

MEMORANDUM

Date:	August 13, 2024
	Revised June 18, 2025
	Revised June 25, 2025
То:	Jay Patel, P.E. – Ardurra (jpatel@ardurra.com)
From:	William L. Fox, P.E. and Gene Williford, P.E.
Subject:	Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Evaluation
	SR 417 SANFORD AIRPORT CONNECTOR PD&E STUDY
	From SR 417 to Red Cleveland Boulevard
	Seminole County, Florida
	CFX Contract No. 002067
	CFX Project No. 417-246A
	GEC Project No. 5603G

The Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) is evaluating a new expressway connection from State Road (SR) 417 (Seminole Expressway) to Orlando Sanford International Airport in Seminole County, Florida. The evaluation area encompasses an approximate 20-square-mile area bounded roughly by SR 417 to the southwest, East Lake Mary Boulevard and the Orlando Sanford International Airport to the north, Skyway Drive to the east, and Lake Jesup to the south. The geotechnical evaluation for this Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study consists of a desktop data review to identify critical geotechnical conditions.

Quadrangle Map Review

Based on review of the U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) Oviedo, Florida and Osteen, Florida Quadrangle Maps, the topography within the evaluation area is nearly level to moderately sloping with natural grades ranging from about elevation +10 feet near Lake Jesup to about elevation +50 feet near the Orlando Sanford International Airport. These elevations are based on National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD). The overall evaluation area, along with the Preferred Alternative and pond alternative sites, are depicted on excerpts of the USGS Quadrangle maps of Oviedo, Florida and Osteen, Florida (**Figure 1**) in the **Appendix**.

According to the USGS Quadrangle Map, the southern part of the evaluation area contains swamps, low-lying wetlands and wooded lands. These features are prevalent along the northern side of Lake Jesup. Drainageways and sloughs are shown on the western and northern parts of the evaluation area south of and crossing East Lake Mary Boulevard. The eastern portion of the

site contains agricultural lands. Several small lakes, ponds and water features are interspersed throughout the evaluation area. Two wells are also depicted on the Quadrangle Map to the north of Palm Way.

The Preferred Alternative traverses mostly wooded lands, agricultural lands, and rural singlefamily residences. Two residential subdivisions are located near the middle part of the preferred alignment.

NRCS Soil Survey Map Review

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey for Seminole County was reviewed for near-surface soil and groundwater information. The NRCS Soil Survey map of the evaluation area, along with the Preferred Alternative and pond alternative sites (**Figures 2A** and **2B**), is attached and the depicted soils are summarized in **Table 1**.

						Classification		
							Seasonal High	
			_				Groundwater	Hydrologic
Unit	Soil		Depth	Soil			Level	Soil
No.	Name	1	(inches)	Description	Unified	AASHTO	(feet)	Group
		Adamsville	0-4	Fine sand	SP-SM	A-3, A-2-4	20-35	А
		/ damsvine	4 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	2.0 5.5	
	Adamsville-Sparr		0-4	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
2	fine sands		4-41	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
		Sparr	41-43	Sandy loam	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4	1.5 – 3.5	A/D
			43 – 72	Fine sandy loam	SC-SM, SC	A-2, A-4, A-6		
			72 - 80	Sandy loam	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2, A-4, A-6		
		A	0-4	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
	Astatula Assaula	Astatula	4 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3	> 6	A
G	fino conde O to E	5 Apopka	0-3	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
0	percent slopes		3-64	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3	>6	
			64 - 80	Sandy clay loam	SC-SM, SC	A-2-4, A-2-6,		A
					,	A-4, A-6		
			0-5	Fine sand	SP	A-3		
		Basinger	5 – 30	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	0.0 - 1.0	A /D
	Basinger and		30 – 50	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4		A/D
0			50 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4		
9	Delray fine sands		0-12	Fine sand	SC-SM, SP-SM,	A-3, A-2-4		
		Dalassi			SM		00.05	A /D
		Deiray	12 – 50	Fine sand	SP-SM	A-3, A-2-4	0.0 – 0.5	A/D
			50 - 80	Sandy loam	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4, A-2-6		
			0-6	Mucky fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4		
10	Basinger Samsula	Basinger	6-18	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	.20.00	A /D
			18 – 35	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	+2.0 - 0.0	A/D
	and Hontoon soils		35 – 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4		
10	depressional	ressional Hontoon	0-30	Muck	PT	A-8		A /D
			30 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	+2.0 - 0.0	A/D
		Samsula	0-80	Muck	РТ	A-8	+2.0 - 0.0	A/D

Table 1: Seminole County NRCS Soils (March 2023)

CFX Project No. 417-246A GEC Project No. 5603G

					Classification		Depth to		
							Seasonal High		
							Groundwater	Hydrologic	
Unit	Soil		Depth	Soil			Level	Soil	
No.	Name		(inches)	Description	Unified	AASHTO	(feet)	Group	
			0 – 5	Mucky fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4			
		Pacingor	5 – 15	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	120 00		
	Desinger and	Dasiligei	15 – 25	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	+2.0 - 0.0	A/D	
11	Basinger and		25 – 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4			
11	Smyrna fine sands,		0-2	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4			
	depressional	6	2 – 15	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3	.20.00	A /D	
		Smyrna	15 – 25	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4	+2.0 - 0.0	A/D	
			25 – 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3			
			0-5	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3			
			6 - 18	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3			
			18 – 30	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		_	
		EauGallie	30 - 45	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	0.5 – 1.5	A/D	
	EauGallie and		45 - 64	Fine sand	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4, A-2-6			
13	Immokalee fine		64 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM_SM	A-3 A-2-4			
	sands		0 - 4	Fine sand	SP-SM SP	Δ-3			
			4 - 42	Fine and	SP_SM_SP	Δ-3			
		Immokalee	4 - 42	Fine cand			0.5 – 1.5	A/D	
			42 - 02	Fine sand		A-3, A-2-4			
		-	02-80			A-5			
		Felda	0 - 4	IVIUCKY fine sand	SP-SIM, SP	A-3			
	Felda and Manatee mucky fine sands, depressional		4 - 28	Fine sand	SP-SIM, SP	A-3	.20.00	A /D	
			28 - 36	Sandy clay loam	SC-SIVI, SC, SIVI	A-2-4, A-2-6	+2.0 - 0.0	AJD	
			36 - 46	Loamy sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4			
15			46 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3			
			0 - 14	Mucky fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4	+2.0 - 0.0		
			14 – 19	Loamy sand	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4		- /-	
		Manatee	19 – 33	Sandy loam	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4		B/D	
			33 – 50	Fine sandy loam	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4			
			50 – 80	Loamy fine sand	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4			
		Brighton,	0-8	Muck	PT	A-8	+1.0 - 0.0	A/D	
		drained	8 - 80	Mucky peat	PT	A-8	110 010	,,,,,	
		Samsula	0-26	Muck	PT	A-8			
17	Brighton, Samsula,	Brighton, Samsula,	drained	26 – 30	Mucky fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3	+2.0-0.0	A/D
17	and Sanibel mucks	cks	30 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4			
		Sanibol	0-6	Muck	PT	A-8			
		drained	6 – 8	Mucky fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3	+1.0-0.0	A/D	
		uraineu	8 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3			
			0-10	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4			
		Manatee,	10-33	Loamy sand	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4		ъ./-	
		flooded	33 – 52	Sandy clay loam	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4	0.0 - 0.5	B/D	
	Manatee,		52 - 80	Loamy fine sand	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4			
	Floridana, and		0-18	Mucky fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4			
19	Holopaw soils,	Floridana,	18 – 29	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3	0.0 - 0.5	C/D	
	frequently flooded	flooded	29 - 80	Fine sandy loam	SC-SM, SC	A-2-4, A-2-6	0.0 0.0	-,-	
			0-6	, Fine sand	SP-SM. SP	A-3	0.0 - 1.0	A/D	
		Holopaw,	6 - 50	Fine sand	SP-SM. SP	A-3			
		flooded	50 - 80	Fine sandy loam	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4, A-2-6			

					Classification		Depth to	
							Seasonal High	Undrologia
Unit	Soil		Denth	Soil			Groundwater	Hydrologic
No	Name		(inches)	Description	Unified	ΑΑSΗΤΟ	(feet)	Group
140.	Nume	[0-5	Fine sand	onnica	70.01110	(1001)	0.000
			5 – 28	Sand, fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
		Myakka	28 – 45	Sand, fine sand, loamy	SP-SM, SP	A-3	0.5 – 1.5	A/D
				fine sand	SP-SIM, SIM	A-3, A-2-4		
	Muakka and		45 - 80	Sand, fine sand	SP-SIVI, SP	A-3		
20	FauGallie fine		0 – 5	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
20	sands		5 – 18	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
	501105		18 - 30	Sand, fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
		EauGallie	30 – 41	Fine sand, sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	0.5 – 1.5	A/D
			41-60	Sandy loam, sandy	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4, A-2-6		
				clay loam				
			60 - 8	Sand, loamy sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
			0-2	Muck Conductorer fine cond		A-8		
	Nittow much accord	a na llu	2 - 10	Sandy loam, fine sand,	SP-SIVI, SIVI	A-3, A-2-4		
22	floodod	Jilally	10 - 60	Sandy clay, clay		A 7	0.0 - 0.5	C/D
	nooueu	flooded		Salluy Clay, Clay		A-7		
			00-80	Sanuy Ioani, nne Sanu	SM SP	A-3, A-2-4		
		Nittaw, flooded	0 - 4	Muck	PT	Δ-8		
	Nitaw, Okeelanta, and Basinger soils,		4 - 9	Mucky fine sand	SP-SM_SM	A-3 A-2-4	0.0 - 0.5	C/D
			9 - 80	Fine sand	CL. CH	A-7	0.0 0.3	0,0
		Okeelanta, flooded	0 - 42	Muck	PT	Δ-8		
23			42 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4	0.0 – 0.5	A/D
	frequently flooded	ed Basinger, flooded	0-4	Fine sand	SP	A-3		
			4 – 22	Fine sand	SP	A-3	0.0 – 0.5	. (5
			22 – 38	Sand, fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4		A/D
			38 - 80	Sand, fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4		
			0-3	Sand	SP	A-3		
	Paola-St. Lucie	Paola	3 – 25	Sand	SP	A-3	>6	А
24	sands, 0 to 5		25 – 80	Sand	SP	A-3		
	percent slopes	Ch. Lucia	0-2	Sand	SP	A-3		
		St. Lucie	2 - 80	Sand	SP	A-3	>6	A
			0-1	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
			1-5	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
		Pineda	5 – 36	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4	05 - 15	∆/D
25		Pineda	36 – 54	Fine sandy loam	SC-SM, SC, CL	A-2-4, A-4,	0.5 1.5	
	Pineda-Pineda.					A-6		
	wet, fine sand, 0		54 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
	to 2 percent slopes		0-1	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
		Pineda, wet	1-5	Fine sand	SP-SIVI, SIVI	A-3, A-2-4		
			36-50	Fine sandy loam	SC-SM SC CI	A-3, A-2-4	+1.0-0.0	A/D
			50-54	The satuy loan	5C-51VI, 5C, CL	Δ-6		
			54 – 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		

					Classific	ation	Depth to	
							Seasonal High	Hudrologic
Unit	Soil		Denth	Soil			Groundwater	Soil
No	Name		(inches)	Description	Unified	ΑΑSΗΤΟ	(feet)	Group
110.	Nume		0-7	Fine sand	SP-SM_SP	Δ-3	(1001)	Group
26	Udorthents, excavat	ed	7 - 80	Sand, fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3	3.5 – 6.0	A
			0-4	Fine sand	SP-SM	A-3		
	Pomello fine sand.		4 – 55	Fine sand	SP-SM	A-3		
27	0 to 5 percent slope	5	55 – 67	Fine sand	SP-SM	A-2-4	2.0 – 3.5	A
			67 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM	A-3, A-2-4		
			0-12	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
		C 1 1	12 – 22	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3	05.45	5 / 5
		St. Johns	22 – 54	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4	0.5 – 1.5	B/D
	Ch. Jahara and		54 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
20	St. Johns and		0-3	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
29	cands	EauGallie	3-16	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3		
	sanos		16 – 35	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4	0.5 – 1.5	P/D
			35 – 38	Fine sand	SP-SM, SP	A-3, A-2-4		Б/О
			38 – 72	Sandy clay loam	SC-SM, SC, SM	A-2-4, A-2-6		
			72 – 80	Loamy sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
		Taurana	0-6	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
	Tayaras	Tavares	6 - 80	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4	3.5 - 0.0	A
	Millhopper fine		0-6	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
31	sands 0 to 5		6 - 64	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
	nercent slones	Millhopper	64 – 72	Fine sandy loam	SC-SM, SM, CL	A-2-4, A-4,	3.5 - 6.0	А
	percent slopes					A-6		
			72 – 80	Sandy clay loam	SC, SM, CL	A-2-4, A-6		
34	Urban land, 0 to 2 percent slopes							
51								
			0-4	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
				Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
	Wabasso fine sand		16 – 28	Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4		
35	0 to 2 percent slope	waudssu iiile sailu, 0 to 2 percent slopes		Fine sand	SP-SM, SM	A-3, A-2-4	0.5 – 1.5	A/D
		-	32 – 48	Fine sandy loam	SC-SM, SC, CL	A-2-4, A-4,		
						A-6		
			48 – 80	Loamy fine sand	SM	A-2-4, A-4		

Information contained in the NRCS Soil Survey is very general and may be outdated. It may not, therefore, be reflective of actual soil and groundwater conditions, particularly if recent development in the site vicinity has modified soil conditions or surface/subsurface drainage. The NRCS seasonal high groundwater levels summarized above do not account for changes in groundwater due to development and are only relevant for the natural, undisturbed condition of the soils.

Sand and Shallow Groundwater

The shallow soils depicted on the Soil Survey map are comprised predominantly of fine sands with varying silt content (A-3, A-2-4) and fine sands with varying clay content (A-2-6, A-4, A-6), except in the swamps, lakes and drainageways, where depressional (organic/muck) soils are

present. Seasonal high groundwater level estimates for the majority of the soils in the evaluation area range from 0.5 foot to 3.5 feet below the natural ground surface. Sands with shallow groundwater are highlighted in blue on **Figures 2A** and **2B**.

The sand soils (A-3, A-2-4) are generally suitable for roadway construction, and most are classified by FDOT as Select material. Shallow groundwater can impact roadway grades and stormwater pond site selection, design and construction.

Muck and Ponded Water

Basinger, Samsula, and Hontoon soils (Soil Unit No. 10), Brighton, Samsula, and Sanibel mucks (Soil Unit No. 17), Nittaw muck (Soil Unit No. 22), and Nittaw, Okeelanta, and Basinger soils (Soil Unit No. 23) are located within the evaluation area. These soil units are classified as very poorly drained, organic soils (A-8) associated with freshwater drainageways, marshes and swamps. According to the NRCS, organic soils extend to depths of about 3.5 feet to more than 6.5 feet. However, relic sinkholes often located within lakes and wetlands can contain muck deposits more than 100 feet deep. The muck soil units are highlighted in pink on **Figures 2A** and **2B**.

Organic soils, classified as A-8 in the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) system, are highly compressible and can have severe limitations for development if left untreated. Removal of the muck, or treatment by means of soil surcharge, is typically required to provide adequate support for the roadway embankment. Extreme muck depths may make removal impractical and a surcharge ineffective, and in that case, a bridge may be the only feasible alternative.

In addition, the NRCS Soil Survey identifies Basinger and Smyrna fine sands, depressional (Soil Unit No. 11) Felda and Manatee mucky fine sands (Soil Unit No. 15) and the Manatee, Floridana, and Holopaw soils (Soil Unit No. 19) as very poorly drained soils located in low, wet depressions, sloughs and swamps. For these soil units, the NRCS estimates seasonal high groundwater levels to be ponded for 6 to 12 months of the year. According to the NRCS, water typically ponds about 0.5 foot to 2 feet above the ground surface. In addition, these soils reportedly contain surficial organic soils to depths of about 0.5 foot to 1.5 feet. The sands with ponded water soil units are highlighted in green on **Figures 2A** and **2B**.

<u>Urban land</u>

The NRCS Soil Survey depicts the Urban land soil series (Soil Unit No. 34) within the evaluation area. Urban Land refers to areas where most of the ground surface is covered by asphalt, concrete, buildings, and other impervious surfaces that modify surface/subsurface drainage and

obscure or alter the soils so that their identification is not possible. The depth to seasonal high groundwater level for this soil unit is typically dependent upon the functioning of existing drainage systems.

Subsurface Drainage

The soils present within the evaluation area are generally identified by NRCS as hydrologic soil group A and dual hydrologic soil groups A/D, B/D and, less frequently, C/D. Group A soils identify drained areas and Group D soils represent undrained areas. Group A soils exhibit low runoff potential due to their sandy, permeable nature. Group B soils and Group C soils exhibit moderate runoff potential due to presence of soils with higher fines content beneath surficial sands that impede the downward flow of water. Group D soils exhibit high runoff potential due to a shallow groundwater table and/or impervious near-surface silt, clay or organic fines.

Group A soils can be conducive to stormwater infiltration and design of dry retention ponds. Group B soils and Group C soils can also be conducive to stormwater infiltration, but to a lesser degree due to their moderate to slow infiltration rates. Group D soils indicate poor infiltration characteristics and are more conducive to the design of wet detention ponds.

Potentiometric Surface Map Review

The Upper Floridan Aquifer Potentiometric Surface contour elevations map developed from September 2021 water level data (the most recent data available) from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), Florida Geological Survey Geospatial data was reviewed to evaluate the potentiometric surface elevations of the Floridan aquifer in the project area. The FDEP map indicates the potentiometric surface of the Floridan aquifer at the site grades from approximately +25 to +30 feet NGVD from the north to the south.

Artesian groundwater conditions can be predicted based on comparison of the Floridan aquifer potentiometric surface and ground surface elevations. Since the existing ground surface in the evaluation area grades from approximately +10 to +50 feet NGVD, artesian flow conditions can occur in areas where the ground surface elevation is lower than the potentiometric surface elevation. This condition is prevalent in the southern portion of the evaluation area and excavations associated with the future construction, such as pond bottom elevations, should be established to prevent penetration of the confining layer soils of the Upper Floridan Aquifer to prevent artesian boils occurring.

Regional Geology

Due to its prevalent geology, referred to as karst, Central Florida is prone to the formation of sinkholes, or large, circular depressions created by local subsidence of the ground surface. The nature and relationship of the three sedimentary layers typical of Central Florida geology cause sinkholes. The deepest, or basement, layer is a massive, cavernous limestone formation known as the Floridan aquifer. The Floridan aquifer limestone is overlain by a silty or clayey sand, clay, phosphate, and limestone aquitard (or flow-retarding layer) ranging in thickness from nearly absent to greater than 100 feet and locally referred to as the Hawthorn Group (Hawthorn). The Hawthorn is in turn overlain by a 40- to 70-foot-thick surficial layer of sand, bearing the water table aquifer. The likelihood of sinkhole occurrence at a given site within the region is determined by the relationship among these three layers, specifically by the water (and soil)-transmitting capacity of the Hawthorn at that location.

The water table aquifer is comprised of Recent and Pleistocene sands and is separated from the Eocene limestone of the Floridan aquifer by the Miocene sands, clays and limestone of the Hawthorn. Since the thickness and consistency of the Hawthorn layer is variable across Central Florida, the likelihood of groundwater flow from the upper to the lower aquifer (known as aquifer recharge) will also vary by geographical location. In areas where the Hawthorn is absent, water table groundwater (and associated sands) can flow downward to cavities within the limestone aquifer, like sand through an hourglass, recharging the Floridan aquifer, and sometimes causing the formation of surface sinkholes. This process of subsurface erosion associated with recharging the Floridan aquifer is known as raveling. Thus, in Central Florida, areas of effective groundwater recharge to the Floridan aquifer have a higher potential for the formation of surface sinkholes.

Sinkhole Risk

No method of geological, geotechnical, or geophysical exploration is known that can accurately predict the occurrence of sinkholes. It is common geotechnical practice in Central Florida to make a qualitative prediction of sinkhole risk on the basis of local geological conditions in the vicinity of a particular site.

Based on our review of the U.S. Geological Survey Map entitled "Recharge and Discharge Areas of the Floridan Aquifer in the St. Johns River Water Management District and Vicinity, Florida," 1984, the evaluation area lies within an area of generally no recharge and, therefore, we can conclude based solely on this data that the evaluation area is located in an area where the relative risk of sinkhole formation is low compared to the overall risk across Central Florida.

Preferred Pond Sites

The locations of the preferred pond sites are shown on the attached **Figure 1** and **Figures 2A** and **2B**. Summaries of readily available soil and groundwater information for the pond sites are presented in **Table 2**.

	NRCS Soil	NRCS Seasonal High Groundwater Level	Soil and Groundwater
Pond Alternative	Unit Nos.	(feet)	(see notes below)
Pond 417-1A	15, 25	+2.0 – 1.5	(2), (3)
Pond 417-1B	15, 25	+2.0 – 1.5	(2), (3)
Pond 417-2A	15, 25	+2.0 – 1.5	(2), (3)
Pond 417-2B	25	+1.0 – 1.5	(2), (3)
Pond 417-3A	10	+2.0 - 0.0	(1)
Pond 417-3B	11, 20	+2.0 – 1.5	
Pond 417-Existing 1	10, 27	+2.0 - 3.5	
Pond 417-4B	10	+2.0 - 0.0	(1)

Table 2: Summary of Soil and Groundwater	Information	for Pond Sites
--	-------------	----------------

1. Soils associated with surficial organic soils. Additional cost for muck removal.

2. High silt and clay content soils present below a depth of 1-foot typically. Limited fill suitability.

3. Potentiometric surface elevation of Upper Floridan Aquifer above ground surface elevation. High risk of artesian conditions.

The organic Muck (M) soils (AASHTO A-8) are not suitable for reuse as fill and should not be used in embankment construction. The A-3 and A-2-4 soils are Select (S) materials and may be reused as select fill in accordance with FDOT Standard Plans provided these soils can be readily placed and compacted and are not mixed with less desirable materials. The A-2-4 materials may retain excess moisture and may be difficult to dry and compact. The clayey soils (A-2-6, A-4, A-6) should be treated as Plastic (P) materials. Reuse of these soils should be in accordance with FDOT Standard Plans. Plastic soils are not typically considered suitable for use as fill for embankment construction and excavation backfill because of the increased difficulty with handling, moisture conditioning and compacting these soils. These plastic soils may be blended with A-3 soils to help improve their compaction characteristics.

Limitations

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of Ardurra and CFX, and for specific application to this project. GEC will not be held responsible for any other party's interpretation or use of this report's subsurface data or engineering analysis without our written authorization.

The sole purpose of this evaluation was to provide preliminary indications of subsurface conditions within the evaluation area as part of a preliminary geotechnical exploration program. This evaluation is preliminary in nature and is intended for project planning purposes only.

The information contained in this report should be disregarded if the nature, design, or location of the facilities is changed. If such changes are contemplated, GEC should be retained to review the new plans to assess the applicability of this report in light of the proposed changes.

GEC has performed the services described in this report in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of our profession currently practicing in Central Florida. No other representation is made or implied in this document.



T:\J5603GE SR 417 Sanford Airport Connector\7 CADD Files\ArcGIS\5603G QUAD.mxd 6/25/2025



T:\J5603GE SR 417 Sanford Airport Connector\7 CADD Files\ArcGIS\5603G NRCS 2A.mxd 6/25/2025



T:\J5603GE SR 417 Sanford Airport Connector\7 CADD Files\ArcGIS\5603G NRCS 2B.mxd 6/25/2025