



Healthy Hemp Research LLC
3208A W Co Rd 54G,
Laporte, CO, 80535
healthyhempresearch@gmail.com
Date: 9-25-2020

Scientific Analysis of GREASE™™ as a Soil Conditioner

The Method of Water Drop Penetration Test (WDPT), and Molarity of Ethanol Droplet Test (MED) for analyzing water repellency in soil.
By Healthy Hemp Research LLC for Fractal Growth LLC

The soil hydrophobicity test data points are a water drop penetration time(WPDT) test, with a control side by side. The test was conducted on September 1, 2020 in an approved laboratory setting at a consistent 75 degrees Fahrenheit. The procedure was as follows: 25 to 30 g samples were taken out of the same sample peat based soil(Biobizz Light-Mix) and put on a horizontal surface[Letey,1969; King 1981]. The samples were leveled and a small 2-3mm drop of water for the control, or GREASE™ as the treatments, was added to the surface of the soil. The time for the drop to infiltrate was recorded. The test was replicated 25 times until a consistent reading was obtained. Water repellency was classified according to Table 1. To ensure uniformity of sampling water repellency was determined with the WDPT method on soil that was moist, air dried, and finally oven dried at 105 degrees Celsius. (Steenhuis 2001)


Table1. Definition of water repellency classes.

Class	Time for Water to Infiltrate (sec)	Description
0	0-5	not water repellent
1	5-60	slightly water repellent
2	60-600	moderately water repellent
3	600-3600	severely water repellent
4	➤ 3600	extremely water repellent

(Steenhuis 2001)


These data collected shows a consistent reading across 25 trials. The average control took 53.04 seconds and is defined by Table 1 as a class 1 soil response of slightly water repellent. The average GREASE™ treatment took 32.52 seconds to infiltrate the soil making it a class 2 repellency class and the soil response was moderately water repellent. This difference in water repellency class is the proof that all labels of GREASE™ are affecting the soil by making it less water repellent. This is useful and

valuable as a wetting agent, breaking the surface tension of the soil. Testing data displayed graphically shows GREASE™ as a drench to improve the properties of the soil.



Data collected: 9/1/2020

The average soil hydrophobicity results show a clear difference between the Control, plain Ethanol, and GREASE™ treatments. Please see data points below:



The scientific research shows the functionality of GREASE™ by Fractal Growth may be considered a soil conditioner. These statements were made with the collection and interpretation of data from standardized experiments taken from Carter, D. J. (2002) Water repellence. In, N.J. McKenzie et al. Soil Physical Measurement and Interpretation for Land Evaluation, CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood. The Molarity of Ethanol Droplet (MED) test for water repellency rating of soil proves the addition of GREASE™ will increase the severity of reaction and aid in the breakdown of surface tension of the soil. The control showed no apparent severity. With the addition of GREASE™, cannabinoid latent ethanol miscible in water, the change in soil hydrophobicity resulted in a clear low change in severity at .35. Please reference the water repellence rating chart below:

Water Repellant Rating

Molarity of Ethanol	Description of Severity
0	Not apparent
0.1-1.1	Low
1.1-2.3	Moderate
2.3-3.5	Severe
>3.5	Very Severe

Certifying Scientist
/MichaelWalsh/
Healthy Hemp Research LLC

References:

King, P.M. 1981. Comparison of methods for measuring severity of water repellence of sandy soils and assessment of some factors that affect its measurements. *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 19:275-285.

Leteý, J. 1969. Measurement of contact angle, water drop penetration time, and critical surface tension. *Proc. Symp. Water Repellent Soils. Univ. Cali., Riverside, CA.* pp. 43-47.

N.J. McKenzie et al. *Soil Physical Measurement and Interpretation for Land Evaluation*, CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood

Steenhuis, T.S. 2001, 'Water Repellency in New York State Soils', *International Turfgrass Society Research Journal*, vol. 9, pp. 624-625.