APPENDIX K

Soil Series Types that would be Crossed by the Rover Pipelines Listed by Milepost (Covers Prime Farmland)

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.0	0.0	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	12	No	8	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
0.0	0.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	264.0	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.1	0.2	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
0.2	0.3	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	422.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.3	0.6	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1372.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
0.6	0.6	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	422.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.6	0.7	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
0.7	0.8	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	739.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.8	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	844.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Vandalia silt loam	211.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Vandalia silt loam	318.9	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	295.0	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Udorthents	982.8	35	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	605.7	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	238.2	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1728.1	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1360.7	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	N/A (Water)	69.5	0	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
1	1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	52.8	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1	1.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
1.1	1.3	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1267.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.3	1.4	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	686.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.4	1.5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	211.2	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
1.5	1.5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	52.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
1.5	2.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	3379.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.1	2.2	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	739.2	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
2.2	2.5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1267.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
2.5	2.6	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	369.6	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.6	2.8	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1425.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
2.8	3.3	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	2587.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.3	3.4	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
3.4	3.4	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	316.8	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.4	3.5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	475.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3.5	3.6	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	211.2	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
3.6	3.6	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	475.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
3.6	3.7	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	211.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.7	3.9	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1108.8	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
3.9	4.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	897.6	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
4.1	4.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
4.1	4.3	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	844.8	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
4.3	4.3	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	264.0	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
4.3	4.4	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	633.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
4.4	4.5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	528.0	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
4.5	4.7	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	633.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
4.7	4.8	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	950.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
4.8	4.9	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	422.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
4.9	4.9	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	158.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
4.9	5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
5	5.4	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	2217.6	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
5.4	5.4	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	211.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
5.4	5.5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	422.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
5.5	5.8	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1531.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
5.8	5.9	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Cotaco silt loam	528.0	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
5.9	6	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	264.0	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
6	6.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	844.8	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
6.1	6.5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1900.8	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
6.5	6.7	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1161.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
6.7	6.7	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	264.0	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
6.7	6.8	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	369.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
6.8	6.9	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	264.0	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
6.9	7	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	844.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
7	7.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	211.2	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
7.1	7.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	105.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
7.1	7.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
7.1	8	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	4699.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8	8.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	264.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.1	8.1	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	211.2	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
8.1	8.2	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	211.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
8.2	8.2	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	158.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.2	8.4	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	844.8	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
8.4	8.5	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	580.8	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.5	8.6	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	633.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
8.6	8.6	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	264.0	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
8.6	8.7	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	264.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
8.7	8.8	Sherwood Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	580.8	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.8	8.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
8.9	9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	633.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
9	9.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
9.1	9.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
9.2	9.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	686.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.4	9.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	422.4	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
9.4	9.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.5	9.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1795.2	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
9.8	10.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	2164.8	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
10.2	10.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1689.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
10.5	10.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1003.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
10.7	10.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
10.8	10.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
10.9	10.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
10.9	11	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	369.6	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
11	11.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
11.1	11.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
11.1	11.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.2	11.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1425.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
11.5	11.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1003.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
11.7	11.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1267.2	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
11.9	12.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1161.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.2	12.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	739.2	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
12.3	12.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1478.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.6	12.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
12.6	12.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
12.7	12.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.8	12.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
12.8	12.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.8	12.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	369.6	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
12.9	13	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	211.2	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
13	13	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
13	13.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	686.4	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
13.1	13.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur-Rock outcrop complex	475.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Well drained
13.2	13.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Water	211.2	0	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
13.2	13.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Hackers silt loam	316.8	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
13.3	13.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Otwell silt loam	897.6	10	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.5	13.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Lindside silt loam	264.0	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.5	13.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Melvin silt loam	211.2	1	No	8	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
13.5	13.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Otwell silt loam	264.0	10	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.6	13.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Hackers silt loam	211.2	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
13.6	13.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Melvin silt loam	211.2	1	No	8	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
13.7	13.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	211.2	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
13.7	13.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur-Rock outcrop complex	211.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Well drained
13.8	13.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
13.8	13.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.9	14	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
14	14.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.1	14.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	528.0	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
14.2	14.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
14.2	14.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1689.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
14.6	14.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
14.6	14.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
14.6	14.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	0.0	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
14.6	14.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
14.7	14.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
14.8	15	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1161.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
15	15.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
15.1	15.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
15.2	15.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	12	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
15.2	15.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
15.3	15.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1900.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.6	15.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15.7	15.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.8	15.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
15.9	16	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
16	16	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16	16.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Upshur silty clay loam	105.6	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	44 P	Good	No	Well drained
16.1	16.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16.1	16.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16.1	16.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	369.6	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
16.2	16.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16.3	16.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	316.8	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
16.4	16.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	739.2	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16.5	16.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	211.2	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
16.5	16.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	158.4	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
16.6	16.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	211.2	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
16.6	16.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.7	17.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	4065.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
17.5	17.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.5	17.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
17.5	17.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.6	17.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	1795.2	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
17.9	18	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18	18.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
18.2	18.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18.3	18.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Moshannon silt loam	422.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	Yes	Well drained
18.3	18.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18.4	18.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Otwell silt loam	316.8	5	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.5	18.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18.5	18.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	844.8	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
18.7	18.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18.8	19.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Moshannon silt loam	2376.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19.2	19.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Melvin silt loam	633.6	1	No	8	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
19.3	19.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Moshannon silt loam	580.8	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	Yes	Well drained
19.4	19.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
19.5	19.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.5	20.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	4435.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
20.3	20.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
20.4	20.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	950.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
20.5	20.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
20.6	20.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1056.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
20.8	21	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	897.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21	21	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21	21	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21	21.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.1	21.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	739.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21.2	21.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1372.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.5	21.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.6	21.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.7	21.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.7	21.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	633.6	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
21.8	21.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.9	22.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1372.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.1	22.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.2	22.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	528.0	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
22.3	22.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	12	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
22.4	22.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1320.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.6	22.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Upshur silty clay loam	580.8	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	44 P	Good	No	Well drained
22.7	22.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	950.4	12	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
22.9	23	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23	23	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	12	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
23	23.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
23.1	23.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Otwell silt loam	422.4	10	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.1	23.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.2	23.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	12	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
23.3	23.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.3	23.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gallia silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
23.3	23.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.3	23.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	12	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
23.4	23.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	950.4	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.6	23.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	316.8	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
23.6	23.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.7	23.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Otwell silt loam	739.2	10	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.8	23.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.9	23.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	264.0	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
23.9	23.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Water	158.4	0	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
23.9	24	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Moshannon silt loam	105.6	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
24	24.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	739.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
24.1	24.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Upshur silty clay loam	1056.0	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	44 P	Good	No	Well drained
24.3	24.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gallia silt loam	0.0	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
24.3	24.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	475.2	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
24.4	24.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Otwell silt loam	0.0	10	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
24.4	24.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	316.8	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
24.4	24.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Otwell silt loam	211.2	10	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
24.5	24.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	739.2	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
24.6	24.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.7	24.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
24.8	24.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	0.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.8	25	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1161.6	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
25	25.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25.1	25.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	158.4	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
25.1	25.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
25.2	25.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25.2	25.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	686.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25.3	25.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	2376.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25.8	25.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25.8	26	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Upshur silty clay loam	1108.8	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	44 P	Good	No	Well drained
26	26.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
26.1	26.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
26.2	26.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	264.0	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
26.2	26.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
26.3	26.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Upshur silty clay loam	316.8	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	44 P	Good	No	Well drained
26.4	26.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
26.4	26.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
26.5	26.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	12	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
26.5	26.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1900.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
26.9	26.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
26.9	27	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	369.6	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
27	27.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
27.1	27.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
27.1	27.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
27.2	27.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	369.6	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
27.2	27.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
27.3	27.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
27.4	27.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1742.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
27.7	27.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
27.8	27.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
27.8	28.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1953.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
28.2	28.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1267.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
28.4	28.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Upshur silty clay loam	792.0	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	44 P	Good	No	Well drained
28.6	28.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
28.7	28.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
28.8	29.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1795.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
29.2	29.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1003.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
29.4	29.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
29.5	29.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
29.6	29.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	897.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
29.7	29.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
29.8	29.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
29.9	29.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
29.9	30.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
30.1	30.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
30.1	30.4	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1689.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
30.4	30.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
30.5	30.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	158.4	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
30.6	30.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	158.4	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
30.6	30.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
30.7	30.7	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
30.7	30.8	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
30.8	30.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	316.8	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
30.9	30.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	52.8	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
30.9	30.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
30.9	31	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
31	31.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1425.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
31.2	31.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
31.3	31.3	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Vandalia silt loam	528.0	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
31.3	31.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	633.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
31.5	31.5	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
31.5	31.6	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
31.6	31.9	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1584.0	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
31.9	32.1	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	950.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
32.1	32.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	20	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
32.2	32.2	Sherwood Lateral / Tyler, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	52.8	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
32.2	32.3	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Skidmore gravelly loam	528.0	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
32.3	32.4	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	528.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 P	Poor	No	Well drained
32.4	32.4	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	264.0	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	27 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
32.4	32.5	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	211.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 P	Poor	No	Well drained
32.5	32.5	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Skidmore gravelly loam	422.4	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
32.5	32.8	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1372.8	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 P	Poor	No	Well drained
32.8	33.5	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	3696.0	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	27 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
33.5	33.6	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	475.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 P	Poor	No	Well drained
33.6	33.6	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Vandalia silty clay loam	105.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
33.6	33.7	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Skidmore gravelly loam	316.8	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
33.7	33.9	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Vandalia silty clay loam	1425.6	30	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
33.9	34	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	528.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 P	Poor	No	Well drained
34	34.1	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	105.6	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	27 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
34.1	34.3	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Rock outcrop complex	1161.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
34.3	34.3	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	105.6	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	27 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
34.3	34.4	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Gilpin-Rock outcrop complex	369.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Well drained
34.4	34.7	Sherwood Lateral / Wetzel, WV	Water	1636.8	0	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
34.7	34.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Water	211.2	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
34.7	34.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Huntington silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
34.8	35	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lindside silt loam	1056.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
35	35	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Made land	158.4	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
35	35	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Vandalia-Sees silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
35	35.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
35.1	35.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur very stony complex	52.8	24	No	8	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
35.1	35.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
35.1	35.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	52.8	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
35.1	35.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
35.2	35.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
35.2	35.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	1108.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
35.4	35.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
35.5	35.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
35.5	35.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	0.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
35.5	35.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	528.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
35.6	35.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
35.6	35.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
35.6	35.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
35.6	35.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	52.8	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
35.6	35.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	0.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
35.6	35.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
35.6	35.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
35.7	35.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
35.7	35.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	316.8	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
35.7	35.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
35.8	35.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
35.8	35.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
35.8	35.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	0.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
35.8	35.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
35.9	35.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
35.9	35.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
35.9	35.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
35.9	36	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
36	36	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
36	36.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	475.2	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
36.1	36.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
36.1	36.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.2	36.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
36.2	36.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
36.3	36.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
36.4	36.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	105.6	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
36.4	36.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.4	36.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
36.4	36.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.4	36.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
36.5	36.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.5	36.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
36.5	36.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.5	36.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
36.5	36.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
36.6	36.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.7	36.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
36.7	36.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
36.8	36.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
36.8	36.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.9	37	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
37	37.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.1	37.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.1	37.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.2	37.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.2	37.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.3	37.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
37.3	37.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
37.3	37.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.4	37.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lindside silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
37.4	37.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.5	37.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.5	37.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
37.5	37.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
37.6	37.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.7	37.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
37.7	37.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.8	37.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
37.8	37.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
37.8	37.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
37.8	37.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.9	37.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
37.9	37.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
37.9	38	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38	38	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38	38.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
38.1	38.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
38.2	38.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	633.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.3	38.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38.4	38.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
38.4	38.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38.4	38.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.4	38.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38.5	38.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.6	38.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38.6	38.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.7	38.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
38.7	38.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Vandalia silt loam	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
38.8	38.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.8	38.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38.9	39.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	1003.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
39.1	39.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.1	39.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
39.2	39.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.2	39.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
39.2	39.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
39.2	39.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.4	39.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	844.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
39.5	39.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.6	39.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
39.6	39.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.7	39.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	211.2	15	No	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
39.7	39.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
39.7	39.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	0.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
39.7	39.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.7	39.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
39.8	39.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.9	39.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
39.9	39.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.9	40.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1636.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
40.2	40.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.3	40.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
40.3	40.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
40.4	40.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
40.4	40.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.4	40.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
40.5	40.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.6	40.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
40.6	40.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.6	40.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
40.7	40.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.7	40.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
40.7	40.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.8	41	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1108.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
41	41	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
41	41.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.1	41.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
41.2	41.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	316.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
41.2	41.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
41.3	41.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.4	41.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	580.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
41.5	41.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.5	41.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Keene silt loam	528.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
41.6	41.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.6	41.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
41.7	41.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.7	41.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
41.7	41.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Upshur silt loam	0.0	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.8	41.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
41.8	41.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.8	41.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
41.9	41.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.9	41.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Upshur silt loam	264.0	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.9	42	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
42	42	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42	42.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
42.1	42.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lindside silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
42.1	42.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
42.2	42.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42.2	42.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
42.3	42.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
42.3	42.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
42.3	42.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
42.4	42.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	475.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
42.5	42.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
42.5	42.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
42.5	42.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
42.5	42.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
42.6	42.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	739.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
42.7	42.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42.8	42.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
42.9	42.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42.9	42.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
42.9	42.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42.9	43.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	1056.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.2	43.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
43.2	43.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	1056.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
43.4	43.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
43.4	43.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	369.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
43.5	43.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.6	43.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
43.6	43.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
43.6	43.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
43.6	43.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.6	43.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
43.7	43.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.7	43.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	792.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
43.9	44	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
44	44	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
44	44.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	897.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
44.1	44.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
44.2	44.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
44.2	44.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
44.2	44.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
44.2	44.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
44.3	44.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
44.3	44.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lindside silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
44.4	44.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
44.4	44.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
44.4	44.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	422.4	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
44.5	44.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	1056.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
44.7	44.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
44.8	44.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	950.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
44.9	45.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	1531.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
45.2	45.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
45.2	45.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1003.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
45.4	45.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
45.5	45.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
45.6	45.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
45.6	45.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
45.6	45.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	792.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
45.8	45.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Upshur clay	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	46 P	Good	No	Well drained
45.8	45.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
45.8	45.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
45.9	45.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
45.9	45.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
45.9	45.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin and Dekalb very stony soils	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
45.9	46	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
46	46	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin and Dekalb very stony soils	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
46	46	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46	46.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
46.1	46.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
46.1	46.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
46.2	46.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	528.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46.3	46.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
46.3	46.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46.4	46.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	422.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
46.5	46.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.5	46.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Upshur clay	422.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.6	46.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	897.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.8	46.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
46.8	46.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Made land	528.0	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
46.9	46.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
46.9	46.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
46.9	47	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47	47.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	475.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
47.1	47.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.1	47.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
47.2	47.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.2	47.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
47.2	47.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	158.4	9	No	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
47.3	47.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.3	47.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	369.6	9	No	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
47.3	47.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
47.4	47.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
47.4	47.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
47.5	47.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	32 L	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.5	47.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
47.5	47.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
47.6	47.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47.6	47.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
47.7	47.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	897.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47.9	47.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.9	47.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47.9	48	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
48	48	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
48	48.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
48.1	48.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
48.2	48.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
48.2	48.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
48.2	48.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
48.3	48.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
48.4	48.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Sees-Woolper silt loams	792.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
48.5	48.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
48.6	48.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	N/A (Water)	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
48.6	48.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
48.7	48.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Sees-Woolper silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
48.7	48.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
48.8	48.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
48.8	48.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur very stony complex	422.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	No	Well drained
48.9	48.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
48.9	49	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	211.2	9	No	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49	49.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49.1	49.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49.1	49.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49.1	49.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49.2	49.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
49.3	49.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Keene silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49.4	49.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	792.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49.5	49.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
49.5	49.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	739.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
49.7	49.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
49.7	49.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
49.8	49.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
49.9	49.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
49.9	50	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
50	50	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
50	50	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
50	50	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
50	50	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
50	50.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
50.1	50.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
50.1	50.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.3	50.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
50.3	50.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.4	50.5	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
50.5	50.7	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	1161.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
50.7	50.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
50.8	50.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
50.9	50.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
50.9	51	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
51	51	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
51	51.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
51.1	51.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.2	51.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
51.2	51.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	950.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.4	51.4	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
51.4	51.6	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	739.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
51.6	51.8	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	1056.0	9	No	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.8	51.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
51.9	51.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
51.9	51.9	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
51.9	52	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
52	52	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
52	52.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
52.1	52.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
52.1	52.1	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	369.6	9	No	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
52.1	52.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
52.2	52.2	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
52.2	52.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
52.3	52.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
52.3	52.3	Sherwood Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0	0	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Vandalia silt loam	158.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0	0.1	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	580.8	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
0.1	0.3	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	686.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
0.3	0.6	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1900.8	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.6	0.7	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	158.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
0.7	0.8	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	528.0	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.8	0.8	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
0.8	1.7	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	4382.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.7	1.8	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	686.4	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
1.8	2.3	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	2481.6	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.3	2.3	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
2.3	2.3	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	211.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
2.3	2.5	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	739.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.5	2.7	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	950.4	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.7	2.7	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	264.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
2.7	3	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1267.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3	3.2	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1214.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
3.2	3.4	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1003.2	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.4	3.4	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
3.4	3.6	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	633.6	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.6	3.7	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	739.2	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
3.7	3.9	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1108.8	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
3.9	4	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	686.4	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
4	4.2	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	686.4	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
4.2	4.2	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	369.6	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
4.2	4.6	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	1900.8	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
4.6	4.9	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1689.6	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
4.9	5	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	369.6	25	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
5	5.1	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	475.2	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.1	5.3	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1056.0	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
5.3	5.4	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	528.0	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
5.4	5.5	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	422.4	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
5.5	5.5	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Vandalia silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Well drained
5.5	5.6	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Gilpin-Peabody complex	422.4	53	Yes	8	No	No	No	27 L	Poor	No	Well drained
5.6	5.6	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	158.4	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
5.6	5.8	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Cotaco silt loam	580.8	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
5.8	5.8	CGT Lateral / Doddridge, WV	Sensabaugh silt loam	211.2	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
0	0.3	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	1531.2	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.3	0.5	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	844.8	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
0.5	0.5	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	105.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
0.5	0.5	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
0.5	0.7	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	1161.6	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.7	0.8	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	264.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
0.8	0.9	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	686.4	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.9	1	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	316.8	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1	1.1	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	580.8	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
1.1	1.2	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	739.2	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.2	1.3	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
1.3	1.4	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	739.2	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.4	1.5	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	528.0	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
1.5	1.5	Seneca Lateral / Noble, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	105.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.5	1.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	475.2	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.6	1.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	105.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.6	1.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.7	1.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.7	1.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.7	1.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.7	1.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.8	1.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	264.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.8	1.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
1.8	1.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	105.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.9	1.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.9	1.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	52.8	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.9	2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2	2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	105.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2	2.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	528.0	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
2.1	2.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
2.1	2.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.2	2.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	528.0	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
2.3	2.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.3	2.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
2.4	2.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
2.4	2.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
2.4	2.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.5	2.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
2.6	2.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.6	2.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.6	2.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.7	2.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.7	2.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.7	2.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	475.2	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
2.8	2.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
2.9	2.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.9	2.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.9	2.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.9	3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
3	3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3	3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
3	3.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	580.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3.1	3.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3.2	3.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3.2	3.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	211.2	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3.3	3.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	369.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3.3	3.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	1531.2	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3.6	3.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lindside silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
3.6	3.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
3.7	3.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
3.7	3.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3.7	3.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3.8	3.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Brooke silty clay loam	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	40 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.8	3.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3.8	3.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3.9	3.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
3.9	3.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.9	3.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	158.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3.9	4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4	4.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
4.1	4.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
4.1	4.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
4.1	4.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	580.8	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
4.2	4.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
4.3	4.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
4.3	4.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.3	4.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.4	4.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.4	4.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.4	4.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
4.4	4.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
4.5	4.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
4.5	4.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
4.5	4.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
4.6	4.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.7	4.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
4.7	4.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.8	4.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
4.8	4.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.9	5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5	5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5	5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5	5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5	5.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
5.1	5.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5.2	5.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5.2	5.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.2	5.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	105.6	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5.2	5.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.3	5.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	475.2	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5.4	5.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.4	5.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
5.5	5.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.5	5.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
5.5	5.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	264.0	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5.6	5.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5.6	5.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	211.2	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5.6	5.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.7	5.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5.8	5.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.9	5.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.9	6.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	844.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.1	6.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
6.1	6.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.1	6.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
6.2	6.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
6.2	6.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.3	6.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.3	6.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
6.4	6.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
6.4	6.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.5	6.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.6	6.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.7	6.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
6.7	6.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.9	7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	32 L	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7	7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7	7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	32 L	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7	7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7	7.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
7.1	7.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.2	7.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.2	7.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.3	7.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.3	7.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.4	7.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.4	7.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.5	7.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
7.5	7.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.6	7.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.7	7.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
7.7	7.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
7.8	8.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	1795.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.1	8.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	32 L	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.2	8.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.2	8.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.3	8.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	32 L	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.3	8.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.3	8.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	422.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
8.4	8.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.4	8.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
8.5	8.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	422.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.6	8.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.6	8.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
8.6	8.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.6	8.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.6	8.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.7	8.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.7	8.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
8.7	8.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.8	8.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	369.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.8	8.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.8	8.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	0.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.8	8.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.9	8.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.9	8.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.9	9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9	9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9	9.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.1	9.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.1	9.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Keene-Latham silt loam	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	56 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
9.1	9.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.2	9.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.2	9.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lindside silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
9.2	9.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.3	9.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	30 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
9.4	9.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.4	9.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lindside silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
9.4	9.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.5	9.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
9.5	9.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.5	9.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
9.6	9.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.6	9.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
9.7	9.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
9.7	9.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.8	9.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.8	9.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.9	9.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.9	10	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10	10	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
10	10	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10	10	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	30 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
10	10.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.1	10.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.1	10.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.2	10.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	739.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.4	10.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
10.4	10.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.4	10.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.4	10.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
10.4	10.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
10.5	10.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
10.5	10.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
10.6	10.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.6	10.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
10.6	10.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.6	10.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
10.7	10.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.8	10.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
10.9	10.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.9	10.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
10.9	11	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11	11	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
11	11	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11	11	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
11	11	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	0.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
11	11.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.1	11.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
11.2	11.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.2	11.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	0.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
11.2	11.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.4	11.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	422.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.4	11.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.4	11.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.5	11.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.5	11.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.5	11.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.6	11.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.7	11.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
11.7	11.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
11.7	11.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	0.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
11.7	11.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.8	11.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.8	11.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.8	11.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	528.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.9	11.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.9	11.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.9	12.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	1056.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55	Good	No	Moderately well drained
12.1	12.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
12.2	12.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.3	12.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.4	12.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.4	12.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.4	12.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
12.5	12.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	52.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
12.5	12.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.5	12.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.6	12.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.6	12.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	45 L	Good	No	Well drained
12.7	12.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
12.7	12.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.7	12.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.8	12.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.8	12.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.8	12.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
12.8	12.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.9	12.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.9	12.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Sees-Woolper silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
12.9	13	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
13	13	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Sees-Woolper silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
13	13	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
13	13.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.1	13.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	844.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.2	13.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.3	13.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.3	13.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.4	13.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.4	13.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.4	13.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.5	13.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
13.6	13.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.6	13.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
13.7	13.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.7	13.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.7	13.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.8	13.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Newark silt loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
13.8	13.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.8	13.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.9	13.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.9	13.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
13.9	13.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.9	13.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.9	14	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14	14.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
14.1	14.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.2	14.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	580.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
14.3	14.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	950.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.5	14.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	32 L	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
14.5	14.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.6	14.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
14.6	14.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.6	14.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
14.7	14.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.7	14.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.8	14.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.8	14.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.8	14.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
14.9	14.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.9	15	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15	15	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	528.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
15	15.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Newark silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
15.1	15.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.1	15.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
15.1	15.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.1	15.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15.2	15.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.2	15.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.2	15.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.3	15.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
15.3	15.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
15.3	15.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.4	15.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.4	15.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
15.5	15.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.5	15.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
15.6	15.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15.6	15.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.7	15.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.7	15.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
15.7	15.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.8	15.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.8	15.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.8	15.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.9	16	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16	16	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16	16.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.1	16.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	422.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.2	16.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.2	16.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.2	16.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Upshur silt loam	52.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	46 P	Good	No	Well drained
16.3	16.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.3	16.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.3	16.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.4	16.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
16.4	16.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.4	16.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
16.4	16.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.5	16.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.5	16.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Newark silt loam	0.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
16.5	16.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.5	16.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
16.6	16.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.7	16.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
16.7	16.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	633.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.8	16.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
16.9	16.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.9	16.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.9	17.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	950.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.1	17.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.1	17.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.2	17.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.3	17.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.3	17.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.4	17.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.4	17.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.5	17.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.5	17.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Vandalia silt loam	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
17.6	17.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.6	17.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	633.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
17.7	17.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.7	17.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
17.8	17.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	897.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.9	17.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.9	18	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18	18	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18	18	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18	18	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Upshur clay	211.2	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18	18.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.1	18.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.2	18.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
18.2	18.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
18.2	18.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.3	18.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.3	18.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.4	18.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.4	18.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.4	18.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	30 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
18.5	18.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.5	18.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.6	18.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.6	18.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.7	18.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
18.7	18.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
18.7	18.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.8	18.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.8	19	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1003.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19	19	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
19	19.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	24 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.1	19.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	158.4	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19.1	19.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.1	19.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	475.2	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
19.2	19.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.3	19.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19.3	19.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.3	19.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Upshur clay	422.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19.4	19.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	105.6	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19.4	19.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
19.5	19.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.5	19.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.5	19.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.5	19.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.6	19.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.6	19.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Sees-Woolper silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
19.6	19.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19.7	19.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Sees-Woolper silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
19.7	19.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.7	19.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.7	19.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19.8	19.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.8	19.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19.9	19.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.9	20	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19.9	20	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20	20.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	686.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.2	20.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
20.2	20.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
20.3	20.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.3	20.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.4	20.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.4	20.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.5	20.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.5	20.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.6	20.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	0.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.6	20.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.6	20.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
20.6	20.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
20.7	20.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	686.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
20.8	20.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.9	20.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.9	20.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.9	20.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.9	20.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.9	21.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	633.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21.1	21.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
21.1	21.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21.1	21.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.2	21.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.2	21.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.3	21.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21.4	21.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.4	21.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
21.4	21.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.5	21.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.5	21.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.5	21.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.5	21.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.6	21.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.7	21.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.7	21.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
21.7	21.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
21.8	21.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
21.8	21.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
21.9	22	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22	22.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	369.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
22.1	22.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	739.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.2	22.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	105.6	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.2	22.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
22.2	22.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.3	22.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	316.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
22.4	22.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
22.4	22.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.5	22.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
22.5	22.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.5	22.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Keene silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.6	22.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.7	22.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Keene-Latham silt loam	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	56 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
22.7	22.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.7	22.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
22.7	22.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
22.8	22.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
22.8	22.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22.8	22.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.9	22.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
22.9	23	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	316.8	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23	23	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
23	23.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	528.0	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.1	23.1	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Well drained
23.1	23.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	158.4	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.2	23.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.2	23.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
23.3	23.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
23.3	23.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	211.2	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.4	23.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.4	23.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	158.4	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.4	23.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.5	23.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	633.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
23.6	23.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	528.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.7	23.8	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
23.8	23.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.9	23.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	105.6	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.9	24	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	211.2	15	No	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	No	Well drained
24	24	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	52.8	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
24	24.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	1584.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
24.3	24.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
24.3	24.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
24.3	24.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	211.2	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
24.4	24.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
24.4	24.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	105.6	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
24.4	24.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville-Woodsfield silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	55	Fair	No	Well drained
24.4	24.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
24.6	24.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
24.6	24.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	422.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
24.7	24.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
24.7	24.7	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
24.7	24.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
24.9	24.9	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
24.9	25	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
25	25	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
25	25.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	739.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
25.2	25.2	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
25.2	25.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	422.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
25.3	25.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	0.0	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
25.3	25.3	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	316.8	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
25.3	25.4	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	580.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
25.4	25.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
25.5	25.5	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	0.0	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
25.5	25.6	Seneca Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
N/A	N/A	Rex Interconnect Noble, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	617.9	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
N/A	N/A	Rex Interconnect Noble, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	371.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
0	0	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0	0	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	105.6	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0	0	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0	0.1	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
0.1	0.1	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	316.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.1	0.2	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	316.8	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.2	0.3	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.3	0.3	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.3	0.3	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.3	0.4	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	369.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
0.4	0.4	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.4	0.4	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.4	0.4	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
0.4	0.7	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	1372.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.7	0.7	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
0.7	0.7	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.7	0.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.8	0.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.8	0.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.8	0.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
0.8	0.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.8	0.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
0.8	0.9	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.9	0.9	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.9	0.9	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
0.9	0.9	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	105.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.9	0.9	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.9	1	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
1	1.1	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	55 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.1	1.1	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
1.1	1.1	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.1	1.2	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	No	Well drained
1.2	1.2	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	105.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.2	1.2	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.2	1.3	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	422.4	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
1.3	1.4	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	No	Well drained
1.4	1.5	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	792.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.5	1.5	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.5	1.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	1056.0	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.8	1.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.8	1.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	52.8	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.8	1.8	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	316.8	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.8	1.9	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	316.8	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.9	2	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	528.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2	2	Berne Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	105.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2	2	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	52.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
2	2	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	52.8	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2	2.1	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
2.1	2.2	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	422.4	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.2	2.3	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	475.2	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
2.3	2.4	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	739.2	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.4	2.5	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	369.6	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
2.5	2.6	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	739.2	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.6	2.7	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	633.6	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
2.7	2.8	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.8	2.9	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	739.2	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
2.9	3	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	316.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
3	3.2	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	1267.2	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.2	3.3	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	211.2	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
3.3	3.3	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	52.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
3.3	3.4	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	950.4	53	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Poor	No	Well drained
3.4	3.8	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Lowell-Gilpin silt loams	1689.6	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	26 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.8	3.8	Bern Lateral / Nobel, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	35 P	Fair	No	Well drained
0	0	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0	0.1	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	264.0	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.1	0.1	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	211.2	44	Yes	6	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
0.1	0.1	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	52.8	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.1	0.2	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.2	0.2	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.2	0.2	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.2	0.3	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Upshur complex	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	46 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.3	0.3	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
0.3	0.3	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	211.2	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.3	0.4	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	52.8	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
0.4	0.4	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	158.4	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.4	0.4	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
0.4	0.4	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.4	0.5	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.5	0.5	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Guernsey-Westmore silt loams	211.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.5	0.5	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	45 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
0.5	0.6	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
0.6	0.7	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	633.6	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.7	0.7	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.7	0.8	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	369.6	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.8	0.9	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.9	0.9	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Dekalb loam	52.8	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	32 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.9	1	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	686.4	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1	1.1	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Sees-Woolper silt loams	369.6	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
1.1	1.2	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Woolper silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.2	1.2	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Gilpin-Upshur complex	105.6	53	Yes	6	No	No	No	30 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.2	1.3	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	158.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	40 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
1.3	1.3	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Woolper and Sees silt loams	105.6	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.3	1.4	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	475.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.4	1.4	Clarington Lateral / Monroe, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
1.4	1.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.5	1.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	52.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
1.5	1.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
1.6	1.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland-Upshur complex	0.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.6	1.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
1.7	1.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.8	1.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland-Upshur complex	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.8	2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	739.2	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
2	2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland-Upshur complex	264.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2	2.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	422.4	12	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
2.1	2.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland-Upshur complex	739.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.3	2.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
2.4	2.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland-Upshur complex	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.4	2.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
2.4	2.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland-Upshur complex	475.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.5	2.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1267.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
2.8	2.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.8	2.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
2.9	3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
3	3.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
3.1	3.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	369.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
3.1	3.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
3.2	3.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	739.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
3.3	3.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
3.4	3.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
3.4	3.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
3.5	3.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	475.2	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3.6	3.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	844.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3.7	3.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
3.8	4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1003.2	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
4	4.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	422.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	40 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
4.1	4.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1108.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
4.3	4.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	686.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
4.4	4.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	633.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
4.6	4.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
4.6	4.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
4.6	4.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1214.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
4.8	4.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
4.9	4.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
4.9	5.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	897.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
5.1	5.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	316.8	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
5.2	5.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
5.2	5.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
5.3	5.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
5.3	5.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	475.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5.4	5.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	1056.0	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	59	Good	No	Moderately well drained
5.6	5.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	528.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
5.7	5.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5.7	5.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
5.7	5.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.8	5.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	316.8	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
5.8	5.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland moderately stony loam	211.2	33	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.9	5.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland loam	422.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.9	6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland silt loam	316.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
6	6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Newark silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
6	6.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
6.1	6.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Udorthents-Urban land complex	264.0	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
6.1	6.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Water	105.6	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
6.2	6.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
6.2	6.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
6.2	6.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
6.3	6.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	422.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
6.3	6.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	792.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
6.5	6.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	316.8	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
6.6	6.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	316.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
6.6	6.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	54 L	Fair	No	Well drained
6.6	6.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
6.7	6.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
6.8	6.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
6.8	6.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
6.8	6.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	52.8	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
6.8	6.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
6.9	6.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	158.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
6.9	6.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
6.9	7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland loam	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7	7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb moderately channery loam	211.2	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	25 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
7	7.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	897.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
7.2	7.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmore silt loam	0.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Well drained
7.2	7.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
7.2	7.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1056.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
7.4	7.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
7.5	7.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmore silt loam	316.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
7.6	7.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	316.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
7.6	7.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
7.7	7.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
7.8	7.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
7.8	7.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmore silt loam	528.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.9	7.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
7.9	8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
8	8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	264.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
8	8.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
8.1	8.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.2	8.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
8.2	8.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.3	8.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
8.3	8.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.3	8.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
8.4	8.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	0.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
8.4	8.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
8.5	8.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	792.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
8.6	8.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.7	8.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
8.7	8.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.8	8.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
8.8	8.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.8	8.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
8.8	8.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
8.9	9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
9	9.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmore silt loam	369.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Well drained
9.1	9.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
9.1	9.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	950.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
9.3	9.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
9.3	9.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.4	9.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
9.4	9.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	580.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
9.5	9.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
9.6	9.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	264.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
9.6	9.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
9.6	9.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
9.7	9.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
9.7	9.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
9.8	9.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
9.8	9.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
9.9	9.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
9.9	9.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
9.9	10	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
10	10.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.1	10.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
10.1	10.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
10.1	10.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.1	10.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
10.2	10.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.2	10.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	686.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
10.3	10.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	844.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.5	10.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
10.5	10.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
10.5	10.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
10.6	10.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.6	10.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	580.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
10.8	10.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
10.8	10.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	316.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
10.9	11	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
11	11	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
11	11.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
11.1	11.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1003.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.3	11.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	686.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
11.4	11.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
11.5	11.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
11.5	11.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.6	11.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
11.6	11.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	528.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
11.7	11.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
11.7	11.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
11.7	11.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	844.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
11.9	11.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
11.9	12.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1320.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
12.2	12.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmore silt loam	158.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
12.2	12.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
12.2	12.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmore silt loam	686.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
12.4	12.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
12.4	12.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
12.5	12.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
12.6	12.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
12.6	12.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
12.7	12.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	633.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.8	13	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1056.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13	13.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
13.1	13.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.2	13.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	316.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
13.2	13.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.2	13.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
13.3	13.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Otwell silt loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.3	13.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.4	13.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
13.4	13.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1003.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
13.6	13.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
13.6	13.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Otwell silt loam	369.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.7	13.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	897.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.9	13.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
13.9	14	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14	14.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.1	14.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.1	14.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.1	14.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.1	14.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland loam	105.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.2	14.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.2	14.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.2	14.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.2	14.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.3	14.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.3	14.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.4	14.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	52.8	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
14.4	14.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.4	14.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
14.5	14.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.5	14.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.6	14.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
14.6	14.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	211.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	40 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
14.6	14.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
14.7	14.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.7	14.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.8	14.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	0.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.8	14.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.8	14.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.8	15.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1425.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.1	15.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
15.2	15.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.3	15.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.3	15.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
15.3	15.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.4	15.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.4	15.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.5	15.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
15.5	15.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.6	15.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	264.0	20	No	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15.6	15.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.6	15.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Water	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
15.6	15.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
15.7	15.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb moderately channery loam	105.6	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	25 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.7	15.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
15.7	15.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Otwell silt loam	686.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
15.9	15.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	0.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
15.9	15.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.9	16.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	844.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
16.1	16.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
16.2	16.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	528.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.3	16.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	369.6	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.4	16.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.4	16.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	1267.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
16.7	16.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
16.7	16.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.7	16.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb moderately channery loam	369.6	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	25 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
16.8	16.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.8	16.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	369.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
16.9	17	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	897.6	6	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
17	17	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	52.8	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
17	17.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.1	17.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	158.4	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.1	17.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	211.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	40 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
17.2	17.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	422.4	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.2	17.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1161.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.5	17.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.5	17.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	0.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.5	17.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
17.6	17.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.7	17.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
17.7	17.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1056.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.9	17.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	158.4	6	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.9	18.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	844.8	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
18.1	18.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.2	18.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	0.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
18.2	18.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	422.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.2	18.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.3	18.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.3	18.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	897.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
18.5	18.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Udorthents-Urban land complex	844.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
18.6	18.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18.7	18.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
18.7	18.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Udorthents-Urban land complex	739.2	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
18.9	18.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	422.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
18.9	19	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
19	19.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	422.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.1	19.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.1	19.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19.2	19.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.2	19.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.3	19.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.3	19.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.4	19.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Newark silt loam	316.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
19.4	19.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19.5	19.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Newark silt loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
19.5	19.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.5	19.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	54 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.6	19.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	211.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
19.6	19.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1161.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
19.8	19.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	54 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.9	19.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	54 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
19.9	20	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	316.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	54 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
20	20	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	264.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	54 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20	20.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	40 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
20.1	20.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
20.1	20.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.1	20.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.2	20.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.2	20.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.2	20.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	0.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.2	20.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.3	20.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
20.3	20.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1108.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.5	20.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
20.6	20.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.6	20.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	528.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
20.7	20.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.8	20.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
20.9	20.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.9	21	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
21	21.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
21.1	21.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	475.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	59	Good	No	Moderately well drained
21.2	21.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.3	21.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
21.3	21.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.3	21.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
21.4	21.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown stony clay loam	105.6	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.4	21.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown very stony clay loam	264.0	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
21.4	21.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	105.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
21.5	21.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Nolin variant silt loam	422.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
21.6	21.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown clay loam	475.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21.6	21.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
21.7	22.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Udorthents-Pits complex	2640.0	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
22.2	22.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.2	22.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22.3	22.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1003.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
22.5	22.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.6	22.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
22.6	22.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.7	22.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	739.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
22.8	22.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.9	23.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1161.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
23.2	23.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.2	23.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	0.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
23.2	23.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	422.4	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	59	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.3	23.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.3	23.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
23.4	23.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.4	23.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	52.8	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	59	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
23.5	23.5	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.5	23.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.6	23.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.6	23.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	158.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
23.7	23.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.7	23.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	792.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
23.9	23.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
23.9	24	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown very stony clay loam	264.0	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24	24	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown stony clay loam	105.6	6	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24	24	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown very stony clay loam	211.2	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24	24.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown stony clay loam	580.8	6	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
24.2	24.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown very stony clay loam	52.8	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24.2	24.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Water	105.6	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
24.2	24.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown very stony clay loam	105.6	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24.2	24.2	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
24.2	24.3	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Bethesda shaly silty clay loam	264.0	16	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24.3	24.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Bethesda shaly silty clay loam	686.4	6	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24.4	24.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown stony clay loam	1372.8	6	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24.7	24.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown very stony clay loam	369.6	55	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
24.7	24.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	264.0	12	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
24.8	24.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	528.0	20	No	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
24.9	25	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	792.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
25	25.4	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1848.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
25.4	25.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1056.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
25.6	25.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Water	105.6	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
25.6	25.6	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
25.6	25.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Well drained
25.7	25.7	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
25.7	25.8	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Bethesda shaly silty clay loam	316.8	16	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
25.8	25.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
25.9	25.9	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Bethesda shaly silty clay loam	316.8	16	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
25.9	26	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Bethesda shaly silty clay loam	580.8	33	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
26	26.1	Clarington Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	158.4	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
26.1	26.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	3273.6	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
26.7	26.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	369.6	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
26.8	27	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	1372.8	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27	27.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	1372.8	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.3	27.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	316.8	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.3	27.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	475.2	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.4	27.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	897.6	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.6	27.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	264.0	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.6	27.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	211.2	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.7	27.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	316.8	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.8	27.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	475.2	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
27.8	28	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	686.4	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28	28.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	580.8	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.1	28.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Fair	No	Well drained
28.1	28.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	369.6	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.2	28.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	264.0	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.2	28.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	52.8	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.2	28.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	369.6	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.3	28.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	422.4	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.4	28.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Aaron silty clay loam	52.8	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
28.4	28.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	52.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Fair	No	Well drained
28.4	28.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	105.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
28.4	28.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	528.0	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.5	28.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	105.6	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.6	28.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	316.8	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.6	28.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	316.8	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.7	28.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	475.2	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.8	28.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	316.8	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.8	28.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	158.4	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
28.8	28.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
28.9	28.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	158.4	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
28.9	29	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	264.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
29	29.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	1161.6	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
29.2	29.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Aaron silty clay loam	158.4	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
29.2	29.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	211.2	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
29.3	29.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29.3	29.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	316.8	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
29.4	29.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	422.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
29.4	29.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	422.4	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
29.5	29.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	316.8	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
29.6	29.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	422.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
29.7	29.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	475.2	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
29.8	29.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	580.8	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
29.9	29.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Melvin silt loam	211.2	1	No	8	No	Yes	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
29.9	29.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29.9	30	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	369.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
30	30	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	105.6	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
30	30.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	158.4	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
30.1	30.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	950.4	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
30.2	30.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	1267.2	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
30.5	30.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
30.5	30.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	422.4	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
30.6	30.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
30.6	30.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
30.7	30.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	369.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
30.7	30.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	633.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
30.8	31	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	792.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
31	31.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	475.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
31.1	31.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	1267.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.3	31.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	1003.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.5	31.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	1372.8	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
31.8	31.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	528.0	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
31.9	31.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	316.8	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
31.9	32	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	369.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
32	32.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	264.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
32.1	32.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
32.1	32.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
32.2	32.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	316.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
32.2	32.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	1003.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
32.4	32.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	475.2	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
32.5	32.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
32.5	32.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Aaron silty clay loam	316.8	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
32.6	32.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	897.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
32.8	32.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
32.8	32.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	316.8	20	No	3	No	No	No	42 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
32.9	32.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0	0	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0	0	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
0	0.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.1	0.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	686.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.2	0.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.2	0.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	1108.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
0.4	0.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0.4	0.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Monongahela silt loam	1372.8	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
0.7	0.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	1214.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
0.9	1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1	1.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	844.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
1.1	1.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.2	1.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
1.2	1.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.2	1.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
1.3	1.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.3	1.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
1.3	1.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.4	1.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
1.4	1.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	211.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.4	1.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	844.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
1.6	1.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.6	1.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	211.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.6	1.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.7	1.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.7	1.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
1.8	1.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
1.8	2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	792.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
2	2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	316.8	12	Yes	4	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
2	2.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka channery silt loam	1003.2	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
2.2	2.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.2	2.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
2.3	2.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Brookside silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.3	2.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Brookside silt loam	264.0	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.4	2.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Brookside silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.4	2.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	316.8	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
2.5	2.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	264.0	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
2.5	2.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Water	105.6	0	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
2.6	2.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	264.0	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
2.6	2.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
2.6	2.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.7	2.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
2.8	2.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.8	2.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Monongahela silt loam	369.6	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
2.9	3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	739.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3	3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3	3.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.1	3.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3.1	3.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	52.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.2	3.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	52.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.2	3.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.2	3.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.2	3.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	211.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.3	3.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3.3	3.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	52.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.3	3.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3.3	3.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	369.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.4	3.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	369.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.5	3.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	52.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.5	3.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
3.5	3.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.5	3.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Omulga silt loam	158.4	11	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
3.6	3.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Omulga silt loam	264.0	5	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
3.6	3.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Omulga silt loam	633.6	11	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
3.7	3.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka channery silt loam	475.2	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
3.8	3.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.8	4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	686.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
4	4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Sensabaugh silt loam	264.0	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
4	4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
4	4.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.1	4.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
4.2	4.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.2	4.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	580.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.3	4.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	422.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.4	4.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
4.4	4.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.5	4.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
4.5	4.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka channery silt loam	211.2	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
4.5	4.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.6	4.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
4.6	4.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	528.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.7	4.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	686.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
4.8	4.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.9	5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5	5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5	5.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	422.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.1	5.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.1	5.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	897.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5.3	5.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	52.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.3	5.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5.3	5.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.3	5.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.4	5.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.4	5.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka channery silt loam	211.2	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
5.5	5.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.5	5.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.5	5.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	580.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5.7	5.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Sensabaugh silt loam	158.4	1	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
5.7	5.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	580.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5.8	5.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.8	5.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	528.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.9	5.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.9	5.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	0.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
5.9	6.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	844.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.1	6.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.1	6.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
6.2	6.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.2	6.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
6.3	6.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.3	6.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
6.4	6.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
6.4	6.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
6.4	6.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.4	6.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	369.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
6.5	6.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	475.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.6	6.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	739.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
6.7	6.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	739.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.9	6.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.9	7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	528.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7	7.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.1	7.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	686.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
7.2	7.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
7.3	7.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.3	7.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.4	7.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	792.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
7.5	7.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	739.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.7	7.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.7	7.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
7.7	7.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	739.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.8	7.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	528.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
7.9	8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8	8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	369.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
8	8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8	8.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	264.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.1	8.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.1	8.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
8.2	8.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.2	8.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	1108.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.4	8.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
8.5	8.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.6	8.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
8.6	8.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	0.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.6	8.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.7	8.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.7	8.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	211.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.8	8.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
8.8	8.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	580.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
8.9	9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	369.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
9	9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Sensabaugh silt loam	105.6	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
9	9.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
9.1	9.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	422.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.1	9.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
9.2	9.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	580.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.3	9.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	950.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.5	9.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	580.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
9.6	9.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Brookside silt loam	105.6	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
9.6	9.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Sensabaugh silt loam	316.8	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
9.7	9.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
9.8	9.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.8	9.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont silt loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
9.8	9.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	211.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.9	9.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont silt loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
9.9	10	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	580.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10	10.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
10.1	10.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.1	10.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka channery silt loam	211.2	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.1	10.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.2	10.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
10.2	10.2	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	264.0	20	Yes	4	Yes	No	No	56 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
10.2	10.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.3	10.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	422.4	20	Yes	4	Yes	No	No	56 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
10.3	10.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.4	10.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
10.4	10.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	52.8	20	Yes	4	Yes	No	No	56 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
10.4	10.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	369.6	12	Yes	4	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
10.5	10.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	105.6	20	Yes	4	Yes	No	No	56 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
10.5	10.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.5	10.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.6	10.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	528.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.7	10.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
10.7	10.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.7	10.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
10.7	10.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.8	10.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.8	10.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.8	10.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
10.9	10.9	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.9	11.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Culleoka-Dormont complex	739.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.1	11.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	1531.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
11.3	11.4	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.4	11.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
11.5	11.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.5	11.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
11.5	11.5	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	0.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.5	11.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
11.6	11.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	0.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.6	11.6	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	0.0	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
11.6	11.7	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	580.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.7	11.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	45	Yes	6	No	No	No	31 L	Poor	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.8	11.8	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Udorthents-Urban land complex	264.0	15	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
11.8	12	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Udorthents	1108.8	5	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
12	12.1	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Huntington silt loam	52.8	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
12.1	12.3	Clarington Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Water	1214.4	0	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
12.3	12.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Water	105.6	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
12.3	12.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Duncannon-Urban land complex	316.8	8	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
12.4	12.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside-Urban land complex	422.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
12.4	12.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.6	12.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
12.6	12.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.7	12.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
12.7	12.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	316.8	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
12.8	12.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
12.8	12.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.9	13	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
13	13.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.1	13.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
13.1	13.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
13.2	13.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1636.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.5	13.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	422.4	27	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
13.5	13.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.6	13.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
13.6	13.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.7	13.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	105.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
13.7	13.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.8	13.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
13.8	13.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
13.8	14	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1214.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14	14.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.1	14.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.1	14.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland loam	475.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.2	14.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
14.2	14.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.2	14.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.3	14.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.3	14.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland loam	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.3	14.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
14.4	14.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.4	14.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.4	14.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.4	14.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	739.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.6	14.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
14.6	14.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
14.7	14.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.7	14.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
14.8	14.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.8	14.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.9	14.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
14.9	15	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	475.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15	15.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland loam	580.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.1	15.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.1	15.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
15.2	15.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	105.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
15.2	15.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	105.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
15.2	15.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15.2	15.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.3	15.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	105.6	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.3	15.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	105.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
15.3	15.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	897.6	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.5	15.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	105.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
15.5	15.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
15.5	15.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.5	15.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
15.6	15.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	1214.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.8	15.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	40 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
15.9	15.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15.9	16	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
16	16.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.1	16.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.1	16.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.1	16.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Dekalb loam	316.8	12	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
16.2	16.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.2	16.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
16.3	16.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.3	16.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
16.3	16.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.4	16.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.4	16.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.4	16.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	316.8	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
16.5	16.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.5	16.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.5	16.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
16.5	16.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
16.6	16.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.6	16.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.6	16.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.7	16.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
16.7	16.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	633.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.8	16.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
16.9	17	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
17	17	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17	17	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
17	17.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.1	17.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.1	17.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.1	17.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.2	17.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.2	17.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.2	17.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.2	17.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland moderately stony loam	211.2	33	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.3	17.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.3	17.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.4	17.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	950.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
17.5	17.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.6	17.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.6	17.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.6	17.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.7	17.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
17.7	17.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	792.0	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.9	17.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.9	18	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	422.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
18	18	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18	18	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18	18.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
18.1	18.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18.2	18.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.3	18.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	422.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
18.4	18.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.4	18.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	475.2	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
18.5	18.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
18.5	18.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
18.6	18.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
18.6	18.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18.7	18.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
18.7	18.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	105.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
18.8	18.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
18.8	18.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	633.6	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18.9	18.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
18.9	19	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
19	19.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	792.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
19.1	19.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.2	19.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	897.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19.3	19.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.4	19.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
19.5	19.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
19.5	19.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
19.5	19.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.6	19.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.6	19.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.7	19.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
19.7	19.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	792.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.9	19.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland-Upshur complex	422.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.9	20	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
20	20.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland-Upshur complex	686.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.1	20.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
20.2	20.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.2	20.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	528.0	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
20.3	20.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Richland silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
20.3	20.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.4	20.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
20.4	20.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.4	20.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
20.5	20.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.6	20.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
20.6	20.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.6	20.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.7	20.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.7	20.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
20.7	20.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
20.8	20.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.8	20.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
20.9	20.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.9	21	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
21	21	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21	21.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.1	21.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.1	21.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
21.1	21.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.2	21.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	528.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
21.3	21.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.3	21.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	844.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
21.5	21.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
21.5	21.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.5	21.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21.6	21.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.6	21.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.7	21.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.7	21.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
21.7	21.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.8	21.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
21.8	21.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.9	21.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	211.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	59	Good	No	Moderately well drained
21.9	22	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22	22.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	580.8	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
22.1	22.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
22.1	22.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
22.1	22.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
22.2	22.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.2	22.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22.2	22.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.3	22.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Zanesville silt loam	211.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	59	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.3	22.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.3	22.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22.4	22.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
22.4	22.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	580.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
22.5	22.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22.6	22.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
22.6	22.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Hartshorn silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	40 L	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
22.7	22.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	50	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
22.7	22.7	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
22.7	22.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
22.8	22.8	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
22.8	22.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
22.9	22.9	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	No	Well drained
22.9	23	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
23	23	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	528.0	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
23	23.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.1	23.1	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
23.1	23.2	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
23.2	23.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	475.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
23.3	23.3	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.3	23.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
23.4	23.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	211.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.4	23.4	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.4	23.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
23.5	23.5	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.5	23.6	Majorsville Lateral / Belmont, Ohio	Lowell-Westmoreland silt loams	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
0	0	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	264.0	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0	0.1	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	158.4	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.1	0.1	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	105.6	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.1	0.2	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	264.0	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.2	0.3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	792.0	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.3	0.3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	105.6	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.3	0.4	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	633.6	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.4	0.5	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	52.8	17	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.5	0.7	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	1531.2	33	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.7	0.9	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	844.8	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.9	1	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silty clay loam	264.0	33	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
1	1	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	422.4	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
1	1.3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	1214.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.3	1.3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.3	1.4	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
1.4	1.6	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	950.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
1.6	1.6	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
1.6	2	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	1953.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2	2.1	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	633.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.1	2.1	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	0.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.1	2.2	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	580.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.2	2.3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	264.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
2.3	2.3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown channery silt loam	52.8	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
2.3	2.4	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	897.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.4	2.5	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.5	2.6	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Nolin silt loam	528.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
2.6	2.6	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	369.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.6	2.8	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	686.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
2.8	2.8	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	211.2	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.8	2.9	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Nolin silt loam	475.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
2.9	3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	580.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3	3.1	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	369.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3.1	3.2	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	792.0	20	No	3	No	No	No	42 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.2	3.3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
3.3	3.3	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	No	No	No	42 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.3	3.4	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	528.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3.4	3.4	Cadiz Lateral / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	No	No	No	42 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0	0.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	1108.8	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
0.2	0.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
0.2	0.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
0.3	0.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	422.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
0.4	0.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Water	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
0.4	0.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Newark silt loam	105.6	1	No	7	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
0.4	0.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
0.5	0.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Glenford silt loam	528.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
0.5	0.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Glenford silt loam	422.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
0.6	0.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Glenford silt loam	1320.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.9	0.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	0.0	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
0.9	0.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	158.4	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
0.9	0.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	52.8	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
0.9	1.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	1056.0	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained
1.1	1.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	422.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
1.2	1.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	158.4	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
1.2	1.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	528.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
1.3	1.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Newark silt loam	369.6	1	No	7	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
1.4	1.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Fluvaquents	105.6	2	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Somewhat poorly drained
1.4	1.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
1.5	1.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1.5	1.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
1.6	1.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	633.6	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained
1.7	1.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
1.7	1.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	264.0	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
1.8	1.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
1.8	1.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Fluvaquents	158.4	2	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Somewhat poorly drained
1.8	1.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
1.9	1.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	105.6	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
1.9	2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	369.6	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained
2	2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	158.4	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
2	2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2	2.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Fluvaquents	211.2	2	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Somewhat poorly drained
2.1	2.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
2.1	2.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	316.8	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained
2.2	2.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	211.2	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
2.2	2.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	475.2	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained
2.3	2.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	52.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
2.3	2.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Fluvaquents	264.0	2	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Somewhat poorly drained
2.4	2.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
2.4	2.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	369.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
2.5	2.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	316.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
2.6	2.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	897.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.7	2.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	158.4	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
2.8	2.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	633.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
2.9	3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	528.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
3	3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	316.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
3	3.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	52.8	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
3.1	3.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
3.1	3.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	1267.2	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
3.4	3.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	264.0	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
3.4	3.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	580.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
3.5	3.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	369.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
3.6	3.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	633.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3.7	3.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	897.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
3.9	4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	369.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4	4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	105.6	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
4	4.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	580.8	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
4.1	4.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	264.0	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
4.1	4.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	316.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4.2	4.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	105.6	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
4.2	4.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	686.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
4.3	4.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4.4	4.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	158.4	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
4.4	4.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
4.5	4.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Fluvaquents	264.0	2	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Somewhat poorly drained
4.5	4.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4.6	4.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	316.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4.7	4.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4.7	4.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4.7	4.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	686.4	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4.9	4.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	0.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
4.9	5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	580.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5	5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5	5.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Fluvaquents	580.8	2	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Somewhat poorly drained
5.2	5.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.2	5.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Library silty clay loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	56	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
5.3	5.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	528.0	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
5.3	5.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	52.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5.4	5.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5.4	5.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	580.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5.5	5.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5.5	5.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	316.8	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
5.6	5.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5.6	5.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	369.6	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained
5.7	5.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5.7	5.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	105.6	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.8	5.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Fluvaquents	158.4	2	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Somewhat poorly drained
5.8	5.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	369.6	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
5.9	5.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	316.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
5.9	6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	316.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
6	6.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Guernsey silt loam	1267.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	56 L	Good	Yes	Moderately well drained
6.2	6.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	105.6	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
6.3	6.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	264.0	6	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
6.3	6.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	105.6	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained
6.3	6.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	105.6	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
6.3	6.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	369.6	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
6.4	6.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	369.6	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
6.5	6.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Newark silt loam	105.6	1	No	7	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
6.5	6.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
6.5	6.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	369.6	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
6.6	6.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
6.6	6.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	475.2	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
6.7	6.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
6.8	6.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	580.8	20	No	7	No	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
6.9	7.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	844.8	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
7.1	7.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	633.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
7.2	7.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	739.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
7.3	7.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	158.4	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
7.4	7.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	211.2	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
7.4	7.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
7.5	7.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
7.5	7.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
7.6	7.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	475.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
7.7	7.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	528.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
7.8	7.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Udorthents	158.4	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
7.8	7.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	264.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
7.9	7.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	211.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
7.9	8.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	2112.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
8.3	8.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	528.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.4	8.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
8.5	8.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka-Upshur complex	580.8	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
8.6	8.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	475.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
8.7	8.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	369.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
8.8	8.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	211.2	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
8.8	8.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
8.8	8.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
8.9	8.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Newark silt loam	422.4	1	No	7	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.9	9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
9	9.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	422.4	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
9.1	9.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	528.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
9.1	9.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
9.2	9.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	686.4	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
9.3	9.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Fluvaquents	105.6	2	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.4	9.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	369.6	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
9.4	9.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	105.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
9.5	9.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	316.8	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
9.5	9.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	211.2	12	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
9.6	9.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	739.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
9.7	9.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	105.6	12	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
9.7	9.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	316.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
9.8	9.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
9.8	9.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka-Upshur complex	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.8	9.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
9.8	9.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	211.2	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
9.9	10	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	580.8	6	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	No	Well drained
10	10	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	211.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
10	10.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
10.1	10.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka-Upshur complex	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.1	10.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka-Upshur complex	211.2	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	31 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
10.1	10.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka-Upshur complex	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	31 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.2	10.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
10.2	10.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	264.0	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.2	10.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	158.4	35	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
10.3	10.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	158.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
10.3	10.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont silt loam	369.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
10.4	10.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Dormont-Culleoka complex	52.8	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	31	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
10.4	10.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Weikert-Culleoka complex	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	19 L	Poor	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained
10.4	10.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Washington, PA	Culleoka channery silt loam	211.2	12	No	7	Yes	No	No	31 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
10.5	10.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	52.8	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
10.5	10.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	105.6	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.5	10.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Clarksburg silt loam	422.4	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
10.6	10.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	52.8	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.6	10.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	52.8	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.6	10.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	52.8	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
10.6	10.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Guernsey silt loam	158.4	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
10.6	10.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
10.7	10.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Guernsey silt loam	158.4	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
10.7	10.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
10.8	10.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Clarksburg silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
10.8	10.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
10.9	11	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Guernsey silt loam	633.6	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
11	11	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
11	11.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	52.8	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.1	11.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.1	11.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	316.8	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
11.2	11.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Philo silt loam	211.2	2	No	8	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained
11.2	11.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	264.0	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.3	11.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	264.0	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
11.3	11.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Wharton silt loam	422.4	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	N/A	Yes	Moderately well drained
11.4	11.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	792.0	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.5	11.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	792.0	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.7	11.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	580.8	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.8	11.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	316.8	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
11.9	11.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	158.4	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.9	11.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Ernest silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.9	12	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	528.0	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12	12.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	2006.4	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.4	12.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	475.2	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.5	12.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.5	12.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Upshur silty clay loam	52.8	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	36 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.6	12.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	158.4	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.6	12.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Ernest silt loam	475.2	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
12.7	12.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	316.8	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.7	12.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	264.0	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
12.8	12.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	422.4	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.9	13.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	1320.0	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
13.1	13.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	369.6	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.2	13.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	264.0	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.2	13.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	739.2	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.4	13.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Ernest silt loam	211.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.4	13.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	422.4	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.5	13.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	580.8	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.6	13.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	528.0	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
13.7	13.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
13.8	13.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	105.6	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.8	13.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	422.4	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.9	14	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	580.8	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14	14	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	369.6	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14	14.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	158.4	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.1	14.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	422.4	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.1	14.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	528.0	13	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.2	14.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	105.6	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.3	14.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	316.8	30	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.3	14.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Ernest silt loam	316.8	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.4	14.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	1689.6	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
14.7	14.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	264.0	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
14.8	14.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Monongahela silt loam	739.2	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
14.9	15	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	580.8	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15	15	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	105.6	13	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
15	15.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	264.0	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.1	15.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	158.4	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.1	15.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Gilpin silt loam	369.6	6	No	8	Yes	No	No	32 P	Good	No	Well drained
15.2	15.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	633.6	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.3	15.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks channery silt loam	369.6	23	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
15.4	15.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Berks soils	1003.2	50	Yes	8	No	No	No	30 P	Poor	Yes	Well drained
15.6	15.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Urban land-Udorthents complex	686.4	5	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
15.7	15.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Water	897.6	0	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
15.9	15.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Hancock, WV	Water	316.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
15.9	16	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Nolin silt loam	633.6	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16	16.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Urban land-Chavies complex	422.4	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
16.1	16.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Nolin silt loam	422.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
16.2	16.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Udorthents-Urban land complex	0.0	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
16.2	16.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Urban land	528.0	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
16.3	16.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Clarksburg-Urban land complex	316.8	20	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
16.4	16.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Udorthents-Urban land complex	369.6	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
16.4	16.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	633.6	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
16.5	16.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	0.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16.6	16.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	844.8	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
16.7	16.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Richland silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
16.8	16.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	528.0	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.8	16.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Richland silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
16.9	17	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	686.4	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17	17.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	633.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.1	17.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
17.2	17.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	686.4	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.3	17.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	528.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.4	17.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Summitville complex	422.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	49 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.5	17.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	580.8	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.6	17.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Summitville complex	422.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	49 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
17.7	17.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	316.8	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.7	17.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Richland silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.8	17.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	475.2	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
17.9	18	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	792.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	24 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
18	18.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	528.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
18.1	18.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	1056.0	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
18.3	18.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Berks complex	475.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	22 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.4	18.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	475.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
18.5	18.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	739.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.7	18.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Bethesda very channery clay loam	158.4	9	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
18.7	18.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Lowell silty clay loam	475.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.8	18.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	528.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
18.9	19	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Berks complex	580.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	22 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19	19.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	580.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.1	19.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Berks complex	369.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	22 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.2	19.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	369.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.2	19.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Berks complex	422.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	22 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.3	19.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	528.0	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
19.4	19.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Berks complex	316.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	22 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.5	19.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	316.8	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.6	19.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	475.2	9	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
19.6	19.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	897.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.8	19.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	422.4	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
19.9	19.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	52.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19.9	20	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	580.8	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20	20.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown silty clay loam	844.8	9	No	4L	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
20.2	20.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.2	20.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.3	20.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	1108.8	9	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
20.5	20.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	950.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
20.6	20.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	633.6	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
20.8	20.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	686.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
20.9	21	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	369.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
21	21.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	792.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.1	21.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	0.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.1	21.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	52.8	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
21.1	21.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	475.2	9	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
21.2	21.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	316.8	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
21.3	21.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	422.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
21.4	21.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	950.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.5	21.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	844.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.7	21.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
21.7	21.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Wellston silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	43 L	Good	No	Well drained
21.8	21.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland-Lowell complex	686.4	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	41 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
21.9	22	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	580.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
22	22.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	422.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
22.1	22.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	422.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.2	22.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	528.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.3	22.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	316.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.4	22.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	158.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.4	22.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	105.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.4	22.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	528.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.5	22.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	528.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	24 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.6	22.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	1689.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
22.9	23.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	792.0	9	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
23.1	23.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	475.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
23.2	23.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
23.2	23.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
23.3	23.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	211.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.3	23.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	369.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
23.4	23.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	422.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.5	23.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	633.6	9	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
23.6	23.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	158.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.6	23.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
23.7	23.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.7	23.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	369.6	9	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
23.8	23.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
23.8	23.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	580.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
23.9	24	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	105.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24	24.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	633.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.1	24.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	158.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.1	24.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	475.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
24.2	24.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	105.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.2	24.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
24.3	24.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	369.6	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
24.4	24.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	105.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
24.4	24.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.4	24.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	950.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
24.6	24.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
24.6	24.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	211.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.7	24.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	264.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.7	24.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
24.8	24.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	158.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.8	24.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	211.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
24.9	25	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	633.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25	25.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	369.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25.1	25.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	475.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25.1	25.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
25.2	25.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	316.8	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
25.3	25.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Keene silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
25.3	25.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	52.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
25.3	25.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	897.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
25.5	25.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
25.6	25.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	158.4	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
25.6	25.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	1003.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
25.8	25.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	633.6	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
25.9	26.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Coshocton silt loams	1056.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
26.1	26.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	316.8	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
26.2	26.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Brookside silty clay loam	369.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
26.2	26.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	211.2	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
26.3	26.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	211.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
26.3	26.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
26.4	26.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	369.6	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
26.5	26.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	105.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
26.5	26.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	158.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	55 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
26.5	26.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	158.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
26.5	26.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	264.0	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
26.6	26.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	897.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
26.8	26.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	528.0	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
26.9	27	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	844.8	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
27	27.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	369.6	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
27.1	27.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	792.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
27.2	27.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	264.0	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.3	27.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	105.6	9	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.3	27.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	422.4	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
27.4	27.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
27.4	27.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	1108.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
27.7	27.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	24 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
27.7	27.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
27.7	27.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	264.0	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
27.8	27.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	792.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	24 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
27.9	28.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	686.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
28.1	28.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	369.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
28.1	28.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	369.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
28.2	28.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
28.3	28.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	528.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
28.4	28.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	264.0	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
28.4	28.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	52.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
28.4	28.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	264.0	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	55 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
28.5	28.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	158.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
28.5	28.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	369.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	55 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
28.6	28.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	158.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
28.6	28.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
28.6	28.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	158.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
28.7	28.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	422.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
28.8	28.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
28.8	28.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	264.0	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
28.8	28.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	211.2	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Good	No	Well drained
28.9	29	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	792.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
29	29.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	316.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Good	No	Well drained
29.1	29.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	739.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
29.2	29.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	844.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
29.4	29.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	475.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
29.5	29.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
29.5	29.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
29.6	29.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
29.6	29.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
29.7	29.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	105.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
29.7	29.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	844.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
29.9	29.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	369.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
29.9	30	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	211.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
30	30	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	369.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
30	30.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	422.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
30.1	30.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	633.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
30.2	30.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	422.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
30.3	30.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
30.4	30.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	211.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
30.4	30.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	59 L	Good	No	Well drained
30.5	30.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	211.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
30.5	30.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	792.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
30.6	30.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	158.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
30.7	30.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	211.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
30.7	30.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	422.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
30.8	30.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	158.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
30.8	30.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	475.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
30.9	31.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	739.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
31.1	31.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	897.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
31.2	31.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
31.3	31.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	475.2	11	No	3	No	No	No	33 P	Good	Yes	Well drained
31.4	31.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	844.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
31.5	31.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	52.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
31.5	31.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
31.6	31.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	158.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
31.6	31.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	475.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
31.7	31.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	0.0	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
31.7	31.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	1056.0	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Good	No	Well drained
31.9	32	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	475.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
32	32.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	633.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
32.1	32.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	950.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
32.3	32.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
32.3	32.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	528.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
32.4	32.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	52.8	20	No	3	No	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
32.4	32.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	105.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
32.5	32.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	422.4	20	No	3	No	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
32.5	32.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	422.4	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
32.6	32.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	686.4	20	No	3	No	No	No	33 P	Fair	No	Well drained
32.7	32.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	792.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
32.9	32.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
32.9	33	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	264.0	11	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
33	33	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	105.6	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
33	33	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Lowell silt loam	211.2	11	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
33	33.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	422.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.1	33.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	316.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
33.2	33.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	211.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.2	33.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.3	33.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.3	33.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
33.4	33.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	316.8	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.4	33.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
33.5	33.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	158.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
33.5	33.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	264.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.6	33.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	158.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.6	33.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	580.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
33.7	33.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.7	33.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
33.8	33.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	316.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
33.9	33.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Fitchville variant silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
33.9	34	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	422.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
34	34.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	475.2	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Fair	No	Well drained
34.1	34.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	633.6	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
34.2	34.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	580.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
34.3	34.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	475.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
34.4	34.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	528.0	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Good	No	Well drained
34.5	34.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	844.8	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
34.7	34.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	580.8	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
34.8	34.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	475.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	23 P	Fair	No	Well drained
34.9	35	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	950.4	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
35	35.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Morristown shaly silty clay loam	422.4	48	Yes	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
35.1	35.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin-Lowell silt loams	528.0	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Fair	No	Well drained
35.2	35.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	792.0	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
35.4	35.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	27 L	Good	No	Well drained
35.4	35.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Steinsburg-Rigley variant fine sandy loams	0.0	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	25 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
35.4	35.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	422.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
35.5	35.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	475.2	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	43 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
35.6	35.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
35.6	35.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	5	Yes	No	No	43 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
35.7	35.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Jefferson, Ohio	Hazleton-Westmoreland complex	105.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	46 L	Fair	No	Well drained
35.7	35.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	52.8	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
35.7	35.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
35.8	35.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	422.4	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
35.9	35.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
35.9	36	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36	36	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36	36.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
36.1	36.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
36.1	36.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.2	36.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.2	36.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	422.4	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
36.3	36.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	105.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.3	36.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	686.4	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
36.4	36.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.5	36.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	686.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.6	36.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
36.7	36.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.7	36.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
36.7	36.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
36.8	36.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	158.4	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
36.8	36.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	105.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
36.8	36.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
36.9	36.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
36.9	37	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	475.2	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
37	37	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37	37.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
37.1	37.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	105.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	35 P	Good	No	Well drained
37.1	37.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	950.4	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
37.3	37.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	580.8	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.4	37.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
37.4	37.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	897.6	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
37.6	37.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	422.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
37.7	37.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	528.0	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
37.8	37.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.9	37.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.9	37.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.9	38	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
38	38	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
38	38.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	475.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.1	38.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	369.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.2	38.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	475.2	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
38.3	38.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.3	38.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.4	38.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	105.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.4	38.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
38.5	38.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	264.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	35 P	Good	No	Well drained
38.5	38.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	422.4	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
38.6	38.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.6	38.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	1214.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38.9	38.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	105.6	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.9	39	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
39	39	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39	39	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
39	39.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	739.2	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
39.2	39.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	52.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
39.2	39.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	633.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.3	39.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
39.3	39.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	422.4	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
39.4	39.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	844.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
39.6	39.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.6	39.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	633.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
39.7	39.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.8	39.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
39.8	39.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	528.0	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.9	40.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	1900.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
40.3	40.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.4	40.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	739.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
40.5	40.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
40.5	40.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	369.6	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
40.6	40.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.7	40.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	528.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
40.7	41	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	1214.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41	41.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	528.0	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
41.1	41.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	52.8	6	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
41.1	41.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	369.6	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
41.2	41.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	369.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.2	41.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	1056.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
41.4	41.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.5	41.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.5	41.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	52.8	20	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
41.5	41.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.6	41.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	105.6	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
41.6	41.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
41.6	41.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	844.8	20	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
41.8	41.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
41.8	41.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
41.9	41.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
41.9	41.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
41.9	42	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	475.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42	42.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	1214.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
42.3	42.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	105.6	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42.3	42.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	369.6	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
42.4	42.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	1003.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42.5	42.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	580.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
42.7	42.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42.7	42.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	686.4	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
42.8	42.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
42.9	43	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	633.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
43	43.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	475.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.1	43.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
43.1	43.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
43.2	43.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	1108.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
43.4	43.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	369.6	20	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	Yes	Moderately well drained
43.5	43.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
43.5	43.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.6	43.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
43.6	43.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.6	43.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	105.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.7	43.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	422.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
43.7	43.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
43.8	44	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	1214.4	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
44	44.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	633.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
44.1	44.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	316.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
44.2	44.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
44.2	44.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	580.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
44.3	44.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
44.4	44.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	264.0	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	35 P	Good	No	Well drained
44.4	44.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	580.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
44.5	44.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	686.4	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
44.7	44.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
44.7	44.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
44.8	44.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	739.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
44.9	44.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	105.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
44.9	45.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	1425.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
45.2	45.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	422.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
45.3	45.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
45.3	45.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
45.4	45.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1108.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
45.6	45.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	105.6	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
45.6	45.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
45.7	45.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
45.7	46	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1372.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
46	46	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46	46.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	580.8	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
46.1	46.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	475.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.2	46.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	422.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
46.3	46.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
46.3	46.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.4	46.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
46.4	46.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	52.8	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.4	46.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.5	46.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	739.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
46.6	46.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley loam	105.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
46.6	46.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	528.0	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
46.7	46.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.8	47	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	1161.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47	47	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	105.6	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47	47	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
47	47.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.1	47.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47.1	47.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	52.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.1	47.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	33	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.2	47.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	264.0	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
47.2	47.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.3	47.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	580.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47.4	47.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	158.4	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	25 P	Poor	No	Well drained
47.4	47.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47.5	47.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
47.5	47.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
47.5	47.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.6	47.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47.6	47.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
47.7	47.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
47.7	47.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.8	47.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	369.6	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
47.9	47.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.9	48	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	475.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
48	48.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	633.6	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
48.1	48.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	369.6	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
48.2	48.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
48.2	48.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
48.2	48.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
48.3	48.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	105.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
48.3	48.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
48.4	48.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	105.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
48.4	48.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
48.4	48.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
48.4	48.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	528.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
48.5	48.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	422.4	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
48.6	48.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	528.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
48.7	48.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
48.7	48.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
48.8	48.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
48.9	48.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
48.9	49	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
49	49.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	475.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	35 P	Good	No	Well drained
49.1	49.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	475.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
49.2	49.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
49.2	49.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
49.2	49.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	52.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
49.3	49.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	422.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49.3	49.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Peoga silt loam	1372.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
49.6	49.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Tioga silt loam	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.7	49.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Chili silt loam	1320.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
49.9	50	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	528.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
50	50.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	1214.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.2	50.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
50.3	50.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	1425.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.6	50.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	633.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
50.7	50.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	316.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.7	50.8	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	105.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.8	50.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	739.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.9	50.9	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
50.9	51	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
51	51.1	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	897.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
51.1	51.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
51.2	51.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
51.2	51.2	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	105.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.2	51.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
51.3	51.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
51.3	51.3	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
51.3	51.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
51.4	51.4	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Coshocton-Keene silt loams	158.4	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.4	51.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
51.5	51.5	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
51.5	51.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	633.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
51.6	51.6	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Coshocton-Keene silt loams	211.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.6	51.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
51.7	51.7	Burgettstown Lateral / Crroll, Ohio	Coshocton-Keene silt loams	0.0	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
0	0	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	105.6	20	No	3	No	No	No	42 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
0	0.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	475.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.1	0.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	739.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.2	0.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	422.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.3	0.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	1372.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.6	0.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Dekalb channery loam	316.8	11	No	5	No	No	No	32 L	Good	No	Well drained
0.7	0.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	158.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.7	0.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	1003.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
0.9	0.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	264.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
0.9	1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Dekalb channery loam	633.6	11	No	5	No	No	No	32 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
1	1.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	528.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.1	1.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	316.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.2	1.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	897.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
1.4	1.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	528.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.5	1.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
1.5	1.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Caneadea silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
1.6	1.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	475.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
1.7	1.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Aaron silty clay loam	1320.0	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
1.9	2.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	686.4	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
2.1	2.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Aaron silty clay loam	158.4	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
2.1	2.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	211.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.1	2.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Dekalb channery loam	580.8	11	No	5	No	No	No	32 L	Good	No	Well drained
2.2	2.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Bethesda channery silty clay loam	633.6	4	No	8	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
2.4	2.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown silty clay loam	1531.2	17	Yes	4L	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	Yes	Well drained
2.6	2.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Morristown silty clay loam	686.4	4	No	4L	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
2.8	2.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	264.0	4	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
2.8	3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	633.6	17	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
3	3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	211.2	4	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
3	3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	158.4	17	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
3	3.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	369.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3.1	3.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Fairpoint silty clay loam	1161.6	4	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
3.3	3.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
3.4	3.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	316.8	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
3.4	3.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	0.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
3.4	3.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	1689.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
3.7	3.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	211.2	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
3.8	4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	1161.6	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4	4.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Upshur silty clay loam	1742.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	54 P	Fair	No	Well drained
4.3	4.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Aaron silty clay loam	316.8	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
4.4	4.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	369.6	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
4.5	4.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	422.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
4.5	4.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Caneadea silty clay loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
4.7	4.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
4.8	5.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Caneadea silty clay loam	2270.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
5.3	5.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	1108.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
5.5	5.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Richland silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
5.6	5.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
5.7	5.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	369.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
5.7	5.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silt loam	792.0	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
5.9	5.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	316.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
5.9	6.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	792.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 P	Fair	No	Well drained
6.1	6.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	422.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
6.2	6.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Aaron silty clay loam	1056.0	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	56 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
6.4	7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks-Guernsey complex	3115.2	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	28 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
7	7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	422.4	55	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 P	Poor	No	Well drained
7	7.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	264.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
7.1	7.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7.2	7.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Nolin silt loam	528.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
7.3	7.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7.4	7.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7.5	7.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	211.2	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
7.5	7.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	158.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.6	7.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	475.2	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
7.7	7.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	1267.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
7.9	8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	686.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8	8.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	844.8	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
8.2	8.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
8.2	8.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
8.3	8.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	1108.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
8.5	8.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	316.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.5	8.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	264.0	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
8.6	8.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	0.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
8.6	8.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	686.4	55	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60 L	Poor	No	Well drained
8.7	8.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	316.8	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
8.8	8.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
8.8	8.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	580.8	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.9	9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	264.0	55	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60 L	Poor	No	Well drained
9	9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	369.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9	9.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	158.4	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
9.1	9.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.1	9.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	633.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
9.2	9.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	686.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
9.3	9.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	369.6	55	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60 L	Poor	No	Well drained
9.4	9.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	2059.2	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
9.8	9.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	316.8	55	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60 L	Poor	No	Well drained
9.9	10.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	1161.6	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
10.1	10.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	422.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.2	10.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	0.0	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
10.2	10.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	475.2	55	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60 L	Poor	No	Well drained
10.3	10.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	475.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.3	10.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
10.5	10.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	475.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
10.6	10.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Hazleton channery sandy loam	633.6	55	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60 L	Poor	No	Well drained
10.7	10.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	580.8	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
10.8	10.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	528.0	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
10.9	11	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	475.2	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
11	11.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	1108.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
11.2	11.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	369.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
11.2	11.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	475.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
11.3	11.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	475.2	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Fair	No	Well drained
11.4	11.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	422.4	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
11.5	11.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.5	11.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
11.6	11.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton complex	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.6	11.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	580.8	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
11.7	11.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	422.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.8	11.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	158.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
11.8	11.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	580.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
11.9	12	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	475.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
12	12.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	264.0	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.1	12.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	633.6	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.2	12.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	369.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.3	12.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	211.2	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.3	12.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	686.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
12.4	12.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	369.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
12.5	12.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	1003.2	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
12.7	12.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
12.7	12.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	316.8	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
12.8	12.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	475.2	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
12.9	13.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	1372.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
13.1	13.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	264.0	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
13.2	13.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	316.8	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.2	13.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	1003.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
13.4	13.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	475.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
13.5	13.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	897.6	55	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Poor	Yes	Well drained
13.7	13.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	897.6	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
13.9	14	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	580.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14	14.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	844.8	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
14.1	14.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	158.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.2	14.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	1372.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
14.4	14.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	316.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.5	14.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.5	14.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	264.0	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
14.6	14.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	211.2	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.6	14.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	633.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.7	14.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.8	14.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
14.8	14.8	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Germano fine sandy loam	158.4	20	No	3	Yes	No	No	33 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
14.8	14.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	316.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
14.9	15	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	633.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
15	15.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	1689.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.3	15.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	264.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15.4	15.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	316.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.4	15.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	105.6	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
15.5	15.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Dekalb complex	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	37 L	Fair	No	Well drained
15.5	15.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	2376.0	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	30 P	Good	No	Well drained
15.9	16	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	528.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16	16.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	1584.0	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
16.3	16.4	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	475.2	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16.4	16.5	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	422.4	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.5	16.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	528.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 P	Fair	No	Well drained
16.6	16.6	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	52.8	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	28 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
16.6	16.7	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	211.2	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 P	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.7	16.9	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	1372.8	20	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
16.9	17.1	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Berks channery silt loam	792.0	33	Yes	6	No	No	No	24 P	Fair	No	Well drained
17.1	17.2	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	792.0	11	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	50 L	Good	No	Well drained
17.2	17.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	50 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.3	17.3	Supply Connector / Harrison, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.3	17.4	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.4	17.4	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	264.0	11	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
17.4	17.5	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
17.5	17.5	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
17.5	17.5	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	105.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.5	17.5	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
17.5	17.7	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	633.6	20	No	5	Yes	No	No	25 P	Fair	No	Well drained
17.7	17.7	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.7	17.9	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	1108.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
17.9	17.9	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Rigley sandy loam	158.4	12	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
17.9	18	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18	18	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	105.6	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
18	18.1	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	580.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.1	18.2	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Elba silty clay loam	211.2	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 L	Good	No	Well drained
18.2	18.2	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.2	18.3	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	316.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
18.3	18.3	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.3	18.3	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.3	18.4	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
18.4	18.4	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.4	18.5	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
18.5	18.5	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.5	18.6	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
18.6	18.6	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.6	18.7	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	580.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
18.7	18.8	Supply Connector / Carroll, Ohio	Coshocton-Keene silt loams	475.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.8	18.9	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Coshocton-Keene silt loams	316.8	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.9	18.9	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
18.9	18.9	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
18.9	19	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
19	19.1	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	580.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.1	19.1	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
19.1	19.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	105.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.2	19.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.2	19.3	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
19.3	19.4	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	686.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.4	19.5	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	686.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
19.5	19.6	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	264.0	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
19.6	19.6	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	422.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.6	19.7	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19.7	19.7	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
19.7	19.8	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
19.8	19.9	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
19.9	19.9	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	52.8	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	35 P	Good	No	Well drained
19.9	20	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	528.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
20	20	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
20	20.1	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.1	20.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	475.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.2	20.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.2	20.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
20.2	20.3	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	528.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.3	20.3	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Culleoka silt loam	211.2	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	35 P	Good	No	Well drained
20.3	20.4	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.4	20.5	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	422.4	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.5	20.5	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.5	20.6	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	316.8	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.6	20.6	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.6	20.6	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Coshocton silt loam	52.8	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	50 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
20.6	20.8	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	633.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.8	20.8	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
20.8	20.8	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	158.4	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.8	20.8	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	52.8	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
20.8	20.9	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	211.2	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
20.9	21	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	686.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
21	21	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
21	21.1	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	422.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
21.1	21.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	633.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.2	21.3	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
21.3	21.4	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.4	21.4	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	316.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
21.4	21.5	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey very stony silt loams	316.8	20	Yes	8	No	No	No	60 P	Poor	Yes	Moderately well drained
21.5	21.5	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
21.5	21.7	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	580.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained
21.7	21.7	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	264.0	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.7	21.7	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	105.6	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.7	21.9	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	844.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
21.9	22	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	580.8	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
22	22	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	158.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22	22.1	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	475.2	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Good	No	Well drained
22.1	22.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	264.0	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.2	22.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	52.8	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22.2	22.2	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	264.0	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.2	22.3	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	369.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	25 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
22.3	22.4	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	633.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22.4	22.5	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Guernsey silty clay loam	264.0	12	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
22.5	22.5	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	369.6	20	No	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
22.5	22.6	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	264.0	20	Yes	5	No	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
22.6	22.6	Mainline / Caroll, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
22.6	22.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	30	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
22.7	22.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	316.8	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
22.8	22.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	528.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
22.9	22.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey very stony silt loams	264.0	20	Yes	8	Yes	No	No	60 P	Poor	Yes	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
22.9	23.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	792.0	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.1	23.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland-Guernsey silt loams	264.0	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.1	23.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	316.8	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.2	23.3	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland-Guernsey silt loams	844.8	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.3	23.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	633.6	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
23.5	23.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland-Coshocton silt loams	422.4	20	Yes	6	No	No	No	65 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.5	23.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
23.6	23.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	264.0	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
23.6	23.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	316.8	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
23.7	23.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland-Guernsey silt loams	950.4	20	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	60 L	Fair	No	Well drained
23.9	24	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	528.0	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
24	24	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	369.6	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
24	24.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	633.6	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.2	24.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Tioga loam	1742.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
24.5	25.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	3907.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
25.2	25.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Tioga loam	844.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
25.4	25.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Morristown loam	1636.8	48	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
25.7	26	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Morristown loam	1478.4	4	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
26	26	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Morristown loam	264.0	12	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
26	26.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Bogart variant loam	369.6	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
26.1	26.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	52.8	14	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
26.1	26.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Plainfield loamy sand	1372.8	6	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Excessively drained
26.4	26.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	158.4	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
26.4	26.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	1108.8	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26.6	26.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Tioga loam	1320.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
26.9	27.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	3696.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
27.6	28.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	3168.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
28.2	28.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	316.8	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
28.2	28.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Wheeling loam	844.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
28.4	28.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	844.8	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
28.5	28.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
28.6	28.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
28.7	28.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
28.7	28.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	950.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
28.9	28.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	211.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
28.9	29	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
29	29.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	633.6	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29.1	29.3	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Tioga loam	950.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
29.3	29.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	739.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
29.4	29.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	211.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29.4	29.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Elkinsville silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
29.5	29.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	369.6	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29.5	30.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	2745.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
30.1	30.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	897.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	59 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
30.2	30.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	52.8	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
30.2	30.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1531.2	30	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
30.5	30.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	316.8	20	No	5	No	No	No	31 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
30.6	30.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	1689.6	30	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
30.9	31.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	1372.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	59 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
31.2	31.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	1425.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	31 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
31.4	31.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	422.4	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
31.5	31.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	528.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
31.6	31.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Bethesda channery clay loam	264.0	48	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
31.7	31.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville-Urban land complex	686.4	4	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.8	31.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Bethesda channery clay loam	316.8	48	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained
31.9	31.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	475.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.9	32	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	211.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
32	32	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	316.8	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
32	32.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	633.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
32.2	32.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Bethesda channery clay loam	2376.0	48	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
32.6	32.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	475.2	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
32.7	32.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Berks shaly silt loam	264.0	20	No	5	No	No	No	31 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
32.8	32.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	369.6	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
32.8	32.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	633.6	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
32.9	33	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	211.2	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
33	33.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	1900.8	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
33.4	33.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	792.0	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
33.5	33.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	1689.6	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
33.8	33.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	211.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
33.9	34	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	739.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
34	34.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	633.6	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
34.1	34.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	211.2	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
34.2	34.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	211.2	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
34.2	34.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	158.4	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
34.2	34.3	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	580.8	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
34.3	34.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	369.6	12	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	Yes	Well drained
34.4	34.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Hazleton channery loam	369.6	33	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	48 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
34.5	34.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	792.0	20	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
34.6	34.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	211.2	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	59 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
34.7	34.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	158.4	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
34.7	34.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	422.4	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	59 P	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
34.8	34.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Coshocton-Guernsey silt loams	52.8	12	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	59 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
34.8	34.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Westmoreland silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	44 L	N/A	No	Well drained
34.8	34.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	158.4	6	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
34.9	34.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili silt loam	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
34.9	35	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	580.8	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
35	35.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Weinbach silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
35.1	35.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	158.4	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
35.1	35.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili silt loam	369.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.2	35.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	211.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
35.2	35.3	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
35.3	35.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	739.2	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
35.4	35.4	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili silt loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.4	35.5	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	316.8	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
35.5	35.6	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili silt loam	528.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.6	35.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	264.0	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
35.7	35.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili silt loam	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.7	35.7	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Tioga loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.7	35.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Water	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
35.8	35.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Tioga loam	475.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.8	36.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	1214.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
36.1	36.8	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Pits	3696.0	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
36.8	36.9	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili silt loam	844.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
36.9	37	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	105.6	6	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
37	37	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	422.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
37	37.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	158.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
37.1	37.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Plainfield loamy sand	211.2	6	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Excessively drained
37.1	37.1	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Pits	158.4	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
37.1	37.2	Mainline / Tuscarawas, Ohio	Plainfield loamy sand	105.6	6	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Excessively drained
37.2	37.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Plainfield loamy sand	528.0	6	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Excessively drained
37.3	37.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	264.0	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
37.3	37.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37.4	37.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Latham silt loam	316.8	12	No	6	No	No	No	36 P	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
37.4	37.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
37.5	37.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Melvin silt loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
37.5	37.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Plainfield loamy sand	264.0	3	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Excessively drained
37.6	37.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Latham silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	36 P	N/A	Yes	Moderately well drained
37.6	37.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum and Gilpin silt loams	105.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	29 L	Fair	No	Well drained
37.6	37.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	0.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
37.6	37.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Arkport fine sandy loam	528.0	3	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37.7	37.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Plainfield loamy sand	475.2	9	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Excessively drained
37.8	37.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Plainfield loamy sand	475.2	3	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Excessively drained
37.9	37.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling loam	316.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37.9	38	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	264.0	4	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38	38.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Melvin silt loam	686.4	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
38.1	38.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
38.2	38.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Melvin silt loam	422.4	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
38.3	38.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.3	38.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.3	38.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Brooke silty clay loam	211.2	8	No	6	No	No	No	23 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
38.4	38.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	52.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.4	38.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Brooke silty clay loam	105.6	8	No	6	No	No	No	23 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
38.4	38.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum and Gilpin silt loams	633.6	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	29 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38.5	38.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	422.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
38.6	38.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum and Gilpin silt loams	1003.2	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	29 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
38.8	38.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	30 L	Good	No	Well drained
38.8	39	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	739.2	19	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
39	39	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Keene silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	34 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
39	39	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	211.2	19	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
39	39.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	422.4	19	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
39.1	39.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
39.1	39.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
39.2	39.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Mentor silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
39.2	39.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	264.0	19	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
39.3	39.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Brooke silty clay loam	422.4	8	No	6	No	No	No	23 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
39.4	39.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	686.4	19	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
39.5	39.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
39.5	39.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
39.6	39.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	211.2	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.6	39.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum silt loam	422.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	29 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.7	39.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum and Gilpin silt loams	211.2	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	29 L	Fair	No	Well drained
39.7	39.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
39.8	39.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
39.8	39.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	105.6	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
39.9	40.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili loam	1742.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
40.2	40.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
40.2	40.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
40.3	40.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Keene silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	34 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
40.3	40.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	1056.0	33	Yes	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
40.5	40.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Keene silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	34 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
40.6	40.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum and Gilpin silt loams	0.0	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	29 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
40.6	40.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Keene silt loam	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	34 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
40.6	40.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	211.2	33	Yes	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
40.6	40.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	1003.2	19	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
40.8	40.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	158.4	33	Yes	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
40.9	40.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Latham silt loam	264.0	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	36 P	N/A	Yes	Moderately well drained
40.9	40.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	52.8	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
40.9	41	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
41	41	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
41	41.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
41.1	41.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
41.1	41.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling soils	528.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
41.2	41.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.2	41.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling soils	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
41.3	41.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	528.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.4	41.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Mentor silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.4	41.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	52.8	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.5	41.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
41.5	41.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Luray silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
41.5	41.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
41.6	41.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.6	41.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	264.0	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
41.7	41.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
41.7	41.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.8	41.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	211.2	7	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
41.8	41.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
41.9	41.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.9	42.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Latham silt loam	686.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	38 P	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
42.1	42.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.1	42.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	0.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.1	42.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
42.2	42.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Water	105.6	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
42.2	42.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sloan silt loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
42.4	42.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	1108.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.6	42.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	52.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.6	42.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.6	42.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.7	42.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
42.7	42.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained
42.7	42.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained
42.8	42.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	580.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.9	42.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
42.9	43	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
43	43	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
43	43.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.1	43.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.2	43.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.3	43.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	686.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
43.4	43.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	369.6	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
43.5	43.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Keene silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	34 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
43.5	43.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained
43.5	43.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	422.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
43.6	43.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	844.8	7	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
43.8	43.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.9	44	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	528.0	7	No	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
44	44	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
44	44.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained
44.1	44.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
44.2	44.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Latham silt loam	422.4	12	No	6	No	No	No	36 P	N/A	No	Moderately well drained
44.2	44.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	1056.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
44.4	44.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wallkill silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
44.5	44.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
44.6	44.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
44.7	44.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
44.7	44.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
44.8	44.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
44.9	44.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
44.9	45	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
45	45	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
45	45.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Dekalb sandy loam	475.2	19	No	3	No	No	No	34 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
45.1	45.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
45.2	45.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Mentor silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
45.2	45.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Weinbach silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
45.2	45.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
45.3	45.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
45.3	45.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
45.3	45.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Luray silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
45.3	45.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
45.4	45.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	844.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
45.5	45.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum silt loam	316.8	15	No	6	No	No	No	29 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
45.6	45.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
45.6	45.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
45.7	45.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
45.8	45.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained
45.8	45.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	211.2	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
45.9	45.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained
45.9	45.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Gilpin silt loam	158.4	15	No	6	No	No	No	30 L	Fair	No	Well drained
45.9	46	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Strip mine spoil	211.2	33	Yes	N/A	No	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
46	46	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Keene silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	34 P	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46	46.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum and Gilpin silt loams	264.0	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	29 P	Fair	Yes	Well drained
46.1	46.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	528.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46.2	46.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
46.2	46.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46.3	46.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46.4	46.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	475.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
46.5	46.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46.5	46.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
46.5	46.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
46.6	46.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
46.7	46.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	264.0	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
46.7	46.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
46.7	46.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	105.6	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
46.7	46.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
46.8	46.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
46.8	46.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
46.8	47	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47	47	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
47	47.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
47.1	47.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.1	47.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
47.1	47.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.1	47.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	105.6	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.2	47.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.2	47.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	475.2	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.3	47.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.3	47.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
47.4	47.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Ginat silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
47.4	47.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Weinbach silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.4	47.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.5	47.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	211.2	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.5	47.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.5	47.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Carlisle muck	158.4	1	No	2	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
47.6	47.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.6	47.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.7	47.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Carlisle muck	158.4	1	No	2	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
47.7	47.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	52.8	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.7	47.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Conotton gravelly loam	211.2	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.8	47.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	52.8	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.8	47.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.8	47.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	264.0	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
47.9	47.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.9	48	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
48	48.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Mentor silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.1	48.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
48.1	48.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.2	48.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	792.0	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
48.3	48.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.4	48.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Mentor silt loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.4	48.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
48.5	48.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.5	48.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.5	48.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.5	48.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
48.7	48.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	528.0	15	No	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
48.8	48.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
48.8	49.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	1320.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
49.1	49.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.1	49.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	633.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
49.2	49.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Chili silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.3	49.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
49.3	49.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
49.3	49.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
49.4	49.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
49.4	49.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
49.4	49.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.5	49.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1003.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
49.7	49.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	633.6	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
49.8	49.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
49.8	49.9	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
49.9	50	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
50	50	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	0.0	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
50	50.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
50.1	50.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
50.1	50.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Muskingum and Gilpin silt loams	158.4	30	Yes	6	No	No	No	29 L	Fair	No	Well drained
50.1	50.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained
50.1	50.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Latham silt loam	739.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	36 P	N/A	Yes	Moderately well drained
50.3	50.5	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	1003.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	28 L	Good	No	Well drained
50.5	50.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	633.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained
50.6	50.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	211.2	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
50.6	50.6	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	0.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.6	50.7	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	369.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
50.7	50.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
50.8	50.8	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.8	51.1	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1636.8	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.1	51.2	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
51.2	51.3	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Dekalb sandy loam	580.8	19	No	3	No	No	No	34 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
51.3	51.4	Mainline / Stark, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.4	51.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	0.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.4	51.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	528.0	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
51.5	51.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.5	51.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
51.6	51.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.6	51.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
51.7	51.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	633.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
51.8	51.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	422.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
51.9	51.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Riddles silt loam	264.0	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
51.9	52.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1056.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
52.1	52.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	844.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
52.3	52.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52.3	52.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
52.3	52.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
52.4	52.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Euclid silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
52.4	52.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
52.5	52.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
52.6	52.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52.6	52.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Berks silt loam	158.4	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	No	Well drained
52.6	52.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	0.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	36 L	Fair	No	Well drained
52.6	52.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	1584.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52.9	53	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Bethesda silty clay loam	105.6	7	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Well drained
53	53	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53	53.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	158.4	9	No	5	Yes	No	No	36 L	Good	No	Well drained
53.1	53.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Berks silt loam	105.6	48	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 P	Poor	No	Well drained
53.1	53.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	211.2	9	No	5	Yes	No	No	36 L	Good	No	Well drained
53.1	53.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	950.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.3	53.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
53.3	53.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.4	53.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Berks silt loam	211.2	48	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 P	Poor	No	Well drained
53.5	53.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.5	53.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
53.6	53.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	52.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.6	53.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
53.7	53.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1003.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
53.9	53.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.9	54.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	1161.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
54.2	54.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
54.2	54.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	686.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
54.3	54.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	1742.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
54.7	54.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Mechanicsburg silt loam	105.6	15	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Well drained
54.7	54.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Mechanicsburg silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Well drained
54.7	54.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Berks silt loam	316.8	15	No	5	No	No	No	28 P	Fair	No	Well drained
54.8	54.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Mechanicsburg silt loam	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Good	No	Well drained
54.9	55	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	686.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
55	55.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1003.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
55.2	55.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
55.3	55.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
55.3	55.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
55.4	55.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
55.5	55.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	580.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
55.6	55.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1636.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
55.9	56	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
56	56	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
56	56.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.1	56.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1372.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
56.3	56.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
56.4	56.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
56.4	56.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
56.5	56.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	950.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
56.7	56.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
56.7	56.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.8	56.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
56.8	56.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
56.9	57	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57	57	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
57	57.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.1	57.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
57.2	57.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.2	57.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1372.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
57.5	57.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.5	57.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
57.6	57.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
57.6	57.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	52.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.6	57.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	105.6	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
57.7	57.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
57.7	57.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Euclid silt loam	1056.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
57.9	57.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Jimtown loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
57.9	58	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
58	58.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	1742.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
58.3	58.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
58.4	58.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
58.4	58.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
58.5	59.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	4065.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
59.3	59.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.3	59.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
59.3	59.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.3	59.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	580.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.4	59.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.5	59.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	369.6	18	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
59.6	59.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	0.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
59.6	59.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Bogart loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
59.7	59.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
59.7	59.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.8	59.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	580.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.9	60.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1003.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
60.1	60.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
60.2	60.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
60.2	60.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
60.3	60.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	52.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
60.3	60.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
60.3	60.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
60.3	60.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
60.4	60.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
60.6	60.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	422.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
60.6	60.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	0.0	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
60.6	60.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
60.7	60.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
60.8	60.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	633.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
60.9	61	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61	61	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
61	61.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.2	61.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
61.2	61.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.3	61.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.3	61.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
61.4	61.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Bogart loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.4	61.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	52.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
61.4	61.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
61.5	61.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Bogart loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.5	61.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
61.5	61.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Bogart loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.6	61.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	1003.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
61.8	61.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	52.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
61.8	61.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
61.8	61.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
61.8	62	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	792.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62	62	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62	62.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.1	62.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
62.1	62.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
62.2	62.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	950.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.3	62.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Bogart loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
62.4	62.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
62.4	62.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
62.5	62.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
62.6	62.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
62.6	62.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.7	62.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.7	62.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.8	62.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
62.8	63	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	580.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
63	63	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
63	63.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
63.1	63.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
63.1	63.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
63.2	63.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
63.3	63.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
63.4	63.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
63.5	63.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Euclid silt loam	1056.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
63.7	63.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
63.7	63.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
63.8	63.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	844.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
63.9	64	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64	64.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	1900.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
64.3	64.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.5	64.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
64.5	64.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.6	64.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.6	64.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.7	64.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.7	64.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	528.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.8	64.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
64.9	64.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
64.9	65	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65	65	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
65	65.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	1108.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.2	65.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
65.3	65.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.3	65.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
65.4	65.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.5	65.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
65.5	65.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.6	65.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
65.6	65.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.6	65.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
65.7	65.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	950.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.9	66.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1584.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
66.2	66.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
66.2	66.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
66.4	66.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
66.4	66.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
66.5	66.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Berks silt loam	316.8	48	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 P	Poor	No	Well drained
66.5	66.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	528.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
66.6	66.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
66.7	67.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	2428.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
67.1	67.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
67.2	67.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
67.2	67.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	897.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
67.4	67.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	1161.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
67.6	67.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Tioga silt loam	475.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
67.7	67.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
67.8	67.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
67.9	68.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
68.1	68.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
68.1	68.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wallkill silt loam	1214.4	1	No	5	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
68.3	68.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Linwood muck	580.8	1	No	2	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
68.4	68.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	2798.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
68.9	69	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Melvin silt loam	422.4	1	No	5	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
69	69.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
69.2	69.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Berks silt loam	105.6	48	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 P	Poor	No	Well drained
69.2	69.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Mechanicsburg silt loam	264.0	15	No	5	Yes	No	No	60 P	Fair	No	Well drained
69.2	69.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.3	69.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	264.0	18	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
69.3	69.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.4	69.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	369.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.5	69.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	264.0	18	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
69.5	69.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.6	69.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.6	69.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.6	69.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.7	69.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili gravelly loam	105.6	18	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
69.7	69.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.8	69.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.9	69.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.9	70	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
70	70.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	1267.2	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
70.2	70.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
70.3	70.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	528.0	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
70.4	70.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Riddles silt loam	844.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
70.6	70.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	792.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
70.7	70.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
70.9	70.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
70.9	71.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1161.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
71.1	71.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
71.2	71.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
71.3	71.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Berks silt loam	422.4	48	Yes	5	No	No	No	28 P	Poor	No	Well drained
71.3	71.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	580.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
71.5	71.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	1214.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
71.7	71.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	369.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
71.8	71.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	422.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
71.8	72.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	2112.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
72.2	72.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
72.3	72.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	792.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
72.4	72.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1425.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
72.7	72.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
72.8	72.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
72.9	73	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	844.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73	73	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73	73.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
73.1	73.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	52.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73.1	73.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73.1	73.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73.2	73.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	1953.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73.5	73.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
73.6	73.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
73.7	73.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
73.7	73.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73.8	74.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	2481.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
74.2	74.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	686.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
74.4	74.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
74.5	74.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
74.5	74.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
74.7	74.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	264.0	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
74.7	74.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
74.7	74.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
74.8	74.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	897.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
74.9	75	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	633.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75	75.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
75.1	75.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
75.1	75.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.2	75.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1108.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
75.4	75.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.5	75.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	369.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.5	75.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	475.2	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
75.6	75.7	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	475.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.7	75.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.8	75.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Tioga silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.8	75.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Riddles silt loam	105.6	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
75.8	75.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
75.9	76	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	475.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76	76	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
76	76	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
76	76.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	528.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.2	76.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
76.2	76.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Orrville silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
76.3	76.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.3	76.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.5	76.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
76.5	76.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	1425.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.8	76.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.8	77	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	897.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77	77.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	633.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77.1	77.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	422.4	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
77.2	77.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77.3	77.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
77.3	77.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Bogart loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
77.4	77.5	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Oshtemo sandy loam	844.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
77.5	77.6	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Chili loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77.6	77.8	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	1161.6	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
77.8	77.9	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Euclid silt loam	316.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
77.9	78	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
78	78.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Linwood muck	369.6	1	No	2	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
78.1	78.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Carlisle muck	52.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
78.1	78.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Linwood muck	475.2	1	No	2	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
78.2	78.2	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Carlisle muck	475.2	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
78.2	78.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Melvin silt loam	422.4	1	No	5	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
78.3	79.1	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Euclid silt loam	4171.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
79.1	79.3	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
79.3	79.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Haskins silt loam	897.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
79.4	79.4	Mainline / Wayne, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
79.4	79.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
79.5	79.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
79.5	79.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
79.7	79.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
79.8	79.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
79.9	80	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
80	80	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
80	80.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	528.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
80.1	80.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	950.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
80.3	80.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	33 L	Good	No	Well drained
80.3	80.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster-Riddles silt loams	2217.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
80.7	80.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	1056.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
80.9	81	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Jimtown silt loam	264.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
81	81.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
81.1	81.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Algiers silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
81.1	81.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
81.2	81.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Algiers silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
81.3	81.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
81.3	81.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
81.3	81.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
81.3	81.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
81.4	81.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	792.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
81.5	81.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
81.6	81.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Algiers silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
81.7	81.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	950.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
81.8	82	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	739.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
82	82	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
82	82.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1848.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
82.4	82.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	0.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
82.4	82.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
82.4	82.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
82.5	82.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
82.6	82.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	844.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
82.7	82.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
82.8	82.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
82.8	82.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
82.9	82.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	475.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
82.9	83	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Lordstown silt loam	211.2	30	Yes	5	No	No	No	27 L	Fair	Yes	Well drained
83	83.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
83.1	83.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
83.2	83.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
83.3	83.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	580.8	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
83.4	83.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
83.4	83.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
83.5	83.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
83.5	83.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
83.5	83.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
83.6	83.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
83.6	83.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
83.6	83.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
83.7	83.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	792.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
83.8	83.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
83.9	84	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
84	84	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
84	84	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
84	84.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Lykens silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
84.1	84.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Holly silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
84.1	84.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	528.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
84.2	84.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Killbuck silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
84.3	84.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
84.3	84.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
84.4	84.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
84.4	84.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
84.5	84.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Carlisle muck	369.6	1	No	2	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
84.6	84.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
84.6	84.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili-Wooster complex	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
84.6	84.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	158.4	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
84.6	84.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili-Wooster complex	369.6	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
84.7	84.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton gravelly loams	580.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
84.8	84.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
84.9	84.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton gravelly loams	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
84.9	85	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili-Wooster complex	580.8	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
85	85.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
85.1	85.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	264.0	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
85.2	85.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
85.2	85.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
85.3	85.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
85.3	85.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
85.4	85.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
85.4	85.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
85.5	85.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
85.5	85.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
85.6	85.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	897.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
85.7	85.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
85.8	85.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	52.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
85.8	85.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
85.9	85.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
85.9	85.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
85.9	86	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
86	86.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
86.1	86.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
86.2	86.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	950.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
86.3	86.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
86.4	86.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
86.4	86.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
86.5	86.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
86.5	86.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
86.5	86.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
86.6	86.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
86.6	86.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	528.0	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
86.7	86.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
86.7	86.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1056.0	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
86.9	87	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
87	87.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
87.1	87.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
87.1	87.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
87.2	87.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
87.3	87.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
87.4	87.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	52.8	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
87.4	87.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
87.4	87.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
87.5	87.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
87.5	87.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
87.6	87.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
87.7	87.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
87.7	87.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
87.8	88.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	2270.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
88.2	88.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
88.3	88.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
88.4	88.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	158.4	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
88.5	88.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1900.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
88.8	88.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
88.9	88.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
88.9	88.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
88.9	89	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
89	89	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	20	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
89	89.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
89.1	89.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	580.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
89.2	89.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	792.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
89.3	89.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
89.4	89.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
89.5	89.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
89.5	89.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
89.7	89.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
89.7	89.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	950.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
89.9	90	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
90	90	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
90	90.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	528.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
90.1	90.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
90.1	90.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
90.2	90.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
90.2	90.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
90.3	90.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
90.5	90.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
90.5	90.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
90.5	90.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
90.6	91.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	3326.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
91.2	91.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	897.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
91.4	91.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1689.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
91.7	91.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Udorthents	475.2	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	Well drained
91.8	91.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
91.8	92	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	739.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
92	92	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
92	92.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
92.1	92.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
92.2	92.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
92.2	92.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	897.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
92.4	92.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	739.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
92.5	92.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	844.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
92.7	92.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	105.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
92.7	92.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
92.8	92.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	369.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
92.9	93.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	2428.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
93.4	93.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	316.8	20	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
93.4	93.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	792.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
93.6	93.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
93.6	93.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
93.6	93.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
93.7	93.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
93.7	93.8	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	369.6	20	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
93.8	93.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	792.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
93.9	94	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	264.0	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
94	94	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
94	94.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	105.6	20	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
94.1	94.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	211.2	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.1	94.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	264.0	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.2	94.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Algiers silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
94.2	94.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	158.4	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.2	94.2	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
94.2	94.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Jimtown silt loam	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
94.3	94.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton gravelly loams	264.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
94.3	94.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Jimtown silt loam	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
94.3	94.3	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton gravelly loams	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
94.3	94.4	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	264.0	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.4	94.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.5	94.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton gravelly loams	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
94.5	94.5	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
94.5	94.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton gravelly loams	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
94.6	94.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton gravelly loams	52.8	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
94.6	94.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	369.6	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.7	94.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton gravelly loams	422.4	27	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
94.7	94.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	844.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.9	94.9	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	211.2	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.9	95	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
95	95	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Chili loam	105.6	8	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
95	95.1	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
95.1	95.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	2640.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
95.6	95.6	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
95.6	95.7	Mainline / Ashland, Ohio	Water	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
95.7	95.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
95.8	95.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
95.9	95.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
95.9	96	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton soils	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
96	96	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
96	96	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton soils	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
96	96.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
96.1	96.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton soils	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
96.1	96.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
96.2	96.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili loam	422.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.2	96.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
96.3	96.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
96.3	96.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
96.4	96.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
96.4	96.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.4	96.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
96.5	96.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
96.5	96.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
96.6	96.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
96.6	96.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
96.6	96.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
96.7	96.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
96.7	96.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Lordstown and Loudonville silt loams	105.6	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	36 L	Fair	No	Well drained
96.8	96.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	0.0	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	38 L	Fair	No	Well drained
96.8	96.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	38 L	Good	No	Well drained
96.8	97	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
97	97	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
97	97	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
97	97.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
97.1	97.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
97.1	97.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
97.2	97.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	38 L	Good	No	Well drained
97.3	97.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	38 L	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
97.3	97.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
97.4	97.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
97.4	97.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
97.5	97.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Ravenna silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
97.6	98	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	1689.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
98	98.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	950.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
98.1	98.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
98.2	98.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Canfield silt loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
98.2	98.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Lordstown silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	36 L	Good	Yes	Well drained
98.2	98.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
98.3	98.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Wooster silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
98.4	98.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Lordstown and Loudonville silt loams	105.6	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	36 L	Fair	No	Well drained
98.4	98.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	528.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
98.5	98.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
98.5	98.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	686.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
98.6	98.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
98.7	98.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
98.7	98.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
98.8	98.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
98.8	99	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
99	99	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton soils	158.4	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
99	99	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99	99.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton soils	369.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
99.1	99.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99.1	99.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Chili and Conotton soils	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	Yes	Well drained
99.1	99.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Linwood muck	316.8	1	No	2	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
99.2	99.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
99.2	99.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	316.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
99.3	99.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	475.2	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99.4	99.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
99.4	99.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	792.0	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99.6	99.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	316.8	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
99.7	99.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99.7	99.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	1056.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
99.9	99.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
99.9	100.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	1003.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
100.1	100.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
100.2	100.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
100.2	100.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
100.3	100.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
100.3	100.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	528.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
100.4	100.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Orrville loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	38 L	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
100.5	100.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
100.5	100.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
100.6	100.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
100.6	100.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Wheeling silt loam	950.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
100.8	100.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Loudonville silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	38 L	Good	No	Well drained
100.8	100.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Orrville loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	38 L	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
100.8	101	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	792.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101	101.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bogart silt loam	633.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.1	101.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.2	101.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Shoals loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
101.2	101.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	105.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
101.2	101.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	475.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
101.3	101.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.4	101.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.5	101.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	369.6	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
101.5	101.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
101.6	101.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.6	101.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
101.7	101.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
101.7	101.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.7	101.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silty clay loam	52.8	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.8	101.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
101.8	101.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silty clay loam	0.0	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.8	101.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
101.8	101.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.8	101.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silty clay loam	211.2	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
101.9	101.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
101.9	101.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silty clay loam	158.4	15	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
101.9	102	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102	102	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102	102	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
102	102	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102	102.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
102.1	102.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
102.2	102.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
102.2	102.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.2	102.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
102.2	102.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.3	102.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.3	102.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
102.3	102.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.4	102.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.5	102.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.5	102.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
102.6	102.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.6	102.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
102.7	102.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.7	102.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	475.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
102.8	102.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.8	102.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.9	102.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.9	102.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
102.9	103	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103	103	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103	103	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103	103	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103	103.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.1	103.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.1	103.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.1	103.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.1	103.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.2	103.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.2	103.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
103.2	103.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.3	103.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.3	103.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
103.3	103.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.4	103.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.4	103.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.4	103.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	52.8	33	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
103.5	103.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.5	103.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.5	103.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.6	103.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
103.7	103.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.7	103.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.7	103.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.7	103.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
103.8	103.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.8	103.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.8	103.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	52.8	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
103.8	103.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
103.8	103.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.9	103.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
103.9	103.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
103.9	104	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
104	104.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bogart loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
104.1	104.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
104.1	104.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
104.1	104.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
104.1	104.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
104.2	104.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	475.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
104.3	104.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
104.3	104.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
104.3	104.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
104.3	104.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
104.4	104.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
104.4	104.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
104.5	104.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
104.5	104.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
104.6	104.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
104.7	104.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
104.7	104.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
104.8	104.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	264.0	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
104.8	104.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
104.9	104.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	211.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
104.9	105	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Linwood muck	211.2	1	No	2	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
105	105	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
105	105.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	1795.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
105.4	105.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
105.4	105.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
105.5	105.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	1108.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
105.7	105.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
105.8	105.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
105.8	105.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
105.8	105.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
105.8	105.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
105.9	105.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	211.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
105.9	106	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Belmore loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
106	106	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106	106.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
106.2	106.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106.2	106.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
106.3	106.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106.3	106.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
106.3	106.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106.4	106.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
106.4	106.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106.4	106.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
106.5	106.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106.5	106.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
106.6	106.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106.6	106.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
106.6	106.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106.7	106.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
106.8	106.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	0.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
106.8	106.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
106.8	106.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	316.8	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
106.9	106.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
106.9	106.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
106.9	107	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
107	107	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
107	107.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
107.1	107.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
107.1	107.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
107.1	107.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	1267.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
107.4	107.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
107.4	107.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
107.4	107.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
107.5	107.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	158.4	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
107.5	107.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
107.5	107.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Condit silt loam	105.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Poorly drained
107.5	107.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
107.5	107.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
107.6	107.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
107.7	107.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
107.7	107.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
107.8	107.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
107.8	107.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
107.8	107.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	475.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
107.9	107.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
107.9	107.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
107.9	107.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
107.9	108	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
108	108.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
108.1	108.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
108.2	108.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
108.2	108.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Belmore loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
108.3	108.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Haney loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
108.3	108.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Belmore loam	158.4	15	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
108.4	108.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Belmore loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
108.4	108.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Belmore loam	158.4	9	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
108.5	108.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Haney loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
108.6	108.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Digby loam	369.6	3	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
108.7	108.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
108.7	108.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Haney loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
108.8	108.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
108.9	109	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Haney loam	580.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
109	109	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	105.6	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
109	109	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109	109.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
109.1	109.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109.1	109.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Lobdell silt loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
109.1	109.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109.1	109.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
109.2	109.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
109.2	109.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Glenford silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
109.2	109.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
109.3	109.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109.3	109.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
109.3	109.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	0.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109.3	109.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
109.3	109.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
109.3	109.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109.4	109.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109.5	109.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
109.5	109.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
109.6	109.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
109.6	109.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	1161.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109.8	109.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
109.8	109.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
109.9	109.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
109.9	109.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
109.9	110	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Haney loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
110	110.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
110.1	110.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silty clay loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
110.1	110.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
110.1	110.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
110.1	110.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	1003.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.3	110.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
110.3	110.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.4	110.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	0.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
110.4	110.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
110.4	110.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
110.4	110.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.5	110.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
110.5	110.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.5	110.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
110.6	110.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.6	110.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
110.6	110.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	0.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.6	110.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.7	110.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.7	110.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
110.8	110.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
110.8	110.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	0.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
110.8	110.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
110.8	110.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
110.9	110.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
110.9	111	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	633.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
111	111	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
111	111.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.1	111.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
111.2	111.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.2	111.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	1056.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
111.4	111.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.4	111.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.5	111.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.5	111.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.5	111.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
111.5	111.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.6	111.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.6	111.7	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
111.7	111.8	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.8	111.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
111.9	111.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
111.9	112	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
112	112.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
112.1	112.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
112.2	112.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
112.2	112.2	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
112.2	112.3	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
112.3	112.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
112.4	112.4	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
112.4	112.5	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
112.5	112.6	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
112.6	112.9	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	1584.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
112.9	113	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	844.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
113	113.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
113.1	113.1	Mainline / Richland, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	0.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
113.1	113.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
113.1	113.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	422.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
113.2	113.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
113.2	113.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	1108.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
113.4	113.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
113.4	113.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
113.5	113.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
113.5	113.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	686.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
113.7	113.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
113.7	113.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
113.7	113.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
113.9	113.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
113.9	114	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
114	114.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
114.1	114.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Alexandria silt loam	158.4	8	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
114.1	114.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
114.2	114.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
114.2	114.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	158.4	8	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
114.3	114.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
114.5	114.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
114.5	114.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	1108.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
114.7	114.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
114.8	114.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
114.8	114.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	8	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
114.9	114.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
114.9	115	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
115	115.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
115.1	115.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	8	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
115.1	115.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Marengo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
115.2	115.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	1689.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
115.5	115.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Kibbie-Bennington complex	580.8	3	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
115.6	115.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
115.7	115.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	8	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
115.7	115.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	950.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
115.9	115.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	8	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
115.9	115.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
115.9	115.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
115.9	116	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	580.8	8	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
116	116.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Colwood silt loam	1108.8	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
116.3	116.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
116.4	116.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
116.4	116.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
116.5	116.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
116.5	116.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
116.5	116.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	1320.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
116.8	116.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
116.8	117	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	633.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
117	117.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
117.1	117.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	1372.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
117.3	117.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
117.4	117.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
117.5	117.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
117.6	117.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
117.6	117.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lykens silt loam	580.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
117.7	117.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	1108.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
117.9	118	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Olentangy mucky silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
118	118	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
118	118.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
118.1	118.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
118.1	118.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
118.2	118.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
118.3	118.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
118.4	118.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
118.4	118.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
118.5	118.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
118.6	118.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
118.6	118.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
118.7	118.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
118.7	118.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
118.9	118.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bono silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
118.9	118.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
118.9	119	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bono silty clay loam	422.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
119	119	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
119	119.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
119.1	119.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	264.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
119.1	119.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
119.2	119.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
119.3	119.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
119.4	119.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
119.6	119.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
119.6	119.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bono silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
119.6	119.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
119.7	119.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bono silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
119.7	119.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
119.8	120	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	1267.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
120	120.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
120.2	120.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
120.2	120.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
120.3	120.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	0.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
120.3	120.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
120.4	120.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
120.5	120.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
120.6	120.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
120.6	120.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	686.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
120.7	120.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
120.8	120.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
120.8	120.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
120.9	120.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
120.9	121.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	1108.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
121.1	121.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
121.1	121.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Wallkill silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
121.2	121.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
121.3	121.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
121.4	121.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Luray silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
121.5	121.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bono silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
121.5	121.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
121.7	121.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
121.8	122	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
122	122	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bono silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
122	122.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	1161.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
122.2	122.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
122.2	122.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
122.3	122.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
122.3	122.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
122.4	122.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
122.4	122.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bono silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
122.5	122.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
122.6	122.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
122.8	122.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
122.8	123	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
123	123	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
123	123.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
123.1	123.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Fitchville silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
123.2	123.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
123.2	123.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
123.2	123.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
123.2	123.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
123.3	123.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
123.4	123.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
123.5	123.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
123.5	123.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
123.5	123.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
123.7	123.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
123.8	124	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
124	124	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
124	124.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
124.1	124.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
124.2	124.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
124.2	124.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
124.3	124.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
124.5	124.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
124.5	124.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
124.6	124.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
124.7	124.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
124.8	124.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
124.8	124.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
124.9	125	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	580.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
125	125.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
125.1	125.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
125.2	125.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
125.2	125.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
125.3	125.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
125.3	125.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
125.4	125.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
125.5	125.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
125.6	125.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
125.7	125.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
125.7	125.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
125.8	125.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	844.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
125.9	126	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
126	126.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
126.1	126.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
126.3	126.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	369.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
126.4	126.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
126.4	126.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
126.5	126.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
126.5	126.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	633.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
126.6	126.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
126.7	126.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
126.7	126.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
126.8	126.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
126.9	127	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127	127	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127	127	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127	127.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127.1	127.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127.1	127.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127.2	127.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
127.3	127.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127.3	127.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127.3	127.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127.4	127.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127.5	127.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127.5	127.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127.6	127.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127.7	127.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127.8	127.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127.8	127.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127.9	127.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127.9	127.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
127.9	127.9	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
127.9	128	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
128	128	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
128	128	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
128	128.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
128.1	128.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
128.1	128.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
128.2	128.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
128.3	128.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
128.3	128.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
128.3	128.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
128.4	128.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
128.5	128.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
128.5	128.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
128.6	128.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
128.6	128.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
128.6	128.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	686.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
128.8	128.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
128.8	129.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	1425.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
129.1	129.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
129.1	129.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tuscola-Bennington complex	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
129.1	129.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
129.2	129.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
129.3	129.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
129.4	129.4	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
129.4	129.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
129.5	129.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
129.6	129.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
129.7	129.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
129.8	129.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
129.8	130	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	1056.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
130	130	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
130	130.1	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
130.1	130.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
130.2	130.2	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
130.2	130.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
130.3	130.3	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
130.3	130.5	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Condit-Bennington silt loams	1056.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
130.5	130.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	105.6	8	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
130.6	130.6	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Sebring silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
130.6	130.7	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Cardington silt loam	264.0	8	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
130.7	130.8	Mainline / Crawford, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
130.8	130.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
130.8	130.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
130.9	130.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
130.9	130.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
130.9	131	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
131	131.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	1531.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
131.2	131.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
131.3	131.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
131.3	131.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
131.4	131.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
131.5	131.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
131.5	131.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
131.7	131.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
131.8	132.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	1584.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
132.1	132.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
132.3	132.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
132.3	132.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
132.4	132.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	1795.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
132.7	132.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
132.8	133.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	2112.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
133.2	133.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
133.2	133.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
133.2	133.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
133.3	133.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
133.3	133.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	739.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
133.5	133.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
133.6	133.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
133.7	134.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Tiro silt loam	2164.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
134.2	134.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	1372.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
134.4	134.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	1372.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
134.7	134.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
134.8	134.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
134.8	134.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Bennington silt loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
134.8	134.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Millsdale silty clay loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	35 L	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
134.9	135.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Milton variant loam	1953.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	38 L	Good	No	Well drained
135.3	135.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haney loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
135.4	135.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Milton variant loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	38 L	Good	No	Well drained
135.4	135.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
135.5	135.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Water	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
135.5	135.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	52.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
135.5	135.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Milton variant loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	38 L	Good	No	Well drained
135.5	135.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood clay loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
135.6	135.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	1320.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
135.8	135.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Rawson loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
135.9	136	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	792.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
136	136.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1161.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
136.2	136.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
136.3	136.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	686.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
136.5	136.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
136.5	136.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	686.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
136.6	136.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
136.8	136.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
136.9	136.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
136.9	137	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	686.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137	137.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.1	137.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.2	137.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.2	137.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.2	137.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.3	137.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
137.3	137.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.4	137.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
137.4	137.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.5	137.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Gallman loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
137.6	137.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
137.6	137.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	316.8	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
137.7	137.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
137.8	137.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.8	137.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	633.6	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
137.9	138	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
138	138.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	633.6	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.1	138.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
138.2	138.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	369.6	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.3	138.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	633.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.4	138.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Rawson loam	0.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
138.4	138.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.6	138.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	52.8	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.6	138.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
138.6	138.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.7	138.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	105.6	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.7	138.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
138.7	138.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	316.8	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.8	138.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
138.8	139	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	897.6	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139	139	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
139	139.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	528.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139.1	139.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haskins loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139.2	139.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1214.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139.4	139.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Bono silty clay	475.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
139.5	139.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haskins loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139.6	139.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139.6	139.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haskins loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139.6	139.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	897.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139.8	139.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
139.9	140.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1372.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
140.1	140.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Morley silt loam	105.6	34	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
140.2	140.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
140.2	140.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Morley silt loam	211.2	34	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
140.2	140.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	1003.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
140.4	140.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Water	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
140.4	140.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	528.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
140.5	140.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Gallman loam	1056.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
140.7	140.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Belmore-Morley complex	0.0	34	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
140.7	141	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	1108.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
141	141	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Belmore-Morley complex	316.8	34	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
141	141.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
141.1	141.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
141.2	141.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1531.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
141.5	141.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	1531.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
141.7	141.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Gallman loam	369.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
141.8	142	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Millgrove loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
142	142.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Chagrin silt loam	1108.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
142.2	142.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
142.2	142.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Water	158.4	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
142.2	142.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	158.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
142.3	142.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
142.3	142.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
142.4	142.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haskins loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
142.5	142.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
142.5	142.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	528.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
142.6	142.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
142.6	142.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
142.7	142.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haney loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
142.7	142.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
142.8	143	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1531.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
143	143.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
143.1	143.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
143.2	143.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	686.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
143.4	143.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
143.4	143.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
143.5	143.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
143.6	143.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
143.6	143.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	1372.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
143.9	144.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	950.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
144.1	144.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
144.1	144.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
144.2	144.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
144.2	144.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	739.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
144.4	144.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
144.5	144.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
144.5	144.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
144.6	144.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
144.6	144.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
144.7	144.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
144.7	144.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	316.8	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
144.8	144.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	158.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
144.8	144.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	264.0	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
144.9	145.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1161.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
145.1	145.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
145.2	145.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
145.3	145.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
145.4	145.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
145.4	145.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
145.5	145.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
145.5	145.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
145.6	145.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	52.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
145.6	145.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
145.6	145.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
145.7	145.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
145.8	146.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1795.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
146.1	146.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
146.1	146.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1372.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
146.4	146.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
146.5	146.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
146.5	146.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
146.5	146.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
146.6	146.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
146.7	146.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
146.9	147.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1267.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
147.1	147.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
147.1	147.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
147.1	147.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
147.2	147.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
147.2	147.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
147.3	147.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
147.4	147.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
147.4	147.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
147.5	147.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
147.6	147.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
147.6	147.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
147.7	147.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haskins loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
147.8	147.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
147.8	147.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haskins loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
147.9	148.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	2006.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
148.3	148.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
148.3	148.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
148.3	148.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
148.3	148.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Haskins loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
148.4	148.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
148.4	148.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
148.5	148.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
148.6	148.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
148.6	148.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
148.8	148.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
148.8	148.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
148.9	149	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
149	149	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
149	149.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
149.1	149.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
149.2	149.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
149.2	149.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
149.4	149.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
149.4	149.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
149.5	149.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
149.6	149.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
149.7	149.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
149.7	149.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	633.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
149.9	149.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Digby loam	422.4	2.5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
149.9	150	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
150	150.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
150.1	150.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
150.1	150.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
150.3	150.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
150.5	150.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
150.5	150.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
150.6	150.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
150.7	150.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	1108.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
150.9	151.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1056.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
151.1	151.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
151.2	151.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1056.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
151.4	151.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
151.5	151.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
151.5	151.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
151.7	151.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
151.7	151.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
151.8	151.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
151.8	151.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
151.8	151.9	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
151.9	152	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
152	152	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
152	152.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
152.1	152.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
152.2	152.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
152.2	152.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
152.3	152.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
152.4	152.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
152.4	152.5	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	633.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
152.5	152.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	739.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
152.7	152.7	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
152.7	152.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
152.8	153	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Glynwood silty clay loam	1056.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
153	153.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	528.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
153.1	153.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
153.1	153.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	1108.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
153.3	153.4	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
153.4	153.6	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	897.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
153.6	153.8	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1056.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
153.8	154	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	792.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
154	154.1	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
154.1	154.2	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Pandora silt loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
154.2	154.3	Mainline / Seneca, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
154.3	154.3	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
154.3	154.3	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
154.3	154.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
154.4	154.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
154.4	154.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
154.5	154.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	316.8	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
154.5	154.6	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
154.6	154.7	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	475.2	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
154.7	154.7	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
154.7	154.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	528.0	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
154.8	155	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	844.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155	155	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
155	155	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	0.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155	155.1	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
155.1	155.1	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.1	155.1	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Glynwood silt loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
155.1	155.1	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.1	155.2	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	369.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
155.2	155.2	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.2	155.2	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.2	155.3	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	211.2	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
155.3	155.3	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.3	155.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
155.4	155.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.4	155.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	422.4	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
155.5	155.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.5	155.7	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	792.0	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
155.7	155.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.8	155.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
155.8	155.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.8	155.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
155.8	155.9	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
155.9	156	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
156	156	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
156	156.1	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
156.1	156.2	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
156.2	156.2	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
156.2	156.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
156.4	156.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	158.4	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
156.4	156.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
156.5	156.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	211.2	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
156.5	156.6	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
156.6	156.7	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
156.7	156.7	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
156.7	156.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
156.8	156.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	52.8	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
156.8	157	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	1161.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
157	157.2	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	686.4	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
157.2	157.3	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Glynwood-Blount-Houcktown complex	686.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
157.3	157.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount-Jenera complex	422.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
157.4	157.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	316.8	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
157.5	157.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
157.5	157.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
157.5	157.6	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount-Houcktown complex	422.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
157.6	157.7	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	369.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
157.7	157.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
157.8	157.9	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount-Houcktown complex	528.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
157.9	157.9	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Mermill loam	211.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
157.9	158	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
158	158.1	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount-Houcktown complex	686.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
158.1	158.1	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	211.2	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
158.1	158.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount-Houcktown complex	1267.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
158.4	158.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	475.2	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
158.5	158.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount-Jenera complex	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
158.5	158.6	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount-Houcktown complex	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
158.6	158.6	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	369.6	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
158.6	158.7	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount-Houcktown complex	580.8	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
158.7	158.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	264.0	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
158.8	158.9	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Blount silt loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
158.9	159.1	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Pewamo silty clay loam	1108.8	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
159.1	159.3	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Fox loam	1214.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
159.3	159.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Cygnet loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
159.4	159.4	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Alvada loam	211.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
159.4	159.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Cygnet loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
159.5	159.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Fox loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
159.5	159.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Aquents	158.4	0.5	No	7	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
159.5	159.5	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Fox loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
159.5	159.6	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Vaughnsville loam	211.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
159.6	159.6	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Alvada loam	158.4	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
159.6	159.6	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Haskins loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
159.6	159.7	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Mermill clay loam	264.0	0.5	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
159.7	159.8	Mainline / Hancock, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	792.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
159.8	160.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	3273.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
160.5	160.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Shawtown loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
160.5	160.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	2059.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
160.9	160.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	52.8	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
160.9	161.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	5121.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
161.9	161.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Mermill loam	475.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
161.9	162	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	369.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162	162.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	369.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
162.1	162.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	105.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.1	162.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	105.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
162.1	162.2	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	211.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.2	162.2	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	105.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
162.2	162.2	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	211.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.2	162.3	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	422.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
162.3	162.4	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	316.8	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.4	162.4	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	52.8	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.4	162.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	686.4	0.2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.5	162.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	369.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.6	162.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	105.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
162.6	162.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Haskins and Digby	105.6	0.5	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.6	162.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
162.6	162.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Haskins and Digby	792.0	0.5	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.8	162.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	158.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
162.8	162.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Haskins and Digby	105.6	0.5	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
162.8	163.2	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	1848.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
163.2	163.2	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Shawtown loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
163.2	163.3	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Aurand loam	369.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
163.3	163.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	3062.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
163.9	163.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	52.8	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
163.9	166.4	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	13411.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
166.4	166.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	739.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
166.6	166.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
166.6	166.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	633.6	0.2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
166.7	166.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	52.8	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
166.7	167.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	4382.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
167.5	167.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	211.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
167.6	167.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	158.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
167.6	167.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	264.0	0.2	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
167.7	167.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	633.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
167.8	167.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	528.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
167.9	167.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Mermill sandy clay loam	105.6	0.2	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
167.9	167.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Haskins and Digby	264.0	0.5	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
167.9	168	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Mermill sandy clay loam	422.4	0.2	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
168	168	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	105.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
168	168.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Haskins and Digby	105.6	0.5	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
168.1	168.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
168.1	168.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	369.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
168.1	168.3	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	633.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
168.3	168.3	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	211.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
168.3	168.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	1636.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
168.6	168.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Castalia-Marblehead complex	158.4	3	No	8	No	No	No	6 L	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
168.6	168.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Millsdale silty clay loam	264.0	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	32 L	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
168.7	168.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Castalia-Marblehead complex	264.0	3	No	8	No	No	No	6 L	Poor	No	Well drained
168.7	168.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Millsdale silty clay loam	633.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	32 L	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
168.9	169.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	4012.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
169.6	169.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	158.4	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
169.7	169.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	264.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
169.7	169.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	158.4	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
169.7	169.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	580.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
169.8	169.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Eel silt loam	475.2	0.2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
169.9	170	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	633.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
170	170.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Udorthents	475.2	13.5	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
170.1	170.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	2217.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
170.6	170.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	264.0	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
170.6	172.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	10560.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
172.6	172.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	158.4	0.2	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
172.6	173.3	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	3590.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
173.3	173.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Millsdale silty clay loam	844.8	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	32 L	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
173.5	173.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	422.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
173.6	173.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Millsdale silty clay loam	52.8	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	32 L	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
173.6	173.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Castalia-Marblehead complex	211.2	3	No	8	No	No	No	6 L	Poor	No	Well drained
173.6	173.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Millsdale silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	32 L	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
173.6	174.4	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	4012.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
174.4	174.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	475.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
174.5	174.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	369.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
174.5	174.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	52.8	0.2	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
174.6	174.6	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Sloan silt loam	211.2	0.2	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	Yes	Very poorly drained
174.6	174.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	686.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
174.7	174.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
174.7	175.2	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	2428.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
175.2	175.2	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	211.2	0.2	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
175.2	175.3	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Sloan silt loam	105.6	0.2	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	Yes	Very poorly drained
175.3	175.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	2851.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
175.8	175.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	158.4	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
175.8	176.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	4699.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
176.7	176.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	158.4	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
176.8	176.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Haskins and Digby	475.2	0.5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
176.9	177.4	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	3115.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
177.4	177.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Wauseon fine sandy loam	52.8	0.2	No	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
177.5	177.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
177.5	177.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Rimer and Tedrow	105.6	0.5	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
177.5	177.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	1267.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
177.7	177.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Rimer and Tedrow	264.0	0.5	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
177.8	177.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	792.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
177.9	178	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Seward and Ottokee	369.6	0.5	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
178	178.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Mermill sandy clay loam	475.2	0.2	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
178.1	179.7	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	8712.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
179.7	179.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	475.2	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
179.8	179.8	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	105.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
179.8	180.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	5491.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
180.9	180.9	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	316.8	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
180.9	181	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	528.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
181	181.1	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Nappanee loam	105.6	0.5	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
181.1	182.5	Mainline / Wood, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	7339.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
182.5	183.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	4171.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
183.2	183.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	2428.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
183.7	183.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
183.7	183.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
183.7	183.8	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
183.8	184	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	1108.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
184	184	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
184	185	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	5491.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
185	185.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
185.1	185.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
185.2	185.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
185.2	185.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
185.2	185.3	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	158.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
185.3	185.3	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
185.3	185.8	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	2270.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
185.8	185.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
185.9	186	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	633.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
186	186	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
186	186.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	2006.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
186.4	186.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
186.4	186.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	369.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
186.5	187	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	2956.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
187	187.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	792.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
187.2	187.3	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
187.3	187.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	1267.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
187.5	187.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	580.8	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
187.6	190.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	14836.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
190.4	190.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
190.5	190.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	105.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
190.6	190.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
190.6	190.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	211.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
190.7	190.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
190.7	193.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	16051.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
193.7	193.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Haskins loam	792.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
193.9	194.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	2640.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
194.4	194.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Haskins loam	369.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
194.4	194.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	158.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
194.5	194.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
194.5	194.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	158.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
194.5	194.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Digby loam	369.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
194.6	194.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Millgrove loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
194.7	194.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
194.7	194.8	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Millgrove loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
194.8	194.8	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Digby loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
194.8	194.8	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Digby fine sandy loam	316.8	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
194.8	194.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Millgrove loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
194.9	194.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Digby loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
194.9	195	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Millgrove loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
195	195.3	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Digby loam	1689.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
195.3	195.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill loam	1372.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
195.6	195.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Digby fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
195.6	195.8	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Millgrove loam	1161.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
195.8	195.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	264.0	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
195.9	195.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Millgrove loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
195.9	196.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	1425.6	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
196.2	196.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Millgrove loam	1372.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
196.4	196.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	316.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
196.5	196.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	580.8	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
196.6	196.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	739.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
196.7	196.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill clay loam	1056.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
196.9	197	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Digby loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
197	197	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	St. Clair silty clay	52.8	35	Yes	4	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Moderately well drained
197	197.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Shoals silt loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
197.1	197.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	St. Clair silty clay	52.8	35	Yes	4	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Moderately well drained
197.1	197.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	422.4	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
197.2	197.3	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	475.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
197.3	197.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	422.4	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
197.4	197.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
197.4	197.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	158.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
197.5	197.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill clay loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
197.5	198.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	5860.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
198.7	198.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	105.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
198.7	198.8	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
198.8	198.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	316.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
198.9	198.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	316.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
198.9	199	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
199	199	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	211.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
199	199.3	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	1689.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
199.3	199.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	369.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
199.4	199.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
199.6	199.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
199.6	199.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
199.6	199.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
199.7	199.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
199.7	199.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
199.7	199.8	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Mermill clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
199.8	200	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee loam	1161.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
200	200.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Haskins loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
200.1	200.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
200.1	200.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
200.1	200.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
200.1	200.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
200.1	200.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Haney and Rawson loams	158.4	9	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
200.2	200.2	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Haskins loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
200.2	200.3	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
200.3	200.3	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	St. Clair silty clay	105.6	35	Yes	4	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Moderately well drained
200.3	200.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
200.4	200.4	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Water	475.2	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
200.4	200.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
200.5	200.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Toledo silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
200.5	200.5	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
200.5	200.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	St. Clair silty clay	158.4	35	Yes	4	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Moderately well drained
200.6	200.6	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
200.6	200.7	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	St. Clair silty clay	211.2	35	Yes	4	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Moderately well drained
200.7	200.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	1320.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
200.9	200.9	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
200.9	201	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Fulton loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
201	201	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Haskins loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
201	201	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Fulton loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
201	201.1	Mainline / Henery, Ohio	Haskins loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
201.1	201.1	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Haskins loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
201.1	201.4	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Mermill loam	1267.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
201.4	201.5	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Millgrove loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
201.5	201.5	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Mermill loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
201.5	201.7	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Nappanee loam	950.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
201.7	203.7	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	10507.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
203.7	203.7	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Nappanee loam	0.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
203.7	203.8	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Mermill loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
203.8	203.8	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	0.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
203.8	203.9	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Nappanee loam	950.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
203.9	205	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville silty clay loam	5702.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
205	205	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Haskins loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
205	205.1	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Mermill loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
205.1	205.2	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Haskins loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
205.2	205.4	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Mermill loam	1478.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
205.4	205.5	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Oshtemo sandy loam	264.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
205.5	205.6	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	844.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
205.6	205.9	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Mermill loam	1214.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
205.9	205.9	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Seward loamy fine sand	211.2	4	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
205.9	206	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	264.0	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
206	206	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	264.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
206	206.1	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Rawson sandy loam	316.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
206.1	206.1	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Haskins loam	369.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
206.1	206.2	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville clay	528.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
206.2	206.3	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	369.6	2	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
206.3	208	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville clay	9187.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
208	208.7	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Latty silty clay	3537.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
208.7	209	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Paulding clay	1267.2	1	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
209	209.1	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Toledo silty clay loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
209.1	209.2	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Seward loamy fine sand	528.0	4	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
209.2	209.2	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Roselms silty clay	158.4	2	No	4	No	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
209.2	209.2	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Paulding clay	264.0	1	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
209.2	209.3	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Roselms silty clay	158.4	2	No	4	No	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
209.3	209.4	Mainline / Defiance, Ohio	Paulding clay	686.4	1	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
0	0.1	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Paulding clay	528.0	1	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
0.1	0.1	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Roselms silty clay	105.6	2	No	4	No	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
0.1	0.1	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Paulding clay	158.4	1	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
0.1	0.2	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Roselms silty clay	105.6	2	No	4	No	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
0.2	0.3	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Toledo silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
0.3	0.3	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	264.0	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
0.3	0.4	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Mermill loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
0.4	0.5	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Paulding clay	686.4	1	No	4	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
0.5	0.5	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Haskins loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
0.5	0.7	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Mermill loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
0.7	0.7	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Toledo silty clay loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
0.7	2.3	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Latty silty clay	8500.8	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
2.3	2.4	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
2.4	2.4	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Latty silty clay	105.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
2.4	2.4	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	158.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
2.4	4	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Latty silty clay	8131.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
4	4.6	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	3326.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
4.6	5.3	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Latty silty clay	3748.8	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
5.3	5.3	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	211.2	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
5.3	5.4	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Latty silty clay	316.8	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
5.4	5.4	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	52.8	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
5.4	5.4	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Latty silty clay	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
5.4	5.5	Market Segment / Defiance, Ohio	Nappanee loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
5.5	5.8	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee loam	1214.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
5.8	5.9	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	950.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
5.9	6	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
6	6.1	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	1003.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
6.1	6.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Seward loamy fine sand	422.4	4	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
6.2	6.5	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	1214.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
6.5	6.5	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Seward loamy fine sand	211.2	4	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
6.5	6.5	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	211.2	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
6.5	6.8	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	1161.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
6.8	6.8	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
6.8	6.8	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	105.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
6.8	6.8	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
6.8	6.9	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	105.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
6.9	6.9	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
6.9	7.1	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	1214.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
7.1	7.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7.2	7.3	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	633.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
7.3	7.3	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7.3	7.7	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	1848.0	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
7.7	7.7	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	105.6	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7.7	7.7	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	264.0	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
7.7	7.8	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
7.8	8	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Latty clay	1267.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
8	8.1	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Mermill loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
8.1	8.1	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	52.8	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.1	8.1	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.1	8.1	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.1	8.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Mermill loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Very poorly drained
8.2	8.5	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	1689.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
8.5	8.6	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	686.4	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
8.6	8.7	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	158.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
8.7	8.7	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.7	8.7	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	158.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
8.7	8.8	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.8	8.9	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	105.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
8.9	8.9	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	0.0	4	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.9	8.9	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
8.9	8.9	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	105.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
8.9	9	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	475.2	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9	9.1	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	264.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
9.1	9.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	580.8	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.2	9.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	0.0	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.2	9.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	105.6	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.2	9.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	105.6	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.2	9.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	105.6	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
9.2	9.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	105.6	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.2	9.3	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Haskins fine sandy loam	105.6	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.3	9.3	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	105.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
9.3	9.3	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.3	9.4	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	264.0	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
9.4	9.4	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.4	9.6	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	897.6	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
9.6	9.6	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.6	9.6	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
9.6	9.6	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	St. Clair silty clay loam	52.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
9.6	9.7	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Nappanee silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
9.7	10.2	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Hoytville clay loam	3062.4	0	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
10.2	10.5	Market Segment / Henry, Ohio	Toledo silty clay	1267.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
10.5	10.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	950.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
10.7	10.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
10.8	10.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	105.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
10.8	10.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
10.8	11.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	4488.0	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
11.7	11.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	158.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
11.7	12.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	2112.0	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
12.1	12.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
12.2	12.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
12.2	12.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Haskins loam	264.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
12.3	12.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
12.3	12.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
12.3	12.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
12.4	12.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	528.0	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
12.5	12.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
12.5	12.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
12.6	12.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
12.6	12.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	792.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
12.8	12.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
12.8	12.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	422.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
12.9	13.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
13.1	13.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	475.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.2	13.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
13.2	13.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Seward loamy fine sand	264.0	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
13.2	13.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	1795.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
13.6	13.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	475.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
13.7	13.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	52.8	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
13.7	14.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Sloan silty clay loam	2217.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
14.1	14.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	580.8	9	Yes	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.2	14.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Cohoctah fine sandy loam	105.6	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
14.2	14.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.3	14.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
14.4	14.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.4	14.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	792.0	9	Yes	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.6	14.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Cohoctah fine sandy loam	1003.2	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
14.7	14.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	475.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
14.8	14.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	369.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
14.9	14.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
14.9	15	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
15	15.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	950.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
15.2	15.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	264.0	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
15.2	15.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	897.6	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
15.4	15.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	1953.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
15.8	15.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
15.8	15.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	158.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
15.8	15.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
15.9	15.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
15.9	16	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
16	16.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	1267.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
16.2	16.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	316.8	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
16.2	16.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
16.3	16.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	316.8	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
16.3	16.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	264.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
16.4	16.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	422.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
16.5	16.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
16.5	16.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
16.5	16.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
16.6	16.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
16.6	16.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	950.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
16.8	16.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
16.8	16.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
16.8	16.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	316.8	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
16.9	17	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
17	17.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	950.4	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
17.1	17.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.2	17.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	105.6	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
17.2	17.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.2	17.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	264.0	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
17.3	17.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.4	17.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	264.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.4	17.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.5	17.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Haskins loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.5	17.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.6	17.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Haskins loam	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.6	17.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Fulton silty clay loam	158.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.6	17.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	52.8	9	Yes	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
17.6	17.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lenawee silty clay loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
17.7	17.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.8	17.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock-Tuscola complex	105.6	6	No	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
17.8	17.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	264.0	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.8	17.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
17.8	17.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
17.9	17.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Latty silty clay	211.2	1	No	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
17.9	17.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Seward loamy fine sand	158.4	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
17.9	18	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock-Tuscola complex	316.8	6	No	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18	18	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Seward loamy fine sand	105.6	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
18	18	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
18	18.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Seward loamy fine sand	211.2	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
18.1	18.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
18.1	18.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock-Tuscola complex	158.4	6	No	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.2	18.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
18.2	18.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	264.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
18.2	18.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
18.3	18.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
18.3	18.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock-Tuscola complex	211.2	6	No	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.3	18.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
18.4	18.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock-Tuscola complex	528.0	6	No	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.5	18.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	52.8	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
18.5	18.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock-Tuscola complex	211.2	6	No	7	No	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.5	18.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tuscola fine sandy loam	264.0	6	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
18.6	18.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	950.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
18.7	18.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	528.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
18.8	18.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	211.2	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
18.9	19	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	475.2	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
19	19.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	1320.0	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
19.2	19.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	264.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
19.3	19.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	211.2	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
19.3	19.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	475.2	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
19.4	19.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
19.4	19.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	580.8	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
19.6	19.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tuscola fine sandy loam	528.0	6	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
19.6	19.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Galen loamy fine sand	316.8	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
19.7	19.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	580.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
19.8	20	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	1056.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
20	20.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
20.1	20.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tuscola fine sandy loam	211.2	6	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
20.1	20.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	52.8	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
20.1	20.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
20.1	20.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	1056.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
20.3	20.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	422.4	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
20.4	20.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
20.4	20.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	633.6	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
20.6	20.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
20.6	20.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	844.8	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
20.7	20.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	528.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
20.8	20.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
20.9	20.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
20.9	20.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	52.8	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
20.9	21	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	528.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
21	21.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
21.1	21.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	475.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
21.2	21.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	1425.6	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
21.4	21.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	158.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
21.5	21.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
21.5	21.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	422.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
21.6	21.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
21.6	21.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
21.7	21.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	158.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
21.7	21.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Shinrock silty clay loam	264.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
21.7	21.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
21.8	21.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	422.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
21.9	21.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
21.9	21.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
21.9	22	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	475.2	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
22	22.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	264.0	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
22.1	22.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Del Rey silt loam	211.2	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
22.1	22.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	580.8	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
22.2	22.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	792.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
22.4	22.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
22.4	22.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	158.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
22.5	22.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	633.6	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
22.6	22.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	158.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
22.6	22.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
22.6	22.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
22.7	22.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	580.8	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
22.8	22.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	528.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
22.9	22.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	105.6	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
22.9	23	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	369.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
23	23	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Ottokee fine sand	264.0	3	No	1	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
23	23.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Kibbie loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
23.1	23.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Lamson fine sandy loam	316.8	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
23.1	23.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	316.8	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
23.2	23.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	211.2	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
23.2	23.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	1267.2	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
23.5	23.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	211.2	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
23.5	23.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	792.0	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
23.6	23.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Brady sandy loam	211.2	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
23.7	23.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
23.7	23.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	897.6	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
23.9	23.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Brady sandy loam	211.2	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
23.9	24	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24	24.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Brady sandy loam	369.6	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.1	24.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24.2	24.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	211.2	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.2	24.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24.3	24.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Brady sandy loam	158.4	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.3	24.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24.3	24.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	844.8	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.5	24.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24.5	24.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	52.8	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.5	24.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Brady sandy loam	0.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.6	24.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
24.6	24.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Digby loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.6	24.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.7	24.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24.7	24.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	211.2	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24.7	24.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24.8	24.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Brady sandy loam	158.4	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.8	24.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
24.8	24.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	211.2	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
24.9	25	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colwood loam	369.6	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
25	25	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	264.0	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
25	25.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	264.0	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
25.1	25.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
25.1	25.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
25.1	25.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	316.8	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
25.2	25.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
25.2	25.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	264.0	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
25.2	25.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Colonie fine sand	158.4	4	No	1	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
25.3	25.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	105.6	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
25.3	25.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Ottokee fine sand	475.2	3	No	1	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
25.4	25.5	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Rimer loamy fine sand	475.2	2	No	2	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
25.5	25.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	844.8	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
25.6	25.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	158.4	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
25.7	25.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	580.8	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
25.8	25.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Dixboro fine sandy loam	264.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
25.8	25.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Bixler loamy fine sand	475.2	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
25.9	26	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	158.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26	26	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Brady sandy loam	475.2	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26	26.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26.1	26.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	52.8	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
26.1	26.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	158.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
26.1	26.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	475.2	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
26.2	26.2	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26.2	26.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	1848.0	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
26.6	26.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	105.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26.6	26.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Ottokee fine sand	211.2	3	No	1	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
26.6	26.6	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	158.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26.6	26.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
26.7	26.7	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Ottokee fine sand	211.2	3	No	1	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
26.7	26.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	158.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26.8	26.8	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
26.8	26.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	422.4	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
26.9	26.9	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Ottokee fine sand	369.6	3	No	1	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
26.9	27	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	422.4	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
27	27.1	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Tedrow loamy fine sand	633.6	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
27.1	27.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Gilford fine sandy loam	792.0	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
27.3	27.3	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Ottokee fine sand	369.6	3	No	1	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Moderately well drained
27.3	27.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Millgrove loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
27.4	27.4	Market Segment / Fulton, Ohio	Brady sandy loam	52.8	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
27.4	27.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady sandy loam	105.6	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
27.4	27.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Millgrove loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	Yes	Very poorly drained
27.5	27.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	633.6	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
27.6	27.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Millgrove loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	Yes	Very poorly drained
27.7	27.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Granby sandy loam	158.4	2	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
27.7	27.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Berrien sandy loam	475.2	5	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
27.8	27.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Granby sandy loam	422.4	2	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
27.9	28	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Plainfield and Ottawa loamy sands	528.0	5	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Excessively drained
28	28	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Granby sandy loam	211.2	2	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
28	28.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Berrien sandy loam	264.0	5	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Moderately well drained
28.1	28.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	475.2	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
28.2	28.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	686.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
28.3	28.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	158.4	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
28.3	28.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	211.2	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
28.4	28.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	211.2	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
28.4	28.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
28.4	28.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	158.4	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
28.5	28.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1108.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
28.7	28.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Nappanee silt loam	158.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
28.7	28.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Genesee loams	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
28.8	29	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1214.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29	29.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
29.1	29.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29.1	29.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
29.1	29.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Hoytville clay loam and Rimer sandy loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
29.1	29.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
29.1	29.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Hoytville clay loam and Rimer sandy loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
29.2	29.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus and Blount loams	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
29.2	29.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Hoytville clay loam and Rimer sandy loam	1108.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
29.4	29.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29.5	29.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	580.8	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
29.6	29.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
29.7	29.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam and Pewamo clay loam	1056.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
29.9	29.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
29.9	30.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam and Pewamo clay loam	844.8	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
30.1	30.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
30.2	30.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam and Pewamo clay loam	316.8	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
30.3	30.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
30.4	30.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo mucky clay loam	264.0	1	No	7	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
30.5	30.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam and Pewamo clay loam	158.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
30.5	30.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Nappanee loam	316.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
30.6	30.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam and Pewamo clay loam	1214.4	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
30.8	30.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Hoytville clay loam and Rimer sandy loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
30.8	31.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam and Pewamo clay loam	1161.6	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.1	31.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
31.1	31.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam and Pewamo clay loam	528.0	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.2	31.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
31.3	31.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam and Pewamo clay loam	369.6	2	No	6	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.3	31.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	369.6	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
31.4	31.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.4	31.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	158.4	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
31.5	31.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	686.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
31.6	31.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus and Blount loams	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
31.6	31.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	580.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
31.7	32.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Macomb sandy clay loam and Hoytville clay loam	1900.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
32.1	32.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
32.1	32.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Macomb sandy clay loam and Hoytville clay loam	1742.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
32.5	32.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
32.5	32.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Macomb sandy clay loam and Hoytville clay loam	1320.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
32.8	33	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	1108.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
33	33	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Ionia loam	369.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
33	33.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	580.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
33.2	33.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Sebewa loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
33.2	33.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	1584.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
33.5	33.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady sandy loam	369.6	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
33.6	33.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	475.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
33.7	33.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady sandy loam	422.4	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
33.8	33.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	422.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
33.9	34	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady sandy loam	792.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
34	34.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	1214.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
34.2	34.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Macomb sandy clay loam and Hoytville clay loam	1003.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
34.4	34.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	1478.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
34.7	35	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Macomb sandy clay loam and Hoytville clay loam	1478.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
35	35.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	792.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
35.1	35.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	1214.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.4	35.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	158.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
35.4	35.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	528.0	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
35.5	35.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	686.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.6	35.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
35.7	35.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	422.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
35.7	35.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Sloan sandy loams	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
35.8	35.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kendallville loam	105.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
35.8	35.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	422.4	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
35.9	36	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	422.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
36	36	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	264.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
36	36	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
36	36.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
36.1	36.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
36.1	36.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
36.2	36.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	1425.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
36.5	36.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
36.5	36.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	369.6	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
36.6	36.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brookston loam	0.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
36.6	36.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	739.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
36.7	36.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	369.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
36.8	36.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	52.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
36.8	36.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brookston loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
36.8	37	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	1056.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37	37.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	422.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37.1	37.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
37.2	37.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	580.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37.3	37.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	316.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37.4	37.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
37.4	37.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	528.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37.5	37.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	580.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
37.6	37.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	1108.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
37.9	37.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
37.9	37.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
37.9	38	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley soils	105.6	19	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
38	38.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	739.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.1	38.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley soils	211.2	19	No	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
38.1	38.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Carlisle muck	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
38.2	38.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	844.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.3	38.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo mucky clay loam	264.0	1	No	7	No	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
38.4	38.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	316.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.4	38.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
38.5	38.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
38.7	38.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	158.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.7	38.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	316.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.8	38.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brookston loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
38.8	38.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.8	38.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	633.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
38.9	39.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	2270.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
39.4	39.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	580.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
39.5	39.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	475.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
39.6	39.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	158.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
39.6	39.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	580.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
39.7	39.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Fox sandy loam	211.2	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
39.8	40	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Genesee loams	1108.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
40	40	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Fox sandy loam	211.2	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
40	40.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Genesee loams	264.0	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
40.1	40.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	158.4	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
40.1	40.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	3009.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
40.7	40.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1056.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
40.9	41	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	1003.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41	41.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley soils	528.0	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.1	41.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	792.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.3	41.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	369.6	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
41.4	41.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	686.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
41.5	42	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	2692.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
42	42.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	2006.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
42.4	42.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	158.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
42.4	42.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	211.2	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
42.5	42.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley soils	52.8	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.5	42.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brookston loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
42.5	42.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.5	42.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	633.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.6	42.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	158.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.7	42.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley soils	369.6	11	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.7	42.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.8	42.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Genesee loams	475.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.9	42.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Genesee loam	105.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
42.9	42.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kendallville loam	52.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	Yes	Well drained
42.9	43.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	1267.2	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
43.1	43.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.2	43.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
43.2	43.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	211.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
43.3	43.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
43.3	43.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	1056.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.5	43.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	422.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.6	43.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	739.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.7	43.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Genesee loams	897.6	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
43.9	43.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	264.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
43.9	44.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1320.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
44.2	44.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	52.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
44.2	44.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	316.8	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
44.3	44.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Genesee loams	1372.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
44.5	44.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	792.0	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
44.7	44.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	1214.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
44.9	45	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Sloan sandy loams	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
45	45.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	739.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
45.1	45.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1003.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
45.3	45.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1214.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
45.6	45.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	264.0	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
45.6	45.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
45.7	45.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
45.7	45.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
45.8	45.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	52.8	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
45.8	45.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Houghton muck	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
45.9	45.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
45.9	46.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
46.1	46.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	686.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
46.2	46.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
46.2	46.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1161.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
46.4	46.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	316.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
46.5	46.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	52.8	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
46.5	46.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	369.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
46.6	46.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	475.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
46.7	46.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
46.7	46.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	528.0	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
46.8	46.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Houghton muck	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
46.8	46.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
46.9	46.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	158.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
46.9	47	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
47	47.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	369.6	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
47.1	47.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
47.1	47.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
47.2	47.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.3	47.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	158.4	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
47.3	47.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.4	47.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.5	47.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	475.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
47.6	47.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
47.7	47.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	52.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.7	47.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
47.7	47.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	158.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.7	47.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.8	47.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	528.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
47.9	47.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
47.9	47.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Carlisle muck	105.6	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
47.9	48	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
48	48	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	52.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48	48	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	158.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
48	48	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
48	48.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
48.1	48.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
48.1	48.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
48.2	48.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
48.2	48.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	316.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.3	48.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
48.4	48.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	52.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
48.4	48.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
48.4	48.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	369.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.5	48.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
48.5	48.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
48.6	48.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1425.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
48.9	48.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
48.9	49	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
49	49	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
49	49.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Carlisle muck	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
49.1	49.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
49.1	49.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
49.2	49.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	316.8	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.2	49.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.3	49.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.3	49.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
49.3	49.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	158.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.3	49.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
49.4	49.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Carlisle muck	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
49.4	49.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
49.4	49.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
49.5	49.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	0.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.5	49.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
49.6	49.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	211.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.7	49.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	264.0	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
49.7	49.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.7	49.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
49.8	49.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
49.8	49.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
49.8	49.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	580.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
49.9	50	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
50	50.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	792.0	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.1	50.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
50.2	50.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	369.6	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.2	50.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	422.4	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.3	50.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	422.4	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
50.4	50.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Carlisle muck	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
50.5	50.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
50.5	50.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus loam	264.0	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
50.6	50.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo and Barry loams	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
50.6	50.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
50.6	50.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
50.7	50.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
50.8	50.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
50.9	50.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
50.9	50.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	0.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
50.9	51	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	422.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
51	51.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	1161.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
51.2	51.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
51.3	51.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	844.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
51.4	51.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	369.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
51.5	51.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
51.5	51.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
51.6	51.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
51.6	51.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
51.7	51.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	633.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
51.8	51.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
51.9	51.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
51.9	51.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	158.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
51.9	52	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	475.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52	52.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	686.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52.2	52.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
52.2	52.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52.2	52.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
52.3	52.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Miami loam	264.0	5	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52.3	52.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
52.4	52.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	580.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52.5	52.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
52.5	52.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Pewamo clay loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
52.6	52.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
52.6	52.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	1108.8	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
52.9	53	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	792.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
53	53.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	792.0	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.2	53.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brookston loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
53.2	53.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	739.2	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.4	53.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	422.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.5	53.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	369.6	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
53.5	53.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	211.2	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.6	53.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
53.6	53.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	158.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.7	53.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	316.8	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
53.7	53.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Griffin and Sloan sandy loams	580.8	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
53.8	53.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	158.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
53.8	54	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	739.2	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
54	54.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	422.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
54.1	54.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	528.0	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
54.2	54.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brookston loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
54.2	54.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
54.3	54.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	686.4	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
54.4	54.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	633.6	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
54.5	54.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	264.0	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
54.6	54.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Wallkill loam	52.8	2	No	5	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
54.6	54.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	158.4	11	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
54.6	54.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Kokomo	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
54.7	54.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	528.0	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
54.8	55	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus sandy loam	1003.2	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
55	55.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Brady and Macomb loams	264.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
55.1	55.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Fox sandy loam	475.2	5	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
55.1	55.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	105.6	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
55.2	55.2	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Colwood very fine sandy loam	316.8	2	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
55.2	55.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	211.2	19	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
55.3	55.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Colwood very fine sandy loam	844.8	2	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
55.4	55.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Lenawee silty clay loam	211.2	1	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
55.5	55.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Colwood very fine sandy loam	686.4	2	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
55.6	55.6	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Fox loam	105.6	11	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
55.6	55.7	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus and Blount loams	528.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
55.7	55.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Fox loam	211.2	11	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
55.8	55.8	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus and Blount loams	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
55.8	55.9	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Colwood very fine sandy loam	475.2	2	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
55.9	56	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Morley loam	369.6	5	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56	56	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Colwood very fine sandy loam	211.2	2	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
56	56.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Cadmus and Blount loams	633.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
56.1	56.1	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Miami loam and Boyer sandy loam	105.6	19	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
56.1	56.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Miami loam	686.4	11	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.3	56.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Blount loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
56.3	56.3	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Miami loam	105.6	11	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.3	56.4	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Miami loam	211.2	19	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
56.4	56.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Miami loam	475.2	11	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.5	56.5	Market Segment / Lenawee, MI	Miami loam	52.8	19	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
56.5	56.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.5	56.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	52.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
56.5	56.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
56.5	56.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
56.5	56.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.6	56.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
56.6	56.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	633.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.7	56.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
56.8	56.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
56.8	56.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	52.8	15	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
56.9	56.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
56.9	57	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	316.8	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
57	57	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
57	57	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Water	158.4	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
57	57.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
57.1	57.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
57.1	57.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	422.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.2	57.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	686.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.3	57.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	316.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.4	57.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover-Brookston loams	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
57.5	57.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	211.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
57.5	57.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	1056.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
57.7	57.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	633.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.8	57.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
57.9	57.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
57.9	58	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	475.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
58	58.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	369.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
58.1	58.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
58.3	58.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
58.3	58.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Sloan silt loam	369.6	1	No	6	No	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
58.3	58.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Riddles sandy loam	475.2	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
58.4	58.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Dixboro-Kibbie fine sandy loams	158.4	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
58.5	58.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
58.5	58.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1425.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
58.8	58.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
58.9	59	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	686.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
59	59.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	528.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
59.1	59.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.1	59.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	264.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
59.2	59.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	316.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.2	59.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	158.4	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
59.3	59.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	528.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.3	59.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	52.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
59.4	59.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.4	59.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pella silt loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
59.4	59.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1003.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.6	59.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	897.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
59.8	59.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
59.8	60	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	792.0	1	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
60	60	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	105.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
60	60.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	2534.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
60.5	60.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	316.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
60.5	60.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	528.0	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
60.6	60.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	633.6	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
60.8	61.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	1900.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.1	61.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
61.1	61.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.2	61.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	1478.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
61.4	61.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
61.5	61.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
61.5	61.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	105.6	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
61.5	61.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
61.6	61.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.6	61.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
61.6	61.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	105.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
61.6	61.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
61.7	61.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	1478.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
61.9	62	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	580.8	22	Yes	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
62	62.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
62.1	62.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	422.4	15	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
62.2	62.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	105.6	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
62.2	62.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Water	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
62.2	62.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Cohoctah fine sandy loam	528.0	1	No	3	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
62.3	62.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	264.0	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.3	62.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Fox sandy loam	686.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.5	62.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Water	52.8	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
62.5	62.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Fox sandy loam	158.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.5	62.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	792.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
62.7	62.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	1425.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
62.9	63.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	792.0	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
63.1	63.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	316.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
63.1	63.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	580.8	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
63.3	63.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	1214.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
63.5	63.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
63.5	63.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
63.5	63.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	0.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
63.5	63.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
63.6	63.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	633.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
63.7	63.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	580.8	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
63.8	64.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	1372.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.1	64.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	264.0	15	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
64.1	64.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	475.2	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
64.2	64.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	950.4	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.4	64.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	264.0	15	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
64.4	64.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	422.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
64.5	64.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	105.6	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
64.5	64.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.6	64.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
64.6	64.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	1425.6	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
64.9	65	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	264.0	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
65	65	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Cohoctah fine sandy loam	264.0	1	No	3	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
65	65	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	0.0	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
65	65	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
65	65.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	211.2	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.1	65.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	528.0	22	Yes	6	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
65.2	65.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	739.2	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
65.3	65.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
65.4	65.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	52.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
65.4	65.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	211.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
65.4	65.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Wasepi sandy loam	1003.2	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.6	65.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
65.6	65.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
65.7	65.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	105.6	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
65.8	65.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Sisson fine sandy loam	422.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
65.8	65.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	316.8	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Moderately well drained
65.9	66	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	422.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
66	66	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pewamo clay loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
66	66.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
66.1	66.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	158.4	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
66.1	66.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Morley loam	686.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
66.3	66.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Blount loam	264.0	3	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	N/A	No	Somewhat poorly drained
66.3	66.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	528.0	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
66.4	66.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Fox sandy loam	1003.2	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
66.6	66.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kendallville loam	422.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
66.7	66.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	422.4	22	Yes	5	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
66.7	66.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
66.8	66.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	580.8	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
66.9	67	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	475.2	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
67	67	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
67	67	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	105.6	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
67	67.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	422.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
67.1	67.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	316.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
67.2	67.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
67.3	67.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	369.6	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
67.3	67.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
67.4	67.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	686.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
67.5	67.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	739.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
67.6	67.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
67.7	67.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
67.7	67.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
67.7	67.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
67.8	67.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
67.9	68	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Fox sandy loam	475.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
68	68	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	52.8	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
68	68.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	369.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
68.1	68.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1161.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
68.3	68.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	1636.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
68.6	68.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Palms muck	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
68.7	68.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	105.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
68.7	68.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	897.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
68.9	68.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
68.9	68.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	105.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
68.9	69	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Palms muck	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
69	69	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69	69.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.1	69.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	633.6	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
69.2	69.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	316.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
69.3	69.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Palms muck	211.2	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
69.3	69.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	580.8	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
69.5	69.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	1689.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
69.8	70.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	3801.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
70.5	70.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	105.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
70.5	70.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	105.6	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
70.5	70.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	316.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
70.6	70.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	316.8	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
70.7	70.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	105.6	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
70.7	70.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Adrian muck	422.4	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
70.7	70.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
70.8	70.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	105.6	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
70.8	70.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Oshtemo loamy sand	739.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
70.9	71.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	950.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
71.1	71.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	1425.6	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
71.4	71.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Oshtemo loamy sand	475.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
71.5	71.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	158.4	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
71.5	71.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
71.6	71.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	369.6	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
71.6	71.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Palms muck	528.0	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
71.7	71.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
71.8	71.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kendallville loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
71.8	71.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kendallville loam	739.2	4	No	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
71.9	72	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kendallville loam	158.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
72	72.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	792.0	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
72.1	72.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Cohoctah fine sandy loam	686.4	1	No	3	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
72.3	72.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	264.0	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
72.3	72.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	686.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
72.4	72.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
72.5	72.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	792.0	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
72.7	72.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Thetford loamy sand	211.2	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
72.7	72.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
72.7	72.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	528.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
72.8	72.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	264.0	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
72.9	73.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kidder sandy loam	1584.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73.2	73.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	475.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
73.3	73.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
73.3	73.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
73.3	73.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
73.4	73.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	2006.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
73.7	73.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Adrian muck	369.6	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
73.8	73.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	211.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
73.9	73.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Adrian muck	52.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
73.9	74	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Cohoctah fine sandy loam	580.8	1	No	3	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
74	74	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
74	74	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Fox sandy loam	52.8	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
74	74.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
74.1	74.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	369.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
74.2	74.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	264.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
74.3	74.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Metamora sandy loam	316.8	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
74.3	74.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	211.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
74.4	74.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	158.4	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
74.4	74.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	158.4	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
74.4	74.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
74.5	74.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
74.6	74.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Hoytville silty clay loam	105.6	1	No	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
74.6	74.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	580.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
74.7	74.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	264.0	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
74.8	75	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	1056.0	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
75	75.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1584.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.3	75.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
75.3	75.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	422.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
75.4	75.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	792.0	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
75.5	75.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	475.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.6	75.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Fox sandy loam	264.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.7	75.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	528.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.8	75.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Edwards muck	264.0	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
75.8	75.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
75.9	75.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Fox sandy loam	158.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
75.9	76	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	528.0	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
76	76	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	52.8	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76	76.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Fox sandy loam	633.6	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.1	76.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1161.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
76.4	76.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	211.2	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.4	76.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Metamora sandy loam	369.6	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
76.5	76.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	211.2	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.5	76.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	52.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.5	76.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	739.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.7	76.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Gilford sandy loam	950.4	1	No	3	No	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
76.8	76.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
76.9	77	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Wauseon fine sandy loam	316.8	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
77	77.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	580.8	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77.1	77.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	158.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77.1	77.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Palms muck	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
77.2	77.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77.2	77.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Palms muck	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
77.2	77.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	105.6	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
77.2	77.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	211.2	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
77.3	77.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	1425.6	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
77.6	77.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1056.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77.8	77.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	369.6	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
77.8	77.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
77.9	77.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
77.9	78	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	475.2	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78	78	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
78	78	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	0.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78	78.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	686.4	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.2	78.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.2	78.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	792.0	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.3	78.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	105.6	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.4	78.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	105.6	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.4	78.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.4	78.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1425.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.7	78.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	475.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.8	78.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	211.2	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
78.8	79	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	686.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
79	79.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1214.4	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
79.2	79.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
79.2	79.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	528.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
79.3	79.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	739.2	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
79.5	79.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pella silt loam	1108.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
79.7	79.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover-Brookston loams	316.8	1	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
79.7	79.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Kibbie fine sandy loam	369.6	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
79.8	80	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	792.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
80	80.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	475.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
80.1	80.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	528.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
80.1	80.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
80.2	80.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Pella silt loam	1584.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
80.5	80.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
80.5	80.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	950.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
80.7	80.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Conover loam	369.6	2	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
80.8	80.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	264.0	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
80.8	80.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Metamora sandy loam	105.6	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
80.8	80.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	105.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
80.8	80.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Sebewa loam	52.8	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
80.9	81.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	1267.2	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
81.1	81.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Palms muck	580.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
81.2	81.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	211.2	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
81.2	81.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	316.8	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
81.3	81.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks-Oshtemo loamy sands	950.4	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
81.5	81.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	580.8	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
81.6	81.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Brookston loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
81.6	81.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Thetford loamy sand	844.8	2	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
81.8	81.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Edwards muck	475.2	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
81.8	81.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	422.4	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
81.9	82	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Palms muck	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
82	82	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	158.4	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
82	82.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	316.8	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
82.1	82.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Wasepi sandy loam	316.8	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
82.1	82.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	1056.0	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
82.3	82.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	950.4	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
82.5	82.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
82.5	82.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Owosso-Miami complex	475.2	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
82.6	82.7	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	211.2	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
82.7	82.8	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	422.4	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
82.8	83.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	2428.8	33	Yes	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
83.2	83.2	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Water	0.0	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
83.2	83.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	475.2	33	Yes	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
83.3	83.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	369.6	22	Yes	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
83.4	83.4	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	52.8	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
83.4	83.5	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Boyer loamy sand	422.4	22	Yes	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
83.5	83.6	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Houghton muck	633.6	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
83.6	83.9	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	1795.2	9	Yes	6	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
83.9	84.1	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Oshtemo loamy sand	1003.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
84.1	84.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Miami loam	739.2	15	Yes	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
84.3	84.3	Market Segment / Washtenaw, MI	Spinks loamy sand	316.8	3	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
84.3	84.5	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Spinks-Oakville loamy sands	1003.2	3	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
84.5	84.5	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Spinks-Oakville loamy sands	158.4	22	Yes	2	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Well drained
84.5	84.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Alluvial land	369.6	1	No	5	No	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Poorly drained
84.6	84.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Spinks-Oakville loamy sands	105.6	22	Yes	2	No	No	No	> 60	Very poor	No	Well drained
84.6	84.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	105.6	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
84.7	84.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox-Boyer complex	739.2	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
84.8	84.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox-Boyer complex	211.2	22	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
84.8	84.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	580.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
84.9	85.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	580.8	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
85.1	85.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	158.4	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
85.1	85.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	1003.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
85.3	85.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	1742.4	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
85.6	85.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	316.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
85.7	86	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox-Boyer complex	1900.8	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
86	86.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	2006.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
86.4	86.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Owosso-Miami sandy loams	897.6	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
86.6	86.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	369.6	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
86.6	86.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Brady loamy sand	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
86.7	86.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	105.6	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
86.7	86.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Brady loamy sand	316.8	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
86.7	86.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Tawas muck	316.8	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
86.8	86.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox-Boyer complex	211.2	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
86.9	86.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	475.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
86.9	87.5	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	3168.0	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
87.5	87.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	1478.4	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
87.8	88.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	1478.4	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
88.1	88.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	158.4	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
88.1	88.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	1584.0	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
88.4	88.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	950.4	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
88.6	88.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	264.0	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
88.7	88.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	686.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
88.8	88.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	633.6	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
88.9	88.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	158.4	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
88.9	89	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
89	89	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox-Boyer complex	158.4	22	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
89	89	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Tawas muck	158.4	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
89	89.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	211.2	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
89.1	89.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	211.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
89.1	89.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
89.2	89.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	1056.0	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
89.4	89.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	369.6	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
89.4	89.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	686.4	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
89.6	89.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	52.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
89.6	89.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	739.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
89.7	89.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	369.6	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
89.8	90	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	1267.2	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
90	90	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	158.4	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
90	90.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	105.6	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
90.1	90.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	316.8	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
90.1	90.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	633.6	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
90.2	90.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Spinks-Oakville loamy sands	2217.6	3	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
90.7	90.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	264.0	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
90.7	90.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Gilford sandy loam	158.4	0	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
90.7	90.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Spinks-Oakville loamy sands	316.8	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
90.8	90.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Gilford sandy loam	158.4	0	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Very poorly drained
90.8	90.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Lamson fine sandy loam	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
90.9	91	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Arkport fine sandy loam	950.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
91	91.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Arkport fine sandy loam	528.0	9	Yes	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
91.1	91.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Arkport fine sandy loam	316.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
91.2	91.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Arkport fine sandy loam	369.6	9	Yes	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
91.3	91.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Houghton muck	686.4	0	No	8	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Very poorly drained
91.4	91.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Spinks-Oakville loamy sands	211.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
91.4	91.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	792.0	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
91.6	91.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	1003.2	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
91.8	91.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Houghton muck	264.0	0	No	8	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	N/A	No	Very poorly drained
91.8	91.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Owosso-Miami sandy loams	158.4	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
91.9	91.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Linwood muck	422.4	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
91.9	92	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	52.8	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
92	92	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Linwood muck	158.4	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
92	92	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	211.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
92	92.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	264.0	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
92.1	92.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	475.2	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
92.2	92.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	1056.0	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
92.4	92.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Sebewa loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
92.4	92.5	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	844.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
92.5	92.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	369.6	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
92.6	92.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Spinks-Oakville loamy sands	211.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained
92.7	92.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	158.4	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
92.7	92.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Brady loamy sand	528.0	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
92.8	92.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	158.4	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
92.8	92.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Brady loamy sand	105.6	1	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
92.8	93	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Tawas muck	897.6	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
93	93.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Wasepi sandy loam	528.0	1	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Somewhat poorly drained
93.1	93.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	422.4	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
93.2	93.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	475.2	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
93.3	93.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	686.4	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
93.4	93.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	105.6	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
93.4	93.5	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	422.4	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
93.5	93.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Sebewa loam	422.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
93.6	93.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	475.2	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
93.7	93.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	475.2	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
93.8	93.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	528.0	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
93.9	94.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	1003.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
94.1	94.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	422.4	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
94.1	94.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	316.8	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
94.2	94.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Brookston loam	158.4	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
94.2	94.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer-Oshtemo loamy sands	211.2	15	No	2	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
94.3	94.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Boyer loamy sand	264.0	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
94.3	94.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	633.6	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.4	94.5	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	264.0	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.5	94.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Linwood muck	316.8	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
94.6	94.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Conover loam	475.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
94.6	94.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Linwood muck	369.6	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
94.7	94.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Miami loam	264.0	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
94.8	94.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Linwood muck	422.4	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
94.8	94.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Sebewa loam	158.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
94.9	94.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	369.6	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
94.9	95.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Miami loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
95.1	95.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Miami loam	158.4	9	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
95.1	95.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	316.8	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
95.1	95.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Brookston loam	52.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
95.2	95.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	316.8	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
95.2	95.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Metea loamy sand	1214.4	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
95.4	95.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	633.6	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
95.6	95.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Sebewa loam	686.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
95.7	95.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	158.4	22	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
95.7	95.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	158.4	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
95.8	95.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	739.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
95.9	96	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	369.6	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
96	96.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	422.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.1	96.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	264.0	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.1	96.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	369.6	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.2	96.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	264.0	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.2	96.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Water	158.4	0	No	N/A	No	Unranked	No	> 60	N/A	No	N/A
96.3	96.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	264.0	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.3	96.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Spinks-Oakville loamy sands	475.2	9	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Poor	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
96.4	96.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	264.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.4	96.5	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	264.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.5	96.5	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Fox sandy loam	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.5	96.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	316.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.6	96.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Locke sandy loam	264.0	2	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
96.6	96.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	580.8	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.7	96.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	264.0	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.8	96.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	52.8	22	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
96.8	96.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	264.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
96.9	97.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	1161.6	22	Yes	3	No	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
97.1	97.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	158.4	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
97.1	97.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	264.0	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
97.2	97.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	580.8	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
97.3	97.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	475.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
97.4	97.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	316.8	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
97.4	97.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Tawas muck	1214.4	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
97.6	97.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	950.4	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
97.8	97.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Tawas muck	105.6	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
97.9	97.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	211.2	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
97.9	97.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	105.6	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
97.9	97.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	105.6	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
97.9	98.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Tawas muck	1003.2	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
98.1	98.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Owosso-Miami sandy loams	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
98.2	98.4	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Metea loamy sand	1267.2	4	No	2	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
98.4	98.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Carlisle muck	2692.8	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
98.9	99	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Tawas muck	264.0	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained
99	99	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Miami-Conover loams	369.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99	99.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Tawas muck	105.6	0	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Poor	No	Very poorly drained

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class
99.1	99.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	158.4	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
99.1	99.2	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Miami loam	633.6	4	No	5	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99.2	99.3	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	422.4	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99.3	99.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	1584.0	15	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Fair	No	Well drained
99.6	99.6	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Brookston loam	316.8	1	No	6	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
99.6	99.7	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Conover loam	211.2	1	No	5	Yes	No	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Somewhat poorly drained
99.7	99.8	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Sebewa loam	686.4	1	No	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	> 60	Good	No	Poorly drained
99.8	99.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	475.2	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99.9	99.9	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Owosso-Miami sandy loams	211.2	4	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained
99.9	100.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Breckenridge loamy sand	633.6	1	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	> 60	Fair	No	Poorly drained
100.1	100.1	Market Segment / Livingston, MI	Hillsdale sandy loam	105.6	9	No	3	Yes	No	No	> 60	Good	No	Well drained

Source: NRCS 2013a, NRCS 2013b
NA - Not Applicable

APPENDIX K

Soil Types and Limitations Crossed by the Rover Pipelines by Milepost

Start MP	End MP	Project Facility / County, State	Soil Association, Soil Complex (if applicable)	Average Length (feet)	Average Slope (%)	Water Erosion Potential a	WEG b	USDA Prime Farmland Designation c	Hydric Soils	High Compaction Potential d	Depth to Bedrock (inches) e	Revegetation Potential f	Rocky Soils g	Drainage Class

a High Water Erosion Potential includes soils with slopes >5% and a K factor > 0.32 or if all slopes were identified as >15%.
b High Wind Erosion Potential for wind erodible soils include those with Wind Erodibility Group (WEG) of 1 or 2.
c Prime Farmland soils includes prime farmlands, farmlands of statewide importance, and farmlands of local importance. No farmlands of unique importance were identified along the Project corridor.
d High Compaction Potential includes soils identified as clay loam or finer texture and a somewhat poor, poor, or very poorly drained drainage class.
e P - Paralithic Bedrock, L - Lithic Bedrock.
f Poor Revegetation Potential reports soils with a poor or very poor potential for grasses.
g Stony/Rocky soils include those with a cobbley, stony, bouldery, shaly, channery, very gravelly, or extremely gravelly modifier to the textural class of the surface layer and/or that have a surface layer that contains greater than 5% by weight rock fragments larger than 3 inches.