ALBUS & ASSOCIATES
formerly Albus-Keefe & Associates, Inc.

July 16, 2021
J.N.: 2954.00

Mr. Erik Pfahler
Borstein Enterprises
11766 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 820
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Subject: **Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Southeast Corner of Phillips Boulevard and Pipeline Avenue (San Bernardino County APN Parcel Numbers 1013-111-01, 1013-161-01, and 1013-111-02), Chino, California.**

Dear Mr. Pfahler,

Pursuant to your request, ***Albus & Associates, Inc***. is pleased to present to you our preliminary geotechnical investigation report for the proposed development at the subject site. This report presents the results of our aerial photo and literature review, subsurface exploration, laboratory testing, and engineering analyses. Conclusions relevant to the feasibility of the proposed site development are also presented herein based on the findings of our work.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you. If you should have any questions regarding the contents of this report, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

ALBUS & ASSOCIATES, INC.

David E. Albus
Principal Engineer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE 1
1.2 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION 1
1.3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 3
2.0 INVESTIGATION 3
2.1 RESEARCH 3
2.2 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION 3
2.3 LABORATORY TESTING 4
3.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS 4
3.1 SOIL CONDITIONS 4
3.2 GROUNDWATER 4
3.3 FAULTING 4
4.0 ANALYSES 5
4.1 SEISMICITY 5
4.2 STATIC SETTLEMENT 6
5.0 CONCLUSIONS 6
5.1 FEASIBILITY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 6
5.2 GEOLOGIC HAZARDS 7
5.2.1 Ground Rupture 7
5.2.2 Ground Shaking 7
5.2.3 Landsliding 7
5.2.4 Liquefaction 7
5.3 STATIC SETTLEMENT 7
5.4 EXCAVATION AND MATERIAL CHARACTERISTICS 8
5.5 SHRINKAGE AND SUBSIDENCE 8
5.6 SOIL EXPANSION 8
6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 9
6.1 EARTHWORK 9
6.1.1 General Earthwork and Grading Specifications 9
6.1.2 Pre-Grade Meeting and Geotechnical Observation 9
6.1.3 Site Clearing 9
6.1.4 Ground Preparation 9
6.1.5 Fill Placement 10
6.1.6 Import Materials 10
6.1.7 Temporary Excavations 10
6.2 SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS 11
6.2.1 Mapped Seismic Design Parameters 11
6.2.2 Site-Specific Seismic Design Parameters 11
6.3 FOUNDATION DESIGN 12
6.3.1 General 12
6.3.2 Soil Expansion 12
6.3.3 Static and Seismic Settlement 12
6.3.4 Allowable Bearing Value 12
6.3.5 Lateral Resistance 13
6.3.6 Footings and Slabs on Grade 13

6.3.7 Foundation Observations 14
6.4 RETAINING AND SCREENING WALLS 14
6.4.1 General 14
6.4.2 Allowable Bearing Value and Lateral Resistance 14
6.4.3 Active Earth Pressures 14
6.4.4 Drainage and Moisture-Proofing 15
6.4.5 Footing Reinforcement and Wall Jointing 16
6.4.6 Foundation Observations 16
6.5 EXTERIOR FLATWORK 16
6.6 CONCRETE MIX DESIGN 17
6.7 CORROSION 17
6.8 PRELIMINARY PAVEMENT DESIGN 17
6.8.1 Preliminary Pavement Structural Sections 17
6.8.1 Subgrade Preparation 17
6.8.2 Aggregate Base 18
6.8.3 Asphaltic Concrete 18
6.8.4 Concrete Paver 18
6.8.5 Portland Cement Concrete 18
6.9 POST GRADING CONSIDERATIONS 19
6.9.1 Site Drainage and Irrigation 19
6.9.2 Utility Trenches 19
6.10 PLAN REVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES 20
7.0 LIMITATIONS 20
8.0 REFERENCES 22

FIGURES AND PLATES

Figure 1 - Site Location Map
Plate 1 - Geotechnical Map

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - EXPLORATION LOGS
Plates A-0 through A-25

APPENDIX B - LABORATORY TESTS RESULTS
Table B – Summary of Laboratory Test Results
Plates B-1 through B-14 – Consolidation Plots
Plates B-15 through B-17 – Direct Shear Plots

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE


The purposes of our preliminary geotechnical investigation were to evaluate geotechnical conditions within the project area and to provide conclusions and recommendations relevant to the design and construction of the proposed improvements at the subject site. The scope of this investigation included the following:

- Review of the historical aerial photographs
- Review of published geologic and seismic data for the site and surrounding area
- Review of our previous geotechnical investigations for the neighboring site to the south
- Exploratory drilling and soil sampling
- Laboratory testing of selected soil samples
- Engineering analyses of data obtained from our review, exploration, and laboratory testing
- Evaluation of site seismicity, liquefaction potential, and settlement potential
- Preparation of this report

1.2 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site is located at 4527 Philips Boulevard within the city of Chino, California. The site is bordered by Philips Boulevard to the north, existing residential units to the east and south, and Pipeline Avenue to the south. The location of the site and its relationship to the surrounding areas is shown on Figure 1, Site Location Map.

The project area encompasses approximately 24 acres of land. The project site is relatively flat with elevation ranging from 830 to 846 feet above mean sea level (based on Google Earth) descending to the southwest. The site is currently occupied predominately by farmland. In addition, a nursery, residential/commercial buildings, and a cellphone tower are located at the corner of the site. Vegetation on-site is comprised of localized areas of crops and medium to large trees. The property boundary is bounded by chain link fence throughout the perimeter of the site.



© 2021 Google

N

FIGURE 1-SITE LOCATION MAP

Borstein Enterprises
Southeast Corner of Phillips Boulevard and Pipeline Avenue
Chino, California

NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 1

1.3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

We understand that a specific concept for site development has not been prepared at this time. We anticipate the properties will be developed for multi-family residential development. The development is anticipated to involve the construction of multi-story (2 to 3) wood-frame buildings. Associated interior driveways, decorative hardscape, parking areas and underground utilities are also anticipated.

No grading or structural plans were available in preparing of this report. However, we anticipate that minor rough grading of the site will be required to achieve future surface configuration and we expect future foundation loads will be relatively light. The structures are also anticipated to be at grade.

2.0 INVESTIGATION

2.1 RESEARCH

We have reviewed the referenced geologic publications and maps (see references) for the site and surrounding area. We have also reviewed available historical aerial photographs. Data from these sources were utilized to develop some of the findings and conclusions presented herein.

Based on our review of the aerial photos, the site has been used for agricultural purposes since 1938. By 1959, the existing residential/agricultural buildings have been constructed within the northeast corner of the site. Between 2010 and 2012, the nursery at the southwest corner of the site has been developed. Since that time, the configuration of the site has remained relatively unchanged after 2012.

2.2 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

Subsurface exploration for this investigation was conducted on January 25, 2021, and consisted of the drilling of twenty-two (22) soil borings to depths ranging from approximately 5.5 to 51.5 feet below the existing ground surface (bgs). The borings were drilled using a truck-mounted, continuous flight, hollow-stem-auger drill rig. Representatives of Albus & Associates, Inc. logged the exploratory borings. Visual and tactile identifications were made of the materials encountered, and their descriptions are presented in the Exploration Logs in Appendix A. The approximate locations of the exploratory excavations completed by this firm are shown on the enclosed Geotechnical Map, Plate 1.

Bulk, relatively undisturbed and Standard Penetration Test (SPT) samples were obtained at selected depths within the exploratory borings for subsequent laboratory testing. Relatively undisturbed samples were obtained using a 3-inch O.D., 2.5-inch I.D., California split-spoon soil sampler lined with brass rings. SPT samples were obtained from the boring using a standard, unlined SPT soil sampler. During each sampling interval, the sampler was driven 18 inches with successive drops of a 140-pound automatic hammer falling 30 inches. The number of blows required to advance the sampler was recorded for each six inches of advancement. The total blow count for the lower 12 inches of advancement per soil sample is recorded on the exploration log. Samples were placed in sealed containers or plastic bags and transported to our laboratory for analysis. The borings were backfilled with auger cuttings upon completion of sampling.

Two additional borings (P-1 and P-2) were drilled adjacent to boring B-17 for percolation testing. Details and results of percolation tests are reported under a separate cover.

2.3 LABORATORY TESTING

Selected samples obtained from our subsurface exploration were tested in our soil laboratory. Tests consisted of maximum dry density and optimum moisture content, in-situ moisture content and dry density, Atterberg limit, expansion index, soluble sulfate content, direct shear, consolidation/collapse potential, 200 wash, and corrosivity testing (pH, chloride, and resistivity). A description of laboratory test criteria and test results is presented in Appendix B.

3.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

3.1 SOIL CONDITIONS

The subsurface soils observed within the site are mostly comprised of alluvial deposits. Some minor fills up to about 4 feet thick were also encountered in the south and western portion of the site. The fill materials consist of silty sand with gravel that are damp to moist and loose to medium dense.

Review of the referenced Diblee Map for the San Dimas and Ontario Quadrangles indicates the site is underlain by Quaternary alluvial gravel and sand from stream channels (Qa). Based on our drilling, the alluvial deposits, also referred to as alluvium herein, consist of silty sand, silty sand with gravel, sand with gravel, and silt. The alluvial deposits are typically damp to very moist and loose to medium dense and stiff to very stiff in fine-grained material. The alluvial deposits extended to the maximum depth explored of 51.5 feet.

A more detailed description of the interpreted soil profile at each of the boring locations, based upon the soil cuttings and soil samples, is presented in Appendix A. The stratigraphic descriptions in the logs represent the predominant materials encountered during our investigation. Relatively thin, often discontinuous layers of different material may occur within the major divisions.

3.2 GROUNDWATER

Groundwater was not encountered during this firm's subsurface exploration to a maximum depth of 51.5 feet. The depth to groundwater has been reported in nearby monitoring wells to be in the approximate range of 270 and 311 feet below the existing ground surface as obtained from California Department Water Resources Water Data Library (WDL) Station map website, respectively.

3.3 FAULTING

Based on our review of the referenced publications and seismic data, no active faults are known to project through or immediately adjacent to the subject sites and the sites do not lie within an "Earthquake Fault Zone" as defined by the State of California in Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Table 3.1 presents a summary of known seismically active faults within 10 miles of the sites based on the 2008 USGS National Seismic Hazard Maps.

TABLE 3.1
Summary of Faults

Name	Dist. (miles)	Slip Rate (mm/yr.)	Preferred Dip (degrees)	Slip Sense	Rupture Top (km)	Fault Length (km)
Chino, alt 2	2.04	1	65	strike slip	0	29
Chino, alt 1	2.07	1	50	strike slip	0	24
San Jose	2.9	0.5	74	strike slip	0	20
Sierra Madre Connected	5.59	2	51	reverse	0	76
Sierra Madre	5.59	2	53	reverse	0	57
Cucamonga	5.59	5	45	thrust	0	28

4.0 ANALYSES

4.1 SEISMICITY

2019 CBC requires seismic parameters in accordance with ASCE 7-16. Unless noted otherwise, all section numbers cited in the following refer to the sections in ASCE 7-16.

Per Section 20.3 the project site was designated as Site Class D. We used the OSHPD seismic hazard tool to obtain the basic mapped acceleration parameters, including short periods (S_S) and 1-second period (S_1) MCE_R Spectral Response Accelerations. Section 11.4.8 requires site-specific ground hazard analysis for structures on Site Class E with S_S greater than or equal to 1.0 or Site Class D or E with S_1 greater than or equal to 0.2. Based on the mapped values of S_S and S_1 the project site falls within this category, requiring site-specific hazard analysis in accordance with Section 21.2.

According to Section 21.2.3 (Supplement 1), the site-specific Risk Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R) spectral response acceleration at any period is the lesser of the probabilistic and the deterministic response accelerations, subject to the exception specified in the same section. The probabilistic response spectrum was developed using the computer program OpenSHA (Field et al., 2013), which implements Method 1 as described on Section 21.2.1.1. Fault Models 3.1 and 3.2 from the Third Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast (UCERF3) were used as the earthquake rupture forecast models for the PSHA. In addition to known fault sources, background seismicity was also included in the PSHA. The ground motion Prediction Equations (GMPEs) selected for use in this analysis are those developed for the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) Next Generation Attenuation (NGA) West 2 project. Four GMPEs - Abrahamson et al. (2014), Boore et al. (2014), Campbell and Bozorgnia (2014), and Chiou and Youngs (2014) were used to perform the analysis.

In accordance with Section 21.2.2 (Supplement 1), the deterministic spectral response acceleration at each period was calculated as the 84th percentile, 5% damped response acceleration, using NGA-West2 GMPE Worksheet. For this, the information from at least three causative faults with the greatest contribution per deaggregation analysis were used and the larger acceleration spectrum among these was selected as the deterministic response spectrum. The deterministic spectrum was adjusted per requirements in Section 21.2.2 (Supplement 1) where applicable. Both probabilistic and deterministic spectra were subjected to the maximum direction scale factors specified in Section 21.2 to produce the maximum acceleration spectra.

Design response spectrum was developed by subjecting the site-specific MCE_R response spectrum to the provisions outlined in Section 21.3. This process included comparison with 80% code-based design spectrum determined in accordance with Section 11.4.6. The short period and long period site coefficient (Fa and Fv, respectively) were determined per Section 21.3 in conjunction with Table 11.4-1. Site specific design acceleration parameters (S_{MS}, S_{M1}, S_{DS}, and S_{D1}) were calculated according to Section 21.4 and are presented in Section 6.2.2.

Per Section 11.2 (definitions on Page 79 of ASCE7-16) for evaluation of liquefaction, lateral spreading, seismic settlements, and other soil-related issues, Maximum Considered Earthquake Geometric Mean (MCE_G) peak ground acceleration PGA_M shall be used. The site-specific PGA_M is calculated per Section 21.5.3, as the lesser of the probabilistic PGA_M (Section 21.5.1) and deterministic PGA_M (Section 21.5.2), but no less than 80% site modified peak ground acceleration, PGA_M, obtained from OSHPD seismic hazard tool.

4.2 STATIC SETTLEMENT

Analyses were performed to evaluate static settlements of spread and continuous footings for expected loading locations for the proposed development. Our analyses were based on correlations between deformation properties (elastic modulus) and the on-site soil properties as represented by standard penetration test blow counts corrected for hammer efficiency (N_{60}). The first model was based on a conventional shallow strip footing 1 foot wide and a wall load of 3,000 psf. This model yielded a total settlement of less than 0.4 inches. The second model was based on a conventional square footing with 5 feet width and a column load of 2,000 psf. This model yielded a total settlement of less than 0.5 inches.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 FEASIBILITY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

From a geotechnical point of view, the proposed site development is considered feasible provided the recommendations presented in this report are incorporated into the design and construction of the project. Furthermore, it is also our opinion that the proposed development will not adversely impact the stability of adjoining properties.

5.2 GEOLOGIC HAZARDS

5.2.1 Ground Rupture

No known active faults are known to project through the subject sites nor do the sites lie within the boundaries of an "Earthquake Fault Zone" as defined by the State of California in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Therefore, potential for ground rupture due to an earthquake beneath the sites is considered low.

5.2.2 Ground Shaking

The site is situated in a seismically active area that has historically been affected by generally moderate to occasionally high levels of ground motion. The site lies in relatively close proximity to several seismically active faults; therefore, during the life of the proposed improvements, the property will probably experience similar moderate to occasionally high ground shaking from these fault zones, as well as some background shaking from other seismically active areas of the Southern California region. Design and construction in accordance with the current California Building Code (CBC) requirements is anticipated to address the issues related to potential ground shaking.

5.2.3 Landsliding

Geologic hazards associated with landsliding are not anticipated at the site since the site is relatively level.

5.2.4 Liquefaction

Engineering research of soil liquefaction potential (Youd, et al., 2001) indicates that generally three basic factors must exist concurrently in order for liquefaction to occur. These factors include:

- A source of ground shaking, such as an earthquake, capable of generating soil mass distortions.
- A relatively loose silty and/or sandy soil.
- A relative shallow groundwater table (within approximately 50 feet below ground surface) or completely saturated soil conditions that will allow positive pore pressure generation.

The site is not located within a State-designated zone of potentially liquefiable soils. Additionally, groundwater was not encountered for the maximum depth drilled of 51.5 feet. Therefore, the potential for liquefaction at the site is considered to be low.

5.3 STATIC SETTLEMENT

Results of consolidation testing indicate the site soils have relatively low compression characteristics. Some consolidation testing exhibited minor collapse upon wetting. However, the characteristics of the curves indicate the collapse was most likely due to sample disturbance rather than actual collapse potential in-situ. Provided site grading is performed in accordance with the recommendations provided herein and based on the anticipated relatively light foundation loads, total and differential static settlement is not anticipated to exceed 1 inch and ½-inch over 30 feet, respectively, for the proposed residential structure. The estimated magnitudes of static settlements are considered within tolerable limits for the proposed structure.

5.4 EXCAVATION AND MATERIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Onsite earth materials are anticipated to be relatively easy to excavate with conventional heavy earthmoving equipment. The site earth materials are generally considered suitable for reuse as fill provided, they are cleared on deleterious debris and oversized rocks (greater than 4 inches in greatest dimension). Site materials are generally below the optimum moisture content. As such, fill soils derived from onsite soils will require the addition of water and mixing in preparation for reuse as compacted fill.

Temporary construction slopes will be required to complete removal of unsuitable soils and for construction of underground utilities. Site materials vary from Type B to Type C per OSHA classification system. Therefore, temporary cuts will require laybacks to differing configurations depending upon the conditions exposed. Under the more constrained condition of Type C soils, temporary slopes will require laybacks to a 1.5 to 1 (H:V) condition. More specific recommendations are provided in Section 6.1.7.

Concrete debris and asphalt can likely be reduced in size (4" minus) and incorporated within fill soils during earthwork operations provided they are blended suitably with onsite soils.

If onsite disposal systems, clarifiers, and other underground improvements are present beneath the site, these improvements will require proper abandonment or removal per the City guidelines.

5.5 SHRINKAGE AND SUBSIDENCE

Volumetric changes in earth quantities will occur when excavated onsite soil materials are replaced as properly compacted fill. We estimate that the existing artificial fill soils and near surface alluvial materials will shrink between 7 to 13 percent within the upper 6 feet. Subsidence due to reprocessing of removal bottoms is anticipated to be on the order of 0.10 feet. The estimates of shrinkage and subsidence are intended as an aid for project engineers in determining earthwork quantities. However, these estimates should be used with some caution since they are not absolute values. Contingencies should be made for balancing earthwork quantities based on actual shrinkage and subsidence that occurs during the grading process.

5.6 SOIL EXPANSION

Based on our laboratory test results and the USCS visual manual classification, the near-surface soils are generally anticipated to possess a **Very Low** expansion potential. Additional testing for soil expansion will be required prior to construction of foundations and other concrete work to confirm these conditions.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 EARTHWORK

6.1.1 General Earthwork and Grading Specifications

All earthwork and grading should be performed in accordance with applicable requirements of Cal/OSHA, applicable specifications of the Grading Codes of the City of Chino, California in addition to the recommendations presented herein.

6.1.2 Pre-Grade Meeting and Geotechnical Observation

Prior to commencement of grading, we recommend a meeting be held between the developer, City Inspector, grading contractor, civil engineer, and geotechnical consultant to discuss the proposed grading and construction logistics. We also recommend a geotechnical consultant be retained to provide soil engineering and engineering geologic services during site grading and foundation construction. This is to observe compliance with the design specifications and recommendations and to allow for design changes in the event that subsurface conditions differ from those anticipated. If conditions are encountered that appear to be different than those indicated in this report, the project geotechnical consultant should be notified immediately. Design and construction revisions may be required.

6.1.3 Site Clearing

Areas to be graded should be cleared of vegetation, underground improvements to be abandoned and deleterious materials. Under certain conditions, existing underground utility lines may also be abandoned in place. However, specific recommendations should be provided by this firm in advance. Any seepage pits and water wells encountered during future site grading should also be properly destroyed or abandoned in accordance with the requirements established by the governing agencies as well as recommendations made in the field by the project geotechnical consultant.

The project geotechnical consultant should be notified at the appropriate times to provide observation services during clearing operations to verify compliance with the above recommendations. Voids created by clearing and excavation should be left open for observation by the geotechnical consultant. Should any unusual soil conditions or subsurface structures be encountered during site clearing or grading that are not described or anticipated herein, these conditions should be brought to the immediate attention of the project geotechnical consultant for corrective recommendations as needed.

Temporary construction equipment (office trailers, power poles, etc.) should be positioned to allow adequate room for clearing and recommended ground preparation to be performed for proposed structures, pavements, and hardscapes.

6.1.4 Ground Preparation

In general, all artificial fill materials and the upper 2 to 3 feet of alluvial soils are considered unsuitable for support of the proposed development at the site. These materials should be removed and recompacted as engineered fill withn the limits of residential structures, retaining walls, site walls, and pavement. The actual depth of removal should be determined by the geotechnical consultant during grading. In addition to these general removals, existing soils should be over-excavated to a depth of at least 1 foot below bottom of footings for the residential buildings.

The removals and over-excavation should extend a distance of at least 5 feet laterally beyond the limits of the proposed structures or a 1:1 projection down and away from the bottom of the footings, whichever is greater. Removals for retaining walls less than 3 feet in height, screen walls and streets may be limited to the edge of the foundations or pavement.

Where removals are limited by protected trees or property lines, special considerations may be required in the construction of affected improvements. Under such conditions, specific recommendations should be provided by this firm based on review of site-specific development plans.

Following removals and over-excavation, the exposed grade should first be scarified to a depth of 6 inches, brought to above the optimum moisture content, and then compacted to at least 90 percent of the laboratory standard (ASTM D 1557).

6.1.5 Fill Placement

Materials excavated from the site may be reused as fill provided; they are free of deleterious materials and particles greater than 4 inches in maximum dimension (oversized materials). Asphaltic and concrete debris generated during site demolition or encountered within the existing fill can be incorporated within new fill soils during earthwork operations provided they are reduced to no more than 4 inches in maximum dimension. Such materials should be mixed thoroughly with fill soils to prevent nesting. All fill should be placed in lifts no greater than 8 inches in loose thickness, moisture conditioned to at least the optimum moisture content, then compacted in place to at least 90 percent of the laboratory standard. Each lift should be treated in a similar manner. Subsequent lifts should not be placed until the project geotechnical consultant has approved the preceding lift.

6.1.6 Import Materials

If import materials are required to achieve the proposed finish grades, the proposed import soils should have an Expansion Index (EI, ASTM D 4829) less than 21 and possess negligible soluble sulfate concentrations. Import sources should be indicated to the geotechnical consultant prior to hauling the materials to the site so that appropriate testing and evaluation of the fill materials can be performed in advance.

6.1.7 Temporary Excavations

Soils at the site alternate between Type B and Type C per OSHA classification. Where Type C materials are exposed, temporary construction slopes or trench excavations in site materials may be cut vertically up to a height of 4 feet provided that no surcharging of the excavations is present. Temporary slopes over 4 feet in height but no more than 10 feet in height should be laid back to 1:1 (H:V) or flatter and evaluated by the geotechnical consultant. Where Type C materials are exposed, excavations should be laid back to a maximum gradient of 1½ :1 (H:V) with no allowances for a vertical height.

Excavations should not be left open for prolonged periods of time. The project geotechnical consultant should observe all temporary cuts to confirm anticipated conditions and to provide alternate recommendations if conditions dictate. All excavations should conform to the requirements of Cal OSHA.

Where temporary excavations cannot accommodate laybacks as discussed above or where surcharging occurs, shoring, underpinning, or other methods should be used. Specific recommendations for other options if considered should be provided by the geotechnical consultant based on review of the final design plans.

6.2 SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS

6.2.1 Mapped Seismic Design Parameters

For design of the project in accordance with Chapter 16 of the 2019 CBC, the mapped seismic parameters may be taken as presented in the tables below.

TABLE 6.1
2019 CBC Mapped Seismic Design Parameters

Parameter	Value
Site Class	D
Mapped MCE_R Spectral Response Acceleration, short periods, S_S	1.69
Mapped MCE_R Spectral Response Acceleration, at 1-sec. period, S_1	0.6
Site Coefficient, F_a	1.0
Site Coefficient, F_v	1.7*
Adjusted MCE_R Spectral Response Acceleration, short periods, S_{MS}	1.69
Adjusted MCE_R Spectral Response Acceleration, at 1-sec. period, S_{M1}	1.020
Design Spectral Response Acceleration, short periods, S_{DS}	1.127
Design Spectral Response Acceleration, at 1-sec. period, S_{D1}	0.680
Long-Period Transition Period, T_L (sec.)	8
Seismic Design Category for Risk Categories I-IV	III

MCE_R = Risk-Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake

*According to Section 11.4.8 in ASCE 7-16, "a ground motion hazard analysis shall be performed in accordance with Section 21.2 for the following structures on Site Class D and E sites with S_1 greater than or equal to 0.2." However, "A ground motion hazard analysis is not required for structures where: Structures on Site Class D sites with S_1 greater than or equal to 0.2, provided the value of the seismic response coefficient C_s is determined by Eq. (12.8-2) for values of $T \leq 1.5T_s$ and taken as equal to 1.5 times the value computed in accordance with either Eq. (12.8-3) for $T_L \geq T > 1.5T_s$ or Eq. (12.8-4) for $T > T_L$." The F_v value of 1.7 above from Table 11.4-2 assumes that this exception is met and that a ground motion hazard analysis is not required. Should this exception not be met, the site-specific seismic design parameters provided in the next section should be used.

6.2.2 Site-Specific Seismic Design Parameters

In addition to the Code Spectra parameters presented in Table 6.1, we have performed a site-specific ground motion hazard analysis in accordance with Chapter 21 of ASCE 7-16 to obtain site-specific seismic design acceleration parameters, the risk-targeted maximum considered earthquake response

spectrum, and the design earthquake response spectrum. The site-specific seismic design parameters are presented below.

TABLE 6.2
2019 CBC Site Specific Seismic Design Parameters

Parameter	Value
Site Coefficient, F_a	1.0
Site Coefficient, F_v	2.5
Adjusted MCE Spectral Response Acceleration, short periods, S_{MS}	1.736
Adjusted MCE Spectral Response Acceleration, at 1-sec. period, S_{M1}	1.200
Design Spectral Response Acceleration, short periods, S_{DS}	1.157
Design Spectral Response Acceleration, at 1-sec. period, S_{D1}	0.800

MCE = Maximum Considered Earthquake

6.3 FOUNDATION DESIGN

6.3.1 General

The following design parameters are provided to assist the project structural engineer to design foundations for structures at the site. These design parameters are based on typical site materials encountered during subsurface exploration and are provided for preliminary design and estimating purposes. The project geotechnical consultant should provide final design parameters following observation and testing of site materials during grading. Depending on actual materials encountered during site grading, the design parameters presented herein may require modification. Protection of existing trees may require special design considerations once detailed plans are prepared.

6.3.2 Soil Expansion

The recommendations presented herein are based on soils with a **Very Low** expansion potential (EI≤20). Therefore, the provisions in CBC Section 1808.6 for expansive soils are not required. Following site grading, additional testing of site soils should be performed by the project geotechnical consultant to confirm the basis of these recommendations. If site soils with higher expansion potentials are encountered or imported to the site, the recommendations contained herein may require modification.

6.3.3 Static and Seismic Settlement

Under normal static conditions, the foundation system should be designed to tolerate a total settlement of 1 inch and a differential settlement of 1/2-inch over 30 feet. These estimated magnitudes of settlement should be considered by the structural engineer in design of the proposed structures at the site.

6.3.4 Allowable Bearing Value

Foundations may utilize a bearing value of 2,800 pounds per square foot (psf) for continuous and pad footings a minimum width of 12 inches and founded at a minimum depth of 12 inches below the lowest adjacent grade. This value may be increased by 550 psf and 1200 psf for each additional foot in width

and depth, respectively, up to a maximum value of 5000 psf. Recommended allowable bearing values include both dead and live loads and may be increased by one-third for wind and seismic forces.

6.3.5 Lateral Resistance

Provided site grading is performed and that foundations are founded in engineered fill, a passive earth pressure of 200 pounds per square foot per foot of depth (psf/ft) may be used to determine lateral bearing for footings. This value may be increased by one-third when designing for wind and seismic forces. A coefficient of friction of 0.39 times the dead load forces may also be used between concrete and the supporting soils to determine lateral sliding resistance. No increase in the coefficient of friction should be used when designing for wind and seismic forces. Footings against property lines should have the above-noted values reduced by 50 percent.

The above values are based on footings placed directly against compacted fill or competent native soils. In the case where footing sides are formed, all backfill against the footings should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the laboratory standard.

6.3.6 Footings and Slabs on Grade

Exterior and interior building footings may be founded at a minimum depth of 12 inches below lowest adjacent grade and have a minimum width of 12 inches. All continuous footings should be reinforced with a minimum of two No. 4 bars, one top and one bottom. The structural engineer may require different reinforcement and should dictate if greater than the recommendations herein.

Interior isolated pad footings should be a minimum of 24 inches square and founded at minimum depths of 12 inches below the lowest adjacent final grade. Exterior isolated pad footings should be a minimum of 24 inches square and founded at a minimum depth of 12 inches below the lowest adjacent final grade.

Interior concrete slabs constructed on grade should be a minimum 4 inches thick and should be reinforced with No. 3 bars spaced 30 inches on center, each way. Care should be taken to ensure the placement of reinforcement at mid-slab height. The structural engineer may recommend a greater slab thickness and reinforcement based on proposed use and loading conditions and such recommendations should govern if greater than the recommendations presented herein.

Concrete floor slabs in areas to receive carpet, tile, or other moisture sensitive coverings should be underlain with a minimum of 10-mil moisture vapor retarder conforming to ASTM E 1745-11, Class A. The membrane should be properly lapped, sealed, and underlain with at least 2 inches of sand having a SE no less than 30. One inch of this sand may be placed over the membrane to aid in the curing of the concrete. This vapor retarder system is anticipated to be suitable for most flooring finishes that can accommodate some vapor emissions. However, this system may emit more than 4 pounds of water per 1000 sq. ft. and therefore, may not be suitable for all flooring finishes. Additional steps should be taken if such vapor emission levels are too high for anticipated flooring finishes.

Special consideration should be given to slabs in areas to receive ceramic tile or other rigid, crack-sensitive floor coverings. Design and construction of such areas should mitigate hairline cracking as recommended by the structural engineer.

Block-outs should be provided around interior columns to permit relative movement and mitigate distress to the floor slabs due to differential settlement that will occur between column footings and adjacent floor subgrade soils as loads are applied.

Prior to placing concrete, subgrade soils below slab-on-grade areas should be thoroughly moistened to provide a moisture content that is equal to or greater than the optimum moisture content to a depth of 12 inches.

6.3.7 Foundation Observations

Foundation excavation should be observed by the project geotechnical consultant to verify that they have been excavated into competent bearing soils and to the minimum embedment recommended above. These observations should be performed prior to placement of forms or reinforcement. The excavations should be trimmed neat, level and square. Loose, sloughed or moisture-softened materials and debris should be removed prior to placing concrete.

6.4 RETAINING AND SCREENING WALLS

6.4.1 General

The following preliminary design and construction recommendations are provided for general retaining and screen walls supported by engineered compacted fill or competent native soils. Final wall designs specific to the site development should be provided for review once completed. The structural engineer and architect should provide appropriate recommendations for sealing at all joints and applying moisture-proofing material on the back of the walls.

6.4.2 Allowable Bearing Value and Lateral Resistance


Design of retaining and screen walls may utilize the bearing and lateral resistance values provided in Section 6.4.4. The passive earth pressure for walls along property lines, where lateral removals are likely restricted, should be reduced by 50%.

6.4.3 Active Earth Pressures

Static and seismic earth pressures for level and 2:1 (H:V) backfill conditions are provided in Table 6.3. Seismic earth pressures provided herein are based on the method provided by Seed & Whitman (1970) using a peak ground acceleration (PGA) of 0.491 g for 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years. As indicated in Section 1803.5.12 of the 2019 CBC, retaining walls supporting 10 feet of backfill or less are not required to be designed for seismic earth pressures. The values provided in the following table do not consider hydrostatic pressure. Retaining walls should also be designed to support adjacent surcharge loads imposed by other nearby footings or traffic loads in addition to the earth pressure.

TABLE 6.3

SEISMIC EARTH PRESSURES
Pressure Diagram



Pressure Values
Walls Up To 10 Feet High

Value	Backfill Condition	
	Level	2H:1V Slope
A	34H	58H
B	14H	14H
C	24H	36H

Note:
H is in feet and resulting pressure is in psf. Design may utilize either the sum of the static component and the seismic component force diagrams or the total force diagram above. SEAOSC has suggested using a load factor of 1.7 for the static component and 1.0 for the seismic component. The actual load factors should be determined by the structural engineer.

6.4.4 Drainage and Moisture-Proofing

Retaining walls should be constructed with a perforated pipe and gravel subdrain to prevent entrapment of water in the backfill. The perforated pipe should consist of 4-inch-diameter, ABS SDR-35 or PVC Schedule 40 with the perforations laid down. The pipe should be embedded in ¾- to 1½-inch open-graded gravel wrapped in filter fabric. The gravel should be at least one foot wide and extend at least one foot up the wall above the footing and drainage outlet. Drainage gravel and piping should not be placed below outlets and weepholes. Filter fabric should consist of Mirafi 140N, or equal. Outlet pipes should be directed to positive drainage devices.

The use of weepholes may be considered in locations where aesthetic issues from potential nuisance water are not a concern. Weepholes should be 2 inches in diameter and provided at least every 6 feet on center. Where weepholes are used, perforated pipe may be omitted from the gravel subdrain.

Retaining walls supporting backfill should also be coated with a moisture-proofing compound or covered with such material to inhibit infiltration of moisture through the walls. Moisture-proofing material should cover any portion of the back of wall that will be in contact with soil and should lap over and onto the top of footing. A drainage panel should be provided between the soil backfill and water proofing. The panel should extend from the top of the backdrain gravel up to within 12 inches of finish grade. The top of footing should be finished smooth with a trowel to inhibit the infiltration of water through the wall. The project structural engineer should provide specific recommendations for moisture-proofing, water stops, and joint details.

6.4.5 Footing Reinforcement and Wall Jointing

All continuous footings should be reinforced with a minimum of two No. 4 bars, one top and one bottom. Walls should be provided with cold joints spaced no more than 40 feet apart. Wall finishes and capping materials should not extend across the cold joint. The structural engineer may require different reinforcement or jointing and should dictate if greater than the recommendations provided herein. Where recommended removals are limited due to space restrictions, greater reinforcement and closer jointing may be recommended. Specific recommendations should be provided by the geotechnical consultant during grading based on as-built conditions exposed in the field.

6.4.6 Foundation Observations

Footing excavations should be observed by the project geotechnical consultant to verify that they have been excavated into competent bearing soils and to the minimum embedment recommended herein. These observations should be performed prior to placement of forms or reinforcement. The excavations should be trimmed neat, level and square. Loose, sloughed or moisture-softened materials and debris should be removed prior to placing concrete.

6.5 EXTERIOR FLATWORK

Exterior flatwork should be a nominal 4 inches thick. Cold joints or saw cuts should be provided at least every 15 feet in each direction. Special jointing detail should be provided in areas of block-outs, notches, or other irregularities to avoid cracking at points of high stress Subgrade soils below flatwork should be thoroughly moistened to at least 110 percent of the optimum moisture content to a depth of 12 inches. Moistening should be accomplished by lightly spraying the area over a period of a few days just prior to pouring concrete. The geotechnical consultant should observe and verify the density and moisture content of subgrade soils prior to pouring concrete to ensure that the required compaction and pre-moistening recommendations have been met.

Drainage from flatwork areas should be directed to local area drains and/or other appropriate collection devices designed to carry runoff water to the street or other approved drainage structures. The concrete flatwork should also be sloped at a minimum gradient of ½ percent away from building foundations and retaining walls.

6.6 CONCRETE MIX DESIGN

Laboratory testing of near-surface soils for soluble sulfate content indicates soluble sulfate concentration of 0.011%, 0.022%, and 0.006%. We recommend following the procedures provided in ACI 318-14, Section 19.3, Table 19.3.2.1 for S0 sulfate exposure. Upon completion of rough grading, evaluation of as-graded conditions and further laboratory testing should be completed for the site to confirm or modify the recommendations provided in this section.

6.7 CORROSION

Results of preliminary testing of soils for pH, chloride, and minimum resistivity indicate the site is potentially **Mildly Corrosive** to metals that are in contact or close proximity to onsite soils. As such, specific recommendations should be obtained from a corrosion specialist if construction will include metals that will be near or in direct contact with site soils.

6.8 PRELIMINARY PAVEMENT DESIGN

6.8.1 Preliminary Pavement Structural Sections

Based on the soil conditions present at the site and an estimated traffic index, preliminary pavement sections are provided in the table below. An assumed "R-value" of 35 was used for the near-surface soil in this preliminary pavement design. The sections provided below are for planning purposes only and should be re-evaluated subsequent to site grading. Final pavement sections should be based on actual R-value testing of in-place soils and analysis of anticipated traffic.

TABLE 6.4
PRELIMINARY PAVEMENT STRUCTURAL SECTIONS

Location	AC (inches)	Concrete Pavers (mm)	PCC (inches)	AB (inches)
Entry Way and Drives with (TI=5.5)	3.0 4.0	-- --	-- --	8.0 5.0
	--	--	6.0	--
	--	80.0	--	8.0
Parking Stalls	3.0	--	--	5.0

6.8.1 Subgrade Preparation

Prior to placement of paving elements, subgrade soils should be scarified 6 inches, moisture-conditioned to above the optimum moisture content then compacted to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry density determined in accordance with ASTM D1557. Areas observed to pump or yield

under vehicle traffic should be removed and replaced with firm and unyielding engineered compacted soil or aggregate base materials.

6.8.2 Aggregate Base

Aggregate base materials should be Crushed Aggregate Base or Crushed Miscellaneous Base conforming to Section 200-2 of the Standard Specification for Public Works Construction (Greenbook) or Class 2 Aggregate Base conforming to the Caltrans' Standard Specifications. The materials should be moisture conditioned to slightly over the optimum moisture content then compacted to at least 95 percent of ASTM D 1557.

6.8.3 Asphaltic Concrete

Paving asphalt should be PG 64-10 conforming to the requirements of Section 203-1 of the Greenbook. Asphalt concrete materials should conform to Section 203-6 and construction should conform to Section 302 of the Greenbook.

6.8.4 Concrete Paver

Concrete pavers should conform to the requirements of ASTM C 936. Construction of the pavers, including bedding sand, should follow manufacturer's specifications. Typical thickness of bedding sand is about 1 inch. The gradation of bedding sand should meet the requirement in Table 6.5.

TABLE 6.5
Gradation for Sand Bedding

Sieve Size	Percent Passing
⅜"	100
No. 4	95 - 100
No. 8	80 - 100
No. 16	50 - 85
No. 30	25 - 60
No. 50	5 - 30
No. 100	0 - 10
No. 200	0 - 1

6.8.5 Portland Cement Concrete

Portland cement concrete used to construct concrete paving should conform to Section 201 of the Greenbook and should have a minimum compressive strength of 3,250 pounds per square inch (psi) at 28 days. Reinforcement and jointing of concrete pavement sections should be designed according to the minimum recommendations provided by the Portland Cement Association (PCA). For rigid pavement, transverse and longitudinal contraction joints should be provided at spacing no greater than 15 feet. Score joints may be constructed by saw cutting to a depth of ¼ of the slab thickness. Expansion/cold joints may be used in lieu of score joints. Such joints should be properly sealed. Where traffic will traverse over cold joints without keyways or dowels or edges of concrete paving, the edges should be thickened by 20% of the design thickness toward the edge over a horizontal distance of 5 feet.

6.9 POST GRADING CONSIDERATIONS

6.9.1 Site Drainage and Irrigation

The ground immediately adjacent to foundations should be provided with positive drainage away from the structures in accordance with 2019 CBC, Section 1804.4. The slope of ground within 10 feet of the buildings may be reduced to 2% based on soil and climatic conditions. No rain or excess water should be allowed to pond against structures such as walls, foundations, flatwork, etc.

Excessive irrigation water can be detrimental to the performance of the proposed site development. Water applied in excess of the needs of vegetation will tend to percolate into the ground. Such percolation can lead to nuisance seepage and shallow perched groundwater. Seepage can form on slope faces, on the faces of retaining walls, in streets, or other low-lying areas. These conditions could lead to adverse effects such as the formation of stagnant water that breeds insects, distress or damage of trees, surface erosion, slope instability, discoloration and salt buildup on wall faces, and premature failure of pavement. Excessive watering can also lead to elevated vapor emissions within buildings that can damage flooring finishes or lead to mold growth inside the home.

Key factors that can help mitigate the potential for adverse effects of overwatering include the judicious use of water for irrigation, use of irrigation systems that are appropriate for the type of vegetation and geometric configuration of the planted area, the use of soil amendments to enhance moisture retention, use of low-water demand vegetation, regular use of appropriate fertilizers, and seasonal adjustments of irrigation systems to match the water requirements of vegetation. Specific recommendations should be provided by a landscape architect or other knowledgeable professional.

6.9.2 Utility Trenches

Trench excavations should be constructed in accordance with the recommendations contained in Section 6.1.7 of this report. Trench excavations must also conform to the requirements of Cal/OSHA.

Trench backfill materials and compaction criteria should conform to the requirements of the local municipalities. As a minimum, utility trench backfill should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the laboratory standard. Materials placed within the pipe zone (6 inches below and 12 inches above the pipe) should consist of particles no greater than ¾ inches and have a SE of at least 30. The materials within the pipe zone should be moisture-conditioned and compacted by hand-operated compaction equipment. Above the pipe zone (>1 foot above pipe), the backfill may consist of general fill materials. Trench backfill should be moisture-conditioned to slightly over the optimum moisture content, placed in lifts no greater than 12 inches in thickness, and then mechanically compacted with appropriate equipment to at least 90 percent of the laboratory standard. For trenches with sloped walls, backfill material should be placed in lifts no greater than 8 inches in loose thickness, and then compacted by rolling with a sheepsfoot roller or similar equipment. The project geotechnical consultant should perform density testing along with probing to verify that adequate compaction has been achieved.

Within shallow trenches (less than 18 inches deep) where pipes may be damaged by heavy compaction equipment, imported clean sand having a SE of 30 or greater may be utilized. The sand should be placed in the trench, thoroughly watered, and then compacted with a vibratory compactor. For utility trenches located below a 1:1 (H:V) plane projecting downward from the outside edge of the adjacent footing base or crossing footing trenches, concrete or slurry should be used as trench backfill.

6.10 PLAN REVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

We recommend ***Albus & Associates, Inc.*** be engaged to review any future development plans, including civil plans (grading plans), foundation plans, and proposed structural loads, prior to construction. This is to verify that the assumptions of this report are valid and that the preliminary conclusions and recommendations contained in this report have been properly interpreted and are incorporated into the project plans and specifications. If we are not provided the opportunity to review these documents, we take no responsibility for misinterpretation of our preliminary conclusions and recommendations.

We recommend that a geotechnical consultant be retained to provide soil engineering services during construction of the project. These services are to observe compliance with the design, specifications or recommendations, and to allow design changes in the event that subsurface conditions differ from those anticipated prior to the start of construction.

If the project plans change significantly from the assumed development described herein, the project geotechnical consultant should review our preliminary design recommendations and their applicability to the revised construction. If conditions are encountered during construction that appear to be different than those indicated in this report or subsequent design reports, the project geotechnical consultant should be notified immediately. Design and construction revisions may be required.

7.0 LIMITATIONS

This report is based on the proposed development and geotechnical data as described herein. The materials encountered on the project site and utilized in our laboratory testing for this investigation are believed representative of the total project area, and the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are presented on that basis. However, soil and bedrock materials can vary in characteristics between points of exploration, both laterally and vertically, and those variations could affect the conclusions and recommendations contained herein. As such, observation and testing by a geotechnical consultant during the grading and construction phases of the project are essential to confirming the basis of this report.

This report has been prepared consistent with that level of care being provided by other professionals providing similar services at the same locale and time period. The contents of this report are professional opinions and as such, are not to be considered a guaranty or warranty.

This report should be reviewed and updated after a period of one year or if the site ownership or project concept changes from that described herein.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of **Borstein Enterprises** and their project consultants in the planning and design of the proposed development. This report has not been prepared for use by parties or projects other than those named or described herein. This report may not contain sufficient information for other parties or other purposes.

This report is subject to review by the controlling governmental agency.

Respectfully submitted,

ALBUS & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Eung Jin Jeon, Ph.D.
Associate Engineer
G.E. 3096



David E. Albus
Principal Engineer
G.E. 2455



8.0 REFERENCES

Publications

Abrahamson, N.A., Silva, W.J., and Kamai, R. 2014. "Update of the AS08 Ground-Motion Prediction Equations Based on the NGA-West2 Data Set." Earthquake Spectra 30 (3): 1179-1197.

American Society of Civil Engineers, 2017, Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures, ASCE 7-16.

Boore, D.M., Stewart, J.P., Seyhan, E., and Atkinson, G.M. 2014. "NGA-West2 Equations for Predicting PGA, PGV, and 5% damped PSA for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes." Earthquake Spectra 30 (3): 1057-1085.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 2000. "Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the Ontario 7.5-Minute Quadrangles, Los Angeles County, California," Seismic Hazard Zone Report 040.

California Geologic Survey, 2000. "Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Ontario Quadrangle." Released on November 17, 2000.

California Geologic Survey, 2008. Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, Special Publication 117A.

Campbell, K.W., and Bozorgnia, Y. 2014. "NGA-West2 Ground Motion Model for the Average Horizontal Components of PGA, PGV, and 5%-damped Linear Acceleration Response Spectra." Earthquake Spectra 30 (3): 1087-1115.

Chiou, B.S.-J., and Youngs, R.R. 2014. "Update of the Chiou and Youngs NGA Model for the Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra, Earthquake Spectra, 30 (3): 1117-1153.

Dibblee, T.W., Jr. 2002. Geologic map of the San Dimas and Ontario Quadrangles, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, California: Dibblee Geological Foundation, Map DF-91, scale 1:24,000.

Field, E.H., Biasi, G.P., Bird, P., Dawson, T.E., Felzer, K.R., Jackson, D.D., Johnson, K.M., Jordan, T.H., Madden, C., Michael, A.J., Milner, K.R., Page, M.T., Parsons, T., Powers, P.M., Shaw, B.E., Thatcher, W.R., Weldon, R.J., II, and Zeng, Y., 2013, Uniform California earthquake rupture forecast, version 3 (UCERF3)—The time-independent model: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2013–1165, 97 p., California Geological Survey Special Report 228, and Southern California Earthquake Center Publication 1792, http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2013/1165/.


Historic Aerials by Netronline, accessed 2021. https://www.historicaerials.com/

REFERENCE (continued)

Seed, HB, and Whitman, RV. "Design of Earth Retaining Structures for Dynamic Loads," ASCE Specialty Conference, Lateral Stresses in the Ground and Design of Earth Retaining Structures, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, New York, 103-147, 1970

Youd, T.L., Idriss, I.M., Andrus, R.D., Arango, I., Castro, G., Christian, J., Dobry, R., Finn, W.D.L., Harder, L.F., Hynes, M.E., Ishihara, K., Koester, J.P., Liao, S.S.C., Marcuson, W.F., Martin, G.R., Mitchell, J.K., Moriwaki, Y., Power, M.S., Robertson, P.K., Seed, R.B., and Stokoe, K.H., "Liquefaction Resistance of Soils: Summary Report from the 1996 NCEER and 1998 NCEER/NSF Workshops on Evaluation of Liquefaction Resistance of Soils", Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, October, 2001.





0 80 160 320

APPROX SCALE : 1" = 160'

EXPLANATION

(Locations Approximate)

B-22 - Exploratory Boring

P-2 - Exploratory Percolation Test Boring

ALBUS ASSOCIATES

GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Job No.: 2954.00	Date: 07/16/21	Plate: 1

APPENDIX A

EXPLORATION LOGS

Field Identification Sheet

Light gray

Gray

Dark gray

Gray Brown

Light brown

Brown

Dark Brown

Olive brown

Olive

Yellow

Yellowish brown

Yellowish red

Red

Reddish Brown

Tan

Description Order:

Description, Color, Moisture, Density, Grain Size, Additional Description

Description	%	Example
	0-5	Sand
trace	5-15	Sand trace Silt
with	15-30	Sand with Silt
	30+	Silty Sand

More Examples

Sand with Silt trace Clay

Sand trace Silt and Clay

Sand with Silt and Clay

Gravelly Sand with Silt trace Clay

Silty Clay with Sand trace Gravel

Moisture

Dry	absence of water
Damp	below optimum
Moist	near optimum
Very Moist	above optimum
Wet	free water visible

Density (Navfac)


Coarse grained soils	SPT	CA
Very Loose	0-3	0-5
Loose	3-8	5-13
Medium Dense	8-14	13-22
Dense	14-25	22-40
Very Dense	25>	40>
Fine grained soils		
Very Soft	2<	0-3
Soft	2-4	3-6
Medium Stiff	4-8	6-13
Stiff	8-15	13-24
Very Stiff	15-30	24-48
Hard	30>	48>

Grain Size

Description		Sieve Size	Approx. Size
Boulders		>12"	Larger than basketball
Cobbles		3-12"	Fist to basketball
Gravel	coarse	3/4-3"	Thumb to Fist
	fine	#4-3/4"	Pea to Thumb
Sand	coarse	#10-4	Rock Salt to Pea
	medium	#40-10	Sugar to Rock Salt
	fine	#200-40	Flour to Sugar
Fines		Pass #200	Smaller than Flour

Additional Description (ie. roots, pinhole pores, debris, etc.)

Trace 5% Moderate 15% Abundant 30%



EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location:
Address:		Elevation:
Job Number:	Client:	Date:
Drill Method:	Driving Weight:	Logged By:

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		EXPLANATION							
		Solid lines separate geologic units and/or material types.							
		Dashed lines indicate unknown depth of geologic unit change or material type change.							
5		**Solid black rectangle** in Core column represents California Split Spoon sampler (2.5in ID, 3in OD).							
		Double triangle in core column represents SPT sampler.							
10		**Vertical Lines** in core column represents Shelby sampler.							
		Solid black rectangle in Bulk column respresents large bag sample.							
		Other Laboratory Tests:							
15		Max = Maximum Dry Density/Optimum Moisture Content							
		EI = Expansion Index							
		SO4 = Soluble Sulfate Content							
		DSR = Direct Shear, Remolded							
		DS = Direct Shear, Undisturbed							
		SA = Sieve Analysis (1" through #200 sieve)							
		Hydro = Particle Size Analysis (SA with Hydrometer)							
20		200 = Percent Passing #200 Sieve							
		Consol = Consolidation							
		SE = Sand Equivalent							
		Rval = R-Value							
		ATT = Atterberg Limits							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-1
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 842.9
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand (SM): Grayish brown, very moist, medium dense, fine to medium grained sand, few fine to coarse gravel, mica present		17		■	5	109.1	
5		Sand (SP): Light gray brown, very moist, loose, fine to coarse grained sand, fine to coarse gravel, very friable disturbed		14		■	13.3		
		Sandy Silt (ML): Brown, very moist, medium stiff, fine to medium grained sand, mica present, trace clay		11		■	11.2	108.5	Consol
10				10		■	15.6	104.4	
15		@ 15 ft, light gray, decreased sand content, iron oxide stains		26		■	20	95.7	
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-2
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 841.6
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand (SM): Grayish brown, very moist, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand, fine to coarse gravel		18		■	8.9	109.6	Max EI SO4 DS 200 pH Resist Ch
		Sand (SP): Grayish brown, damp, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand, fine to coarse gravel, few silt		22	■	■	2.9	106.8	
5				33	■		3.1	109.6	
10		Silt (ML): Brown, moist, very stiff, fine grained sand, caliche stainings, mica present		21	■		12.9	112.8	
15		@ 15 ft, Gray, very moist, porous, iron oxide stainings		23	■		18.6	88.6	Consol
20		@ 20 ft, iron oxide stainings		23	■		34.6	85.4	
		End of boring at depth of 21.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-3
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 838.9
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal)							
		Silty Sand/ Sandy Silt (SM/ML): Brown, moist, loose/stiff, fine to coarse grained sand, fine to coarse gravel, rootlets present		12	■		6.6	102	
				13	■		7.3	107.5	
5				14	■		7.1	112.5	
10		Silt (ML): Grayish brown, moist, stiff, fine grained sand, trace coarse grained sand		16	■		17.4	105.8	
15		@ 15 ft, Gray, very stiff, decreased sand, iron oxidestainings		21	■		16.8	96.5	
		End of boring at 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-4
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 840.2
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand/ Sandy Silt (SM/ML): medium grayish brown, moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand, trace fine gravel		10	■		6.1	105.3	
		@ 4 ft, medium dense		16	■		4.9	108.6	
5		Silt (ML): Reddish brown, moist, loose, trace pores, trace fine grained sand, mica present		10	■		8.8	107.6	Consol
10		Silt (ML): Olive gray, moist, medium dense, few fine grained sand, mica present		17	■		9.9	108.8	
15		Silt (ML): Gray, moist, medium dense, few clay, iron oxide stainings, trace pores		17	■		16.4	96.4	
20		@ 20 ft, increasing iron oxide stainings		29	■		36.2	82.9	
		End of boring at depth of 21.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-5
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 840.7
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand/ Sandy Silt (SM/ML): Reddish brown, very moist, loose, fine to coarse grained sand, few fine gravel		12	■		4.2	107.9	
		Sandy Silt (ML): Brown, moist, stiff, fine grained sand, trace fine gravel		16	■		6.7	109.9	
5		@ 4 ft, medium dense		15	■		7.4	109.9	
10		@ 10 ft, decreasing sand content		16	■		10.4	103.6	
15		@ 15 ft, gray, porous, iron oxide staining, no sand		18	■		12	90.8	
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-6
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 838.3
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand (SM): Grayish brown, moist, loose, fine to coarse grained sand, trace fine gravel		8	■		6.2	104.4	
		Sandy Silt (ML): Reddish brown, moist, medium stiff, fine grained sand, trace pores		9	■		8.6	102.4	
5		@ 6 ft, trace fine gravel		13	■		7.2	111.5	
10		Silt (ML): Grayish brown, damp to moist, stiff, few fine to coarse grained sand		13	■		10.3	109	Consol ATT
15		@ 15 ft, gray, very moist, very stiff, decreasing sand content, iron oxide stains, mica presented		27	■		19	92	
20		Clayey Silt (ML): Gray, very moist, very stiff, iron oxide stains, trace pores		27	■		24.3	90.2	
		End of boring at depth of 21.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

Albus & Associates, Inc.

Plate A-7

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-7
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 838.7
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Sand (SP): Light gray, moist, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand, fine to coarse gravel, very friable		22	■		1.4		
5		Silty Sand/ Sandy Silt (SM/ML): Medium brown, moist, loose/stiff, fine to medium grained sand		13	■		6.3	109.7	
		@ 6 ft, medium dense/stiff, decreasing sand contetnt		19	■		6.9	114.2	Consol
10		@ 10 ft, grayish brown, decreasing sand		22	■		8.9	114.2	
15		@ 15 ft, very moist			⧗				
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-8
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 838.5
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ARTIFICIAL FILL (Af) Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp to moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand, trace fine gravel		8	■		4.8	103.1	
		ALLUVIUM (Qal)		6	■		6.2	100.1	Consol
5		Silty Sand/ Silty Sand (SM/ML): Brown, moist, loose/medium dense, fine to medium grained sand, trace fine gravel		13	■		7.9	106.7	
		@ 6 ft, Reddish brown, caliche, decreasing sand							
10		Silt with Sand (ML): Gray, moist, stiff, fine grained sand, trace fine gravel		16	■		11.2	110.9	
15		Silt (ML): Gray, moist, very stiff, iron oxide stains		11	▼ ▲				
20				11	▼ ▲				
		End of boring at depth of 21.5. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-9
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 835.5
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Sand (SP): Grayish brown, damp to moist, loose, fine to coarse grained sand, trace sand friable		9	■		5.7	101	
		Sand with Silt (SP): Medium brown, moist, loose, fine grained sand, fine to coarse gravel		8	■		6.6	96.9	200
5		@ 4 ft, trace pores							
		@ 6 ft, loose/stiff		12	■		7.4	111.4	
10		@ 10 ft, Pale brown, very stiff, increasing fines		25	■		7.3	102.6	
15		clayey Silt (ML/CL): Gray, very moist, hard, trace pores		25	▼				ATT
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-10
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 835.5
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal)							Max EI SO4 DS pH Resist Ch
		Sand (SP): Grayish brown, dry, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand, few fine to coarse gravel, friable, disturbed		15			1.7		
5		Silty Sand/ Sandy Silt (SM/ML): Medium brown, moist, loose/medium stiff, fine to coarse grained sand, few fine gravel		9			7.7	103.7	
		@ 6 ft, loose/stiff, decreasing sand, trace pores, decreasing gravel		13			8.2	115.3	Consol
10		Silt (ML): Gray, moist, stiff, fine grained sand, trace pores, trace fine gravel		13			8.1	110.7	
15		Silt with Clay (ML): Gray, moist, very stiff, iron oxide stainings		19					
		Silty Clay (CL): Gray, moist, stiff, trace pores, iron oxide stains		9					ATT
		End of boring at depth of 21.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-11
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 838.8
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal)							
		Sand (SP): Light grayish brown, dry to damp, loose, fine to coarse grained sand, fine to coarse gravel, few silt		10	■		2.8	112.6	
5		Silty Sand (SM): Medium brown, moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand		10	■		7.2	98.7	
		Sand trace Gravel (SP): Light gray, dry, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand, fine gravel, friable		23	■		1.8	119.8	200
10		@ 10 ft, loose		13	■		2	112.6	
15		@ 15 ft, medium dense, increasing fines		19	▼				
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							
20									

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-12
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 835.6
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: mprincipe

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal)							
		Silty Sand (SM): medium grayish brown, dry to damp, loose, fine to coarse grained sand, trace fine gravel							
				13	■		2.9		
		@ 4 ft, damp, medium dense		19	■		4.3	107.4	
5									
		End of boring at depth of 5.5 feet.							
		No groundwater encountered.							
		Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-13
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 838.9
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal)							
		Silty Sand (SM): Brown, dry, loose, fine grained sand		10	■		2.3	110.3	
		Gravelly Sand trace Silt (SP): Brown, dry to damp, medium dense, fine grained sand, disturbed		19	■		1.5		200
5		@ 6 ft, damp to moist		12	■		6.2	110.5	
10		Gravel with Sand (GP): Light brown, dry, medium dense, fine to coarse gravel		30	■		2		
		End of boring at depth of 11.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-14
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 832.4
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Sand with Silt and Gravel (SP): Light brown, dry, loose, fine to coarse grained sand, disturbed		14	■		1.5		
		Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp, loose, fine grained sand		11	■		5	108.1	Consol
5		Gravelly Sand with Silt (SP): Light brown, dry, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand		40	■		1.5		
10		Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp, medium dense, fine grained sand		40	■		4.8	110.6	
15		Sandy Silt (ML): Grayish brown, moist, very stiff, fine grained sand		13	▼				
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-15
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 832.3
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp, loose, fine grained sand		8	■		4.9	102.7	
5		Sand with Silt (SP-SM): Brown, damp to moist, loose, fine grained sand, trace pin-hole pores		10	■		6.3	105.9	Consol 200
		Sand (SP): Light brown, dry, loose, fine grained sand @ 7 ft, fine to coarse grained sand		13	■		2.2	93.2	
10		@ 10 ft, medium dense		33	■		2.1		
15		Sandy Silt (ML): Grayish brown, stiff, fine grained sand		6	▼				
20				8	▼				
		End of boring at depth of 21.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-16
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 832.5
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ARTIFICIAL FILL (Af) Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp, loose, fine grained sand, pinhole pores and rootlets		8	■		4.1	106.4	
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp, loose, fine grained sand, pinhole pores and rootlets		8	■		4.5	100.1	
5		@ 6 ft, trace pinhole pores		11	■		6.7	106.2	Consol
10		@ 10 ft, damp to moist, trace pinhole pores		12	■		7	110.7	
15		Silty Sand/ Sandy Silt (SM/ML): Brown, damp to moist, loose/medium dense, fine grained sand		4	▼				
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-17
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 830.7
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ARTIFICIAL FILL (Af) Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp to moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand		7	■		6.1	104.7	
5		**ALLUVIUM (Qal)** Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp to moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand		7	■		7.1	103.9	
				14	■		2.3	114.1	
		Sandy Gravel (GP): Light brown, dry, loose, fine to coarse grained sand							
10		@ 10 ft, disturbed		30	■		1.5		
15		Silty Sand (SM): Brown, moist, loose, fine grained sand, trace pinhole pores		9	■		8.9	104.9	
20		Silt with Sand trace Clay (ML): Grayish brown, moist, medium dense, fine grained sand, trace pinhole pores		24	■		9.7	109.3	200

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-17
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 830.7
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		@ 25 ft, loose		6					
30		Sand (SP): Light brown, damp, medium dense, fine to medium grained sand		10					
		Sandy Silt (ML): Grayish brown, moist, very stiff, fine grained sand							
35		Silty Sand (SM): Light brown, damp to moist, very dense, fine grained sand		34					
		Sand (SP): Light gray, damp, very dense, fine to medium grained sand							
40		Sandy Gravel (GP): Light brown, damp, very dense, fine to coarse grained sand		60					
45		Silty Sand (SM): Light reddish brown, moist, very dense, fine to medium grained sand		31					

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-17
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 830.7
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
				68					
		End of boring at depth of 51.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-18
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 831.2
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ARTIFICIAL FILL (Af) Silty Sand (SM): Brown, moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand							Max EI SO4 DS 200 pH Resist Ch
				7		■	8.8	106.2	
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Sand with Silt (SP-SM): Brown, moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand, increasing sand		7		■	12.4	100.2	Consol 200
5		@ 6 ft, dry, medium dense		16	■		1.8		
		Sand with Gravel (SP): Light brown, damp, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand							
10		Sand with Silt and Gravel (SP): Brown, moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand		8	■		6.3	92.9	
15		@ 15 ft, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand		19	■		10.5	100.8	
20		@ 20 ft, dry to damp		23	■		3.6	100.7	
		End of the boring at depth of 21.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-19
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 829.2
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand (SM): Brown, moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand							
				7	■		8.9	106.3	
		@ 4 ft, increasing sand content		9	■		6.5	106.7	
5				10	■		5.9	109.3	Consol
10		@ 10 ft, medium dense		15	■		9.9	101.1	
		Sand (SP): Light brown, dry to damp, medium dense, fine to coarse grained sand							
15				18	■		3.6	99.7	
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-20
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 829.3
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ARTIFICIAL FILL (Af) Silty Sand (SM): Brown, damp to moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand		7	■		5.6	103.2	
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Silty Sand trace Gravel (SM): Brown, damp to moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand		7	■		5.1	103.6	Consol
5				9	■		5.8	108.1	200
10		Sand with Gravel (SP): Light brown, dry, medium dense, fine to medium grained sand		16	■		1.9	101.6	
15		Sand (SP): Light brown, damp, medium dense, fine grained sand		20	■		4.5	109.7	
20				15	■		16.8	105	
		Sandy Silt (ML): Grayish brown, moist, stiff, fine grained sand End of boring at depth of 21.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Bckfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-21
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 829.9
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ARTIFICIAL FILL (Af) Silty Sand with Gravel (SM): Brown, moist, medium dense, fine to medium grained sand, moderate pinhole pores		39	■		6.1	106.8	
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Gravelly Sand (SP): Light brown, damp, loose, fine to coarse grained sand		13	■		2		
5				11	■		5.5	110.4	
		Silty Sand (SM): Brown, moist, loose, fine grained sand							
10				13	■		8	110.5	
15		Sandy Silt / Clayey Sand (ML/SM): Grayish brown, moist to very moist, medium dense, fine grained sand		16	■		17.6	103.9	
		End of boring at depth of 16.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

EXPLORATION LOG

Project:		Location: B-22
Address: 4257 Phillips Blvd, Chino, CA 91710		Elevation: 832.1
Job Number: 2954.00	Client: Borstein Enterprises	Date: 1/25/2021
Drill Method: Hollow-Stem Auger	Driving Weight: 140 lbs / 30 in	Logged By: ddalbus

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Water	Samples: Blows Per Foot	Samples: Core	Samples: Bulk	Laboratory Tests: Moisture Content (%)	Laboratory Tests: Dry Density (pcf)	Laboratory Tests: Other Lab Tests
		ARTIFICIAL FILL (Af) Silty Sand with Gravel (SM): Brown, damp to moist, loose, fine to medium grained sand		12	■		4.1	111	
		ALLUVIUM (Qal) Gravelly Sand with Silt (SP): Light brown, damp to moist, loose, fine to coarse grained sand		10	■		3.2	107	
5		Silty Sand (SM): Brown, moist, loose, fine grained sand		11	■		5.5	106.9	Consol
10		@ 10 ft, medium dense, increasing silt, trace pinhole pores		14	■		7.6	114.2	
15		Sandy Silt with Clay (ML): Grayish brown, very moist, very stiff, fine grained sand, trace pinhole poers		20	■		22.6	102.3	
20				20	■		32.7	87.6	
		End of boring at depth of 21.5 feet. No groundwater encountered. Backfilled with soil cuttings.							

APPENDIX B

LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

LABORATORY TESTING PROGRAM

Soil Classification

Soils encountered within the exploratory borings were initially classified in the field in general accordance with the visual-manual procedures of the Unified Soil Classification System (ASTM D 2488). The samples were re-examined in the laboratory and classifications reviewed and then revised where appropriate. The assigned group symbols are presented on the Exploration Logs provided in Appendix A.

In-Situ Moisture Content and Dry Density

Moisture content and dry density of in-place soil materials were determined in representative strata. Test data are summarized on the Exploration Logs, Appendix A.

Atterberg Limits

Atterberg Limits (Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index) were performed in accordance with Test Method ASTM D 4318. Pertinent test values are presented within Table B-1.

Percent Passing the No. 200 Sieve

Percent of material passing the No. 200 sieve was determined on selected samples to verify visual classifications performed in the field. These tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D1140. Test results are presented on Table B-1.

Maximum Dry Density and Optimum Moisture Content

Maximum dry density and optimum moisture content were performed on a representative sample of the site materials obtained from our field explorations. The test was performed in accordance with ASTM D 1557. Pertinent test values are given in Table B-1.

Expansion Potential

Expansion index testing was performed on a selected sample. The test was performed in accordance with ASTM D4829. The test result and expansion potential are presented in Table B-1.

Soluble Sulfate Content

A chemical analysis was performed on a selected sample to determine soluble sulfate content. This test was performed in our soil laboratory in accordance with California Test Method No 417. The test result is included in Table B-1.

Consolidation

Consolidation tests were performed for selected soil samples in general conformance with ASTM D 2435. Axial loads were applied in several increments to a laterally restrained 1-inch-high sample. Loads were applied in geometric progression by doubling the previous load, and the resulting deformations were recorded at selected time intervals. The specific test samples were inundated at selected loads to evaluate the effects of a sudden increase in moisture content (hydro-consolidation potential). Results of the tests are graphically presented on Plates B-1 to B-14.

Direct Shear

The Coulomb shear strength parameters, angle of internal friction and cohesion, were determined for a bulk sample and intact samples obtained from one our borings. The tests were performed in general conformance with Test Method ASTM D 3080. The bulk sample was remolded to 90 percent of maximum dry density and at the optimum moisture content. Three specimens were prepared for each test, artificially saturated, and then sheared under varied loads at an appropriate constant rate of strain. Results are graphically presented on Plates B-15 to B-17.

Corrosion

Select samples were tested for minimum resistivity, chloride, pH in accordance with California Test Method 643. Results of these tests are provided in Table B-1.


TABLE B-1
SUMMARY OF LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

Boring No.	Sample Depth (ft)	Soil Description	Test Results	
B-2	0-5	Silty Sand	Max. Dry Density (pcf): Opt. Moisture Content (%): Expansion Index: Expansion Potential: Soluble Sulfate Content: Sulfate Exposure: Passing No. 200 Sieve: PH: Chloride content (ppm): Resistivity (ohms):	122 11.5 1 Very Low 11 Negligible 23.3 7.4 45 3300
B-6	10	Silt with Sand	Liquid Limit (%): Plasticity Index (%):	20 2
B-9	4	Sand with Silt	Passing No. 200 Sieve:	16.7
B-9	15	Silt	Liquid Limit (%): Plasticity Index (%):	34 9
B-10	0-5	Silty Sand	Max. Dry Density (pcf): Opt. Moisture Content (%):	122 11.0

			Expansion Index: Expansion Potential: Soluble Sulfate Content: Sulfate Exposure: PH: Chloride content (ppm): Resistivity (ohms):	2 Very Low 11 Negligible 8.02 67.5 9000
B-10	20	Silt	Liquid Limit (%): Plasticity Index (%):	35 10
B-11	6	Sand trace Gravel	Passing No. 200 Sieve:	3.6
B-13	4	Gravelly Sand trace Silt	Passing No. 200 Sieve:	6.2
B-15	4	Sand with Silt	Passing No. 200 Sieve:	15.9
B-17	20	Silt with Sand trace Clay	Passing No. 200 Sieve:	80.3
B-18	0-5	Silty Sand	Max. Dry Density (pcf): Opt. Moisture Content (%): Expansion Index: Expansion Potential: Soluble Sulfate Content: Sulfate Exposure: Passing No. 200 Sieve: PH: Chloride content (ppm): Resistivity (ohms):	132 8.5 14 Very Low 11 Negligible 32.5 7.74 32.5 1500
B-18	4	Sand with Silt	Passing No. 200 Sieve:	24
B-20	6	Silty Sand trace Gravel	Passing No. 200 Sieve:	30.1

Note: Additional laboratory test results are provided on the boring logs provided in Appendix A.


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-1	6	Sandy Silt trace Clay

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
107.8	12.4	18.4


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-2	15	Silt

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
91.9	12.5	28.3


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-4	6	Silty Sand

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
101.2	9.2	19.5


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-6	10	Silt with Sand

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
112.6	11.6	16.8


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-7	6	Silty Sand

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
119.3	7.4	13.1


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-8	4	Silty Sand trace Gravel

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
107.1	7.3	17.1


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-10	6	Silty Sand

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
116.9	8	14.2


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-14	4	Silty Sand

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
104.7	5.7	18.4


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-15	4	Sand with Silt

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
105.6	6.6	17.3


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-16	6	Silty Sand

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
107.2	6.7	18.5


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-18	4	Sand with Silt

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
102.6	12.3	20.1


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-19	6	Silty Sand with Gravel

Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
107.8	6.8	16.3


CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-20	4	Silty Sand with Gravel


Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
105.9	5.4	16.2

CONSOLIDATION



Job Number	Location	Depth	Description
2954.00	B-22	6	Silty Sand


Initial Dry Density (pcf)	Initial Moisture Content (%)	Final Moisture Concent (%)
108.6	5.1	16.4



Strain Rate: 0.05 in. / min.

Sample	Type	Description	Dry Density (pcf)	Initial W.C (%)	Final W.C. (%)
B2@0-5'	Remolded & Saturated	Silty Sand	109.8 (90% Max Density)	11.5	17.2

Normal Pressure (psf)	Peak Shear Strength (psf)	Ultimate Shear Strength (psf)
1000	790 @ 0.0690"	700
2000	1320 @ 0.0720"	1310
4000	2590 @ 0.2235"	2570
	C = 155 psf	C = 70 psf
	$\phi = 31^0$	$\phi = 32^0$



Strain Rate: 0.05 in. / min.


Sample	Type	Description	Dry Density (pcf)	Initial W.C (%)	Final W.C. (%)
B10@0-5'	Remolded & Saturated	Silty Sand	109.8 (90% Max Density)	11.0	16.7

Normal Pressure (psf)	Peak Shear Strength (psf)	Ultimate Shear Strength (psf)
1000	860 @ 0.0340"	720
2000	1580 @ 0.1140"	1420
4000	2740 @ 0.1045"	2560
	C = 280 psf	C =150 psf
	$\phi = 31.5^0$	$\phi = 31.5^0$

Date: 06-15-21

Geo**L**ogic **A**ssociates

Plate B-16



Strain Rate: 0.05 in. / min.

Sample	Type	Description	Dry Density (pcf)	Initial W.C (%)	Final W.C. (%)
B18@0-5'	Remolded & Saturated	Silty Sand	118.8 (90% Max Density)	8.5	14.5

Normal Pressure (psf)	Peak Shear Strength (psf)	Ultimate Shear Strength (psf)
1000	840 @ 0.0425"	700
2000	1620 @ 0.0525"	1360
4000	2860 @ 0.0890"	2540
	C = 200 psf	C =100 psf
	$\phi = 33.5^0$	$\phi = 31.5^0$

Date: 06-15-21

Geo**L**ogic **A**ssociates

Plate B-17