 40
0 and	a un ide.	uer cond	nions state	eu. Fluctuati	ions of groun	iuwater ma	by occur due to other factors than those present at the time	measurements were	2	Boring No.: CF-10

GZ\

GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. Engineers and Scientists

CHICOPEE FALLS LEVEE CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

Boring No.: <u>CF-10</u> Page: <u>3</u> of <u>3</u> File No.: <u>15.0702100.50</u> Check: DMB

		Sam	ple Inforr	mation					Check. Bill
Depth	No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Casing Blows/ Ft.	Sample Description & Classification	Stratum Desc.	Remarks	Equipment Installed
	CR-2	60/60	65-70	11:30		sub-horizontal joints/fractures	SANDSTONE	-	
66-				13:00		CR-2: Soft to moderately hard, moderate		12	
67-				8:45		weathering, fine grained, red-brown SANDSTONE with horizontal to			
68-				7:00		sub-horizontal, iron-oxide stained			
69-				5:00		zones from 66 to 66.7 feet and 67.5 to 68.3	70'		
70-						RQD = 21%		13	-
						End of Exploration at 70'			
72-									
74									
75-									
76-									
77-									
78-									
79-									
80-									-
81-									
82-									
83-									
84-									
85-									-
86-									
87-									
88-									
89-									
90-									-
91-									
92-									
93-									
ສິ່94 <i>−</i>									
95 –									-
-96 									
97-									
-98 –									
-99 ALLS									
DIED BORINGS CHICOPEE F	12. Drille 13. Bore	er increaso hole grou	ed penetrati ted to grour	on rate aroi nd surface v	und 66.8 f vith 1 tub	eet. No significant fluid loss during coring. bentonite/cement grout (~30 gallons/tub) upon completi	on.	1	
Stratif and un made	ication line	es represe	nt approxima d. Fluctuatio	ate boundary ons of groun	v between dwater ma	soil types, transitions may be gradual. Water level readings by occur due to other factors than those present at the time r	have been made a measurements were	t time:	s Boring No.: CF-10

		L G7	7.Δ				CHICOPE	E FALLS LE'	VE	Ε		_	Boring No	b.: CF	-11
	$\overline{7}$	Ge	oEnviron	mental, Iı	nc.	CH	IICOPEE, N	MASSACHU	SE	TTS			Page:	1 of .	3
	_//	En En	gineers an	d Scientis	ts							•	File No.: _	15.0702	100.50
Co	ntractor	:	A&A D	rilling, LLC	;		Auger/	0				-	Check:	DME	3
For	eman: _		A. Au	gustine			Casing	Sampler			GRO	UNE	WATER F	READING	5
Log	ged by	:	R.	House		Туре:	HSA/Steel	<u> </u>		Date	Tim	ne	Depth	Casing	Stab
Dat	e Start/	Finish:_	2-1	<u> -10 / 2-4-</u>	10	I.D.: .	2-1/4"/4"	<u>2" O.D.</u>	- -	2/2/10	125	50 0	6'	25'	40 min.
Boi	ring Loc	ation:		See Plan		Hammer Wt.:.	300 lbs.	140 lb	- -	2/3/10	073	56 15	14	31	16.5 hour
GS	Elev.: _	90 ±		um:N	AVDoo	Hammer Fall:	24	30	- -	2/3/10	072	25	10'	60'	15.5 hour
		San	nple Infor	mation		Other.			- -	2/4/10	125	56	12.5'	75'	45 min.
pth		Pen./			Casing		<u> </u>			0 4 4		S	Equip	ment Inst	alled
۵ ۵	No.	Rec. (in.)	(Ft.)	(/6")	Blows/ Ft.	Descript	sample ion & Classif	ication		Desc.		кеша			
	S-1	24/12	0-2	24-30		S-1: Top 1": Dar	k brown, fine S	SAND and	\ <u>0.</u> ^	1' TOPSOIL FILL		1		None	
1-	1			13-13		Middle 6": Browr	n, fine to coars	e SAND, little			2	2			
2-	S-2	24/11	2-4	27-27		fine to coarse Gr	avel, little Silt	, I				3			
3-	-			26-16		SAND, some fine	brown, fine to	medium avel, little Silt							
4-	6.2	24/16	4.6	12.22	50	S-2: Very dense	, brown, fine to	medium							
5-	3-3	24/10	4-0	28-32		SAND, some Silt	t, little fine to c	oarse Gravel,							
6					75	S-3: Brown, fine	to medium SA	ND, little Silt,							
-0	S-4	24/12	6-8	24-25	97	little fine Gravel	hunder the state								
7-	1			32-30	172	SAND, some fine	e to coarse Gr	avel, little Silt							
8-	1				193										
9-	-				120										
10-	85	24/12	10.12	63 66	11	S 5: Brown fino	to coorso SAN	ID some Silt				1			
11-	- 3-3	24/12	10-12	42-22	41	little fine to coars	se Gravel	D, Some Sill,			1	*			
12-					31										
12					30										
13-	1				89										
14-	1				200										
15-	S-6	24/7	15-17	82-88	83	S-6: Very dense	, brown, fine to	coarse			Ę	5			
16-	-			63-34	47	SAND and fine to	o coarse GRA	VEL, some							
17-	-				36	Sill									
18-	-				10										
19-					46										
20-					90										
20-	S-7	24/0	20-22	47-46	44	S-7: No sample	recovered				6	5			
21-	1			54-53	37										
22-	S-8	24/0	22-24	41-53	34	S-8: No sample	recovered								
23-	-			23-22	50										
24-	-				60										
25-		0.4/7	05.07	04.07	00	0.0.)(
26-	5-9	24/7	25-27	24-37	44	S-9: Very dense SAND and fine to	, brown, fine to o coarse GRA	vcoarse VEL. some							
20					41	Silt		,							
27-	S-10	24/7	27-29	32-26	79	S-10: Very dense	e, brown, fine	to coarse							
28-				19-15	49	SAND, some fine	e to coarse Gr	avel, little Slit							
29-	S-11	24/0	29-31	13-8	40	S-11: No sample	recovered								
R E M A R K S	 SPT of 2. Boreh and ro Grour groun Driller Shale Driller on blo 	conducted note advan otary was ndwater r dwater. r roller bitt fragment noted litt ows and la	d using "safe nced from 0 h methods. eadings take ted ahead, p ts observed le to no resi ack of recov	ety" hamme to 4 feet be Drilling wa en after intre prior to drivi in sample s istance whe eries.	r and 2" d elow grade sh water i oduction o ng casing S-6. en removir	iameter split spoon sa e using 2-1/4" I.D. holl ntroduced to borehole of drilling fluid and mea from 10 to 29 feet. ng spoon S-7 from sar	ampler. Cobbles low stem augers e at 8 feet below asured groundwa npling depth. Po	3"x4" and 5"x4" Borehole advar grade to completi ater readings likel ossible that cobbl	remo nced ion o ly pe e wa	oved from t from 4 to 7 f boring. rched drilli s encounte	top foot 75 feet ng fluic ered ar	t. belo I and nd ad	ow grade with d not indicati dvanced dov	n 4" flush jo ve of actua vn by spoor	int casing
Strati and u	fication line	es represe litions state	ent approxima ed. Fluctuati	ate boundar	y between ndwater ma	soil types, transitions n ay occur due to other fa	nay be gradual. V octors than those p	Vater level reading present at the time	s hav mea	ve been ma surements	de at tir were	mes	Boring N	lo.: CF-11	

CHICOPEE FALLS LEVEE CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

CF-11 Boring No.: ____ Page: _____ of ____3

1		San	nple Infori	mation		Check: DMB									
Depth	No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Casing Blows/ Ft.	Sample Description & Classification	Remarks	Equipment Installed							
				6-5	30		FILL								
31 - 32 -	S-12 S-13	24/0 10/18	31-33 31-31.8		71 73	S-12: No sample recovered S-13: Brown, fine to coarse SAND, some Silt, little fine Gravel	22	7 8 9							
33- 34-	S-14	24/6	33-35	31-15 10-16	75 60	S-14: Medium dense, brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine to coarse GRAVEL, trace Silt	SAND AND GRAVEL								
35- 36-	S-15	24/0	35-37	19-22 22-29	99 120	S-15: No sampled recovered									
37 - 38 -	S-16	24/3	37-39	32-20 15-13	123 91	S-16: Dense, brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL, some fine to coarse Sand, little Silt									
39-	-				350/6"										
40-	S-17	24/12	40-42	28-31	88	S-17: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse									
41-	-			28-24	68	SAND, some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt (Piece of gravel observed in spoon tip.)									
42-	42-				76										
43-	-														
44-					143										
45-	S-18	S-18 24/16 45-47		31-31	74	S-18: Very dense, brown, fine to coarse									
46-				51-69	69	SAND, some Siit, little fine Gravel									
47-					75										
48-					91										
49- 50-					300	S-19: Brown, fine to coarse SAND and fine									
51-	S-19	3/1	50-50.3	100/3"	251		1	10							
52-					187										
53-	_				135										
54-	_				/5			11							
55-	S 20	24/0	55 57	21.25	100	S 20: Top 6": Brown find to coarse SAND									
56-	- 3-20	24/3	00 07	26-30	103	some fine to coarse Gravel, little Silt	56' SILT AND	-							
57-	-				100	Bottom 3": Brown, CLAY and SILT, little coarse Gravel	CLAY								
58-	-				81										
59-	-				116										
60-	S-21	24/24	60-62	12-17	89	S-21: Hard, brown, SILT and CLAY, trace	12								
61-	-			20-21	72	fine Sand Ty = 0.65 tsf									
<u>62</u>	-				72										
63-	-				76										
ģ 64-	-				93										
	 No re Hamr used Fallin Driller Shal 10. Shal 11. Drille 12. Tv = 13. PP = 	covery of ner dropp in sample g head te r roller bitt le fragme er noted h Field Tor = Pocket p	sample S-1. ed greater ti S-14. st conducted ed ahead, p nts observer leavy roller ti vane Shear penetromete	2. Therefo han 30" in a d over zone rior to drivi d in sample bit resistant Strength in er compress ate boundar	re sample attempt to between ng casing S-19. ce at 53 fe tons per sive streng	S-13 redrove into other side of borehole. Sample S-12 obtain recovery. Upon retrieval, playtex liner, inserted 31 to 35 feet, following sampling. from 31 to 35 feet and 39.5 to 75 feet. S-17 sampled o et. square feet (tsf). th readings in tons per square foot (tsf). soil types, transitions may be gradual. Water level reading	not conducted in a in spoon and resa pen hole. s have been made a	accorda mpled.	nce with ASTM D1586. Recovery successful. Liner also						
and mad	under cond	itions state	ed. Fluctuation	ons of grour	ndwater ma	by occur due to other factors than those present at the time	measurements were	e	Boring No.: CF-11						

CHICOPEE FALLS LEVEE CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS

Boring No.: <u>CF-11</u> Page: <u>3</u> of <u>3</u> File No.: <u>15.0702100.50</u> Check: DMB

		San	nple Infor	mation												
Depth	No.	Pen./ Rec. (in.)	Depth (Ft.)	Blows (/6")	Casing Blows/ Ft.	Sample Description & Classification	Stratum Desc.	Remarks	Equipment Installed							
	S-22	24/24	65-67	19-37	97	S-22: Hard, brown, Clayey SILT, little fine	SILT AND CLAY	13								
66-	1			39-82	70	Sand PP = >4 tsf (Silt)										
67-	1				52											
68-	1				66			14								
69-	-				86											
70-	S-23	24/24	70-72	22-20	63	S-23: Hard, brown, SILT and CLAY, trace										
71-	-			17-21	55	fine Gravel, trace fine Sand										
72-	-				65	Tv = 1 tsf										
73-	-				69											
74-	-				81											
75-	S 24	24/24	75 77	22.14	01	S 24: Hard brown CLAY and SILT										
76-	- 3-24	24/24	13-11	20-24		PP = 3.5 tsf										
77-						Tv = 1.45 tsf										
78-																
79-							78.5' WEATHERED	15								
80-							80'									
91_	<u>S-25</u>	1/0.5	80-80.1	100/1"		S-25: Red-brown, fine to coarse GRAVEL		16								
						Sand, little Silt										
82-]					End of Exploration at 80.1										
83-	1															
84-	1															
85-	1								-							
86-	1															
87-	1															
88-	1															
89-	1															
90-	1								-							
91-	-															
92-	-															
93-	-															
94-	-															
95-	-								-							
96-	-															
97-	-															
98-	4															
99-	-															
R E M A R K S	14. Drille 15. Drille 16. Bore	er noted r or noted h hole trem	od chatter a leavy roller l lie grouted t	t 68 feet. bit resistanc o ground su	ce at 78 fe urface with	et. Roller bitted additional two feet and sampled S-25. 1 1/2 tubs bentonite/cement grout (~30 gallons/tub) up	oon completion.									
Strati and u made	fication line	es represe itions state	nt approxima ed. Fluctuati	ate boundary ons of grour	/ between idwater ma	soil types, transitions may be gradual. Water level readings y occur due to other factors than those present at the time	s have been made a measurements were	at times e	Boring No.: CF-11							

SECTION A-3.3

GEOTECHNICAL LABORATORY RESULTS

Martha Dagree		ved			- σ ₃ Strai Laboratory Log	sf % Soil Description	Brown f-c SAND	some Silt, little fine Gravel (SM)	Brown f-c SAND	some f-c Gravel, little Silt (SM)	Brown f-c SAND	some fine Gravel, little Silt (SM)	Brown f-c SAND, little Silt	little fine Gravel (trace Org.) (SM)	Brown f-c SAND	some Silt, some f-c Gravel (SM)	Brown f-c SAND	some f-c Gravel, some Silt (SM)	Brown f-c SAND	little Silt, little fine Gravel (SM)	Brown f-c SAND	some Silt, little fine Gravel (SM)	Brown f-c SAND	some Silt, little f-c Gravel (SM)	Brown f-c GRAVEL and	f-c SAND, little Silt (GW-GM)	Brown f-m SAND	little Silt, little fine Gravel (SM)	Brown f-c SAND	some Silt, little f-c Gravel (SM)	Brown f-c SAND some Silt little fine Gravel (SM)
Reviewed		Date Review		trength Tests	$\frac{-}{\sigma_c}$ Failure σ_1 -	psf Criteria ^{Or}																									
bee, MA	ISE	010		2	It Perme- Torvane	f annuy of type cm/sec Test																									
Location Chicor	signed By R. Hou	port Date 3/24/20		sts	yd ORG Dry uni	^{2μ} % wt. pcf								5.4																	
S	Ass	Re	L	Identification Te	PL Sieve H	6 % %		31		19		15		15		28		22		15		25		28		10		26		24	28
od Control Work	0	Bjarngard			Water LL	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~																									
e Floc	100.5	or/A.			Lab	No.		25		26		27		28		29		30		31		32		33		34		35		36	37
Chicope	. 15.0702	r <u>M. Tayl</u>			Dout 6	nepui it		2-4		10-12		20-22		27-29		2-4		10-12		28-30		10-12		10-12		35-37		4-6		10-12	31-33
t Name	ject No.	ngineer			Sample	No.		S-2		S-5		S-7		S-9		S-2		S-5		S-11		S-5		S-5		S-12		S-3		S-5	
Projec	Proj	Project E			Boring	No.		CF-3		CF-3		CF-3		CF-3		CF-5		CF-5		CF-5		CF-6		CF-7		CF-7		CF-11		CF-11	CF-11

LABORATORY TESTING DATA SHEET

GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc.









Chicopee Flood Control Works 0.001 ٩ C \neg \checkmark \succ Chicopee, MA Ч ╘ WC SILT 0.01 Fines 14.9% Brown f-c SAND, little Silt, little fine Gravel (tr. Organics) (SM) Description #200 **U.S. STANDARD SIEVE AND HYDROMETER** 0.1 #100 Fine Grain Size (mm) 09# SAND #40 Medium #20 Sand 72.2% Depth (ft) 27-29' ~ #10 Coarse Sample 8-9 # Fine 9 Exploration GRAVEL CF-3 1/2" 3/4" Gravel 12.9% Coarse Lab # 28 2 ات 100 o 100 30 20 9 8 80 2 09 50 4 Percent Finer by Weight

K

3/18/10 3/24/10 GZA File # 15.0702100.50 Tested by: MST/PEC Date: sviewed by: MBP Date: Reviewed by:





K









NU

Reviewed by:



K

3/18/10 3/24/10





APPENDIX A-4.1

FREEBOARD



APPENDIX A-4.2

CLOSURES
SYSTEM PENETRATIONS SUMMARY	PEE FALLS
FLOOD SYSTE	CHICOPEE FA

11/12/2010	BEC, INC.

ltem	Location	Station	Description	Shown on USACE	Observed in field?	Comments	O&M MANUAL INFO.
-	Chicopee Falls	36+10	48" diam. RCP pressure drain with gate structure	YES	YES	Previously utilized by US Rubber Co. Gate located near Main Street in chamber operated and maintained by Clty	Sluice gates formerly operated for flushing lower level drainage system of former U.S. Rubber Co. consist of 48" diam. gravity discharge conduit, 24" sluice gate and a 48" sluice gate, under both normal & hood conditions, the 48" gate should remain wide open & the 24" ightly closed. During a localized storm causing local runoff not accompanied by a rise in the niver level above el. 90.0, the 24" gate should be opened completely and slowly closing the 48" gate to flush 24" diam. bypass pipe.
0	Chicopee Falls	36+10	24" diam. RCP storm drain connected to drop inlet	YES	YES	Outfall shares same headwall as 48° diam. RCP. Pipe outlets slotted drain near top of levee which is higer than the one percent chance flood elevation.	
σ	Chicopee Falls	48+00	30"x30" intake with gate structures on both sides	YES	YES	Previously utilized by U.S. Rubber Co. and no longer in use. Gate closed and pumps not operating.	See below * U.S. Rubber Co. no longer in operation. Gate is to be maintained in the CLOSED position.
4	Chicopee Falls	52+50	30" diam. RCP pressure drain	YES	YES	Outfall is from an area higher than the one percent chance flood elevation.	

* From Section VI of *Operation and Maintenance Manual*, USACE, 1984: "6-01. DESCRIPTION - Located at Sta. 48+00 are process water intake (30x30 sluice gate) and intake cooling water structure (30" wafer butterfly valve and 30" gate valve). Wafer butterfly maintains water levels between el. 77 and 79 in existing intake structure. 30" gate valve is, normally open but should be closed with cooling water pumps stopped. 6-03. OPERTION - When the river level is rising and reaches El. 79, the 30". 45 + 00 are process water intake (30x30 sluice gate) and intake cooling water pumps stopped. 6-03. OPERTION - When the river level is rising and reaches El. 79, the 30". 45 + 00 are structure behind the dike should be throttled and constantly controlled to maintain the water level in the pit between El. 77 & 79. The elev. of the top of the gate structure is 84.5. Therefore, the water heavel mater and are that the level at times is between 5.5 and 7.5 it below the top of the structure. This must be constantly watched as the level at times is between 5.5 and 7.5 it below the top of the structure. This must be constantly watched as the level at the level at the level at the rest as topped and the pressure through the water level in water level in the pit between 5.5 and 2.5 it below the top of the structure. This must be constantly watched as the level at the rest level at the rest level in the pit between 5.5 and 2.5 it below the top of the structure. This must be constantly watched as the level at the revel water head and the pressure through the water butterfly valve causes the water level in the pit to exceed EL 70. The sluce gate located on the river side of the dike should be kept open at all times. It should be closed only in the event of a rupture in the conduit between the 30" gate valve and the river."

APPENDIX A-4.3

EMBANKMENT PROTECTION

ANALYSIS OF EMBANKMENT PROTECTION CHICOPEE FALLS FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

CHICOPEE FLOOD CONTROL WORKS CITY OF CHICOPEE HAMPDEN COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS



October 2010

Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	.1
1.1	Chicopee Falls Flood Control System Description	.1
2	EMBANKMENT PROTECTION ANALYSIS	.2
2.1	Flow Velocity Impacts	.2
2.2	Wind and Wave Action	.4
2.3	Ice and Debris Impacts	.7
3	CONCLUSION	.7

<u>Tables</u>

Table 1.	Flow Velocities for Chicopee Falls Flood Control System along Chicopee River
Table 2.	Wave Height Computation Input and Results

Figures

Figure 1: Longest Fetch

Appendices

Appendix A. Flow Velocity Impact Calculations Appendix B. Wave Height Calculations

1 INTRODUCTION

The federal regulations pertaining to mapping of areas protected by levee systems require an analysis of embankment protection which demonstrates "that no appreciable erosion of the levee embankment can be expected during the base flood, as a result of either currents or waves, and that anticipated erosion will not result in failure of the levee embankment or foundation directly or indirectly through reduction of the seepage path and subsequent instability. The factors to be addressed in such analyses include, but are not limited to: Expected flow velocities (especially in constricted areas); expected wind and wave action; ice loading; impact of debris; slope protection techniques; duration of flooding at various stages and velocities; embankment and foundation materials; levee alignment, bends, and transitions; and levee side slopes" (44 CFR 65.10(b)(3)).

The analysis of embankment protection was performed in accordance with 44 CFR 65.10(b)(3) and by the application of methods and guidelines found in the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Engineering Manual on Hydraulic Design of Flood Control Channels (EM 1110-2-1601, Change 1, 30 Jun 94), USACE Coastal Engineering Manual, Part II (EM 1110-2-1100, Change 2, 1 August 2008), and United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service (USDA SCS) Handbook of Channel Design for Soil and Water Conservation (TP-61, 1954).

The following sources were consulted for information supporting the analysis of embankment protection:

- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), *Preliminary Flood Insurance Study Number* 25013CV001 (April 30, 2009).
- Heritage Surveys, Inc. Topographic Plan of Land in Chicopee, MA, (December, 2009).
- National Climatic Data Center, "Climatic Wind Data for the United States" (November 1998).

1.1 Chicopee Falls Flood Control System Description

The Chicopee River is described by lettered cross-sections in the Preliminary Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for Hampden County, MA (April 30, 2009). The segment of the Chicopee River along which the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System is located extends from approximately Cross-Section "U" (upstream) to Cross-Section "Q" (downstream). The Chicopee Falls Flood Control System consists of two segments of cast-in-place concrete floodwall and two segments of earthen levee, for a total length of 5,002 linear feet. From the Deady Bridge upstream extending for 557 linear feet downstream, the system consists of cast-in-place cantilever concrete floodwall. The upstream $400\pm$ feet of wall is founded directly on ledge with rock anchors, while the last $157\pm$ feet is founded on earth. The exposed wall height is approximately 20 feet on both the landside and the riverside. The next downstream segment of the system consists of $712\pm$ feet of earthen levee. The top of levee is approximately 17 feet higher than the landside grading. The second segment of cast-in-place cantilever concrete floodwall extends for another $863\pm$ feet downstream. This wall section is located on the inside of a bend in the Chicopee River where flow direction turns approximately 90 degrees from westerly to southerly. This entire segment of wall is

founded directly on ledge, and the exposed wall height is approximately 16 feet on the landside and 20 feet on the riverside. The second segment of earthen levee extends $2,870\pm$ linear feet downstream to complete the system.

Approximately eleven soil borings were recently performed along the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System and observed by GZA, and were advanced to depths ranging from approximately 20 to 80 feet below the ground surface (January/February, 2010). Seven (7) of the borings were performed either at the top of the levee near the riverside edge, or on the riverside slope. The borings indicated that soils near the surface of the levee consist primarily of sand with some gravel and silt.

Almost the entire length of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System is protected on the riverside with hand- or machine-placed stone riprap. The riprap is angular rock, $1\pm$ ft in diameter, on average, and placed to provide a reasonably smooth surface approximately 18 inches thick. The USACE Specifications for construction of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System indicate that "The material for stone slope protection shall consist of a well graded, angular quarry run stone which can be placed in an 18-inch layer. The maximum size stone shall weigh more than 200 pounds. The minimum size stone shall weigh less than 40 pounds. Material shall contain not more than 10 percent by weight of fragments that pass a two inch screen." Along the upstream section of floodwall, between the Deady Bridge and the beginning of the earthen levee section, the embankment riverward of the floodwall is covered mostly by grassy vegetation.

The City of Chicopee maintains the levees with regular mowing of the grass turf, repair of animal burrows, removal of drift and debris, repair of displaced riprap, and repair of erosion. Grass is generally maintained at a height between 4 and 8 inches.

2 EMBANKMENT PROTECTION ANALYSIS

2.1 Flow Velocity Impacts

Equation 3-3 of EM 1110-2-1601 computes the allowable characteristic side slope velocity of a channel based on the minimum riprap size of which 30% is finer by weight (D_{30}) and the local depth of flow. Based on the USACE's material specifications for stone slope protection described above in Section 1.1, the minimum size stone shall weigh less than 40 pounds. Assuming a unit weight of 100 pounds per cubic foot, a stone of 40 pounds is approximately 0.4 cubic foot in volume. A stone of 0.4 cubic foot in volume equates approximately to a rock of 0.91 feet in diameter. As most of the stone, as specified, must be greater than this size, it was assumed that the D_{30} for existing riprap along the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System is at least 0.91 ft, or 11± inches. Field inspections confirmed that the existing riprap generally conforms to the specifications. Therefore, as a check on slope protection along the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System, Equation 3-3 of EM 1110-2-1601 was used to estimate the characteristic side slope velocity for a D_{30} of 11 inches, under the consideration that existing riprap has a D_{30} of greater than 11 inches. The characteristic side slope velocity may be considered the allowable velocity for areas with riprap.

Equation 3-3 computes the characteristic side slope velocity based on the local depth of flow, both of which are typically taken at the subsection adjacent to the bank in the cross-section modeled in a water-

surface profile computation. However, FEMA did not perform a new detailed study of the Chicopee River as part of the *Preliminary Flood Insurance Study* (FIS) *Number 25013CV001* (April 30, 2009). Therefore, a hydraulic model from which characteristic side slope velocities and local depths of flow along the Chicopee River could be estimated was unavailable. The best available source for velocity and depth data was the tabulated mean floodway velocities and flood profiles for the Chicopee River published in the Preliminary FIS. Cross-sections 'Q' through 'U' from the Preliminary FIS overlap the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System along the Chicopee River. The mean floodway velocities and levee surface cover at the locations of these cross-sections are listed in the following table.

Based on the maximum depth of flow at the applicable cross-sections for the 1% annual chance event, as shown on the Flood Profiles for the Chicopee River in the FEMA FIS, the computed characteristic side slope (allowable) velocity as computed by Equation 3-3 for a D_{30} of 11 inches ranged from approximately 12.9 to 13.6 feet per second (fps). Calculations are attached in Appendix A.

Cross-section*	Distance in feet above confluence with Connecticut River*	Floodway Width (feet)*	Mean Floodway Velocity (feet per second)*	Levee Surface Cover
Q	12,100	339	6.1	Riprap
R	13,470	283	6.5	Riprap
S	15,040	201	10.5	Riprap
Т	16,090	282	6.8	Riprap
U	16,360	351	7.4	Vegetation

Table 1. Flow Velocities for Chicopee Falls Flood Control System along the Chicopee River.

*From Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), *Preliminary Flood Insurance Study Number 25013CV001* (April 30, 2009).

The mean floodway velocities indicated in the FEMA Preliminary FIS are under 12.9 fps at all of the cross-sections. At cross-sections 'Q', 'R', 'S', and 'T', the existing cover at the levee is adequate to protect against erosion, even conservatively assuming that the characteristic side slope velocities are equal to the mean floodway velocities from the 1% annual chance flood. In open channel flow, velocity is not uniform across the area in flow, due to the adhesion between the wetted surface of the channel and the water. Generally, the velocity is at a maximum towards the center of the channel cross-section, and decreases towards the edges of the channel cross-section. Thus, it is concluded that the existing riprap protection is more than adequate to protect the embankment against erosion from the 1% annual chance flood.

The embankment riverward of the floodwall at cross-section 'U' is vegetated, rather than surfaced with riprap. Table 2-5 of EM 1110-2-1601 provides suggested maximum permissible mean channel velocities for design of non-scouring flood control channels based on channel material. For a channel material of sandy silt with Kentucky bluegrass, the maximum permissible mean channel velocity is 5.0 feet per second (fps), provided that the grass cover is good and maintained properly. This is equal to the recommended permissible velocity for "easily eroded soil" covered with Kentucky bluegrass indicated in Table 3 of the Handbook of Channel Design for Soil and Water Conservation, TP-61 (USDA SCS, 1954).

The mean floodway velocity at cross-section 'U' of 7.4 fps exceeds the suggested maximum permissible mean channel velocity of 5.0 fps. However, it is likely that the velocity adjacent to the earthen slope is significantly less than 7.4 fps, due to the typical variations in velocity across an open channel. Furthermore, the section of the floodwall in the vicinity of cross-section 'U' is founded directly on ledge with rock anchors; thus, erosion of the embankment riverward of the floodwall in this area is unlikely to cause failure of the floodwall.

In summary, the majority of the riverside embankment along the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System is adequately protected against erosion from the 1% annual chance flood due to cover of riprap. Within the upstream section where the embankment riverward of the floodwall is covered by vegetation, the characteristic side slope velocity is likely such that the vegetation provides adequate protection against erosion from the 1% annual chance flood. Even if the vegetation did not provide adequate protection against erosion, the floodwall in this area is founded on ledge with rock anchors, and erosion of the embankment would be unlikely to cause failure of the floodwall.

2.2 Wind and Wave Action

The effects of wind and wave action were evaluated by estimating the maximum wave height using the simplified procedures in EM 1110-2-1100, Coastal Engineering Manual (Part II), 1 August 2008 (Change 2).

Wave prediction was based on an assumed sustained wind equivalent to the peak recorded wind gust at the Chicopee Falls/Westover Air Force Base recording station, located 75.0 meters above sea level. The peak gust of 79 miles per hour had a prevailing wind direction of west-northwest (WNW). Data were obtained from "Climatic Wind Data for the United States" (National Climatic Data Center, November 1998).

Using the "Step-by-step procedure for simplified estimate of winds for wave prediction" outlined in EM 1110-2-1100, the wind speed of 79 miles per hour (35 meters/second) was adjusted to represent overwater wind speed. The resulting wind speed used in subsequent analyses was 42 meters/second. Calculations are shown in Appendix B.

Wave height was estimated using the equations in EM 1110-2-1100 applicable to wave growth with fetch, in which the wave height depends on straight line fetch distance and wind speed. The straight line fetch distance was approximated by determining the location along the flood control system at which the longest fetch could occur over water in a WNW direction and during the base flood as indicated by FEMA floodplain mapping.

The longest fetch along the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System is $292\pm$ meters, located at the downstream end of the levee, as shown in Figure 1. At this location, available base flood freeboard is approximately 7.1 feet, which is representative of the lowest available freeboard along the system.

The estimated wave height was checked for shallow water limitations in accordance with the procedures in EM 1110-2-1100. Calculations are shown in Appendix B.

The input parameters and results are summarized in the following Table 2.

As the predicted wave height is less than the available freeboard for the base flood, overtopping is not expected to occur. Therefore, appreciable erosion and failure of the flood control system due to wave action is unlikely.

Flood Control System	Chicopee Falls
Peak Gust Wind Speed (mph)	79
Peak Gust Wind Speed (m/s)	35
Peak Gust Prevailing Wind Direction	WNW
Wind Speed Adjusted for Overwater (m/s)	42
Fetch (m)	292
Wave Height (m)	0.48
Wave Height (ft)	1.6
Available Freeboard for Base Flood (ft)	7.1

Table 2. Wave Height Computation Input and Results



2.3 Ice and Debris Impacts

There are no areas of the Chicopee Falls Flood Control System along the Chicopee River that are likely to experience direct impacts of ice or debris. The hydroelectric dam located upstream of the Deady Bridge will contain some of the ice and debris during the 1% annual chance flood. Ice formation on the Chicopee River through Chicopee is rare, and does not coincide with the typical timing of flood events during the spring months when the temperatures are above freezing. Average channel velocities of about 6 to 10 feet per second are such that it is not expected that any impacts of ice or debris will cause significant damage to the system.

3 CONCLUSION

No appreciable erosion of the levee embankment is expected during the base flood due to currents, waves, or ice and debris impacts which would result in failure of the levee embankment. The Chicopee Falls Flood Control System levee meets the requirements of 44 CFR 65.10 for embankment protection.

APPENDIX A-4.4

EMBANKMENT AND FOUNDATION SEEPAGE & STABILITY

EMBANKMENT AND FOUNDATION SEEPAGE AND STABILITY ANALYSIS CHICOPEE FALLS FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

CHICOPEE FLOOD CONTROL WORKS CITY OF CHICOPEE HAMPDEN COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS





November, 2010 GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc.

1 SEEPAGE

Seepage was evaluated for the Chicopee Falls Levee using SEEP/W 2007 a two-dimensional finite element seepage modeling software created by GEO-SLOPE International, Ltd, and analyzed in general accordance with USACE Technical Letter ETL 110-2-569 *Design Guidance for Levee Underseepage*. Seepage was evaluated for Normal and 100 Year Flood per FEMA regulations 44 CRF 65.2 and 65.10, assuming steady-state seepage conditions. Flow and exit gradients were estimated in the vicinity of the drain from SEEP/W results and compared to the limiting gradient criteria of 0.5. The seepage analyses were also performed with an assumed non-functional toe drain in order to determine if the required criteria would be met even with a compromised or non-functioning drain.

2 STABILITY

Slope Stability simulations were performed using guidance from USACE *Design and Construction of Levees*, EM 1110-2-1913 under normal and 100 year flood (steady-state seepage and sudden drawdown), for the landside and riverside slopes. Models were evaluated using SLOPE/W, a two-dimensional finite element slope stability modeling software created by GEO-SLOPE International, Ltd. utilizing the Spencer method and incorporating the parent SEEP/W model's seepage forces and phreatic surfaces. Staged Rapid Drawdown was modeled using the USACE 3-stage method.

3 TYPICAL SECTIONS

Station 13+30 (typical of Station 9+50 to 16+82 and 25+25 to 39+25) was selected as a representative cross-section to analyze the Chicopee Falls Levee system, as Station 13+30 had the loosest fill and loss of washwater was noted during boring (indicative of high permeability). Station 13+30 appears to represent the "worst case" along the Chicopee Falls Levee. An additional cross section was analyzed at Station 41+00 (typical of Station 39+25 to Station 50+00) that did not incorporate the gravelly sand layer. Two final cross sections were analyzed for seepage only at Station 9+00 (typical of Station 0+00 to 9+50) and 20+00 (typical of Station 16+82 to 25+50), as representative "worst-case" wall sections, where the difference between flood elevation and landside grade and/or difference between bottom of footing and top of bedrock were greatest.

4 SEEPAGE ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Hydraulic conductivities were estimated from grain-size distribution correlations and from published literature. Material properties and a typical cross-section can be found at the end of Appendix A-4.4. Boundary conditions were applied along the landside ground and wall surface. The toe drain was modeled as a point element with zero pressure head, surrounded by a flux section to estimate drain flow. An additional load case was modeled without the toe drain to check whether seepage would present an issue if the toe-drain was not functioning as designed. Elevations for normal and flood pools can be found in the Calculation Summary Sheets and the Freeboard Evaluation Plans at the end of Appendix A-4.4.

The computed exit gradients for the Chicopee Falls Levee system were found to be less than the limiting gradient criteria of 0.5, per ETL 110-2-569 *Design Guidance for Levee Underseepage*. The evaluated sections of the Chicopee Falls Levee had acceptable gradients for the 100-year flood with and without a functioning toe drain. Estimates of gradients and unit flow rates through the toe drain can be found in the Calculation Summary Sheet at the end of Appendix A-4.4.

5 STABILITY ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Minimum factors of safety against normal and flood conditions were conservatively assumed to be 1.4 using USACE guidance from EM 1110-2-1913. A specific factor of safety for sudden drawdown is not given in EM 1110-2-1913, but rather a range from 1.0 to 1.2 based upon the period of sustained flood level is recommended. GZA used a value of 1.0 for factor of safety against sudden drawdown in our analyses, which we consider appropriate based upon our assumption of steady-state seepage and instantaneous flood elevations. Material unit weights, strength and internal friction angle values were estimated using SPT N-value correlations and values from published engineering literature.

All computed factors of safety against sliding were greater than the minimums specified above.

GZA	Engineers and	JOB	15.070	2100.50 - Chicopee	River Levee
GeoEnvironmental, Inc.	Scientists	SHEET NO.	1	OF	2
One Edgewater Drive		CALCULATED BY	RDH/JGD	DATE	5/13/2010
Norwood, MA 02062		CHECKED BY	JGD	DATE	5/13/2010
781-278-3700		SCALE		N/A	
FAX 781-278-5701					
http://www.gza.com					

Objective: To assess seepage and stability of the **Chicopee Falls Section** of the Chicopee Flood Control Works

Method:

1) Develop typical cross section of levee at Station 13+30, typical from Station 9+50 to 16+82 and 25+25 to 39+25 (See attached figure).

2) Determine material parameters from test borings and typical values of similar materials.

3) Calculate location of phreatic surface within levee for normal and flood conditions, using SEEP/W. Calculate factor of safety against piping failure (where applicable).

4) Using pore water data from SEEP/W, calculate factors of safety against slope failure for the following load cases defined by requirements of EM 1110-2-1913, Section 6-7302. Steady-state factors of safety calculated for both riverside and landside slopes using Spencer method. Rapid drawdown factor of safety calculated using USACE 3-stage method.

Case #1 -	Steady-state seepage at normal	pool
		1

- Case #2 Steady-state seepage at 100yr Flood
- Case #3 Rapid Drawdown from 100 yr Flood (Riverside only)

5) Where applicable, the above load cases were also checked for non-functioning drains and/or cutoffs

Subsurface Information:

- Test borings CF-1 through CF-11 and Exploration Location Plan by GZA (2009)

- "Chicopee River Flood Control - Chicopee Falls, Chicopee River, Massachusetts" U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England Corps of Engineers, Waltham, Mass. Dated April 1963

- "Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project - Design Memorandum No. 5 - Embankments and Foundations" U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England Corps of Engineers, Waltham, Mass. Dated March 1963

Assumptions:

- Soil strata interpreted from available test boring data and design drawings, actual configuration may vary.

Material Properties:

	Total Unit	Effectiv	e Strength	Total St	rength	K Ratio	Saturated Ho	orizontal	
Strata	Weight, γ_t	Cohesion,	Friction	Cohesion, c	Friction	(k _v /k _h)	Permeabili	ty, k _{sat}	Notes
Impervious Fill	118	0	35	0	35	1	4.6E-06	1.4E-04	(2),(3)
Existing Fill	120	0	30	0	30	1	3.3E-05	1.0E-03	(4),(5)
Silty Sand	110	0	30	0	27	1	4.6E-06	1.4E-04	(2),(4)
Gravelly Sand	130	0	35	0	35	1	6.6E-05	2.0E-03	(2),(4)
Riprap	140	0	42	0	42	1	8.0E-03	2.4E-01	(1)
Sandstone	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.6E-06	5.0E-05	(1),(6)

(1) - Unit weight and permeability values based on typical values for similar materials

(2) - Permeability values estimated from correlations with grain size distribution

(3) - Drained strength values based on correlations from SPT-N testing, total strength values are estimated

(4) - Drained strength based on values in USACE design

(5) - Permeability values based values used in USACE report

(6) - Strength of sandstone not included in slope stability analysis (assumed impenetrable)

Analysis Results:

Case	River Elevation	Unit Flowrate, Q ⁽¹⁾ (through slope into drain)	Exit Gradient, i _e ⁽¹⁾	Limiting Gradient ⁽²⁾	OK?
1	Normal (El. ±83)	0 ft ³ /s/ft	N/A	0.5	Y
2	100yr Flood (El. 97.9)	3.3E-05 ft ³ /s/ft	0.04	0.5	Y
2a	100yr Flood (No Drain)	0 ft ³ /s/ft	0.14	0.5	Y

SEEPAGE ANALYSIS RESULTS - EXISTING CONDITIONS

- Note: Factor of safety values less than recommended values are shown in italics

(1) - Flow and exit gradient estimated from results of SEEP/W analysis at toe drain or landside face of the levee

(2) - Limiting gradient per requirements of US Army Corps Technical Letter ETL 1110-2-569 "DESIGN GUIDANCE FOR LEVEE UNDERSEEPAGE"



GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. One Edgewater Drive Norwood, MA 02062 781-278-3700 FAX 781-278-5701 http://www.gza.com

JOB	15.0702100.50 - Chicopee River Levee					
SHEET NO.	2	OF	2			
CALCULATED BY	RDH/JGD	DATE	5/13/2010			
CHECKED BY	JGD	DATE	5/13/2010			
SCALE	N/A					

SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - EXISTING CONDITIONS

Engineers and

Scientists

Load Case	Loading Condition	Loveo Faco	Facto	r of Safety	Commonts / Notos
Luau Case	Loading condition	Levee Face	Minimum	Existing	comments / Notes
1	Normal Conditions	Riverside	1.4	1.61	
I	Normal conditions	Landside	1.4	1.64	
2	100-year Flood (Steady State)	Riverside	1.4	1.73	
		Landside		1.62	
3	Sudden drawdown from 100yr Flood	Riverside	1.0 - 1.2 ⁽¹⁾	1.27	

SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - EXISTING CONDITIONS - NON-FUNCTIONING DRAINS

	Las dina Canditian		Facto	r of Safety	Commonte / Notes
Load Case	Loading Condition	Levee Face	Minimum	Existing	Comments / Notes
1	Normal Conditions	Riverside	1.4	-	Same as Previous
I	Normal Conditions	Landside	1.4	-	Same as Previous
2	100-year Flood (Steady State)	Riverside	1.4	1.70	
Z		Landside	1.4	1.47	
3	Sudden drawdown from 100yr Flood	Riverside	1.0 - 1.2 ⁽¹⁾	1.27	

- Note: Factor of safety values less than recommended values are shown in italics

(1) - FS = 1.0 applies to flood levels unlikely to persist for long periods prior to drawdown, FS = 1.2 applies to levels likely to persist for long periods prior to drawdown.

- Refer to Attached SLOPE/W slope stability analysis graphical results

J/hanch/NORWOOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Explorations/Calcs/Final/Station 0+00 to 39+25/



Elevation (ft., MSL)



Chicopee Flood Control - Chicopee Falls Section Chicopee, Massachusetts GZA Project No. 15.0702100.50

J:Branch/NORW OOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Exporations/Caks/Final/Station 0+00 to 39+25/

190



Chicopee Flood Control - Chicopee Falls Section Chicopee, Massachusetts GZA Project No. 15.0702100.50

115

Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explorations\Calcs\Final\Station 0+00 to 39+25\



Elevation (ft., MSL)

Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7'). Station 13+30 - 100yr Flood (No Drain)



Chicopee Flood Control - Chicopee Falls Section Chicopee, Massachusetts GZA Project No. 15.0702100.50

120

Station 0+00 to 39+25/ J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explor









Elevation (ft., MSL)

Chicopee Flood Control - Chicopee Falls Section Chicopee, Massachusetts GZA Project No. 15.0702100.50

120









Elevation (ft., MSL)

Chicopee Flood Control - Chicopee Falls Section Chicopee, Massachusetts GZA Project No. 15.0702100.50



J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explorations\Calcs\Final\Station 0+00 to 39+25\



Elevation (ft., MSL)

Chicopee Flood Control - Chicopee Falls Section

Chicopee, Massachusetts GZA Project No. 15.0702100.50

Station 0+00 to 39+25\ J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explor





Elevation (ft., MSL)

Station 0+00 to 39+25\ J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explor



J/Branch/NORWOOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Explorations/Calcs/Final/Station 0+00 to 39+25/



Elevation (ft., MSL)

Chicopee Flood Control - Chicopee Falls Section Chicopee, Massachusetts GZA Project No. 15.0702100.50 Station 13+30 Landside Slope Stability - 100yr Flood (No Drain) Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').





J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explorations\Calcs\Final\Station 0+00 to 39+25\



Elevation (ft., MSL)



GZA	Engineers and	JOB	15.07021	.00.50 - Chicopee	River Levee
GeoEnvironmental, Inc.	Scientists	SHEET NO.	1	OF	2
 One Edgewater Drive		CALCULATED BY	RDH/JGD	DATE	5/13/2010
Norwood, MA 02062		CHECKED BY	JGD	DATE	5/13/2010
781-278-3700		SCALE		N/A	
FAX 781-278-5701					
http://www.gza.com					

Objective: To assess seepage and stability of the **Chicopee Falls Section** of the Chicopee Flood Control Works

Method:

1) Develop typical cross section of levee at Station 41+00, typical from Station 39+25 to 51+15 (See attached figure).

2) Determine material parameters from test borings and typical values of similar materials.

3) Calculate location of phreatic surface within levee for normal and flood conditions, using SEEP/W. Calculate factor of safety against piping failure (where applicable).

4) Using pore water data from SEEP/W, calculate factors of safety against slope failure for the following load cases defined by requirements of EM 1110-2-1913, Section 6-7302. Steady-state factors of safety calculated for both riverside and landside slopes using Spencer method. Rapid drawdown factor of safety calculated using USACE 3-stage method.

<u>c</u>	Case #1 -	Steady	/-state see	page a	at n	orma	роо

- Case #2 Steady-state seepage at 100 yr Flood
- Case #3 Rapid Drawdown from 100 yr Flood (Riverside only)

5) Where applicable, the above load cases were also checked for non-functioning drains

Subsurface Information:

- Test borings CF-8 through CF-11 and Exploration Location Plan by GZA (2009)

- "Chicopee River Flood Control - Chicopee Falls, Chicopee River, Massachusetts" U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England Corps of Engineers, Waltham, Mass. Dated April 1963

- "Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project - Design Memorandum No. 5 - Embankments and Foundations" U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England Corps of Engineers, Waltham, Mass. Dated March 1963

Assumptions:

- Soil strata interpreted from available test boring data and design drawings, actual configuration may vary.

Material Properties:

	Total Unit	Effectiv	e Strength	Total St	rength	K Ratio	Saturated Ho	rizontal	
Strata	Weight, γ_t	Cohesion,	Friction	Cohesion, c	Friction	(k _v /k _h)	Permeabilit	t y, k_{sat}	Notes
Impervious Fill	118	0	35	0	35	1	4.6E-06	1.4E-04	(2),(3)
Random Fill	120	0	32	0	32	1	2.5E-03	7.6E-02	(1),(3)
Existing Fill	120	0	25	0	25	1	3.3E-04	1.0E-02	(4),(5)
Silty Sand	110	0	30	0	27	1	4.6E-06	1.4E-04	(2),(4)
Gravelly Sand	130	0	35	0	35	1	6.6E-05	2.0E-03	(2),(4)
Riprap	140	0	42	0	42	1	8.0E-03	2.4E-01	(1)

(1) - Unit weight and permeability values based on typical values for similar materials

(2) - Permeability values estimated from correlations with grain size distribution

(3) - Drained strength values based on correlations from SPT-N testing, total strength values are estimated

(4) - Drained strength based on values in USACE design

(5) - Permeability values based values used in USACE report

(6) - Strength of sandstone not included in slope stability analysis (assumed impenetrable)

Analysis Results:

Case	River Elevation	Unit Flowrate, Q ⁽¹⁾ (through slope into drain)	Exit Gradient, ie ⁽¹⁾	Limiting Gradient ⁽²⁾	OK?
1	Normal (El. ±80)	-	N/A	0.5	Y
2	100yr Flood (El. 93)	9.7E-05	0.05	0.5	Y
2a	100yr Flood (No Drain)	-	0.08	0.5	Y

SEEPAGE ANALYSIS RESULTS - EXISTING CONDITIONS

- Note: Factor of safety values less than recommended values are shown in italics

(1) - Flow and exit gradient estimated from results of SEEP/W analysis at toe drain or landside face of the levee

(2) - Limiting gradient per requirements of US Army Corps Technical Letter ETL 1110-2-569 "DESIGN GUIDANCE FOR LEVEE UNDERSEEPAGE"



GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. One Edgewater Drive Norwood, MA 02062 781-278-3700 FAX 781-278-5701 http://www.gza.com

JOB	15.0702100.50 - Chicopee River Levee					
SHEET NO.	2	OF	2			
CALCULATED BY	RDH/JGD	DATE	5/13/2010			
CHECKED BY	JGD	DATE	5/13/2010			
SCALE		N/A				

SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - EXISTING CONDITIONS

Engineers and

Scientists

		Laura Fara	Facto	r of Safety	· · · · ·	
Load Case	Loading Condition	Levee Face	Minimum	Existing	Comments / Notes	
1	Normal Conditions	Riverside	1.4	1.57		
1	Normal Conditions	Landside		1.56		
n	100 year Flood (Stoody State)	Riverside	1.4	1.71		
2	100-year Flood (Steady State)	Landside	1.4	1.56		
3	Sudden drawdown from 100yr Flood	Riverside	1.0 - 1.2 ⁽¹⁾	1.51		

SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - EXISTING CONDITIONS - NON-FUNCTIONING DRAINS

	Loading Condition		Facto	r of Safety	Commonte / Notes	
Load Case	Loading Condition	Levee Face	Minimum	Existing	Comments / Notes	
1	Normal Conditions Riverside 1.4		Normal Conditions	1.4	-	Same as Previous
I	Normal conditions	Landside	1.4	-	Same as Previous	
2	100 year Flood (Stoody Stote)	Riverside	1.4	1.70		
Z	100-year Flood (Steady State)	Landside	1.4	1.55		
3	Sudden drawdown from 100yr Flood	Riverside	1.0 - 1.2 ⁽¹⁾	1.51		

- Note: Factor of safety values less than recommended values are shown in italics

(1) - FS = 1.0 applies to flood levels unlikely to persist for long periods prior to drawdown, FS = 1.2 applies to levels likely to persist for long periods prior to drawdown.

(2) - Factor of safety not provided in EM 1110-2-1913

- Refer to Attached SLOPE/W slope stability analysis graphical results

120



Station 41+00 - Normal Conditions

5

Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').

J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explorations\Calcs\Final\Sta 39+25 to 51+15\

115



Elevation (ft., MSL)



Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explorations\Calcs\Final\Sta 39+25 to 51.

115



Elevation (ft., MSL)

Station 41+00 - 100yr Flood (No Drain)

Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



J:/Branch/NORWOOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Explorations/Calcs/Final/Sta 39+25 to 51-



Elevation (ft., MSL)

Station 41+00 - Landside Slope Stability - Normal Conditions Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



U:BranchINORWOOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Exporations/Calcs/Final/Sta 39+25 to 51+15/



Station 41+00 - Riverside Slope Stability - Normal Conditions Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



J:\Branch\NORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explorations\Calcs\Final\Sta 39+25 to 51-



J:\Branch\NORW OOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explorations\Calcs\Final\Sta 39+25 to 51+15\


Station 41+00 - Riverside Slope Stability - 100yr Flood Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



J:/Branch/NORWOOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Explorations/Catcs/Final/Sta 39+25 to 51+15/



Station 41+00 - Riverside Slope Stability - 100yr Drawdown Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



JriBranch/NORWOOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Explorations/Calcs/Final/Sta 39+25 to 51+15/



Station 41+00 - Landside Slope Stability - 100yr Flood (No Drain) Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



J:BranchiNORWOOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Explorations/Calcs/Final/Sta 39+25 to 51+15/



Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



J.3BranchiNORWOOD/CHICOPEE-LEVEE/Chicopee Falls Explorations/Calcs/Final/Sta 39+25 to 51+15/



Note: Elevations in Means Sea Level datum. To convert to NAVD88, subtract 0.7' (MSL = NAVD88 + 0.7').



J:\Branch\WORWOOD\CHICOPEE-LEVEE\Chicopee Falls Explorations\Calcs\Finah\Sta 39+25 to 51+15\

GZA	Engineers and	JOB	15.0702	100.50 - Chicopee	River Levee
GeoEnvironmental, Inc.	Scientists	SHEET NO.	1	OF	2
One Edgewater Drive		CALCULATED BY	JGD	DATE	6/17/2010
Norwood, MA 02062		CHECKED BY	ABB	DATE	
781-278-3700		SCALE		N/A	
FAX 781-278-5701					
http://www.gza.com					

Objective:	To assess seepage FS for the flood walls of the Chicopee Falls Section of the Chicopee Flood Control Works
Method:	 1) Develop typical cross section of flood wall at "worst-case" stations. a) Stations having the largest difference bewteen flood elevations and landside grade b) Stations having the largest difference bewteen the bottom of footing and top of bedrock. 2) Determine subsurface profile from closest test borings and Corps design drawings. 3) Using soil parameters developed for levee embankment analyses, calculate exit gradient using SEEP/W. If a soil layer exists for the wall section which wasn't used in the embankment analyses, estimate permeability using grain-size correlations (if tested)
	or typical values for similar materials. 4) The following cases were analyzed and compared to the USACE limiting gradient of 0.5:

Case #1 -100-yr Flood - Operating DrainCase #2 -100-yr Flood - No Drain

Subsurface Information:

- Test borings CF-1 through CF-11 and Exploration Location Plan by GZA (2009)

- "Chicopee River Flood Control - Chicopee Falls, Chicopee River, Massachusetts" U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England Corps

of Engineers, Waltham, Mass. Dated April 1963

- "Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project - Design Memorandum No. 5 - Embankments and Foundations" U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England Corps of Engineers, Waltham, Mass. Dated March 1963

Assumptions:

- Soil strata interpreted from available test boring data and design drawings, actual configuration may vary.

Material Properties:

		Saturated Horizontal		
	K Ratio	Permeability, k _{sat}		
Strata	(k _v /k _h)	ft/s	cm/s	Notes
Random Fill	1	3.3E-04	1.0E-02	(3)
Existing Fill	1	3.3E-05	1.0E-03	(1)
Silty Sand	1	4.6E-06	1.4E-04	(2)
Gravelly Sand	1	6.6E-05	2.0E-03	(2)
Riprap	1	8.0E-03	2.4E-01	(1)
Sandstone	1	1.6E-06	5.0E-05	(1)
Concrete	1	3.3E-11	1.0E-09	(1)

(1) - Permeability values based on typical values for similar materials

(2) - Permeability values estimated from correlations with grain size distribution

(3) - Permeability values based values used in USACE report

Analysis Results:

SEEPAGE ANALYSIS RESULTS - STATION 9+00 (TYPICAL FROM STATION 0+00 TO 9+50)

Case	River Elevation	Landside Elevation ⁽¹⁾	Max. Exit Gradient, i _e ⁽²⁾	Limiting Gradient ⁽³⁾	OK?
1	100yr Flood (El. 99.3)	83	0.03	0.5	ОК
2	100yr Flood (No Drain)	92	0.13	0.5	ОК

SEEPAGE ANALYSIS RESULTS - STATION 20+00 (TYPICAL FROM STATION 16+82 TO 25+50)

Case	River Elevation	Landside Elevation ⁽¹⁾	Max. Exit Gradient, i _e ⁽²⁾	Limiting Gradient ⁽³⁾	OK?
1	100yr Flood (El. 99.3)	84	<0.01	0.5	ОК
2	100yr Flood (No Drain)	88.5	0.03	0.5	OK

- Note: Factor of safety values less than recommended values are shown in italics

(1) - Landside elevation refers to grade or toe drain, depending on the case

(2) - Flow and exit gradient estimated from results of SEEP/W analysis at toe drain or landside ground surface

(3) - Limiting gradient per requirements of US Army Corps Technical Letter ETL 1110-2-569 "DESIGN GUIDANCE FOR LEVEE UNDERSEEPAGE"

APPENDIX A-4.5

SETTLEMENT

APPENDIX A-4.6

INTERIOR FLOODING

U.S. Department of Homeland Security Region I 99 High Street, 6th Floor Boston, Massachusetts, 02110-2320



July 19, 2010

The Honorable Michael D. Bissonnette 17 Springfield Street Chicopee, MA 01013

Appeal Resolution and Revised Preliminary Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map

Dear Mayor Bissonnette:

Thank you for your interest and engagement with us through the floodmap revision process. As you recall, preliminary Hampden County Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps (DFIRMs) and Flood Insurance Study (FIS) report were provided to your community on April 30, 2009. We recognize the impact the revised flood mapping could have on the community and have devoted close and serious attention to the matter. The purpose of this letter is to provide you with a revised preliminary DFIRM for your community, as well as to give you a status update and describe next steps in the process.

We have completed our preliminary review of the Interior Drainage Analysis submitted to FEMA on May 26, 2010 in support of the City of Chicopee's prior technical appeal that was submitted to FEMA during the 90-day appeal period offered for Hampden County. This appeal addressed the extent of the flooding represented on the preliminary DFIRMs in the vicinity of the drainage pump station locations behind the Chicopee Flood Control Systems and demonstrated a new extent of flooding based on an interior drainage analysis. While the technical analyses submitted for each individual pumping station demonstrates the ability of the flood control system to reduce flooding on the protected side of the levee system, FEMA cannot accept the appeal until the City attains certification of the Chicopee flood control system as providing protection from the 1percent-annual-chance flood. We are aware that the City continues to work closely with USACE to make improvements so that the Chicopee flood control systems may ultimately be certifiable. FEMA greatly appreciates your continued efforts towards reaching this goal. Once certification is achieved, the City may submit data at any time showing that the criteria of Title 44, Chapter 1, Section 65.10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR 65.10) have been met. If the required data and documentation are acceptable, FEMA will initiate a map revision to accredit the levee system and map the impacted areas on the landward side of the levee system as being protected from the 1percent-annual-chance flood. As the interior drainage analysis submitted appears to be technically valid, we will retain this appeal information so that it may be used in future mapping updates as described above and as appropriate.

Mayor Michael D. Bissonnette Page 2 of 3

In accordance with 44 CFR 65.10, it is the responsibility of the community or other party seeking recognition of a levee system, to provide the data and documentation defined and outlined in 44 CFR 65.10. Specifically, the design and construction data provided must be certified by a registered professional engineer or by a Federal agency with responsibility for levee design.

As was noted in the supporting analyses of your appeal, Plainfield Street Flood Control System along the Connecticut River is a continuation of a flood control system in the City of Springfield. As a result of the Springfield accredited flood control system and Springfield appeal resolution, the following current preliminary DFIRM panel has been revised and affects a portion of the City of Chicopee: 25013C0213C.

For your review and comment, we have mailed you a CD containing a PDF of the abovementioned revised preliminary DFIRM panel and a hard copy of the revised preliminary DFIRM panel was forwarded to your community's Floodplain Administrator. The revised copy will replace the current preliminary map panel for the community. Please note that not all panels in your community were affected by this revised preliminary issuance.

Your community will have 30 days from the receipt of this letter to comment on this revised information. All comments should be compiled and verified by the community and sent to FEMA Region I, attention:

David Mendelsohn 99 High Street, 6th Floor Boston, MA 02110

After this comment period has ended and all comments have been addressed, the Letter of Final Determination (LFD) will be sent to you. The new DFIRMs and FIS report for your community will become effective 6 months later. Following the LFD date and before the effective date, you will be reminded that your community must adopt new floodplain ordinances or modify existing ordinances as necessary to reflect any changes in the DFIRMs or FIS report, including reference to the new effective date. If you or other community officials have any questions regarding the floodplain ordinance for your community, you may raise them at the community coordination meeting if such a meeting is held, or you may discuss those issues with your State NFIP Coordinator. Approximately 1 or 2 months before the effective date, we will send your community printed copies of the DFIRMs and FIS report.

The floodmap gives your community the means to mitigate flood risk through improved floodplain management policies and tactics and enables your citizens to mitigate their risk through implementing flood-resistant building techniques and/or buying flood insurance. These maps can also play an important part of your community's disaster planning. It is important to FEMA that we collaborate with you to develop the most accurate flood maps possible. If you have any questions about the flood map update process , have suggested areas for improvement, or are interested in discussing the

Mayor Michael D. Bissonnette Page 3 of 3

enclosed data, please contact Kerry Bogdan with FEMA Region I, at (617) 956-7576 or David Mendelsohn with FEMA Region I, at (617) 832-4713.

Sincerely,

Mpchan & Jo

Michael J. Goetz, Branch Chief Mitigation Division

Enclosure: Revised Preliminary DFIRM CD

cc:

(Enclosure not included) The Honorable Deval Patrick, Governor The Honorable John F. Kerry, U.S. Senator The Honorable Scott Brown., U.S. Senator The Honorable John W. Olver, U.S. Congressman The Honorable Richard E. Neal, U.S. Congressman The Honorable James T. Welch, State Representative Natalie M. Blais, Congressman Olver's Office Thomas Hamel, Chief Operator, Chicopee DPW Stanley W. Kulig, Superintendent of Public Works Rosalie Starvish, Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc. Scott Michalak, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Richard Zingarelli, State Floodplain Manager, MA Dept. of Conservation and Recreation Kerry Bogdan, FEMA Region I David Mendelsohn, FEMA Region I Stuart Rooney, AECOM Laura Keating, Regional Service Center

INTERIOR FLOODING ANALYSIS CHICOPEE FALLS FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

CHICOPEE FLOOD CONTROL WORKS CITY OF CHICOPEE HAMPDEN COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS



May, 2010

Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	Sources of Flooding	2
1.2	Chicopee Flood Control Works Overview	2
1.3	Chicopee Falls System	3
2	INTERIOR HYDROLOGIC ANALYSIS	3
2.1	Precipitation	2
2.2	Interior Drainage Areas	4
2.3	Other Sources of Pumping Station Inflow	6
3	INTERIOR HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS	6
3.1	Main Street Pumping Station	7
3.2	Oak Street Pumping Station	7
4	COINCIDENT FREQUENCY ANALYSIS	8
5	RESULTS	11

Tables

- Table 2. Precipitation
- Table 3. Drainage Area Characteristics
- Table 4. Other Sources of Pumping Station Inflow
- Table 5. Elevations of Interest, feet (NAVD88)
- Table 6. Adjustments for Stage Frequency Curves
- Table 7. Probability of Exceeding a Given Interior Flooding Elevation, if the Exterior River Stage is at a Specific Elevation
- **Table 8. 1% Chance Interior Flood Results**

Figures

- Figure 1: Site Locus
- Figure 2: Main Street Pumping Station Drainage Area
- Figure 3: Oak Street Pumping Station Drainage Area

Figure 4: Soils Map

Appendices

Appendix A. Curve Number and Lag Time Calculations

Appendix B. Pumping Station Stage Storage Data

Appendix C. Pump Head Discharge Curves

Appendix D. Pump Test Data

Appendix E. River Stage Frequency Curves

Appendix F. Coincident Frequency Analysis

1 INTRODUCTION

The interior drainage analysis for the City of Chicopee's Chicopee Falls Flood Control System was performed in accordance with 44 CFR 65.10(b)(6), and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Engineering Circular on Certification of Levee Systems (EC 1110-2-6067).

The following sources were consulted for information supporting the interior drainage analysis:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Connecticut River Flood Control; Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project; Chicopee River, Massachusetts; Design Memorandum No. 2; General Design, Hydrology, Hydraulics & Geology (December 1962).
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance Manual For Flood Protective Works on Connecticut and Chicopee Rivers at Chicopee Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts (1984).
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Preliminary Flood Insurance Study Number* 25013CV001 (April 30, 2009)

All elevations referenced in this report are NAVD88 datum.

1.1 Sources of Flooding

The Chicopee Falls Flood Control System protects the Chicopee Falls section of the City of Chicopee from flooding along the Chicopee River.

1.2 Chicopee Flood Control Works Overview

The Chicopee Flood Control Works (CFCW) includes the Chicopee Local Protection Project (CLPP) and the Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project (CFLPP). The CFCW was constructed in four separated systems, namely the Willimansett System, the Plainfield Street System, the South Bank Chicopee River System, and the Chicopee Falls System. The CFCW, its four systems, and the sources of flooding are summarized below.

Chicopee Flood Control Works (CFCW)				
Chicopee Local Protection Project (CLPP)	Source of Flooding			
Willimansett System	Connecticut River			
Plainfield Street System	Connecticut River			
South Bank Chicopee River System	Chicopee River			
Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project (CFLPP)	Source of Flooding			
Chicopee Falls System	Chicopee River			

Table 1. City of Chicopee Flood Control Works

This report describes the interior drainage analysis for the Chicopee Falls System. In total, the Chicopee Falls System includes two (2) pumping stations. The attached locus plan (Figure 1) illustrates the locations of the Main Street and Oak Street pumping stations.

1.3 Chicopee Falls System

The Chicopee Falls System includes two pumping stations: the Main Street Pumping Station and the Oak Street Pumping Station, which discharge stormwater runoff and toe drain seepage from the low-lying areas landward of the flood control system. The $31\pm$ acre interior drainage area is divided between the Main Street Pumping Station to the north (upstream), at $16\pm$ acres, and the Oak Street Pumping Station to the south (downstream), at $15\pm$ acres. Collector drains which run alongside the flood control system discharge to both pumping stations. There also are floodwall and levee toe drains which discharge to the collector drains.

The two pumping stations are of a similar design. Each pumping station has one (1) gravity-flow outlet to the Chicopee River, which is used during low river stages. Each has sluice gates which control and direct the flow of stormwater runoff to either the gravity outlet or the pumping wet well, depending upon river conditions.

The Main Street Pumping Station's gravity outlet is a 36-inch square conduit. The pumping station houses two (2) Detroit diesel engines driving two (2) 16-inch propeller pumps, each with a rated capacity of 20 cubic feet per second (cfs) at a static head of 19.4 feet and a total dynamic head of 21.4 feet (river at high stage). Both pumps discharge through the pumping station's riverward wall, directly to the Chicopee River.

The Oak Street Pumping Station's gravity outlet is a 48-inch square conduit. The pumping station houses three (3) Detroit diesel engines and three (3) 16-inch propeller pumps, each with a rated capacity of 16 cfs at a static head of 21.1 feet and a total dynamic head of 23.5 feet (river at high stage). All three pumps discharge to the 48-inch outlet, which serves as a pressure conduit discharging to the Chicopee River when the appropriate sluice gates are closed.

2 INTERIOR HYDROLOGIC ANALYSIS

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center's Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS) was used to apply the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) curve number loss and unit hydrograph models to generate runoff hydrographs from each of the interior drainage areas. For each pumping station, the HEC-HMS model includes one or more subwatershed(s) that represents the interior drainage area. The model uses applied precipitation in the form of a hypothetical, SCS Type III, 24-hour storm distribution, and drainage area characteristics to generate runoff.

2.1 Precipitation

Precipitation was applied to each drainage area in the HEC-HMS model as a hypothetical, SCS Type III, 24-hour storm distribution. The depth in inches applied for each storm event frequency is summarized as follows.

Storm Event Frequency	24-Hour Precipitation Depth (inches)
1-Year	2.5
2-Year	3.1
5-Year	3.8
10-Year	4.5
25-Year	5.2
50-Year	5.8
100-Year	6.6
500-Year	7.9

Table 2. Precipitation

The precipitation depths for the 2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, 50-, and 100-year frequency storm events were obtained from the Intensity-Duration-Frequency (IDF) curve for Springfield, Massachusetts, from the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT), Highway Design Manual (1997). These curves were compiled from information included in Technical Paper No. 25, *Rainfall Intensity-Duration-Frequency Curves*, U.S. Weather Bureau (December, 1955). The depth for the 1-year frequency storm event was taken from Technical Paper (TP) No. 40, *Rainfall Frequency Atlas of the United States* (1963), as the Springfield IDF curves did not exhibit a 1-year frequency event. The depth for the 500-year frequency storm event was extrapolated from the existing data.

2.2 Interior Drainage Areas

The City of Chicopee provided mapping of the areas draining to each pumping station based upon stormwater collection systems and the current status of combined sewer system diversions and separation efforts. Neither of the Chicopee Falls System pumping stations are believed to receive wet weather flow discharges from combined sewer systems within Chicopee Falls. Drainage areas were delineated based on the information provided by the City, as well as a review of existing topography taken from *Topographic Plan of Land in Chicopee, MA*, Heritage Surveys, Inc. (Preliminary-December 12, 2009), and the Massachusetts Geographic Information System (MassGIS) Digital Elevation Model (February, 2005). Other sources of information which were reviewed as part of the drainage area delineations include the USACE design documents for each of the pumping stations, and the following plans as they relate to drainage:

1. Map of Phased Recommended Plan, Final Long-Term CSO Control Plan, Chicopee, Massachusetts, Tighe & Bond Consulting Engineers (October, 2009)

Existing conditions were reviewed in the field to validate these prior plans. The interior drainage areas for the Main Street and Oak Street Pumping Stations are shown on Figures 2 and 3, and the computed areas in acres of each drainage area are included in Table 3.

The SCS (USDA's Soil Conservation Service, now the Natural Resources Conservation Service) runoff curve number (CN) is an empirical parameter used in hydrology for predicting direct runoff or infiltration from rainfall excess. The CN is widely used and is an efficient method for determining the approximate amount of direct runoff from a rainfall event in a particular watershed or drainage area. It is a function of the hydrologic soil group (HSG), the land use/cover complex, and the antecedent moisture condition.

These three watershed factors have the most significant impact in determining runoff from a watershed, and, in conjunction with precipitation data, provide the basis for runoff volume estimation.

The HSG is identified for each soil type in the SCS soil classification system. There are four groups ranging from A, for soils with high infiltration rates and low runoff potential, to D, for soils with low infiltration rates and high runoff potential. The MassGIS SCS soil group datalayer was utilized to identify the soil types within each drainage area. Each soil type was then categorized according to its HSG by reference to the Hampden County Soil Survey (SCS). For those soils which had a compound classification (e.g. were classified as C/D, B/C, etc.), a single representative HSG was calculated, based on a weighting of the individual soils in the map unit. A map of soil types within the drainage areas to the Main Street and Oak Street Pumping Stations is included as Figure 4.

The land uses within each drainage area were identified by reference to the MassGIS Land Use 2005 datalayer. The land uses were modified to reflect current conditions as needed. Each land use is associated with a curve number depending on the HSG within the area. A composite curve number for each drainage area was generated based on the areas of each HSG within each land use. Tables summarizing the composite curve number calculation for both drainage areas are included in Appendix A. Average antecedent soil moisture conditions (Condition II) were assumed. The resulting curve numbers are listed in Table 3.

The SCS unit hydrograph method applies the lag time to scale the dimensionless generalized hydrograph to produce the unit hydrograph used in the analysis. The standard lag is defined as the length of time between the centroid of precipitation mass and the peak flow of the resulting hydrograph. Studies by the SCS found that in general the lag time can be approximated as 60% of the time of concentration, which was applied for this analysis.

The time of concentration is the time required for water to travel from the most hydrologically remote point in the drainage area to the point of collection. It is computed as the sum of the travel times of sheet flow, shallow concentrated flow, and channel or pipe flow. The travel time of sheet flow depends on the length of flow, surface cover, precipitation intensity and slope. For this analysis, the length of sheet flow was assumed to be on the order of 50 to 100 feet, while the slope was assumed to be 2 percent. The precipitation intensity was represented by the 2-year, 24-hour rainfall depth using the Welle and Woodward (1986) equation for sheet flow (McCuen, R.H., <u>Hydrologic Analysis and Design</u>, 2nd ed., 1998). The Manning's Roughness Coefficient (n) for overland flow surfaces represents surface cover effects.

The travel times of shallow concentrated flow and channel/pipe flow are computed based on the velocity of flow. The velocity of shallow concentrated flow was computed using the Manning's Equation. By applying assumed values for the hydraulic radius and Manning's n coefficient, the equation is simplified to provide a relationship between the velocity and the average slope of the surface. The hydraulic radius and Manning's n are incorporated into a factor, k, which varies with surface cover. The slope of shallow concentrated flow was assumed to be 2 percent for this analysis.

Chicopee Falls is a highly-developed area; thus, drainage is delivered to the pumping stations via a network of pipes. Therefore, the last segment of the time of concentration calculation assumes pipe flow. Flow capacities of these closed systems were not specifically computed, as that effort is beyond the scope of this analysis. The travel time is computed as the length of pipe flow divided by the velocity of flow. A velocity of 2.5 feet per second was assumed for pipe flow in Chicopee Falls. The lag times for each drainage area are included in Table 3.

Table 3. Drainage Area Characteristics

Drainage Area	Area (acres)	Curve Number	Lag Time (minutes)
Main Street	16	88	50
Oak Street	15	92	10

Appendix A includes the calculations for the composite SCS runoff curve number and lag time for each drainage area.

2.3 Other Sources of Pumping Station Inflow

As indicated in the table below, the Main Street and Oak Street pumping stations receive inflow from the toe drains, generally limited to periods of high river stage. The toe drain seepage flows applied in the model are based on information provided in the USACE design reports for the pumping stations. There are no additional sources of inflow to the pumping stations.

Table 4. Other Sources of Pumping Station Inflow

Pumping Station	Assumed Toe Drain Seepage Flow (cfs)
Main Street	6 (during high river stage only)
Oak Street	4 (during high river stage only)

3 INTERIOR HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS

HEC-HMS is used to evaluate the hydraulics of discharge from each interior area to the river through the levee. During an interior storm event, interior drainage may discharge to the river via a gravity outlet through the levee, or by being pumped through the pumping station. The method of discharge will depend on the exterior river stage during the interior storm event, identified on the river frequency curves as the Pump Activation Elevation. In HEC-HMS, the potential interior flooding area is represented by a reservoir. HEC-HMS has the capability of modeling discharge from a reservoir through gravity outlets and/or by pumping. Models were developed for each pumping station that incorporate both gravity outlets and pumping. In addition, the model includes setting a tailwater on each reservoir to represent the exterior river stage.

Reservoirs are defined in HEC-HMS by a stage-storage curve. Reservoir stage-storage data for each of the pumping stations was determined based on the Digital Elevation Model (Feb., 2005) provided by the Massachusetts Geographic Information System (MassGIS). The storage volume between elevations was computed using ESRI's ArcGIS 3D Analyst. The Main Street and Oak Street pumping stations do not have storage ponds; thus, the potential flood storage areas were defined by the topographical characteristics of each drainage area's lower elevations. The storage provided by the sump for each pumping station

was incorporated into the stage-storage data. The stage-storage data for each pumping station is included in Appendix B.

The pumps are defined in HEC-HMS by pump-head discharge curves, which are based on the pump capacity information provided in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' "Analysis of Design" documents prepared for each of the pumping stations. The discharge varies with the head on the pump which depends on the exterior river stage. The pump-head discharge curves are included in Appendix C. The derivation of the curve for each pumping station is described below.

For simplicity in modeling, it was conservatively assumed that the efficiency of the drainage systems conveying runoff to each pumping station is 100%. That is, it was assumed that all direct runoff generated over the drainage area was able to enter the drainage system and reach the pumping stations with no delay or surcharging. In reality, inefficiencies (such as undersized pipes or clogged inlets) of the drainage system would impede the conveyance of direct runoff to the pumping stations. Modeling results indicated no interior flooding at Main Street and Oak Street pumping stations; thus, it was deemed unnecessary to further refine the models for these pumping stations by including some allowance for the inefficiency of the drainage systems.

The specific assumptions applied to the hydraulic model for each pumping station are described as follows.

3.1 Main Street Pumping Station

Pump capacity curves were not provided in the USACE Design Memorandum No. 2, General Design, Hydrology, Hydraulics & Geology (December 1962) for the Main Street Pumping Station. However, pump design capacities were provided for two values of pump head; thus, a simplified pump head-discharge curve was developed using the provided values. The two pumps at the Main Street Pumping Station were field tested on April 1, 2010, to verify pumping capacities. The Chicopee River elevation was below the pump discharge elevation during the test. Two trials were performed for each pump, in which the time to reach various stages in the wet well was recorded. The average pump rate for each pump was then computed. The pump tests indicated an overall pumping station pumping rate equivalent to about 82% of the design pumping rates provided. Pump test data is included in Appendix D. The subsequent interior drainage analysis was conducted for both full design pumping rates and at reduced pumping rates. Full station capacity consists of two 16-inch pumps.

3.2 Oak Street Pumping Station

Pump capacity curves were not provided in the USACE Design Memorandum No. 2, General Design, Hydrology, Hydraulics & Geology (December 1962) for the Oak Street Pumping Station. However, pump design capacities were provided for two values of pump head; thus, a simplified pump head-discharge curve was developed using the provided values. The three pumps at the Oak Street Pumping Station were field tested on April 1, 2010, to verify pumping capacities. The Chicopee River elevation was below the pump discharge elevation during the test. Two trials were performed for each pump, in which the time to reach various stages in the wet well was recorded. The average pump rate for each pump was then computed. The pump tests indicated an overall pumping station pumping rate equivalent

to about 65% of the design pumping rates provided. Pump test data is included in Appendix D. The subsequent interior drainage analysis was conducted for both full design pumping rates and at reduced pumping rates equivalent to 65% of the design pumping rates, which is representative of documented pumping rates. Full station capacity consists of three 16-inch pumps.

Elevations of interest for these pumping stations are listed below.

Pumping Station Location Riverine 100-Year Flood Approximate Exterior **Ground Elevation at** at Pumping Station at Pumping Station Elevation of Levee Pump Activation **Gravity Outlet** Elevation of Elevation of Elevation Location Location Pumping Station 76.3 81.8 89.0 104.4 94.6 Main Street Oak Street 78.3 85.1 99.3 91.4 75.3

 Table 5.
 Elevations of Interest, feet (NAVD88)

4 COINCIDENT FREQUENCY ANALYSIS

The federal regulations pertaining to mapping of areas protected by levee systems indicates that the analysis of interior flooding must be based on "the joint probability of interior and exterior flooding" (44 CFR 65.10(b)(6)). The USACE Engineering Circular on Certification of Levee Systems (EC 1110-2-6067) states: "The analysis of interior flooding is based on a coincident analysis of exterior and interior stages that includes the capacity of gravity and blocked gravity drainage features. Coincident analysis for interior areas is explained in Chapter 4 of EM 1110-2-1413, Hydrologic Analysis of Interior Areas. For riverine levee systems, the interior analysis considers interior rainfall events during both low river stages (gravity conditions) and high river stages when the gravity outlets are closed (blocked conditions) and the performance of pumping stations as might exist." The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Engineer Manual, "Hydrologic Analysis of Interior Areas" (EM 1110-2-1413) provides guidance for a "Coincident Frequency Method" of analysis which computes the percent chance exceedance frequencies of various interior flooding elevations based on the probabilities of exceeding given exterior river stages during different interior storm events. Coincidence is the degree to which the interior and exterior events occur at the same time. The Coincident Frequency analysis provides a method to compute the joint probability of interior and exterior flooding and to determine the base flood elevation for interior areas.

The Coincident Frequency Method is a probabilistic approach that is applicable to areas where the occurrence of the exterior and interior events are independent, such that the physical and meteorologic processes of the exterior and interior events are unrelated. Relatively small interior areas located along large rivers, such as in Chicopee, are typically independent. At the confluence of the Connecticut River and the Chicopee River, the watershed to the Connecticut and Chicopee Rivers are $9,000\pm$ square miles and $722\pm$ square miles, respectively. The drainage area to the Main Street Pumping Station is 16 acres and to the Oak Street Pumping Station is 15 acres. The ratio of river watershed to interior drainage area is approximately 30,000:1. As such, the behavior of interior runoff generation is highly independent of the river's hydrologic behavior, and the Coincident Frequency Method is a valid approach in this setting.

In accordance with the Coincident Frequency Method, the probability of exceeding a given interior flooding elevation, "A", is computed as follows:

$$P(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [P(A/Bi) \times P(Bi)]$$

Where:

A = given interior flooding elevation;

Bi = given exterior river stage, from i = 1 to n stages;

P(A) = total probability of attaining a given interior flooding elevation;

P(Bi) = probability that the river is at a given exterior river stage;

P(A/Bi) = probability of attaining a given interior flooding elevation if the exterior river stage is at a specific elevation.

The river stages, Bi, and probabilities of each river stage, P(Bi), were determined from the Chicopee River Stage Frequency curves developed by the local USGS gage data at Indian Orchard, Springfield, MA (USGS 01177000). The period of record spans from 1928 to the present. The Chicopee River modified stage frequency curves at Main Street and Oak Street Pumping Stations were determined by translating the Indian Orchard gage data to the locations of the pumping stations based on the stages at each location, as indicated by the flood profiles computed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project Design Memorandum No. 2. The differences in stage vary with discharge; thus, the translated stages were computed depending on the recorded discharge at Indian Orchard.

Table 6. Adjustments for Stage Frequency Curves

From USACE Profiles:

Chicopee River Discharge, cuft/sec	Main St. Stage, feet (NAVD88)	Oak St. Stage, feet (NAVD88)	Indian Orchard Stage, feet (NAVD88)
10,000	85.0	82.4	136.6
70,000	96.8	94.7	142.6

Stage Adjustment, as compared to Indian Orchard gage data:

Chicopee River Discharge, cuft/sec	Main St. Stage, feet (NAVD88)	Oak St. Stage, feet (NAVD88)	
10,000	- 51.6	- 54.2	
70,000	- 45.8	- 47.9	

Each location-specific stage frequency curve is divided into stage intervals, with each stage interval represented by an index stage, Bi. The probability of each index stage, P(Bi), is computed as the fraction of the percent of time the index stage is equaled or exceeded, in accordance with EM 1110-2-1413. The Chicopee River stage frequency curves for each pumping station are reproduced in Appendix E.

The probability of attaining a given interior flooding elevation if the exterior river stage is at a specific elevation, P(A/Bi), is considered as equivalent to the annual probability of the interior storm events evaluated in the model, as follows:

Interior Storm Return Period (Year)	Interior Storm Annual Probability (P(A/Bi))
1	1 000
2	0.500
5	0.200
10	0.100
25	0.040
50	0.020
100	0.010
500	0.002

 Table 7. Probability of Attaining a Given Interior Flooding Elevation, if the Exterior River Stage is at a Specific Elevation.

Each interior storm event is analyzed at each exterior river index stage to compute each corresponding interior flooding elevation. The probabilities associated with the various combinations of interior storm events and exterior stage which produce a given interior flooding elevation are multiplied and then summed to compute the total probability of exceeding that interior flooding elevation. A plot of interior flooding stages versus the total probabilities of exceeding each interior flooding stage reveals the interior flooding stage at which the total probability is equal to 0.01 (1%). This recurrence interval is selected by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as the "base flood" for estimating the extent of interior flooding and the calculation of flood insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

Appendix F reproduces the coincident frequency analysis matrices and resultant curves. Matrix One computes the values of $[P(A/Bi) \times P(B)]$ for each of the selected river index stages. Each index stage is the midpoint elevation of a selected range of river stage. Matrix Two identifies the interior flood storage elevation for each interior storm event and for each river index stage. The family of curves on Graph One illustrates the relationship of the interior flood elevation and the $[P(A/Bi) \times P(B)]$ values for each river

index stage. Then, for each interior flood elevation, the intercept of each index stage curve is summed to provide a value of \sum [P(A/Bi) x P(B)], which is the probability of interior flooding to that particular elevation. These values are then plotted on Graph Two and, for purposes of FEMA interior flooding mapping, P(A) was set at 0.01. The 1% change interior flood elevation is then read directly off Graph Two using linear interpolation between adjacent data points.

5 RESULTS

The computed interior stages resulting from the analyses of various combinations of exterior river index stage and interior storm return period for each pumping station are shown on the Coincident Frequency Analysis Matrices in Appendix F. For each pumping station, also included in Appendix F is the summation of probabilities to compute the total probability of exceeding a given interior flooding elevation and determination of the resulting 1% chance interior elevation. The 1% chance interior elevation at each pumping station is summarized in the table below. Also shown is the total area and average depth of interior flooding.

Using design pumping capacities, the computed flood elevation at the Main Street pumping station was 78.6, and at the Oak Street pumping station was 78.7. The predicted 1% chance interior flood elevations at both the Main Street and Oak Street pumping stations do not exceed the lowest ground surface elevations within their respective drainage areas, as indicated by the topographic contours generated from the MassGIS Digital Elevation Model. Therefore, there is no interior flooding associated with the 1% chance event at either of these pumping stations. Using modified pumping rates in the modeling, based on the pumping field tests as described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, had no impact on the resulting 1% chance interior flood extent and elevations.

Pumping Station	1% Chance Interior Flood Elevation (ft, NAVD88)	Total Area of 1% Chance Interior Flood (acres)	Average Depth of 1% Chance Interior Flood (ft)
Main Street	78.6	0	0
Oak Street	78.7	0	0

 Table 8.
 1% Chance Interior Flood Results

Figures









APPENDIX A-4.7

OTHER DESIGN CRITERIA (STRUCTURAL)

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS CHICOPEE FALLS FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

CHICOPEE FLOOD CONTROL WORKS CITY OF CHICOPEE HAMPDEN COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS



October, 2010

Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc.



BACKGROUND

GZA's understanding of the project is based on our review of 44CFR65.10, our work at the site, discussions with the City of Chicopee, and the following project documents:

• A Plan set, entitled "Connecticut River Flood Control Project, Chicopee Falls, Mass., Plans for the Local Protection Project, Construction of, Chicopee River, Massachusetts," prepared by the U.S Army Engineer Division, New England, Corp of Engineers, Waltham, Mass., dated June 1963, sheets 1- 68.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Chicopee Falls system is comprised of two sections of concrete flood wall, one approximately 530 feet long and the other approximately 860 feet long, installed at the top of an earthen embankment. The first wall section begins at the South abutment of the Deady Memorial Bridge, at project station 4+37.5 and extends about 530 feet to the west to Sta 9+69.8 along the southern/eastern shore of the Chicopee River. The final 20 feet at the western terminus of the floodwall, Sta 9+49.8 to Sta 9+69.8, is embedded in an earthen dike. The dike continues along the shore to the west until the second section of wall begins at project station 16+81.5. The second wall extends about 860 feet to the west along the eastern shore of the Connecticut River, to Sta 25+44.5. The final 20 feet at each end of the second wall is embedded in earthen dikes. The second length of dike, starting at Sta 25+24., extends to the southern terminus of the flood control system.

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION

Our structural engineers reviewed the original design documents in order to determine the assumed loading conditions and to review how the structural elements were designed. The results of the original analysis were compared to the current USACE guidance to verify that the structures meet current design requirements specified in the following documents:

1. USACE Manual EM 1110-2-2100 Stability Analysis of Concrete Structures.

2. USACE Manual EM 1110-2-2104 Strength Design for Reinforced Concrete Hydraulic Structures.

3. USACE Manual EM 1110-2-2502 Retaining And Flood Walls.

A total of eleven different wall sections between two sets of stations: 4+37.5 to 9+69.8 and 16+81.5 to 25+44.5 have been evaluated for this analysis with the methods prescribed in Reference 3. Our engineers evaluated each section for the load condition of the 1-percent-annual chance flood as required by FEMA Regulations 44 CFR 65.10. Analysis parameters and results are included in this Appendix 4.7. It is our opinion that the floodwalls will perform adequately under the 1-percent-annual-chance flood.

As prescribed by the USACE, the floodwalls were evaluated for sliding stability, overturning stability, foundation soil bearing capacity and strength and serviceability of the floodwalls. The floodwalls were analyzed as inland flood walls, critical structures with Case R1, "Usual Loading" conditions applied. Elevations and geometry data were taken from the 1963 USACE Construction Drawings referenced above, adjusted for the current survey datum. The flood wall section analysis is heavily based on Example 3 on page N-22 of Reference 3.

MATERIAL PROPERTIES

Subsurface conditions varied significantly over the length of the floodwalls. The original construction drawings indicate that much of the northern portion of the floodwall adjacent to the Deady Bridge is founded on rock and that the wall footing is secured with rock anchors. The subsurface investigations undertaken for this evaluation encountered weathered rock in the vicinity of the bottom of wall footing, east (up-station) of Sta $6+00\pm$.

The effects of rock anchors were conservatively neglected in our analyses. In the original design documents, the floodwalls were designed for a flood elevation greater than the 1-percent-annual-chance flood upon which this current evaluation is based. The higher flood level necessitated the use of rock anchors (in the design calculations) to maintain wall stability. Confirmation of the rock anchor installation was not included in this evaluation as the current analyses indicate that they are not required for stability during the 1-percent-annual-chance flood.

Table 1 - Material properties for the wall sections analyzed were selected based on the original design calculations and field observations made for this report.

MATERIAL PROPERTIES		
Backfill Soil:		
Cohesion of Backfill soil un-drained	0.00	PSF
Cohesion of Backfill soil drained	0.00	PSF
Friction angle of backfill soil	26.50 - 35.00*	DEG
Developed friction angle = $.0.667$ x friction angle	17.67 – 23.33*	DEG
Coefficient of earth pressure at rest (Ko = 1 -sin)	0.43 - 0.55	
Unit weight of soil backfill per unit volume	100.00 - 130.00*	PCF
Unit weight of water	62.50	PCF
Saturated unit weight of soil	125.00 - 135.00*	PCF
Buoyant unit weight	62.50 - 72.50*	PCF
Buoyant unit weight on land side due to seepage	78.81 - 123.06*	PCF
Concrete:		
Unit Weight of Concrete	150.00	PCF
Unconfined Compressive Strength	4000.00	PSI

Steel Reinforcing Strength	60000.00	PSI
Depth of concrete cover for deign	3.00 - 4.50*	IN
Strength reduction factor	0.90	
Shear factor	0.85	

* Values vary along length of wall. For specific values refer to Wall Analysis Data Sheets

Lateral Soil Forces

Lateral soil forces were calculated based on methods prescribed in Reference 3. We have assumed that a vertical soil tension crack will form at the riverside (RS) edge of the footing thus minimizing any active soil forces on the RS of the wall and footing. The passive soil force on the landside (LS) of the wall is included for bearing pressure and overturning calculations but neglected for the sliding stability analysis. All wall sections analyzed meet or exceed all of the USACE recommended factors of safety. For the wall section models, the ground surface elevations on the riverside and landside vary but are considered to be level as they extend away from the wall. Since the active and passive soil pressures are neglected in the sliding analysis, the coefficient of active and passive earth pressures are not calculated. To balance the wall in the lateral direction for the calculation of bearing pressures, we have calculated a required passive soil pressure to achieve this balanced condition. The engineer then reviewed this "back-calculated" coefficient to decide if this value is reasonable. This value is presented as "Kp required to balance horizontal forces" on the analysis summary page.

Sliding Stability

Floodwall sliding stability was evaluated based on Reference 3, Section 4-14. The friction factor for sliding was based upon either a cast-concrete/soil or cast-concrete/rock interface, depending upon location. The contribution of any potential sliding resistance of the rock anchors was neglected.

Bearing Capacity

Floodwall foundation bearing capacity was evaluated based on Reference 3, Chapter 5. Given the firm nature of the underlying rock or soils and the width of the footings, bearing capacity is not an issue of concern for the subject walls.

APPENDIX A-6

CITY OF CHICOPEE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE MANUAL (BOUND SEPARTELY)

APPENDIX B – City of Chicopee Project Endorsement
Richard J. Kos Mayor

Michael L. Bachand, P.E. Levee Safety Program Manager United States Army Corps of Engineers New England District 696 Virginia Road Concord, Massachusetts 01742

Re: City of Chicopee Chicopee Falls – Flood Control Works Intent to Apply for Section 408 Approval

Dear Mr. Bachand:

The City of Chicopee is proposing to backfill the lower tier of the former Uniroyal property in Chicopee with excess construction soils prior to redevelopment. Earlier this year we discussed the proposal with you at an initial coordination meeting attended by City Department of Public Works and Community Development staff, our Consultants, BETA Group Inc., and Special Environmental Counsel, Louis Moore. We believe that the proposed backfilling can be done safely and cost effectively to enhance the property and eliminate long term operating and maintenance costs related to the flood control structure.

Please consider this the City's Letter of Intent to Apply for Approval under 33 U.S.C., § 408. It is the City's understanding that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will assign staff to this project to provide assistance with and coordination of the necessary permitting and approval requirements. We are proceeding with the technical review and initiating design calculations for the proposal. We will be working with designated USACE staff on these issues as well as coordinating on real estate issues and permitting requirements.

Accordingly, I am requesting that you advise Michael Vedovelli, the City's Director of Community Development, of the USACE technical and legal staff assigned to this project. In the meantime, please contact Mr. Vedovelli at (413) 594-1489 or <u>mvedovelli@chicopeema.gov</u> with any questions or concerns related to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Richard N 1/2-

Richard J. Kos Mayor

cc: Jeff Neece, Chicopee DPW
Joe Kietner, Chicopee DPW
Michael Vedovelli, Chicopee OCD
Alan Hanscom, BETA Associates, Inc.
Louis S. Moore, Esq., Annino, Draper & Moore, P.C.



City Hall • Market Square • 17 Springfield Street • Chicopee, Massachusetts 01013 Tel. (413) 594-1500 • Fax (413) 594-1504 • E-Mail mayorkos@chicopeema.gov

APPENDIX C – Slope Stability Analysis, OTO, Sept. 2016

EnvironmentalSafetyHealthGeotechnical

O'Reilly, Talbot & Okun

293 Bridge Street Suite 500 Springfield, MA 01103 Tel 413 788 6222 Fax 413 788 8830 www.oto-env.com

J2463-03-01 September 14, 2016

BETA Group, Inc. 315 Norwood Park South Norwood, Massachusetts 02062 Attn: Alan Hanscom

Re: Chicopee Levee Slope Stability Uniroyal Filling Project Chicopee, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Hanscom:

This letter presents results for the slope stability analysis for the Uniroyal Filling project located in Chicopee, Massachusetts. Our work involved the review of previous plans and reports prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Baystate Environmental Consultants (BEC), stability analyses of the proposed conditions, and preparation of this report. No subsurface information or testing was performed as part of this project. The analyses presented in this report are limited to the assumed conditions as described below. Should any of the conditions change, we recommend that additional analyses be performed to evaluate the proposed changes.

This letter is subject to the attached Limitations.

SITE INFORMATION & PROPOSED WORK

The Site is located within the former Uniroyal Complex off Grove Street in Chicopee, Massachusetts. Specifically, the area addressed in this letter is located within the lower level, western portion of the Site, adjacent to the Chicopee River levee. At the time of this letter, we understand that a portion of the buildings within the proposed work area have been demolished and that the remaining buildings will be demolished prior to the start of filling. Existing condition plans prepared by Heritage Survey, Inc. and dated 2009 are attached as Sheets 1 through Sheet 5.

The proposed work will consist of filling behind the levee with excess construction soils as part of an overall redevelopment of the Site. The fill will be placed in the low lying areas created between the levee and the sloping terrain in the eastern portion of the Site. We understand that backfill soils will consist of excess construction soils from local construction sites. The soils may contain oil and hazardous constituents at concentrations below reportable conditions in the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP). A Beneficial Use Determination (BUD) will be obtained from the MassDEP to allow the subject fill soils to be reused at the Site. Since fill will be placed against the existing levee, a permit from the USACE will also be obtained.

We understand that the area to be filled is approximately located between levee stations 30+00 and 50+00. This area does not extend to the floodwall located further upstream,



which terminates at approximate station 25+50. According to project plans, the fill soils will be placed to the approximate top of the levee (approximate elevation 100); therefore, maximum fill heights will be on the order of 15 feet. A final grading plan has not been prepared at the time of this letter; however, we have assumed that the fill soils on the land side (east) of the levee, extend along a relatively flat surface until grades are matched to the east.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The slope stability analysis was based on information provided in the following documents:

- Plan titled "Topographic Plan of Land in Chicopee, Massachusetts, Surveyed for The City of Chicopee" by Heritage Surveys, Inc., dated December 12, 2009;
- Plan set titled "Connecticut River Flood Control Project, Chicopee Falls, Mass" prepared by Green Engineering Affiliates, Inc. for the U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England, dated April 1963;
- Design memorandum titled "Chicopee Falls Local Protection Project, Design Memorandum No. 5" by the U.S. Army Engineering Division, New England, dated March 1963;
- "FEMA Accreditation Report, Chicopee Falls Flood Control System" by Baystate Environmental Consultants, Inc., dated November 2010; and
- "Design and Construction of Levees Engineering Manual"- EM 1110-2-1913, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, dated April 2000.

The information obtained from these sources that were used in our evaluation included the following:

- Details on levee construction;
- Design flood elevations and river levels;
- Existing ground surface topography;
- Subsurface information; and
- Soil properties.

SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS

Slope stability was evaluated using the SLOPE/W computer program using the Spencer method. The SLOPE/W program performs a limit equilibrium analysis using various analytical methods to determine the factor of safety and the critical failure surface. The Spencer method, which assumes that the resultant interslice forces have constant slope through the sliding mass, was chosen per USACE guidance.

The slope stability for typical design conditions of the work area was evaluated using a limit equilibrium analyses. The Spencer Method determines the critical failure surface and the minimum factor of safety. Levee slope stability was analyzed for critical design condition as described in the USACE *Design and Construction of Levees*, EM 1110-2-1913, namely under normal, 100 year flood conditions, and rapid drawdown. For these analyses, only failure into the river side was considered, since the placement of fill on the landward side increases the resistance to failures in that direction. The results of the recent analyses are attached.



Model Information

Our analysis was performed on a section modeled at Station 41+00, which is described in BEC's report as being typical of station 39+25 to station 50+00. In addition, a "worst case" section was analyzed at Station 13+30. This section is typical of Stations 9+50 to 16+82 and Stations 25+25 to 39+25. Levee geometry was based upon typical cross sections provided in the "Connecticut River Flood Control Project, Chicopee Falls, Mass" plan set and stability analysis provided in BEC's report. Soil properties were based upon information provided in BEC's report. A table of soil values used in the analysis is provided below.

	Total Unit Weight (lb/ft3)	Effective Strength		Total Strength	
Soil Layer		Cohesion	Friction	Cohesion	Friction
Compacted Impervious Fill	118	0	35	0	35
Compacted Gravel Fill	120	0	32	0	32
Silty Sand	110	0	30	0	27
Till	130	0	35	0	35
Riprap	140	0	42	0	42
Crushed Fill	120	0	30	0	30

Table 1 Soil Properties

Notes:

1. Assumed soil properties based upon values provided in 2010 BEC report.

The sections were analyzed for the three separate conditions as described in the USACE manual: rapid drawdown (performed using the USACE 3-stage method), long-term (steady seepage during 100 year flood conditions), and normal water conditions. Analyses of each of these potential failure mechanisms for existing conditions were previously evaluated by BEC, and were documented in their November 2010 FEMA Accreditation Report (a copy of the pertinent portion of that report, Appendix A-4.4 is attached). An additional condition was analyzed for total embankment failure during rapid drawdown. In general, this analysis forced the failure plane to be seated within the underlying silty sand (or weakest layer).

As provided in the USACE design manual, the recommended minimum factor of safety for rapid drawdown is between 1.0 to 1.2, and the recommended minimum factor of safety for long term (steady seepage) is 1.4. A specific factor of safety for normal water conditions is not provided in the USACE design manual; therefore, a value of 1.4 was used.

Results

Based upon our analysis, the computed factors of safety for the proposed conditions met or exceeded the required minimums specified above. The results are compared to previous values and required minimums are shown in Table 2. In general, the computed values for each condition were similar to the computed values by BEC and the proposed landside filling has only minimal impact on levee stability. Therefore, it appears that the proposed fill will likely have little effect on the stability of the levee.

	A	USACE Minimum		
Condition	Proposed Conditions		Existing Condition	Factor of Safety
	Station 41+00	Station 13+30	BEC Factor of Safety	
Normal Water Conditions	1.5	1.5	1.6	None Provided ^{1.}
Long Term (Steady Seepage)	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.4
Rapid Drawdown	1.4	1.2	1.3 - 1.5	1.0 - 1.2
Total Embankment (Failure within silty sand)	2.4	1.7	Not Analyzed	None Provided ^{1.}

Table 2Factors of Safety Against Sliding

Notes:

1. No minimum factor of safety provided, assumed to be 1.4

This analyses are limited to the assumed conditions as described above. Should any of the conditions change, we recommend that analyses be performed to evaluate the proposed changes.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

To limit the buildup of hydrostatic pressures against the landside of the levee, we recommend that a drainage layer be placed between the landside slope and proposed construction fill. The drainage layer should consist of a minimum of one foot of crushed stone wrapped in a non-woven geotextile fabric and be tied into the existing toe drain. A typical drainage detail is attached as Figure 1. The crushed stone should meet the grain size requirements presented in Table 3.

Size	Crushed Stone Percent Finer by Weight		
4 inch	100		
1 inch	100		
³¼ inch	90-100		
1∕₂ inch	10-50		
3∕₃ inch	0-20		
No. 4	0-5		

Table 3Grain Size Distribution



Geotechnical Engineering Services Slope Stability Uniroyal Filling Project Chicopee, Massachusetts

We appreciate the opportunity to be considered for this project. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours, O'Reilly, Talbot & Okun Associates, Inc.

M.9 .

Stephen McLaughlin Project Engineer

Ashley/L. Sullivan, P.E. Project Reviewer

J. Talbot, P.E. Principal

Attachments: Limitations, Topographic Plans (Sheet 1 through 5), Drainage Detail, OTO 2016 Slope Stability Analysis – Proposed Fill Condition, BEC Appendix A-4.4 – 2010 Embankment and Foundation Seepage Stability

O:\J2400\2463 BETA GROUP INC\03-01 Permitting of Filling Uniroyal Site Front St Chicopee MA - Geotech Srvs\Slope Stability\Slope Stability 9-14-16.doc

LIMITATIONS

LIMITATIONS

- The observations presented in this report were made under the conditions described herein. The conclusions presented in this report were based solely upon the services described in the report and not on scientific tasks or procedures beyond the scope of the project or the time and budgetary constraints imposed by the client. The work described in this report was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Terms and Conditions attached to our proposal.
- 2. The analysis and recommendations submitted in this report are based in part upon the data obtained from widely spaced subsurface explorations. The nature and extent of variations between these explorations may not become evident until construction. If variations then appear evident, it may be necessary to reevaluate the recommendations of this report.
- 3. The generalized soil profile described in the text is intended to convey trends in subsurface conditions. The boundaries between strata are approximate and idealized and have been developed by interpretations of widely spaced explorations and samples; actual soil transitions are probably more erratic. For specific information, refer to the boring logs.
- 4. In the event that any changes in the nature, design or location of the proposed structures are planned, the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report shall not be considered valid unless the changes are reviewed and conclusions of this report modified or verified in writing by O'Reilly, Talbot & Okun Associates Inc. It is recommended that we be retained to provide a general review of final plans and specifications.
- 5. Our report was prepared for the exclusive benefit of our client. Reliance upon the report and its conclusions is not made to third parties or future property owners.

SITE PLANS

DRAINAGE DETAIL



2016 SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS -PROPOSED FILL CONDITION



















Station 13+30 - Normal Water Conditions













Station 13+30 - 100yr Rapid Drawdown - Embankment Failure

APPENDIX D – Easement and Survey Plans





Ô	TRAFFIC SIGNAL
	RAILROAD CONTROL BOX
Ø	RAILROAD SWITCH
Ô	SHRUB
Q	ROCK
≝	MARSH SYMBOL
Ō	HYDRANT
\bowtie	GATE /VALVE
\bowtie	
0	UNCERTAIN HYDRANT
- M	MANHOLE
ŏ	UNCERTAIN MANHOLE
⊕	CATCH BASINS
	UNCERTAIN CATCH BASIN
- O -	UTILITY POLE
- 수 -	UTILITY POLE WITH LIGHT
¢	STREET LIGHT
+	GUY ANCHOR
-0-	UNCERTAIN UTILITY POLE
	UTILITY BOX
0	POLE
0	POST
0	UNCERTAIN POLE
+	ROAD SIGN
\boxtimes	MONUMENT
0	UNCERTAIN OBJECT
×723.8	SPOT HEIGHT
x74.0	FIELD LOCATED GRADE
\frown	TREE
2 {	

~		\mathbf{v}	\sim	×
^	•	^	~	~
Δ		Δ	Δ	_Δ
—×—	-×—->	<—×—	-×	×——×—
	۸	Δ	Λ	Δ







Page 1 of 1

6/17/2016



· 像)心,这些个正确。 1.10 € 305,⁵⁰⁰_ BOSTON & MAINE R. R. CO. 1180 PLAN AND SURVEY BY TIGHE & BOND, CONSULTING ENGINEERS BOWERS ST., AT PEQUOT ST. HOLYOKE, MASS. 2 Jugar SIGNED E.U. BAYON () DATE: 23 AUG. 1963 SHEET 2 OF 2 F.B.; CHICOPEE 12 8 13 CHICOPEE FALLS LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT CHICOPEE, MASS. PLAN OF LAND AQUIRED BY THE CITY OF CHICOPEE FOR CHICOPEE FALLS LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT SCALE: 1"= 100" Muslim E. Mief DIRECTOR & CHIEF ENGINEER MASS. WATER RESOURCES COMM FILE NO. APPROVED: DATE: Cyres. 14, 19604 1.3. Le. · •



71-59 A



部署

32635 Υ. Hampden County Register of Deeds Reo'dlay1981_arth hid Pm ecorded in Book o' Plens 200 Page 57 ATTEST: n John Bur Lynch REGISTE RESERVED FOR REGISTERS USE ONLY -NOG-08-01"E _____ 149.84 TOTAL STREET (VARIABLE WIDTH) \$2)¹⁷ 貿易 STATES OF 2537- PAGE PARCELS 192 285-31-01"E-438.15 MEAS. (438.06 VB VBEAS. FORMERLY AMERICA COURT FORMERLY MIDDLE STREET STREET STREET STREET H. G. LUCIER FIELD WORK: D. W. THOMPSONI COMPLICATIONS: I CERTIFY THAT THIS FLAN AND SURVEY LAND IN D.T. HUNTLEY CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS D. M. THOMPSON SURVEYED FOR UNIROYAL, INC. F) 1" = 50' owner TE: 0CT08ER 29 ,196 ALMER HUNTLEY, JR. B. ASSOCIATES, INC. SURVEYORS - ENGINEERS - PLANNERS WEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS. 125 PLEASANT STREET No. 2006 NORTHAMPTON, MASS. JOB # 160-004-1 SHEET: Z OF. 4 DATE Stater 29.1981

QUITCLAIM DEED

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that **FACEMATE CORPORATION** a/k/a DHJ FACEMATE CORPORATION of 5 West Main Street, Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts,

In accordance with an Agreement for Judgment filed with the Hampden County Superior Court, Civil Docket No. HDCV2005-00299

grant to THE CITY OF CHICOPEE, a municipal corporation duly established under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and having its usual place of business at 17 Springfield Street, Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts

WITH QUITCLAIM COVENANTS

The land located in the City of Chicopee, County of Hampden, Commonwealth of Massachusetts and as bounded and described in the attachment hereto marked "Exhibit A", together with all buildings and improvements and structures located thereon.

Subject to facts shown on survey prepared by Almer Huntley, Jr. & Associates, Inc. dated October 29, 1981 as set forth in Book of Plans 200, Pages 54 thru 61.

BEING a portion of the premises conveyed to the grantor herein by deed of UNIROYAL, INC. dated November 10, 1981 and recorded with the Hampden County Registry of Deeds in Book 5191, Page 343.

"THIS TRANSFER DOES NOT CONSTITUTE ALL OR SUBSTANTIALLY ALL OF THE ASSETS OF THE GRANTOR CORPORATION."

Executed as a sealed instrument this 30^{30} day of April 2009.

WITNESS

FACEMATE CORPORATION Its President and Treasurer Walter F. Mrd 2005K

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

HAMPDEN, SS.

April 30,2009

On this 30^{44} day of April 2009 the undersigned notary public, personally appeared Walter F. Mroziuski , who proved to me through satisfactory evidence of identification, which was a Massachusetts Drivers License, to be the person whose name is signed on the preceding or attached document, and acknowledged to me that he signed it voluntarily for its stated purpose on behalf of Facemate Corporation.



XIM

Notary Public LAURA EDEN HEEMSKERK My Commission Expires: 12/24/15

EXHIBIT "A"

The following are descriptions of three (3) parcels of land in Chicopee, Massachusetts, shown on 4 sheets of a plan by Almer Huntley, Jr., & Associates, Inc., Surveyors, Engineers, Planners, 125 Pleasant Street, Northampton, Massachusetts entitled "Land in Chicopee, Massachusetts Surveyed for – Uniroyal, Inc." and are bounded and described according to said plan as follows:

PARCEL – A

Beginning at an iron pin on the Westerly line of land of the Boston & Maine Railroad at the Southeasterly corner of land of Chicopee Manufacturing Corporation;

<u>Thence</u>, running Southerly along a curve to the left having a radius of 5445.24 feet an arc distance of 110.25 feet to a point of compound curvature;

<u>Thence</u>, running Southerly along a curve to the left having a radius of 2424.19 feet an arc distance of 141.70 feet to an iron pin;

<u>Thence</u>, running S83°-52'-32"E a distance of 40.25 feet to a point, the last three (3) courses being along the Westerly line of Boston & Maine Railroad;

<u>Thence</u>, running Southerly along land of unknown owners along a curve to the left having a radius of 2384.19 feet an arc distance of 41.56 feet to a point;

<u>Thence</u>, running N83°-52'-32"W a distance of 57.88 feet to the Northeast corner of a 4 story brick building;

<u>Thence</u>, running S06°-31'-30"W along the East face of said building 27.61 feet to a point;

<u>Thence</u>, running Southerly along a curve to the left having a radius of 2445.42 feet an arc distance of 95.121 feet to a point of compound curvature;

<u>Thence</u>, running Southerly and Southeasterly along a curve to the left having a radius of 802.36 feet an arc distance of 263.74 feet to a point;

Thence, running S22°-52'-02"E a distance of 94.28 feet to a point;

<u>Thence</u>, running Southeasterly along a curve to the right having a radius of 8658.28 feet an arc distance of 453.56 feet to a point of compound curvature;

<u>Thence</u>, running Southerly along a curve to the right having a radius of 3028.30 feet an arc distance of 93.00 feet to an iron pin at the Southeasterly corner of the parcel herein described, the last seven (7) courses being along land of the Boston & Maine Railroad;

<u>Thence</u>, running S65°-05'-00"W along land of unknown owners a distance of 135 feet, more or less, to a point on the East edge of the Chicopee River;

<u>Thence</u>, running Northwesterly and Northerly along the East edge of the Chicopee River 1525 feet, more or less, to a point;

<u>Thence</u>, running S83°-23'-38"E along land of Chicopee Manufacturing Corporation 340 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

The above described parcel contains 10.07 acres, more or less.

PARCEL – B

Beginning at an iron pin on the Southerly line of Oak Street at the intersection with the Southwesterly line of Grove Street;

<u>Thence</u>, running S27°-53'=55"E along the Southwesterly line of Grove Street 758.42 feet to an iron pin on the Northwesterly line of Front Street;

<u>Thence</u>, running S20°-01'-14"W along the Northwesterly line of Front Street 592.96 feet to an iron pin at the Northeasterly corner of land of Stanley Kopcienski & Jennie Frances Kopcienski;

<u>Thence</u>, running N70°-45'-46"W along said Kopcienski 209.80 feet to an iron pin on the Easterly line of the Boston & Maine Railroad;

<u>Thence</u>, running Northwesterly along a curve to the left having a radius of 1004.57 feet an arc distance of 28.60 feet to a point of compound curvature;

<u>Thence</u>, running Northwesterly along a curve to the left having a radius of 3144.55 feet an arc distance of 153.68 feet to a point;

Thence, running N23°-25'-23"W a distance of 143.85 feet to a point;

Thence, running N19°-37'-95"W a distance of 111.51 feet to a point;

Thence, running N37°-39'-08"W a distance of 63.19 feet to a point;

<u>Thence</u>, running Northwesterly along a curve to the left having a radius of 8740.78 feet an arc distance of 347.36 feet to a point;

Thence, running N22°-52'-02"W a distance of 94.28 feet to a point:

<u>Thence</u>, running Northwesterly and Northerly along a curve to the right having a radius of 719.86 feet an arc distance of 236.62 feet to a point of compound curvature;

<u>Thence</u>, running Northerly along a curve to the right having a radius of 2,362.94 feet an arc distance of 108.37 feet to a point, the last nine (9) courses being along the Easterly line of the Boston & Maine Railroad;

<u>Thence</u>, running S83°-23'-07"E along land of unknown owners and along the Southerly line of Oak Street 452.92 feet to the point of beginning.

The above described parcel contains 13.112 acres.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM said parcel previously conveyed to Chicopee Municipal Employees Credit Union by deed dated January 9, 1987 and recorded with the Hampden County Registry of Deeds in Book 6493, Page 595.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM said parcel previously conveyed to Thomas M. Zombik and Veronica T. Zombik by deed dated January 31, 1989 and recorded with the Hampden County Registry of Deeds in Book 7089, Page 304.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM said parcel previously conveyed to John Salema a/k/a Joao Salema and Natalia Salema a/k/a Maria N. Salema by deed dated May 8, 1997 and recorded with the Hampden County Registry of Deeds in Book 9855, Page 107.

PARCEL – C

Beginning at an iron pin on the Northwesterly line of Front Street at the Southeasterly corner of land of Thaddeus M. Cygan & Caroline A. Cygan;

<u>Thence</u>, running S19°-59'-46"W along the Northwesterly line of Front Street 371.99 feet to a point;

<u>Thence</u>, running Southwesterly along said Front Street along a curve to the right having a radius of 620.28 feet an arc distance of 97.61 feet to an iron pin at the Northeasterly corner of land of Front Street Automotive and Parts, Inc.;

<u>Thence</u>, running N79°-28'-42"W along said Front Street Automotive and Parts, Inc. 151.82 feet to an iron pin in the Northeasterly line of land of the Boston & Maine Railroad;

<u>Thence</u>, running N48°-27'-12"E a distance of 112.28 feet to a point;

Thence, running N37°-28'-26"E a distance of 109.46 feet to a point;

<u>Thence</u>, running Northeasterly and Northerly along a curve to the left having a radius of 722.02 feet an arc distance of 295.08 feet to an iron pin at the Southwesterly corner of the aforementioned Cygan; the last three (3) courses being along land of the Boston & Maine Railroad;

<u>Thence</u>, running S69°-50'-14"E along said Cygan 103.95 feet to the point of beginning.

The above described parcel contains 42,545 square feet, more or less;

DONALD E. ASHE, REGISTER HAMPDEN COUNTY REGISTRY OF DEEDS

QUITCLAIM DEED

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that DHJ FACEMATE CORPORATION A/K/A FACEMATE CORPORATION of 5 West Main Street, Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts,

In accordance with an Agreement for Judgment filed with the Hampden County Superior Court, Civil Docket No. HDCV2005-00299

grant to THE CITY OF CHICOPEE, a municipal corporation duly established under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and having its usual place of business at 17 Springfield Street, Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts

Hereby grants to the Grantee all the Grantor's right, title and interest, without any warranties or covenants of title whatsoever, in a certain parcel of land, and the buildings, fixtures and improvements thereon, if any, situated in Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts (hereinafter referred to as the "Premises") described as follows:

SEE EXHIBIT "A' ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF BY THIS REFERENCE

This conveyance is made subject to the following reservations, conditions, covenants and agreements:

- 1. This conveyance is made without granting any right of way, either by necessity or otherwise over any remaining land or location of the Grantor.
- 2. The Grantor hereby reserves to itself, its successors, assigns, affiliates and licensees, a permanent right of way, license and easement in, on, over, under, across and through the Premises for the purpose of accessing, constructing, installing, operating, maintaining, modifying, repairing, replacing, relocating and removing a telecommunications system or other system for transmission of intelligence or information by any means, whether now existing or hereafter devised, including such poles, pipes, wires, fibers, fiberoptic cables, repeater stations, attachments, appurtenances, structures or other equipment and property

of any description necessary or useful for the same (hereinafter referred to as the "Telecommunications Easement"). The Grantor further reserves the right to freely lease, license, mortgage, assign, pledge and otherwise alienate the Telecommunications Easement. The Grantee hereby covenants with the Grantor to recognize the Telecommunications Easement and, without the payment of any further consideration, to execute, acknowledge and deliver such instruments suitable for recording with the registry of deeds as the Grantor may reasonably require to confirm and acknowledge title to the Telecommunications Easement in the Grantor.

- 3. There is excepted from this conveyance any and all railroad tracks, railroad track materials (including, but not limited to, ties, connections, switches and ballast), and/or related equipment located in whole or in part within the Premises (hereinafter referred to as the "Trackage") and this conveyance is subject to the right of the Grantor to enter the Premises from time to time and at any and all times within the ninety (90) day period commencing with and subsequent to the date of delivery of this deed, with such men, equipment and materials as, in the sole and reasonable opinion of the Principal Engineering Officer of the Grantor, are necessary for the removal of such Trackage. Days during the months December, January, February and March shall not be counted or included in the aforesaid ninety (90) day period. If the Trackage is not removed from the Premises by the expiration of said ninety (90) day period, the Trackage shall be deemed abandoned by the Grantor and shall then become the property of Nothing in this paragraph shall affect the rights of the Grantee. Facemate Corporation, its agents or assigns, from its right to remove personal property and railroad tracks as provided under a Settlement Agreement between Facemate Corporation and the City of Chicopee dated March 7, 2009.
- 4. There is excepted from this conveyance any and all advertising signs and/or billboards located upon the Premises which are not owned by the Grantor. Furthermore, this conveyance is subject to the right of the owners of said signs and/or billboards to remove them from the Premises within ninety (90) days from the date of delivery of this deed.
- 5. By the acceptance of this deed and as part consideration therefor, the Grantee hereby assumes any and all agreements, covenants, obligations and liabilities of the Grantor in respect to any underground facilities, drainage culverts, walls, crossings and/or other structures of any nature and description located in whole or in part within the Premises.

- 6. By the acceptance of this deed and as part consideration therefor, the Grantee covenants and agrees to indemnify, defend and hold harmless the Grantor (including its officers, employees, agents, directors, shareholders and affiliates) from and against any and all loss, liability, damage, cost and expense (including reasonable attorneys' fees) occasioned by or associated with any claims, suits and/or enforcement actions (including any administrative or judicial proceedings and any remedial, removal or response actions) ever asserted, threatened, instituted or requested by any person and/or governmental agency on account of: (a) any release of oil or hazardous materials or substances of any description on, upon or into the Premises in contravention of any ordinance, law or statute (including, but not limited to, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. Section 9601, et. seq., as amended); and (b) any and all damage to real or personal property, natural resources and/or harm or injury to persons alleged to have resulted from such release of oil or hazardous materials or substances.
- 7. By the acceptance of this deed and as part consideration therefor, the Grantee hereby covenants and agrees to build and forever maintain fences (together with any necessary gates), suitable to the Principal Engineering Officer of the Grantor, along the boundaries of the Premises which are common to remaining land or location of the Grantor (hereinafter referred to as the "Fences"), if such Fences are ever required in the sole and reasonable opinion of said Principal Engineering Officer. If the Grantee fails to install, maintain, repair or replace the Fences within sixty (60) days after having been requested or ordered to do so by the said Principal Engineering Officer of the Grantor, then the Grantor shall have the right to so install, maintain, repair or replace the Fences. The Grantee further covenants and agrees that, upon the rendering of a bill for the expense of such installation, maintenance, repair or replacement of the Fences, the Grantee shall pay said bill in full within thirty (30) days fro the date of receiving it. The Grantee further covenants and agrees that if said bill is not paid within thirty (30) days, it shall become subject to a finance charge computed at a periodic rate of 1.5% per month applied to the previous balance after deducting any current payment. If said finance charge is now lawful, then the finance charge shall then be the highest lawful amount which does not exceed said 1.5% per month charge. If the Grantee, for any reason whatsoever, fails to pay said bill (and finance charges, if applicable) the Grantee shall pay all Grantor's costs of collection, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses.
- 8. This conveyance is subject to the following restrictions for the benefit of other land or location of the Grantor, to wit: that from the date of this deed, the Grantor shall not be liable to the Grantee or any lessee or user of the Premises (or any part thereof) for any damage to any buildings or property upon them caused by fire, whether communicated directly or indirectly by or from locomotive engines or any description upon the railroad operated by the Grantor, or otherwise.
- 9. By the acceptance of this deed and as part consideration therefor, the Grantee hereby covenants and agrees to make no use of the Premises which, in the sole and reasonable opinion of the Principal Engineering Officer of the Grantor, adversely affects, increases or decreases drainage to, from, upon or in any remaining land or location of the Grantor. The Grantee further covenants and agrees not to permit or allow, either directly or indirectly, any drainage to flow from the Premises onto other land or location of the Grantor (including, but not limited to, flowing drainage from the Premises into or to existing drainage ditches or culverts located either in part or entirely upon remaining land and location of the Grantor.) Furthermore, the Grantee covenants and agrees to indemnify and save the Grantor harmless from and against any and all loss, cost, damage or expense including, but not limited to, the cost of defending all claims and/or suits for property damage, personal injury or death arising out of or in any way attributable to any breach of these covenants in respect to drainage.
- 10. There is excepted from this conveyance any and all overhead, surface or underground signal and communication line facilities of the Grantor located within the limits of the Premises and this conveyance is subject to the Grantor and its licensees to use any such facilities in their present locations and to enter upon the Premises from time to time to maintain, repair, replace, renew, relay or remove such facilities.
- 11. Whenever used in this deed, the term "Grantor" shall not only refer to the FACEMATE CORPORATION, but also its successors, assigns, affiliates and the term "Grantee" shall not only refer to CITY OF CHICOPEE, but also its successors, assigns and grantees, as the case may be.

12. The several reservations, conditions, covenants and agreements contained in this deed are to be considered as running with the land and are to be binding upon the Grantee forever.

"THIS TRANSFER DOES NOT CONSTITUTE ALL OR SUBSTANTIALLY ALL OF THE ASSETS OF THE GRANTOR CORPORATION."

Executed as a sealed instrument this

WITNESS

day of April, 2009.

CEMATE CORPORATION

Its President and Treasurer Walter F. Mroziuski

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

HAMPDEN, SS.

April 30,2009

On this 30^{H} day of April 2009 the undersigned notary public, personally appeared Walter F. MrozinsKi, who proved to me through satisfactory evidence of identification, which was a Massachusetts Drivers License, to be the person whose name is signed on the preceding or attached document, and acknowledged to me that he signed it voluntarily for its stated purpose on behalf of Facemate Corporation.

FENSKER K



Notary Public LAURA EDEN (TETE My Commission Expires: 12 2415

EXHIBIT A

A certain line of railroad of varying width, including all the fixtures and improvements thereon, known as the "Chicopee Falls Branch", located in Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts (the "Line"). The Line is described on unrecorded federal valuation plans as lying on valuation section 42.2, maps 1, 2 and 3 between station points 208+20 and 282+52 along the centerline of the railroad tracks on said Line. The Line contains two parcels, extending a distance of approximately 7,432 feet and is more particularly described as follows:

PARCEL I

Beginning at said station point 208+20, which is approximately 170 feet east of the easterly sideline of Grape Street in said Chicopee, thence running north to a point approximately 40 feet south of the south bank of the Chicopee River, thence running and running in a generally southerly and easterly direction parallel to, and approximately 40 feet south of, said southerly bank of the Chicopee River a distance of approximately 320 feet to a point, thence turning and running in a generally northerly direction to said south bank of the Chicopee River, thence continuing generally south, east and north along said south bank of the Chicopee River to the point of intersection therewith with land now or formerly of U.S. Rubber Co., thence continuing by sad land of U.S. Rubber Co. to Oak Street, thence turning and running east along the southerly sideline of said Oak Street a distance of approximately 80 feet to other land now or formerly of U.S. Rubber Co., thence turning and running generally south, west and north in various courses by said other land of U.S. Rubber Co. and by land now or formerly of J. Hafet, Burtworth Carpet Company, Darcy Pie Company, City of Chicopee (Chicopee Power Station, Manual Training School and Chicopee High School), G. Blaisdell, Richard Crowin, Starzyk, Murphy, Ludden, J. Devan, Ryate Estate, City of Chicopee, Kinna Heirs, and others, to a point 25 feet south of said station point 208+20, thence turning and running approximately 25 feet north to said station point 208+20, and the place of beginning.

Meaning and intending to convey all the Grantor's right, title and interest in Parcel I of said Line as acquired by virtue of the following instruments (running successively south, east and north towards Oak Street):

- (1) Deed of Merrick Murphy dated May 29, 1846 and recorded with the Hampden County Registry of Deeds at Book 132, Page 154;
- (2) Deed of John Chase dated February 8, 1847 and recorded with said Deeds at Book 132, page 498;

- (3) Condemnation by Location filed with the Clerk of Courts for Hampden County on March 27, 1847 against Charles McClellan;
- (4) Condemnation by Location filed with the Clerk of Courts for Hampden County on March 27, 1847 against John Chase;
- (5) Condemnation by Location filed with the Clerk of Courts for Hampden County on March 27, 1847 against Charles McClellan;
- (6) Deed of George Rumrill dated July 3, 1846 and recorded with said Deeds at Book 132, Page 201;
- (7) County Commissioner's Decree dated May 20, 1846 against Erastus Taylor, as filed with the records of the County Commissions of Hampden County, April Term 1846;
- (8) Deed of Erastus Taylor dated August 8, 1846 and recorded with said Deeds at Book 132, Page 276;
- (9) Deed of Delia Towne dated July 29, 1846 and recorded with said Deeds at Book 132, Page 234;
- (10) Deed of Daniel Warren dated July 3, 1846 and recorded with said Deeds at Book 132, Page 228; and
- (11) Condemnation by Location filed with the Clerk of Courts for Hampden County on March 27, 1847 against Chicopee Manufacturing Co.

BEING a portion of the premises conveyed to the grantor herein by deed of The Boston and Maine Corporation dated January 4, 1990 and recorded with the Hampden County Registry of Deeds in Book 7362, Page 362.

DONALD E. ASHE, REGISTER HAMPDEN COUNTY REGISTRY OF DEEDS

*





đ

5

 $\mathbf{i}_{\geq 1}$

7:

÷,

2

1.

10 1

 \mathbf{x}

ţ.

:

5



Page 4 of 18



562 BOOK 3102 PAGE 562 thence N 84*49'04" W a distance of one hundred five and eighty-one hundredths (105.81) feet to a point; thence S 81°00'00" W a distance of sixty-nine and no hundredths (69.00) feet to a point; thence S 9°00'00" E a distance of thirty-three and no hundredths (33.00) feet to a point; thence S 48°00'00" W a distance of twenty-nine and eighty-five hundredths (29,85) feet to a point; thence N 42°00'00" W a distance of fifty and no hundredths (50.00) feet to a point; thence S 48°00'00" W a distance of sixty and no hundredths (60.00) feet to a point; thence S 42°00'00" E a distance of forty-one and no hundredths (41.00) feet to a point; thence S 36°10'23" W a distance of fifty-five and twenty-five hundredths (55.25) feet to the northeasterly face of Building B2A of the Chicopee Manufacturing Corp.; thence N 47°08'54" W a distance of thirty-five and no hundredths (35.00) feet along the northeasterly face of said Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. building to a point; thence N 35°53'20" E a distance of twenty-eight and twenty-seven hundredths (28.27) feet to a point; thence N 42°00'00" W a distance of twelve and no hundredths (12.00) feet to a point; thence S 48°00'00" W a distance of fifty-seven and no hundredths (57.00) feet to a point; thence S 20°46'14" W a distance of one hundred twentyfour and no hundredths (124.00) feet to a point, said point being a distance of 2 ft. westerly of the westerly face of Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. Building B2A; -5-

Page 6 of 18

:563

BOOK 3102 PAGE 563

thence S 16°16'14" W a distance of one hundred sixty-seven and thirteen hundredths (167.13) feet to a point; thence N 76°12'18" E a distance of fifty-six and seventy-five hundredths (56.75) feet to a point;

 $I_{n_{k}}^{i}$

2.2

έ;

1:

5

54

1.0

а.

....

12

thence S 83°42'23" E a distance of about fifteen (15) feet to a westerly property line of the Boston & Maine Railroad Company, said last course being a distance of one (1) foot from the southerly face of Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. Building B2A;

thence S $6^{\circ}33'14"$ W a distance of fifteen and eightyfour hundredths (15.84) feet along said westerly property line of Boston & Maine Railroad Company to a point;

thence S 76°12'18" W a distance of seventy-six and ninety-three (76.93) feet to a point, said last four courses describing a projection designated as Tract 12A for identification purposes;

thence S $6^{\circ}3^{4^{\circ}}03''$ W a distance of one hundred sixty-three and no hundredths (163.00) feet;

thence S $2^{\circ}34'03''$ W a distance of one hundred seventeen and no hundredths (117.00) feet to a point;

thence S $0^{\circ}55'57''$ E a distance of one hundred fiftysix and ninety-four (156.94) feet to a point, said point being one (1) foot westerly of the westerly face of Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. Building C;

thence S $6^{\circ}26'42"$ W a distance of fifty and no hundredths (50.00) feet to a point, said last course being a distance of one (1) foot westerly and parallel to the westerly face of Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. Building C;

thence S 83°33'18" E a distance of nine and no hundredths (9.00) feet, said course being one (1) foot southerly and parallel to the southerly face of Chicopee Manufacturing Corporation Building C;

-6-

564

BOOK 3102 PAGE 564

thence S 2°01'41" W a distance of one hundred twentytwo and sixty-seven hundredths (122.67) feet to the land now or formerly of the United States Rubber Company and the point of beginning and containing about one and eleven hundredths (1.11) acres; being Tract 12 as shown on Sheets 1 and 2 of plans titled: "Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project, Chicopee, Mass., Scale: 1"=100', Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers," and which said plans are on file in the office of the City Engineer of the City of Chicopee.

THIRD PARCEL -

Beginning at the northwesterly corner of property now or formerly of the U.S. Rubber Company at the Chicopee River;

thence southerly along the easterly shore of the Chicopee River a distance of about nineteen hundred (1900) feet to the southwesterly corner of Tract R8 as shown on Sheet 2 of plans titled: "Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project, Chicopee, Mass., Scale: 1"=100', Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers;

thence S $78^{\circ}11'55"$ W a distance of about one hundred (100) feet to the center of the Chicopee River;

thence southerly and/or westerly along the centerline of the Chicopee River a distance of about eleven hundred seventyfive (1175) feet to a point;

thence N 2°45'00" W a distance of about one hundred twenty (120) feet to the northerly shore of the Chicopee River;

thence easterly and/or northerly along the northerly and/or westerly shore of the Chicopee River a distance of about twenty-seven hundred (2700) feet to land of the Chicopee Manufacturing Corporation, said point being the southeasterly corner of Tract R9;

-7-

1

BOOK 3102 PAGE 565

thence northerly along the low water mark of the westerly shore of the Chicopee River a distance of about nine hundred fifteen (915) feet to a point;

W::

t)

 \mathbb{R}^{n}_{2}

lų.

1

1

1

ï

łŧ

12

2:

63

2

ť

5

2.

:,

É

thence N $82^{\circ}18'12''$ B a distance of about one hundred (100) feet to the center of the Chicopee River;

thence in a northerly direction along the centerline of the Chicopee River a distance of about three hundred feet (300ft.) to a point;

thence S $82^{\circ}18'12"$ W a distance of about eighty (80) feet to the low water line of the westerly shore of the Chicopee River, said point being the southeasterly corner of Tract R7;

thence northeasterly along the low water line of the westerly shore of the Chicopee River a distance of about six hundred thirty (630) feet to a point; said point being the northeasterly corner of Tract R7;

thence S $40^{\circ}04'34"$ E a distance of about ninety (90) feet to the center of the Chicopee River;

thence northerly and easterly along the centerline of the Chicopee River a distance of about eleven hundred twenty (1120) feet to a point; said point being the northwesterly corner of Tract W1;

thence S 17°09'19" W a distance of about seventy-five (75) feet to the southerly shore of the Chicopee River, said point being a southwesterly corner of Tract W1, also being the northwesterly corner of Tract R1;

thence westerly and southerly along the southerly and easterly shore of the Chicopee River a distance of about twentynine hundred (2900) feet to the northerly property line of U.S. Rubber Company, being the point of beginning, and containing about nine (9) acres; being Tract W4 as shown on Sheet 1 and Sheet 2 of plans titled "Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection

-8-

BOOK 3102 PAGE 566

وأرا

1361

Project, Chicopee Mass., Scale: 1"=100', Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers", and which said plans are on file in the office of the City Engineer of the City of Chicopee.

FOURTH PARCEL -

Beginning at a northerly corner of the tract herein described, said point being the northwesterly corner of Tract R1, also being the northwesterly corner of property now or formerly of James C. Cayon;

thence S 17°09'19" W a distance of about one hundred forty (140) feet from the southerly shore of the Chicopee River to the northwesterly corner of the land now or formerly of the Glenwood Trucking Co., also being the northwesterly corner of Tract R5;

thence continuing on same course a distance of thirtytwo and fifty-eight (32.58) feet alongh the westerly line of the Glenwood Trucking Co. to a point;

thence N 75°48'51" W a distance of two hundred thirtysix and sixty-seven hundredths (236.67) feet to a point;

thence N 79°36'39" W a distance of two hundred fortytwo and eighty-eight hundredths (242.88) feet to a point;

thence N 68°36'01" W a distance of ninety-five and thirty-eight hundredths (95.38) feet to a point;

thence N 89°11'47" W a distance of one hundred fiftyeight and twenty-seven hundredths (158.27) feet to a point, said last course being parallel to and two (2) feet northerly of the northerly face of the platform attached to Building 5 of the Chicopee Manufacturing Corp.;

thence S 61°49'49" W a distance of two hundred ten (210) feet to a point one (1) foot northeasterly from the northeasterly face of Building 2 of the Chicopee Manufacturing Corp.;

-9-



ſ.

11

11:

.....

÷.

-

H.,

12

10.0

25.

1:

5

.....

u.

5

2

ŝ



BOOK 3102 PAGE 568

Consulting Engineers", and which said plans are on file in the office of the City Engineer of the City of Chicopee. Tract R6 subject to Western Mass. Electric Co. rights of way for electrical transmission lines.

FIFTH PARCEL -

Beginning at the northeasterly corner of the tract herein described, said point being at the intersection of the low water mark of the northwesterly shore of the Chicopee River and the line of the northeasterly face of Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. Building 2 extended, said line having a bearing of N 40°04'34" W from the northeasterly corner of said Building 2;

thence southwesterly along the northwesterly shore of the Chicopee River a distance of about six hundred thirty (630) feet to a point;

thence S 82°18'12" W a distance of about seventeen and no hundredths (17.00) feet to a point, said point being a distance of sixteen and five-tenths (16.5) feet westerly of the low water mark of the westerly shore of the Chicopee River;

thence northeasterly along a line being parallel to and sixteen and five-tenths (16.5) feet northwesterly from the low water mark of the northwesterly shore of the Chicopee River a distance of about six hundred thirty (630) feet to a point;

thence S 40°04'34" E a distance of about seventeen (17) feet to the point of beginning, and containing about twenty-four hundredths (0.24) acres, being Tract R-7 as shown on Sheet 1 of plans titled "Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project, Chicopee, Mass., Scale: 1"=100', Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers", and which said plans are on file in the office of the City Engineer of the City of Chicopee.

-11-

R7

569

BOOK 3102 PAGE 569

SIXTH PARCEL -

lı,

N

ų,

2.

14

ŧ

E.

32

1

1.1

E

41

12

...

2

17

5

:1:

A.

2

Beginning at the northeasterly corner of the tract herein described, said point being located as follows: Beginning at an iron pin, lying along the southerly line of Nelson St. at the intersection of the westerly line of Hampden St.; thence N 3°26'31" E a distance of five hundred nine and ninetyfour hundredths (509.94) ft. to a stone bound on the easterly line of Hampden St. said land located at coordinates N 423,137.87; E 304,039.26 Mass. State Board Coordinate System; thence S 53" 01'29" E a distance of one hundred seventy-three and seventysix hundredths (173.76) ft. along property now or formerly of the United States Rubber Company and property now or formerly of the Western Mass. Electric Company to a point; thence N 15° 17'47" E a distance of seven hundred five and sixteen hundredths (705.16) ft. along the westerly lines of Tracts R-11 and R-12 to a point; thence N 82°18'12" E a distance of about ninety-six and fifty hundredths (96.50) ft. to the low water mark of the westerly shore of the Chicopee River, said point being the northeasterly corner of Tract R-9;

thence along the low water mark of the westerly shore of the Chicopee River in a southerly direction a distance of about nine hundred fifteen (915) feet to property now or formerly of the United States Rubber Company;

thence N 84°31'42" W a distance of about twenty (20) ft. along land of United States Rubber Company to a point;

thence N 5°31'16" E a distance of about one hundred forty-five and thirty-five hundredths (145.35) ft. along property now or formerly of United States Rubber Company and Western Mass. Electric Co., to a point being sixteen and five tenths (16.5) ft. westerly of the low water mark of the westerly shore of the Chicopee River;

-12-



BOOK 3102 PAGE 5'71

571

of the easement and rights granted herein, to any individual, partnership, corporation or political body, for any purpose related to the construction, maintenance or repair of the dikes, flood walls and drain system of the Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project.

(b) That the payment by the City of Chicopee of the consideration recited herein shall constitute full, fair value and full compensation to the grantor, for the easement and rights herein granted, whether such easement and rights shall be exercised by the City of Chicopee or by any of its grantees, transferees, assignees, lessees, licensees, or permittees as described in the foregoing subsection (a) of this paragraph; and the grantor expressly releases and relinquishes any and all claims against any of the aforementioned for further or future payment of consideration for the aforesaid easement and rights except as stated herein.

Said easement and rights shall continue in perpetuity from the date of this instrument conveying the same to the City of Chicopee and its successors and assigns.

Subject to existing easements for public roads and highways, for public utilities, for railroads, and pipe lines.

Meaning and intending to convey an easement entered in the same premises conveyed to the grantor herein by deed of Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. dated December 31, 1962, and recorded with the Hampden County Registry of Deeds, Book 3091, Page 236.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the easement and right-of-way with all the privileges thereof, unto the said City of Chicopee and its successors and assigns, to its and their use and behoof forever.

-14-

14

12



Page 16 of 18

573 BOOK 3102 PAGE 573 te in right-of-way caused by the construction, maintenance or repair $h_{\mathcal{K}}$ of the Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project. 4, 22 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said grantor, JOHNSON & JOHNSON, 142 has hereunto set its hand and seal this 1/2 day of 7.401.4 8 6 1965. 1.1. 24 JOHNSON & JOHNSON 4. 12.2 th. $\vec{u} \geq$ ATTEST: 2:3 ð, 1 STATE OF NEW JERSEY) ::: COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX 24 22 Then personally appeared the above named faund Cheline) 10 and acknowledged the foregoing instrument, 16. the free act and deed of the corporation, before 2 **3**2 -11 My commission expires NOTARY PUBLIC OF NEW JERSEY 22 My Commission Expires Oct. 9, 1966 μī. -16-

.,

و منتقر الله 012 BOOK 3102 PAGE 574 STATE OF NEW JERSEY) 88.: COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX Then personally appeared the above-named JOHN J. SMITH, President of Chicopee Manufacturing Company, Division of Johnson & Johnson, and acknowledged the attached instrument to the City of Chicopee to be the free act and deed of the corporation, before me ŝΞ ar NOTARY PUBLIC OF MEN JF SYN My Commission Expires Oct. 17, 1966. 11 21.12 ٠, CITY OF CHICOPEE MASSACHUSETTS OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK ARTHUR BALTHAZAR March 29, 1965 CITY CLERK Mayor Edward Lysek: I hereby certify that the following order, recommended by the Mayor, was passed by the Board of Aldermen at a meeting held March 23, 1965, presented to the Mayor March 26, 1965, and approved by the Mayor March 26, 1965: ORDERED THAT, the City of Chicopee accept from the Chicopee Manufacturing Company, a division of Johnson & Johnson, a deed dated February 12, 1965, wherein the said Chicopee Manufacturing Company conveys to the City of Chicopee certain rights and easements in relation to the Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project. Attest: City Clerk Ni AB/jg

BOOK 3102 PAGE 575

575

I, JAMES SCOTT HILL, Secretary of Johnson & Johnson, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, hereby certify that a meeting of the Board of Directors of said Corporation was duly called and held on the 18th day of January, 1965, and that at said meeting, at which a quorum was present and voting throughout, the following resolution, upon motion duly made and seconded, was duly and unanimously adopted:

\$

i.

× 11 ×

i

RESOLVED: that John J. Smith, President, Chicopee Manufacturing Company, a division of the Corporation, or the President, any Vice-President, the Secretary and any Assistant Secretary, be, and each of them hereby is, authorized to execute and deliver, on behalf of this Corporation, any and all deeds and other instruments necessary to grant and convey unto the City of Chicopee, County of Hampden, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement and right-of-way to the lands of the Corporation in the City of Chicopee to be used in connection with the Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project, and to take whatever other action is necessary or advisable in furtherance of the foregoing resolution.

Secretar

Johnson & Johnson

As said Secretary of Johnson & Johnson, I further certify that the foregoing resolution has not been repealed, annulled, altered or amended in any respect but remains in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of Johnson & Johnson this day of March, 1965.

5.30 LM 5

R as this marile & L

2) 2)

0

EAL

8

y of x aKNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that UNITED STATES RUBBER CONFANY; a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, having its principal office at Rocke-Teller Genter, Number 1830 Avenue of the Americas, New York 20, N. Y., in consideration of ONE (1) POLLAR paid by the CITY OF CHICOPEE, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, do hereby grant, unto the said fity of thisones and its successors and assigns forever, a perpetual, permanent and assignable easement and rights for the right-of-way to construct, maintain, repair, operate, patrol, replace and or remove "A dike, Flood wall, a surface drain system with fiftings and all appliances attached thereto together with all ressonable facilities in relation to Chicopes Falls Local Flood Protection Project", and to pass freely over the same in any manner with vehicles and equipment for the purpose of maintaining, constructing and repairing said system, and including the rights hereinafter described in, upon, under over and across certain parcels of land situated in the City of Chicopee, County of Hanpden, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, being more perticularly bounded and described as follows: -

15911 · ···

EABENT

664-6 K

1/65

. Martin de Carl Sti las

FIRST PARCEL - Beginning at the northeasterly corner of the trast herein described, said point being N 829311 29" M, a distance of twenty=three and no hundredths (23,00) feet along the southerly property line of land of the Chicopee Manufacturing Gorp, from an iron pipe marking the northeasterly corner of United States Rubber Company property at land of the Chicopee Manufacturing Gorp, and the Poston & Maine Reliroad Company, said iron pipe located at emordinates N 423,093,20, P 305,034,72 in the Messachusatts State Coordinate System

thence 8 45°38121" W a distance of one hundred eighty-two

and firty-three hundredths (182.53) feet to a point;

thence N $78^{\circ}42^{\circ}18^{\parallel}$ W a distance of twenty-six and sixtyfive hundredths (26.65) feet along the northerly line of Tract 19 to a point;

BOOK 3119 MICE 207

thence N 45038121" E a distance of one hundred fifty and twenty-seven hundredths (150.27) feet to a point),

thence N 82°31 25" W, a distance of one hundred fiftythree and forty-three (153.43) feet to a point;

thence N 20⁸17¹42¹¹ B, a distance of twenty-four and sixtyone hundredths (24.61) feet along an easterly line of fract no to the property line of the chicopee Manufacturing Corporation;

thence S 82⁸31 29" E a distance of two hundred twentythree and fillety-four hundredths (223.94) feet along the southerly property of Chicopee Manufacturing Corporation to the place of beginning and containing about filleteen hundredths (0.19) acres; being Tract 14 as shown on Sheet 2 of plans titled; "Chicopee Falls local Flood Protection Project, Chicopee, Massachusetts, Scale: 1"=100', Tighe & Hond, Consulting Engineers", which plans are on file in the office of the City Engineers of the City of Chicopee and which was filed in the Hampden County Registry of Deeds on May 12, 1965, Hook of Plans 99, Fages 9, 10, 11 and 12.

<u>SECOND PARCEL</u> - Beginning at the northerly corner of the tract herein described, said point being N 82°31'29" W a distance of twenty-three and no hundredths (23.00) feet along the southerly property line of land of the Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. from an iron pipe marking the northeast corner of United States Rubber Company property at land of the Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. and the Boston & Maine Railroad Company, said iron pipe located at Coordinates N 423,093.20, E 305,034.72 in the Massachusetts State Coordinate System

thence S 7045100 E a distance of ninety three and no hundredths (93.00) feet to a point;

4 h

thence 8 4030100" E a distance of shout forty-seven (47) feet to land now or formerly of the Boston & Maine Bailroad Companyi

thence & 3⁹24110" W a distance of shout thirty-two (32) fest along the westerly property line of land now or formerly of the Poston & Maine Bailroad Company to a point;

thence N H^{0} 30100¹¹ W a distance of about seventy-nine (79) feet to a point!

thence N 7945100" W a distance of sixty-nine and twentysix hundredths (69:26) feet to a point:

thence N 82931120" W & distance of twenty and thirty-elent hundredths (20,38) feet to a point;

thence N 45938121" E a distance of thirty and no hundredths (30:00) feet along the southeasterly line of Tract 14 to the point of beginning and containing about twenty-four hundredths (0,24) acres; being Tract 17 as shown on Sheet 2 of plans aforementioned titled: "Chicopee Falls Local Flood Frotection Project, Chicopee, Mass., Scale: 11"=100', Tighs & Bond, Consulting Engineers", which paid plans are on file in the office of the City Engineer of the City of Chicopee.

THIRD PARCEL - Beginning at the northeasterly corner of the tract herein described, said point heing § $70^{\circ}39'35''$ W a distance of five (5) feet from the southeasterly corner of United States Rubber Gompany building No. 33;

thence S 23000100""W & distance of ninety-three and no hundredths (93.00) feet to a point;

thence 8 $63^{\circ}00^{\circ}00^{\circ}100^{\circ}$ W a distance of thirty-three and no hundredths (33.00) feet to a point:

thence $\$ 5^{\circ} 30100^{\parallel}$ E a distance of about twenty-six (26) feet to the easterly line of property now or formerly of the Boston & Maine Ballroad Company;

BOOK 3119 PACE 209

thence N 22⁰30'00^{||} W a distance of about forty-five (45) feet along the easterly line of property of the Boston & Maifie Railroad Company to a point;

thence N 23⁰00¹00¹¹ H a distance of about twenty-six (26) feet to a point!

thence N $63^{0}00^{1}00^{1}$ E a distance of forty and no hundredths (40.00) feet to a point;

thence N $23^{0}00^{1}00^{11}$ E a distance of forty and no hundredths (40.00) feet to the southerly face of United States Rubber Company Suilding No. 33j

thence N 70⁶39135" E a Mistance of eighteen and hinety-fourhundredths (18.94) feet along the southerly face of the United States Rubber Company building No. 33 to the point of beginning and containing about six hundredths (0.06) acres; being Tract 21 as shown on Sheet 2 of plans aforementioned titled: "Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project; Chicopee, Mass., Scale: 1"=100¹, Tighe & Bond Consulting Engineers", and which said plans are on file in the office of the City Engineer of the City of Chicopee.

FOURTH PARCEL - That portion of the below described parcel which runs from the westerly shoreline of the Chicopee River to a line measured twenty-five (25) feet westerly from the top of slope to the dike and parallel thereto, and also including that part of ABANDONED WEST OAK STREET which is the access road to said dike:

Beginning at a Westerly corner of the tract herein described, said point being N 84⁶49¹51¹¹ E a distance of one hundred fiftysix and fifty-seven hundredths (156.57) feet projected along the southerly line of Nelson St. extended from an iron pin at the intersection of the Southerly line of Nelson St. and the Westerly line of Hampden St.

thence S 2845100" is a distance of eleven hundred thirty

ch.

19083119 PAGE 210

(1130) feet thru Land of the United States Rubber Company to a paints

thence 8 840451001 E a distance of one hundred eighty and no hundredthe (180.00) feat to a point:

the here \$ 2845 000 E a distance of about five hundred ten (510) feet along other land of the United States Rubber Company to the northerly shore of the Chicopes River;

thence easterly and northerly along the shore of the Chicopes River a distance of about twenty-seven hundred (2700) feet to a point.

thence N 84931142" W & distance of shout twenty (20) feet slong land now or formerly of the Chicopes Manufacturing Corp. to a point;

thence N 5⁹31116¹¹ B a distance of twenty-five and thirtyfive hundredths (25.35) feet elong land now or formerly of the Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. to a point;

thenes N 68"02129" W a distance of two hundred fifty-five and thirty=two hundredths (255.32) feet along property now or formerly of the Western Mass. Flectric Company to a stone bound;

thense N 53⁰01129" W a distance of ninety and fifty-two hundredths (99.52) feet slong a southerly line of land now or formerly of Western Mass, Electric Company to a point;

thence S $15^{\circ}17^{147^{\parallel}}$ W a distance of two hundred one and sixteen hundredths (201.16) feat to a point;

thence N 84"31142" N a distance of one hundred five and fifty-three hundredths (105.53) feet to the easterly line of Hampden Street;

thence S 207143" E a distance of fifty and forty-four hundredths (50,44) feet slong the easterly line of Hampden St. to a pointi

thence 5 84031 48" E a distance of one hundred five and fifty-three hundredths (105,53) feet to a point;

(=5÷

thence b 2⁸07142" E a distance of one hundred bieven and eighty-three hundredths (111,83) feet to a point; thence N 84⁸49151" & a distance of twenty-seven and no. hundredths (27,00) feet to a point;

BOOK 3119 Mat 211

thefice § 2⁸14¹09¹¹ E a distance of one hundred thirty-two and no hundredths (132.00) feet along the easterly line of other property of the United States Hubber Company and the Easterly property line of land now or formerly of Theodore Murdza to a point marking the southeasterly corner or the said land of Theodore Murdzaj

thence S 84°49'51" W & distance of twenty-five (25) feet along the southerly line of land now or formerly of Theodofe Murdza to the point of beginning, and containing about twenty-six (26) acres; being Tract R-13 at shown on Sheet 2 of plans aformentioned titled "Chicopse Falls Local Flood Ffotection Project, Chicopse, Mass., Scale: 1"=100', Tighs & Bond, Consulting Engineers", and which faid plans are on file in the office of the City Engineer of the City of Chicopse.

FIFTH PARCES. - Beginning at the northeasterly corner of the tract herein described, said point also being the southeasterly corner of Tract 14 as shown on Sheet 2 of plans titled: "Chicopee Fails local Flood Protection Project, Chicopee, Mass., Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers";

thence 8 42⁸21/01" W & distance of fifty-five and thirtyseven hundredths (55.37) feet to a point;

thende S 45 38 21" W a distance of one hundred fifty-one and sixty-one hundredths (151.61) feet to a point;

thence N 8⁰48144" W a distance of twenty-seven and four Hundredths (27.04) feet along an easterly line of Tract R-8 to a point; thence N 45⁰38121" E a distance of one hundred ten and ninety-four hundredths (110.94) feet to a point; 100K3119 Mg 212

thance N 7910140" B & distance of twenty-five and no hundreaths (25:09) feet to a point:

thence N 82°49120" W & distance of fiftyraeven and no hundredths (57.00) fest to a pointi

thence N 20917142 F a distance of thirty-five and no hundredths (35.00) fest clong an easterly line of Treat B-8 to a

point; thence A 78° 218 F a distance of one hundred thirteen and no hundredths (113.00) feet to the point of beginning and containing about seventeen hundredths (0.17) sores;

Reing Tract 15 as shown on Sheet 2 of plans aformentioned titled: "Onicopes Falls Local Flood Protection Project, Onicopes, Mass., Scala: 1"=100", Tighe & Bond, Inc., Consulting Engineers", end which said plans are on file in the office of the City Engineer of the City of Chicopes.

BIXTH PARCEL - Reginning at the intersection of the southerly line of Oak Street and the westerly line of West Main Street; thence N $82^{\circ}45110^{\circ}$ W a distance of thirty-one and sixty-

seven hundredths (31,67) feet along the southerly line of Oak Streat extended to a point;

thence N 7°14150" E a distance of thirty-two and seventyfive hundresths (32,75) feet to a point:

thense N 36 47 128 W & distance of eighty-five and no hundreaths (85.99) fest to a point;

fnence N 78941134" W a distance of one hundred thirty-six and thirty-seven hundredths (136.37) fast to a point;

thence N H2°211018 E a distance of sixteen and thirty-four hundreaths (16,34) feat along the southeasterly line of Tract 15 to a point!

snd ninety-four hundradths (127.94) feet to a point;

thence & 66°30100 & a distance of about forty-nine (49)

rest to the westerly property line of land now or formerly of the Boston & Maine Raliroad Company

BOOK 3119 PACE 213

thence B 3⁵24110ⁿ E a distance of about twenty-eight (28) feet along a westerly property line of land now of formerly of the Boston & Maine Railfold Company to a point?

thence i 3⁸24110" is a distance of about forty (40) feet along a southerly property line of land now or formerly of the Boston & Maine Railroad Company to the westerly line of West Main Street,

thence B 3⁰24110" W a distance of sixty-six and fifteen hundredths (55.15) feet along the westerly line of West Main Street to the point of beginning and containing about thifteen hundredths (0.13) adress being Tract 15 as shown on Sheet 2 of plans aforementioned titled; "Chicopes Fails Local Flood Protection Project, Chicopes, Massi, Scale: 1"=100", Tighe & Bond, Uonsulting Engineers", and which said plans are on file in the office of the Oity Engineer of the City of Chicopes. Said Tract 16 being subject to failroad track location Fights and railroad crossing rights of the Boston & Maine Railford Company.

<u>SEVENTH PARCEL</u> - Beginning at the northeasterly corner of said parcel herein described, said point being N 82⁰31/29" W a distance of two hundred forty-six and ninety-four hundredths (246.94) rest along the southerly property line of the Chicopes Manufacturing Corp. from an iron pipe marking the northeasterly corner of the United States Rubber Company property at the land of Chicopes Manufacturing Corp. and the Boston & Mains Bailroad Company, said iron pipe located at Coordinates N 423,093.20, E 305,034.72 in the Massachusetts State Coordinate System;

thence S 20⁰17142" W a distance of one hundred seventy-four and eighty-nine hundredths (174.89) feet to E point;

<u> 48</u>4

600x 3119 PAGE 214

thence N 82°491204 W & distance of thirteen and no hundredths (13.00) feat to a point, said course being two (2) feet northerly of the north face of the foundation of the Western Mass. Electric Company Transformer Stationi

thence S 7^{2} 10140" W a distance of one hundred twelve and no hundredths (112.00) feet. seld course being A ft, westerly and parallel to the westerly face of the foundation of the Western Mass. Electric Company Transformer Station;

thence 8 8948144 E a distance of thirty-one and fiftyning hundredths (31.59) fast to a point;

thence S QQ13128" E a distance of fifteen and thirty-two hundredths (15.32) feet along the westerly face of the United States Rubber Company concrete retaining walls

thense 8 3°55137" F a distance of two hundred twenty-four and thirty-serven hundredths (224.37) feet along the westerly face of said wall and United States Rupher Company buildings No, 13 and No, 11 to a point;

thense 8 23⁰29155" E a distance of twenty-four and eightythree hundredths (24,83) feet elong the westerly face of building No. 11 to a point!

thence 8,28°29'15" E a distance of two hundred two and fifty-seven hundredths (202.57) feet along the westerly wall of Building No. 11 and the westerly face of said congrete wall to a point:

thence 8.32.361055 F a distance of one hundred fifty-six and thirty-seven hundredths (156.37) feet along the westerly face of said generate wall to a point;

thence 8 37°24141" 5 a distance of two hundred fifty-four and no hundredths (254.99) feet along the westerly face of the concrete well and the westerly face of Building No. 9 to a point; thence N 52°35'19" 5 a distance of sight and no hundredths (8.00) feet to a point;

BUOK 3119 PAGE 215

thence B 36⁰44152" E a distance of sighty-six and one hundredths (86.01) rest to a point;

1.1

thence \$ 39⁶47147¹¹ E a distance of twenty-four and one hundredths (24.01) feet to a point;

thence 8 52⁶35¹19¹¹ W a distance of eight and no hundredths (8.00) feet to the westerly face of said concrete retaining wall; thence 8 37⁶24¹41¹¹ E a distance of one hundred fifty-nine and thirty hundredths (159.30) feet along the westerly face of the concrete wall to a point;

thence N 89⁰35¹19" E a distance of twenty-five and no hundredths (25.00) feet to a point;

thence B 27⁰35¹07" E a distance of about thirty-one (31) feet to a point at the westerly property line of the Boston & Maine Railroad Company, said point being point "X" for identification;

thence southerly along the curve to the right a distance or about three hundred sixty (360) feet to a point, said last course being along the westerly line of property of the Boston & Maine Railroad Company;

thence 5 78⁸11155" W about twenty-five and no hundredths (25.00) feet to the easterly shore of the Chicopes Hiver;

thence northerly along the shoreline of the river a distance of about nineteen hundred (1900) feet to the southerly property line of the Unicopes Manufacturing Corp.;

thence B B2⁶31 29" E a distance of about one hundred (100) reet along the southerly property line of the Chicopee Manufacturaing Corp. to the point of beginning and containing about three (3) acres; being Tract R-8 as shown on Sheet 2 of plans afordamentioned titled: "Chicopee Falls Local Flood Protection Project, Chicopee, Mass., Scale: 1=100", Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers", and which said plans are on file in the office of the

-10-

BOOK 9119 MALE 216

1. r. -

1.3

City Engineer of the City of Chicopee,

Together with the right to trim, cut, fell and remove therefrom all trees and underbrush and opstructions and any other vegetation, structures or obstacles within the limits of said gasement of right-of-May.

Reserving, however, to the grantors, their heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns, all right, title, interest and privilege, as may be exercised and enjoyed without interference with or abridgement of the easement and rights granted for said right-of-way.

The granter further agrees to abide by the following covenants which shall run with the land subjected to easement.

(a) That the City of Chicopae may grant, convey, transfer or assign or permit the use and gooupation of, by grant of easement, lease, license, permit or otherwise; all or any part of the easement and rights granted herein, to an individual, partnership, porporation or political body, for any purpose consistent with the purpose of rights herein granted and the rights retained by the grantor.

(b) That the payment of the United States of America and/or the Gity of Chicoppa of the consideration redited herein shall constitute full fair value and full compensation to the grantor, for the samement and rights granted herein, whether such essement and rights shall be exercised by the City of Chicoppes or by any of its grantees, transferres, assigness, lessees, licensees, or permittees as described in the foregoing subsection (a) of this paragraph; and the granter expressly releases and relinquishes any and all plains against any of the storementioned for further or future payment of consideration for the aforesaid easement and rights granted herein,

500x3119 142217

said aforementioned easement and rights shall continue in perpetuity from the date of this instrument conveying the same to the City of Chicopee and its successors and assigns.

subject to existing easements for public roads and highways, for public utilities, for railroads, and pipe lines.

To HAVE and to HOLD the easement and rights for right of way with all the privileges thereor, unto the said city or Chicopee and its successors and assigns, to its and their use and behoof forever.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said grantor, UNITED STATES RUBBER 28 COMPANY, has hereinto set its hand and seal this day of Cipril 1965.

Origned, sealed and Delivered

W.

, UNITED STATES RUBBER COMPANY

STATE OF NEW YORK) SS.: COUNTY OF NEW YORK)

10

C08)

CĻĀ υ

NEW Y CON

OTA

łΠ

RK .

ORK 1TY

Then personally appeared the above named H. N. Barrett. and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be the free act and deed of the corporation, before me this 28th day of afred March, 1965,

Pub] Notary HARION LASEY Hotary Public, Lists of Heyl York 110. 31.7 22 350 Qualified in fierr York County Cominission Expires March 30, 1967

My Commission Expires

FEE PAID 504

83818

Potal 1

State of New York, County of New York, } \$3.: t, JAME 5 M & G U R R I N, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, ourt of Record having by law a scal, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that New

Nø..

County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County

whose name is subscribed to the sinnexed affidavit, or bosition, certificate of scknowledgment or proof, was at the time of taking the same a NOVARY PUBLIC in and for the State of New York; duty commissioned and sworn and qualified to act as such throughout the State of New York; that pursuant to law a commission, or a certificate of his official character, and his subograph signalure, have been filed in my office; that as such Notary Public he was duly authorized by the laws of the State of New York to administer oaths and affirmations; to receive and certify the acknowledgement or proof of deeds, morigages, powers of attorney and inter written instruments for lands, tenements and hereditaments to be tead in evidence of vecorded in this State, to protest notes and to take and certify affidavits and depositions; and that I am well acquainted with the handwriting of such Notary Public, or have compared the bifdature of the aincard instrument with this aulograph signature deposited in imy office, and believe that the signature is genuine. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seat this APPRIO



BOOK 3119 PAGE 219

WITNESS my hand and the seal of said United States Rubber Company, this 1770 day of June, 1965

MAY Y & COULD

6/7/55

64-4

I, FRANK J. McGRATH, Financial Vice President of United States Rubber Company, acting under the authority given to me by the Board of Directors of said Company at its meeting held May 9, 1962, do hereby delegate to Harold N. Barrett, Divisional President of U. S. Rubber Tire Company, authority in the name and on behalf of the Company to execute and deliver the following types of contracts, agreements and other documents insofar as they relate to the operations of the U. S. Rubber Tire Company!

1. The following types of contracts, agreements and other documents relating to real estate. Authority under items 1(a) through 1(d) may not be delegated to others.

a. Contracts, agreements and other documents relating to the purchase or sale of real estate, provided the subject real estate is within the scope of an approved appropriation request:

b. Leases and sub-leases of real property provided (1) they are within the scope or an approved appropriation request or (2) the annual rental does not exceed \$100,000 and the aggregate rental for the term of the lease, excluding optional renewals, does not exceed \$500,000;

o. Grants of easements or rights of Way; andd. Side trade agreements.
600H3118 PAGE 220

2. Bids, honds, proposals, contracts or other instruments relating to the sale of goods and services to Federal, State of Local Governments or Agencies thereof. This suthority may be delegated to others.

3; Other contracts and agreements for the sale, rental or other sonveyance of goods, materials or other things produced by the Company or purchased for resale in the normal course of business, provided such contracts do not extend beyond one year without a six months! cancellation clause, This suthority may be delegated to

others. Eurther delegations by you, as and to the extent authorized above, shall be made by written instrument settins forth the specific delegation and the limitations and restrictions, if any. One copy of each such instrument shall be delivered to the person to whom the authority is delegated and one copy to the Secretary of the Company.

McGrath President

STATE OF NEW YORK) SS

COUNTY OF NEW YORK).

On this 11th day of Just , 1965 before me personally appeared E, J. Mograth to me known to be the person described in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and

Acknowledged that he excouted the same as his free act and deed.

RECEIVED

UN 1 61965 My Commission Expires:

NOTARY FUDIC BRACE I. PETTERSON Notary Public, State of New York Ro. 30:3079630 Qualified in Nav2504 Co Certificate Filed in New York County Term Expires March 30, 1067

APPENDIX E – Environmental Assessment, BETA, Nov. 2016 (Not included, submitted as separately bound report)