

**From:** Neal Price <nprice@horsleywitten.com>

**Sent:** Monday, November 29, 2021 11:18 AM

**To:** Charles Rowley; asmith@atlanticcompanies.com

**Cc:** rtab@atlanticcompanies.com; joe.shanahan@cleanenergyco.com; Richard Swenson; Kenneth Buckland; Aaron Shaheen

**Subject:** RE: Fearing Hill Road - Test Pit, Soil Boring & GW Monitoring Locations

Hi Charlie,

I'll say this much – its good that the Applicant will be doing both test pits and wells. In many, perhaps most, cases I would agree that test pits are the most informative means of estimating SHGW, if long-term average SHGW is your sole interest (like for Title 5 compliance). However, I have also seen plenty of times where mottling is absent, non-distinct, or otherwise open to some degree of interpretation. The wells will allow for direct measurement of groundwater elevation at various times and for comparison to USGS index well data using the Frimpter method to estimate SHGW, as well as other ranges of likely groundwater. Having both the test pits and the wells will allow for comparison – do we get similar results? Different?

The wells will of course also allow for mapping of GW flow direction at a more precise scale than could test pit SHGW data and provide input data for the groundwater mounding evaluation. We do need both for this project.

Thanks, Neal