

## **APPENDIX G5: GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION SITES 3 & 4**

*This page intentionally left blank.*

**GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION  
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL  
DEVELOPMENT – SITES 3 & 4**

Laurel Avenue, South of Santa Ana Avenue  
Bloomington, California  
for  
Howard Industrial Partners



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
*A California Corporation*

February 26, 2021

Howard Industrial Partners  
1944 North Tustin Street, Suite 122  
Orange, California 92865



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
*A California Corporation*

Attention: Mr. Mike Tunney  
Vice President

Project No.: **20G172-5**

Subject: **Geotechnical Investigation**  
Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development – Sites 3 & 4  
Laurel Avenue, South of Santa Ana Avenue  
Bloomington (Unincorporated San Bernardino County), California

Mr. Tunney:

In accordance with your request, we have conducted a geotechnical investigation at the subject site. We are pleased to present this report summarizing the conclusions and recommendations developed from our investigation.

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to be of service on this project. We look forward to providing additional consulting services during the course of the project. If we may be of further assistance in any manner, please contact our office.

Respectfully Submitted,

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL, INC.**

Pablo Montes Jr.  
Staff Engineer

Robert G. Trazo, GE 2655  
Principal Engineer



Distribution: (1) Addressee



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.0 SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Site Conditions	4
3.2 Proposed Development	5
3.3 Previous Study	5
<b>4.0 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Scope of Exploration/Sampling Methods	7
4.2 Geotechnical Conditions	7
<b>5.0 LABORATORY TESTING</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1 Seismic Design Considerations	11
6.2 Geotechnical Design Considerations	13
6.3 Site Grading Recommendations	15
6.4 Construction Considerations	18
6.5 Foundation Design and Construction	19
6.6 Floor Slab Design and Construction	20
6.7 Retaining Wall Design and Construction	21
6.8 Pavement Design Parameters	24
<b>7.0 GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
A Plate 1: Site Location Map Plate 2: Boring Location Plan	
B Boring Logs	
C Laboratory Test Results	
D Grading Guide Specifications	
E Seismic Design Parameters	
F Excerpts from Previous Study	

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

Presented below is a brief summary of the conclusions and recommendations of this investigation. Since this summary is not all inclusive, it should be read in complete context with the entire report.

### Site Preparation Recommendations

- Initial site stripping should include removal of the existing vegetation including grass and weeds, as well as any underlying topsoil, and any trees that will not remain with the proposed development. Removal of the trees should include the root masses. These materials should be disposed of off-site.
- Demolition should include all foundations, floor slabs, septic systems, utilities and any other subsurface improvements that will not remain in place with the new development. Debris resultant from demolition should be disposed of off-site. Alternatively, concrete and asphalt debris may be pulverized to a maximum 2-inch particle size, well mixed with the on-site soils, and incorporated into new structural fills, or it may be crushed and made into crushed miscellaneous base (CMB), if desired.
- All of the borings encountered undocumented fill soils, extending to depths of 1½ to 5½± feet. The fill soils are underlain by moderate strength native alluvium. Based on these conditions, remedial grading is considered warranted within the proposed building area in order to remove all of the undocumented fill soils in their entirety, any soils disturbed during demolition, and replace these materials as compacted fill soils.
- It is recommended that the proposed building pad area be overexcavated to a depth of at least 5 feet below existing grade and to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed pad grade. The overexcavation should also extend to a sufficient depth to remove all of the artificial fill materials. Overexcavation within the foundation areas is recommended to extend to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade.
- Additional soils classified as possible fill were encountered at some of the boring locations, extending to depths of 3 to 6½± feet. The possible fill soils should be evaluated at the time of grading. If they are deemed to be comprised of undocumented fill soils, they should be removed in their entirety.
- After overexcavation has been completed, the subgrade soils should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to identify any additional soils that should be overexcavated. The resulting subgrade should then be scarified to a depth of 12 inches, thoroughly moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above optimum, and recompact to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.
- The new pavement and flatwork subgrade soils are recommended to be scarified to a depth of 12± inches, thoroughly moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above optimum, and recompact to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

### Building Foundation Recommendations

- Spread footing foundations, supported in newly placed structural fill soils.
- Maximum, net allowable soil bearing pressure: 2,500 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>.
- 1,500 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup> maximum allowable soil bearing pressure for footings located in close proximity to the property line, where the full lateral extent of overexcavation is not feasible.

- Reinforcement consisting of at least two (2) No. 5 rebars (1 top and 1 bottom) in strip footings. Additional reinforcement may be necessary for structural considerations.

### Building Floor Slab Recommendations

- Conventional slab-on-grade, at least 6 inches thick.
- Modulus of Subgrade Reaction:  $K = 150 \text{ psi/in.}$
- Reinforcement is not expected to be necessary for geotechnical considerations.
- The actual thickness and reinforcement of the floor slab should be determined by the structural engineer

### Pavements

ASPHALT PAVEMENTS (R= 40)					
Materials	Thickness (inches)				
	Auto Parking (TI = 4.0)	Auto Drive Lanes (TI = 5.0)	Truck Traffic		
			(TI = 6.0)	(TI = 7.0)	(TI = 8.0)
Asphalt Concrete	3	3	3½	4	5
Aggregate Base	3	4	6	7	8
Compacted Subgrade	12	12	12	12	12

PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENTS (R=40)				
Materials	Thickness (inches)			
	Auto Parking & Drives (TI = 5.0)	Truck Traffic		
		(TI =6.0)	(TI =7.0)	(TI =8.0)
PCC	5	5	5½	6½
Compacted Subgrade (95% minimum compaction)	12	12	12	12

## **2.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES**

---

The scope of services performed for this project was in accordance with our Change Order No. 20G172-CO, dated February 9, 2021. The scope of services included a visual site reconnaissance, subsurface exploration, field and laboratory testing, and geotechnical engineering analysis to provide criteria for preparing the design of the building foundations, building floor slab, and parking lot pavements along with site preparation recommendations and construction considerations for the proposed development. The evaluation of the environmental aspects of this site was beyond the scope of services for this geotechnical investigation.

## **3.0 SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **3.1 Site Conditions**

The overall subject site is identified as the Bloomington Business Park and consists of four (4) contiguous areas (identified as Site 1 through Site 4), approximately 213 acres in size, in Bloomington, an unincorporated portion of San Bernardino County, California. This investigation only includes Site 3 and Site 4. The general location of the site is illustrated on the Site Location Map, enclosed as Plate 1 of this report.

Sites 3 and 4 are comprised of fifteen (15) individual parcels with a combined total size of approximately 40.11 acres. The parcel APN's included for the subject site are:

0256-091-07	0256-101-34
0256-101-02	0256-101-35
0256-101-03	0256-101-36
0256-101-10	0256-101-49
0256-101-11	0256-101-57
0256-101-12	0256-101-60
0256-101-14	
0256-101-34	
0256-101-15	

#### **Site 3**

Site 3 is located on the west side of Locust Avenue, south of Santa Ana Avenue in Bloomington area of unincorporated San Bernardino County, California. The site is bounded to the north by Santa Ana Avenue and single-family residences, to the west by Laurel Avenue, to the south by single-family residences, and to the east by Locust Avenue.

The site consists of multiple contiguous rectangular-shaped parcels which total 30.61± acres in size. The site is developed with several single-family residences, commercial/industrial buildings, and trailer storage yards. Ground surface cover generally consists of exposed soil with sparse to moderate native grass and weed growth with limited areas of concrete flatwork, and aggregate base in the trailer storage areas.

Detailed topographic information was not available at the time of this report. Based on visual observations made at the time of the subsurface investigation and from elevations obtained from Google Earth, the overall site topography of Site 3 appears to slope gently to the southeast with an estimated gradient of 1 to 1.5± percent. There is approximately 15 to 20± feet of elevation differential across Site 3.

#### **Site 4**

Site 4 is located on the west side of Laurel Avenue, approximately 650± feet south of Santa Ana Avenue in Bloomington, California. The site is bounded to the north, west, and south by single-family residences, and to the east by Laurel Avenue. The site consists of multiple contiguous rectangular-shaped parcels which total 9.50± acres in size. The site is generally vacant, with the exception of one abandoned single-story wood frame structure. Ground surface cover generally consist of exposed soil with moderate native grass and weed growth with a row of several large trees across the east-central region of the site.

Detailed topographic information was not available at the time of this report. Based on visual observations made at the time of the subsurface investigation and from elevations obtained from Google Earth, the overall site topography of Site 4 appears to slope gently to the southeast at an estimated gradient of 1½± percent. There is approximately 10± feet of elevation differential across this site. A north-south trending 5 to 7± foot-high berm exists within Site 4, located 200± feet west of Laurel Avenue and includes the above mentioned row of large trees.

### **3.2 Proposed Development**

A conceptual master plan identified as the Bloomington Industrial Master Plan, prepared by AO, has been provided to our office by the client. As previously stated, this investigation only includes Site 3 and Site 4 of the overall development.

#### **Site 3**

Site 3 will be developed with a commercial/industrial building, 477,000± ft<sup>2</sup> in size, that will be located in the western region of the site. The building will be constructed with dock-high doors located along portions of the east and west sides of the building. The building is expected to be a tilt-up concrete structure, supported on conventional shallow foundations with a concrete slab-on-grade floor. The remainder of Site 3 will be utilized for automobile parking as well as trailer parking and storage. The ground surface cover is expected to include some areas of asphaltic concrete pavements for automobile parking, with the majority of the site utilizing Portland cement concrete in the loading dock and truck traffic areas, and some limited areas of landscape planters throughout.

#### **Site 4**

Site 4 is approximately 413,820± ft<sup>2</sup> in size and will be utilized for trailer parking. The trailer parking lot is expected to be either of asphaltic concrete or Portland cement concrete pavements. The parking lot will consist of 294 trailer parking stalls with associated drive lanes.

### **3.3 Previous Study**

Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. (SCG) previously performed a geotechnical investigation for the subject sites. The results of this study is presented in the referenced report:

Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development, Laurel Avenue, South of Santa Ana Avenue, Bloomington (Unincorporated San Bernardino County),

As part of this investigation, a total of twelve (12) borings, advanced to depths of 10 to 30± feet below currently existing site grades. Artificial fill soils and possible fill soils were encountered at the ground surface at all twelve (12) of the boring locations, extending to depths of 1½ to 5½± feet below the existing site grades. The artificial fill soils consist of very loose to medium dense silty fine sands and medium dense fine sandy silts. Trace to little quantities of medium to coarse sands were encountered within the artificial fill soils and occasional trace quantities of fine to coarse gravel were present in the strata. Possible fill soils were also encountered at the ground surface of B-10 and beneath the artificial fill soils at B-6, extending to depths of 3 and 6½± feet, respectively. The possible fill soils are comprised of loose silty fine sands with the same characteristics as the fill soils, except lacking indications of being disturbed. Native alluvium was encountered beneath the fill and possible fill soils at all of the twelve (12) boring locations, extending to the maximum explored depth of 30± feet below existing site grades. The shallow native alluvial soils at depths less than 10± feet consist of loose to medium dense fine to coarse sands, silty fine sands and fine sandy silts, with varying amounts of fine to coarse gravel, and occasional cobbles. At depths greater than 10± feet, the alluvium consists of medium dense to very dense fine to coarse sands, silty fine sands and fine sandy silts, with varying fine to coarse gravel and occasional cobbles. At Boring No. B-5, trace quantities of clays were encountered at depths of 22 to 27± feet below existing site grades. Groundwater was not encountered at any of the borings.

## **4.0 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION**

---

### **4.1 Scope of Exploration/Sampling Methods**

The subsurface exploration conducted for this geotechnical investigation consisted of three (3) borings, advanced to a depth of 20± feet below currently existing site grades. Including the subsurface exploration discussed in the referenced report, a total of fifteen (15) borings were advanced to depths of 10 to 30± feet below existing site grades. All of the borings were logged during drilling by a member of our staff.

All borings were advanced with hollow-stem augers, by a conventional truck-mounted drilling rig. Representative bulk and relatively undisturbed soil samples were taken during drilling. Relatively undisturbed samples were taken with a split barrel "California Sampler" containing a series of one inch long, 2.416± inch diameter brass rings. This sampling method is described in ASTM Test Method D-3550. Samples were also taken using a 1.4± inch inside diameter split spoon sampler, in general accordance with ASTM D-1586. Both of these samplers are driven into the ground with successive blows of a 140-pound weight falling 30 inches. The blow counts obtained during driving are recorded for further analysis. Bulk samples were collected in plastic bags to retain their original moisture content. The relatively undisturbed ring samples were placed in molded plastic sleeves that were then sealed and transported to our laboratory.

The approximate locations of the borings are indicated on the Boring Location Plan, included as Plate 2 in Appendix A of this report. The Boring Logs, which illustrate the conditions encountered at the boring locations, as well as the results of some of the laboratory testing, are included in Appendix B.

### **4.2 Geotechnical Conditions**

#### Artificial Fill

Artificial fill soils and possible fill soils were encountered at the ground surface at all fifteen (15) of the boring locations, extending to depths of 1½ to 5½± feet below the existing site grades. The artificial fill soils consist of very loose to medium dense silty fine sands and medium dense fine sandy silts. Trace to little quantities of medium to coarse sands were encountered within the artificial fill soils and occasional trace quantities of fine to coarse gravel were present in the strata.

Possible fill soils were also encountered at the ground surface of Boring No. B-10 and beneath the artificial fill soils at Boring Nos. B-6 and B-14, extending to depths of 3 to 6½± feet. The possible fill soils are comprised of loose silty fine sands with the same characteristics as the fill soils, except lacking indications of being disturbed.



## Alluvium

Native alluvium was encountered beneath the fill and possible fill soils at all of the fifteen (15) boring locations, extending to the maximum explored depth of 30± feet below existing site grades. The shallow native alluvial soils between the depths of 6½ to 10½± feet consist of loose to medium dense fine to coarse sands, silty fine sands and fine sandy silts, with varying amounts of fine to coarse gravel, and occasional cobbles. At greater depths, the alluvium consists of medium dense to very dense fine to coarse sands, silty fine sands and fine sandy silts, with varying fine to coarse gravel and occasional cobbles. At Boring No. B-5, trace quantities of clays were encountered at depths of 22 to 27± feet below existing site grades.

## Groundwater

Groundwater was not encountered at any of the borings. Based on the lack of any water within the borings, and the moisture contents of the recovered soil samples, the static groundwater table is considered to have existed at a depth in excess of 30± feet below existing site grades, at the time of the subsurface investigation.

As part of our research, we reviewed available groundwater data in order to determine the historic and more recent high groundwater levels for the site. The primary reference used to determine the groundwater depths in this area is the California Department of Water Resources website, <http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/>. The nearest monitoring well is located approximately 2,600 feet southeast from the site. Water level readings within this monitoring well indicate a historic high groundwater levels of 176± feet in October 2011, and more recent groundwater levels of 187± feet below the ground surface in October 2019.

## 5.0 LABORATORY TESTING

---

The soil samples recovered from the subsurface exploration were returned to our laboratory for further testing to determine selected physical and engineering properties of the soils. The tests are briefly discussed below. It should be noted that the test results are specific to the actual samples tested, and variations could be expected at other locations and depths.

### Classification

All recovered soil samples were classified using the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS), in accordance with ASTM D-2488. Field identifications were then supplemented with additional visual classifications and/or by laboratory testing. The USCS classifications are shown on the Boring Logs and are periodically referenced throughout this report.

### Density and Moisture Content

The density has been determined for selected relatively undisturbed ring samples. These densities were determined in general accordance with the method presented in ASTM D-2937. The results are recorded as dry unit weight in pounds per cubic foot. The moisture contents are determined in accordance with ASTM D-2216, and are expressed as a percentage of the dry weight. These test results are presented on the Boring Logs.

### Consolidation

Selected soil samples have been tested to determine their consolidation potential, in accordance with ASTM D-2435. The testing apparatus is designed to accept either natural or remolded samples in a one-inch high ring, approximately 2.416 inches in diameter. Each sample is then loaded incrementally in a geometric progression and the resulting deflection is recorded at selected time intervals. Porous stones are in contact with the top and bottom of the sample to permit the addition or release of pore water. The samples are typically inundated with water at an intermediate load to determine their potential for collapse or heave. The results of the consolidation testing are plotted on Plates C-1 through C-4 in Appendix C of this report. The results of consolidation testing performed as part of the previous study and plotted on plates C-1 through C-7 in Appendix F of this report.

### Maximum Dry Density and Optimum Moisture Content

As part of the referenced geotechnical investigation, two (2) representative bulk samples were tested for their maximum dry densities and optimum moisture contents. The results have been obtained using the Modified Proctor procedure, per ASTM D-1557 and are presented on Plates C-8 and C-9 in Appendix F of this report. This test is generally used to compare the in-situ densities of undisturbed field samples, and for later compaction testing. Additional testing of other soil types or soil mixes may be necessary at a later date.

## Soluble Sulfates

Representative samples of the near-surface soil were submitted to a subcontracted analytical laboratory for determination of soluble sulfate contents. Soluble sulfates are naturally present in soils, and if the concentration is high enough, can result in degradation of concrete which comes into contact with these soils. The results of the soluble sulfate testing are presented below, and are discussed further in a subsequent section of this report.

<b><u>Sample Identification</u></b>	<b><u>Soluble Sulfates (%)</u></b>	<b><u>Sulfate Classification</u></b>
B-15 @ 0 to 5 feet	<0.001	Not Applicable (S0)
B-1 @ 0 to 5 feet (From Previous Study)	0.005	Not Applicable (S0)
B-4 @ 0 to 5 feet (From Previous study)	0.001	Not Applicable (S0)

## Corrosivity Testing

Representative bulk samples of the near-surface soils were submitted to a subcontracted corrosion engineering laboratory to identify potentially corrosive characteristics with respect to common construction materials. The corrosivity testing included a determination of the electrical resistivity, pH, and chloride and nitrate concentrations of the soils, as well as other tests. The results of some of these tests are presented below.

<b><u>Sample Identification</u></b>	<b><u>Saturated Resistivity (ohm-cm)</u></b>	<b><u>pH</u></b>	<b><u>Chlorides (mg/kg)</u></b>	<b><u>Nitrates (mg/kg)</u></b>
B-15 @ 0 to 5 feet	8,400	7.2	3.7	42
B-1 @ 0 to 5 feet (From Previous Study)	3,160	7.5	5.6	190
B-4 @ 0 to 5 feet (From Previous Study)	11,600	6.9	4.4	48

## R-value

R (resistance)-value testing was conducted on one (1) representative bulk soil sample obtained from the near-surface soils at the site. The R-value was determined in accordance with CA Test Method 301. This test provides a measure of the pavement support characteristics of the soils, and is used in the pavement thickness design procedure. The results of the R-value testing are presented below:

<b><u>Sample ID</u></b>	<b><u>R-Value</u></b>
B-12 @ 0-5 feet	63

## **6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

Based on the results of our review, field exploration, laboratory testing and geotechnical analysis, the proposed development is considered feasible from a geotechnical standpoint. The recommendations contained in this report should be taken into the design, construction, and grading considerations.

The recommendations are contingent upon all grading and foundation construction activities being monitored by the geotechnical engineer of record. The recommendations are provided with the assumption that an adequate program of client consultation, construction monitoring, and testing will be performed during the final design and construction phases to verify compliance with these recommendations. Maintaining Southern California Geotechnical, Inc., (SCG) as the geotechnical consultant from the beginning to the end of the project will provide continuity of services. The geotechnical engineering firm providing testing and observation services shall assume the responsibility of Geotechnical Engineer of Record.

The Grading Guide Specifications, included as Appendix D, should be considered part of this report, and should be incorporated into the project specifications. The contractor and/or owner of the development should bring to the attention of the geotechnical engineer any conditions that differ from those stated in this report, or which may be detrimental for the development.

### **6.1 Seismic Design Considerations**

The subject site is located in an area which is subject to strong ground motions due to earthquakes. The performance of a site specific seismic hazards analysis was beyond the scope of this investigation. However, numerous faults capable of producing significant ground motions are located near the subject site. Due to economic considerations, it is not generally considered reasonable to design a structure that is not susceptible to earthquake damage. Therefore, significant damage to structures may be unavoidable during large earthquakes. The proposed structures should, however, be designed to resist structural collapse and thereby provide reasonable protection from serious injury, catastrophic property damage and loss of life.

#### **Faulting and Seismicity**

Research of available maps indicates that the subject site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Furthermore, SCG did not identify any evidence of faulting during the geotechnical investigation. Therefore, the possibility of significant fault rupture on the site is considered to be low.

The potential for other geologic hazards such as seismically induced settlement, lateral spreading, tsunamis, inundation, seiches, flooding, and subsidence affecting the site is considered low.

#### **Seismic Design Parameters**

The 2019 California Building Code (CBC) provides procedures for earthquake resistant structural design that include considerations for on-site soil conditions, occupancy, and the configuration of

the structure including the structural system and height. The seismic design parameters presented below are based on the soil profile and the proximity of known faults with respect to the subject site.

Based on standards in place at the time of this report, the proposed development is expected to be designed in accordance with the requirements of the 2019 edition of the California Building Code (CBC), which was adopted on January 1, 2020.

The 2019 CBC Seismic Design Parameters have been generated using the SEAOC/OSHPD Seismic Design Maps Tool, a web-based software application available at the website [www.seismicmaps.org](http://www.seismicmaps.org). This software application calculates seismic design parameters in accordance with several building code reference documents, including ASCE 7-16, upon which the 2019 CBC is based. The application utilizes a database of risk-targeted maximum considered earthquake ( $MCE_R$ ) site accelerations at 0.01-degree intervals for each of the code documents. The table below was created using data obtained from the application. The output generated from this program is included as Plate E-1 in Appendix E of this report.

The 2019 CBC requires that a site-specific ground motion study be performed in accordance with Section 11.4.8 of ASCE 7-16 for Site Class D sites with a mapped  $S_1$  value greater than 0.2. However, Section 11.4.8 of ASCE 7-16 also indicates an exception to the requirement for a site-specific ground motion hazard analysis for certain structures on Site Class D sites. The commentary for Section 11 of ASCE 7-16 (Page 534 of Section C11 of ASCE 7-16) indicates that "In general, this exception effectively limits the requirements for site-specific hazard analysis to very tall and or flexible structures at Site Class D sites." **Based on our understanding of the proposed development, the seismic design parameters presented below were calculated assuming that the exception in Section 11.4.8 applies to the proposed structure at this site. However, the structural engineer should verify that this exception is applicable to the proposed structure.** Based on the exception, the spectral response accelerations presented below were calculated using the site coefficients ( $F_a$  and  $F_v$ ) from Tables 1613.2.3(1) and 1613.2.3(2) presented in Section 16.4.4 of the 2019 CBC.

#### 2019 CBC SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS

Parameter		Value
Mapped Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	$S_s$	1.500
Mapped Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	$S_1$	0.600
Site Class	---	D
Site Modified Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	$S_{MS}$	1.500
Site Modified Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	$S_{M1}$	1.020
Design Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	$S_{DS}$	1.000
Design Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	$S_{D1}$	0.680

It should be noted that the site coefficient  $F_v$  and the parameters  $S_{M1}$  and  $S_{D1}$  were not included in the SEAOC/OSHPD Seismic Design Maps Tool output for the 2019 CBC. We calculated these parameters-based on Table 1613.2.3(2) in Section 16.4.4 of the 2019 CBC using the value of  $S_1$

obtained from the Seismic Design Maps Tool, assuming that a site-specific ground motion hazards analysis is not required for the proposed building at this site.

### Liquefaction

Liquefaction is the loss of strength in generally cohesionless, saturated soils when the pore-water pressure induced in the soil by a seismic event becomes equal to or exceeds the overburden pressure. The primary factors which influence the potential for liquefaction include groundwater table elevation, soil type and grain size characteristics, relative density of the soil, initial confining pressure, and intensity and duration of ground shaking. The depth within which the occurrence of liquefaction may impact surface improvements is generally identified as the upper 50 feet below the existing ground surface. Liquefaction potential is greater in saturated, loose, poorly graded fine sands with a mean ( $d_{50}$ ) grain size in the range of 0.075 to 0.2 mm (Seed and Idriss, 1971). Clayey (cohesive) soils or soils which possess clay particles ( $d < 0.005\text{mm}$ ) in excess of 20 percent (Seed and Idriss, 1982) are generally not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction, nor are those soils which are above the historic static groundwater table.

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has not yet conducted seismic hazard mapping in the area of the subject site. The San Bernardino County Land Use Plan, Geologic Hazard Overlays, Fontana Quadrangle, FH29C, indicates that the subject site is not located within a zone of liquefaction susceptibility. Based on the mapping performed by the County of San Bernardino and the subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations, liquefaction is not considered to be a design concern for this project.

## **6.2 Geotechnical Design Considerations**

### General

The proposed building area is underlain by undocumented fill soils, extending to depths of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to  $5\frac{1}{2}\pm$  feet. Based on a lack of documentation regarding the placement and compaction of the existing fill materials, these soils are considered to consist of undocumented fill, and are not suitable for the support of the foundation loads of the proposed building. The undocumented fill soils are underlain by moderate strength native alluvium.

Remedial grading is considered warranted within the proposed building area to remove the artificial fill soils in their entirety, and an upper portion of the near-surface native alluvium, and replace these soils as compacted structural fill.

### Expansion

The near-surface soils consist of sands and silty sands with no appreciable clay content. These materials have been visually classified as non-expansive. Therefore, no design considerations related to expansive soils are considered warranted for this site.

### Soluble Sulfates

The results of the soluble sulfate testing indicate that the selected samples of the on-site soils correspond to Class S0 with respect to the American Concrete Institute (ACI) Publication 318-05 Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete and Commentary, Section 4.3. Therefore, specialized concrete mix designs are not considered to be necessary, with regard to sulfate protection purposes. It is, however, recommended that additional soluble sulfate testing be conducted at the completion of rough grading to verify the soluble sulfate concentrations of the soils which are present at pad grade within the building area.

### Corrosion Potential

The results of laboratory testing indicate that the tested sample of the on-site soils possesses saturated resistivity values of 3,160 and 11,600 ohm-cm, and pH values of 6.9 and 7.5. These test results have been evaluated in accordance with guidelines published by the Ductile Iron Pipe Research Association (DIPRA). The DIPRA guidelines consist of a point system by which characteristics of the soils are used to quantify the corrosivity characteristics of the site. Sulfides, and redox potential are factors that are also used in the evaluation procedure. We have evaluated the corrosivity characteristics of the on-site soils using resistivity, pH, and moisture content. Based on these factors, and utilizing the DIPRA procedure, the on-site soils are not considered to be corrosive to ductile iron pipe. **However, SCG does not practice in the area of corrosion engineering. Therefore, the client may also wish to contact a corrosion engineer to provide a more thorough evaluation.**

### Chlorides

Relatively low concentrations (3.7 and 5.6 mg/kg) of chlorides were detected in the samples submitted for corrosivity testing. In general, soils possessing chloride concentrations in excess of 500 parts per million (ppm) are considered to be corrosive with respect to steel reinforcement within reinforced concrete. Based on the lack of any significant chlorides in the tested sample, the site is considered to have a C1 chloride exposure in accordance with the American Concrete Institute (ACI) Publication 318 Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete and Commentary. Therefore, a specialized concrete mix design for reinforced concrete for protection against chloride exposure is not considered warranted.

### Nitrates

Nitrates present in soil can be corrosive to copper tubing at concentrations greater than 50 mg/kg. The tested samples possess nitrate concentrations ranging from 42 to 190 mg/kg. **Based on this test result, the on-site soils are considered to be corrosive to copper pipe. Since SCG does not practice in the area of corrosion engineering, we recommend that the client contact a corrosion engineer to provide recommendations for the protection of copper tubing/pipe in contact with the on-site soils.**

### Shrinkage/Subsidence

Removal and recompaction of the existing fill soils, extending to depths of 1½ to 5½± feet is estimated to result in an average shrinkage of 9 to 17 percent. Removal and recompaction of the near-surface alluvium is estimated to result in an average shrinkage of 5 to 14 percent. However,



potential shrinkage for individual samples ranged locally between 0 and 19 percent. The potential shrinkage estimate is based on dry density testing performed on small-diameter samples taken at the boring locations. If a more accurate and precise shrinkage estimate is desired, SCG can perform a shrinkage study involving several excavated test-pits where in-place densities are determined using in-situ testing methods instead of laboratory density testing on small-diameter samples. Please contact SCG for details and a cost estimate regarding a shrinkage study, if desired.

Minor ground subsidence is expected to occur in the soils below the zone of removal, due to settlement and machinery working. The subsidence is estimated to be 0.1 feet.

These estimates are based on previous experience and the subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations. The actual amount of subsidence is expected to be variable and will be dependent on the type of machinery used, repetitions of use, and dynamic effects, all of which are difficult to assess precisely.

#### Grading and Foundation Plan Review

No grading or foundation plans were available at the time of this report. It is therefore recommended that we be provided with copies of the preliminary plans, when they become available, for review with regard to the conclusions, recommendations, and assumptions contained within this report.

### **6.3 Site Grading Recommendations**

The grading recommendations presented below are based on the subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations and our understanding of the proposed development. We recommend that all grading activities be completed in accordance with the Grading Guide Specifications included as Appendix D of this report, unless superseded by site-specific recommendations presented below.

#### Site Stripping and Demolition

Initial site stripping should also include removal of any surficial vegetation from the site. This should include any weeds, grasses, shrubs, and trees. Root systems associated with the trees should be removed in their entirety, and the resultant excavations should be backfilled with compacted structural fill soils. The actual extent of site stripping should be determined in the field by the geotechnical engineer, based on the organic content and stability of the materials encountered.

Demolition of the existing structures will be necessary in order to facilitate the construction of the proposed development. Demolition should include all foundations, floor slabs, utilities and any other subsurface improvements that will not remain in place with the new development. Based on our experience with nearby projects, septic systems may be present in the areas of the existing structures. Any septic systems, including the associated leach fields encountered during demolition and/or grading should be removed in their entirety. If deeper seepage pits are encountered, our office should be contacted for additional recommendations. Debris resultant from demolition should be disposed of off-site. Alternatively, concrete and asphalt debris may be



pulverized to a maximum 2-inch particle size, well mixed with the on-site soils, and incorporated into new structural fills or it may be crushed and made into crushed miscellaneous base (CMB), if desired.

#### Treatment of Existing Soils: Building Pad

Remedial grading should be performed within the proposed building area in order to remove the existing undocumented fill soils, any soils disturbed during demolition. The undocumented fill soils were encountered at all of the boring locations extending to depths of 1½ to 5½± feet below the existing site grades. Based on conditions encountered at the boring locations, the existing soils within the proposed building area is recommended to be overexcavated to a depth of at least 5 feet below existing grade and to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed building pad subgrade elevation, whichever is greater. Within the influence zones of the new foundations, the overexcavation should extend to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade.

The overexcavation areas should extend at least 5 feet beyond the building and foundation perimeters, and to an extent equal to the depth of fill placed below the foundation bearing grade, whichever is greater. If the proposed structure incorporates any exterior columns (such as for a canopy or overhang) the area of overexcavation should also encompass these areas.

Following completion of the overexcavation, the subgrade soils within the building area should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to verify their suitability to serve as the structural fill subgrade, as well as to support the foundation loads of the new structures. This evaluation should include proofrolling and probing to identify any soft, loose or otherwise unstable soils that must be removed. Some localized areas of deeper excavation may be required if loose, porous, or low density native soils are encountered at the base of the overexcavation. The possible fill soils encountered at Boring Nos. B-6, B-10 and B-14 should be further evaluated. If they are determined to consist of undocumented fill soils, they should be removed in their entirety.

After a suitable overexcavation subgrade has been achieved, the exposed soils should be scarified to a depth of at least 12 inches, thoroughly moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above optimum, and recompacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

#### Treatment of Existing Soils: Retaining Walls and Site Walls

The existing soils within the areas of any proposed retaining walls and site walls should be overexcavated to a depth of 3 feet below foundation bearing grade and replaced as compacted structural fill as discussed above for the proposed building pad. Any undocumented fill soils or disturbed native alluvium within any of these foundation areas should be removed in their entirety. The overexcavation areas should extend at least 5 feet beyond the foundation perimeters, and to an extent equal to the depth of fill below the new foundations. Any erection pads for tilt-up concrete walls are considered to be part of the foundation system. Therefore, these overexcavation recommendations are applicable to erection pads. The overexcavation subgrade soils should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer prior to scarifying, moisture conditioning to within 0 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, and recompacting the

upper 12 inches of exposed subgrade soils. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

If the full lateral recommended remedial grading cannot be completed for the proposed retaining walls and site walls located along property lines, the foundations for those walls should be designed using a reduced allowable bearing pressure. Furthermore, the contractor should take necessary precautions to protect the adjacent structures during rough grading. Specialized grading techniques, such as A-B-C slot cuts, will likely be required during remedial grading. The geotechnical engineer of record should be contacted if additional recommendations, such as shoring design recommendations, are required during grading.

#### Treatment of Existing Soils: Flatwork, Parking and Drive Areas

Based on economic considerations, overexcavation of the existing near-surface existing soils in the new flatwork, parking and drive areas is not considered warranted, with the exception of areas where lower strength or unstable soils are identified by the geotechnical engineer during grading. Subgrade preparation in the new flatwork, parking and drive areas should initially consist of removal of all soils disturbed during stripping and demolition operations.

The geotechnical engineer should then evaluate the subgrade to identify any areas of additional unsuitable soils. Any such materials should be removed to a level of firm and unyielding soil. The exposed subgrade soils should then be scarified to a depth of 12± inches, moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, and recompacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. Based on the presence of variable strength surficial soils throughout the site, it is expected that some isolated areas of additional overexcavation may be required to remove zones of lower strength, unsuitable soils.

The grading recommendations presented above for the proposed flatwork, parking and drive areas assume that the owner and/or developer can tolerate minor amounts of settlement within these areas. The grading recommendations presented above do not mitigate the extent of undocumented fill in the flatwork, parking and drive areas. As such, some settlement and associated pavement distress could occur. Typically, repair of such distressed areas involves significantly lower costs than completely mitigating these soils at the time of construction. If the owner cannot tolerate the risk of such settlements, the flatwork, parking and drive areas should be overexcavated to a depth of 2 feet below proposed pavement subgrade elevation, with the resulting soils replaced as compacted structural fill.

#### Fill Placement

- Fill soils should be placed in thin (6± inches), near-horizontal lifts, moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, and compacted.
- On-site soils may be used for fill provided they are cleaned of any debris to the satisfaction of the geotechnical engineer.
- All grading and fill placement activities should be completed in accordance with the requirements of the 2019 CBC and the grading code of the County of San Bernardino.
- All fill soils should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

- Compaction tests should be performed periodically by the geotechnical engineer as random verification of compaction and moisture content. These tests are intended to aid the contractor. Since the tests are taken at discrete locations and depths, they may not be indicative of the entire fill and therefore should not relieve the contractor of his responsibility to meet the job specifications.

#### Imported Structural Fill

All imported structural fill should consist of very low expansive ( $EI < 20$ ), well graded soils possessing at least 10 percent fines (that portion of the sample passing the No. 200 sieve). Additional specifications for structural fill are presented in the Grading Guide Specifications, included as Appendix D.

#### Utility Trench Backfill

In general, all utility trench backfill soils should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. It is recommended that materials in excess of 3 inches in size not be used for utility trench backfill. Compacted trench backfill should conform to the requirements of the local grading code, and more restrictive requirements may be indicated by the County of San Bernardino. All utility trench backfills should be witnessed by the geotechnical engineer. The trench backfill soils should be compaction tested where possible; probed and visually evaluated elsewhere.

Utility trenches which parallel a footing, and extending below a 1h:1v plane projected from the outside edge of the footing should be backfilled with structural fill soils, compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 standard. Pea gravel backfill should not be used for these trenches.

### **6.4 Construction Considerations**

#### Excavation Considerations

The near-surface soils are predominately granular in nature. These materials will likely be subject to caving within shallow excavations. Where caving occurs within shallow excavations, flattened excavation slopes may be sufficient to provide excavation stability. On a preliminary basis, the inclination of temporary slopes should not exceed 2h:1v. Maintaining adequate moisture content within the near-surface soils will improve excavation stability. All excavation activities on this site should be conducted in accordance with Cal-OSHA regulations.

#### Moisture Sensitive Subgrade Soils

Some of the near surface soils possess appreciable silt content. These soils may become unstable if exposed to significant moisture infiltration or disturbance by construction traffic. In addition, based on their granular content, some of the on-site soils will also be susceptible to erosion. The site should, therefore, be graded to prevent ponding of surface water and to prevent water from running into excavations.

## Groundwater

The static groundwater table at this site is considered to exist at a depth of more than 30± feet. Therefore, groundwater is not expected to impact the grading or foundation construction activities.

## **6.5 Foundation Design and Construction**

Based on the preceding grading recommendations, it is assumed that the new building pad will be underlain by structural fill soils used to replace existing undocumented fill soils and the upper-portion of the alluvium. These new structural fill soils are expected to extend to depths of at least 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade, underlain by 1± foot of additional soil that has been densified and moisture conditioned in place. Based on this subsurface profile, the proposed structure may be supported on conventional shallow foundations.

### Foundation Design Parameters

New square and rectangular footings may be designed as follows:

- Maximum, net allowable soil bearing pressure: 2,500 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>.
- New foundations adjacent to property lines should be designed for maximum allowable soil bearing pressure of 1,500 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup> due to the limited lateral extent of remedial grading that will be achievable in this area.
- Minimum wall/column footing width: 14 inches/24 inches.
- Minimum longitudinal steel reinforcement within strip footings: Two (2) No. 5 rebars (1 top and 1 bottom).
- Minimum foundation embedment: 12 inches into suitable structural fill soils, and at least 18 inches below adjacent exterior grade. Interior column footings may be placed immediately beneath the floor slab.
- It is recommended that the perimeter building foundations be continuous across all exterior doorways. Any flatwork adjacent to the exterior doors should be doweled into the perimeter foundations in a manner determined by the structural engineer.

The allowable bearing pressure presented above may be increased by one-third when considering short duration wind or seismic loads. The minimum steel reinforcement recommended above is based on geotechnical considerations; additional reinforcement may be necessary for structural considerations. The actual design of the foundations should be determined by the structural engineer.

### Foundation Construction

The foundation subgrade soils should be evaluated at the time of overexcavation, as discussed in Section 6.3 of this report. It is further recommended that the foundation subgrade soils be

evaluated by the geotechnical engineer immediately prior to steel or concrete placement. Soils suitable for direct foundation support should consist of newly placed structural fill, compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. Any unsuitable materials should be removed to a depth of suitable bearing compacted structural fill or suitable native alluvium (where reduced bearing pressures are utilized), with the resulting excavations backfilled with compacted fill soils. As an alternative, lean concrete slurry (500 to 1,500 psi) may be used to backfill such isolated overexcavations.

The foundation subgrade soils should also be properly moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum, to a depth of at least 12 inches below bearing grade. Since it is typically not feasible to increase the moisture content of the floor slab and foundation subgrade soils once rough grading has been completed, care should be taken to maintain the moisture content of the building pad subgrade soils throughout the construction process.

### Estimated Foundation Settlements

Post-construction total and differential settlements of shallow foundations designed and constructed in accordance with the previously presented recommendations are estimated to be less than 1.0 and 0.5 inches, respectively. Differential movements are expected to occur over a 50-foot span, thereby resulting in an angular distortion of less than 0.002 inches per inch.

### Lateral Load Resistance

Lateral load resistance will be developed by a combination of friction acting at the base of foundations and slabs and the passive earth pressure developed by footings below grade. The following friction and passive pressure may be used to resist lateral forces:

- Passive Earth Pressure: 300 lbs/ft<sup>3</sup>
- Friction Coefficient: 0.30

These are allowable values, and include a factor of safety. When combining friction and passive resistance, the passive pressure component should be reduced by one-third. These values assume that footings will be poured directly against compacted structural fill. The maximum allowable passive pressure is 3,000 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>.

## **6.6 Floor Slab Design and Construction**

Subgrades which will support the new floor slab should be prepared in accordance with the recommendations contained in the ***Site Grading Recommendations*** section of this report. Based on the anticipated grading which will occur at this site, the floor of the new structure may be constructed as a conventional slab-on-grade supported on newly placed structural fill soils. These fill soils are expected to extend to a depth of at least 3 feet below finished pad grade. Based on geotechnical considerations, the floor slab may be designed as follows:

- Minimum slab thickness: 6 inches.

- Minimum slab reinforcement: Reinforcement is not expected to be required for geotechnical conditions. The actual floor slab reinforcement should be determined by the structural engineer, based upon the imposed loading.
- Modulus of subgrade reaction:  $k = 150 \text{ psi/in}$
- Slab underlayment: If moisture sensitive floor coverings will be used then minimum slab underlayment should consist of a moisture vapor barrier constructed below the entire slab area where such moisture sensitive floor coverings are expected. The moisture vapor barrier should meet or exceed the Class A rating as defined by ASTM E 1745-97 and have a permeance rating less than 0.01 perms as described in ASTM E 96-95 and ASTM E 154-88. A polyolefin material such as 15 mil Stego® Wrap Vapor Barrier or equivalent will meet these specifications. The moisture vapor barrier should be properly constructed in accordance with all applicable manufacturer specifications. Given that a rock free subgrade is anticipated and that a capillary break is not required, sand below the barrier is not required. The need for sand and/or the amount of sand above the moisture vapor barrier should be specified by the structural engineer or concrete contractor. The selection of sand above the barrier is not a geotechnical engineering issue and hence outside our purview. Where moisture sensitive floor coverings are not anticipated, the vapor barrier may be eliminated.
- Moisture condition the floor slab subgrade soils to 0 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum moisture content, to a depth of 12 inches. The moisture content of the floor slab subgrade soils should be verified by the geotechnical engineer within 24 hours prior to concrete placement.
- Proper concrete curing techniques should be utilized to reduce the potential for slab curling or the formation of excessive shrinkage cracks.

The actual design of the floor slab should be completed by the structural engineer to verify adequate thickness and reinforcement.

## **6.7 Retaining Wall Design and Construction**

Small retaining walls are expected to be necessary in the truck dock areas and may also be required to facilitate the new site grades. The parameters recommended for use in the design of these walls are presented below.

### **Retaining Wall Design Parameters**

Based on the soil conditions encountered at the boring locations, the following parameters may be used in the design of new retaining walls for this site. We have provided parameters assuming the use of on-site soils for retaining wall backfill. The on-site soils generally consist of silty sands and sands. Based on their classification, these materials are expected to possess a friction angle of at least 30 degrees when compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

If desired, SCG could provide design parameters for an alternative select backfill material behind the retaining walls. The use of select backfill material could result in lower lateral earth pressures. In order to use the design parameters for the imported select fill, this material must be placed within the entire active failure wedge. This wedge is defined as extending from the heel of the retaining wall upwards at an angle of approximately 60° from horizontal. If select backfill material behind the retaining wall is desired, SCG should be contacted for supplementary recommendations.

### **RETAINING WALL DESIGN PARAMETERS**

<b>Design Parameter</b>		<b>Soil Type</b>
		On-site Sands and Silty Sands
Internal Friction Angle ( $\phi$ )		30°
Unit Weight		128 lbs/ft <sup>3</sup>
Equivalent Fluid Pressure:	Active Condition (level backfill)	43 lbs/ft <sup>3</sup>
	Active Condition (2h:1v backfill)	68 lbs/ft <sup>3</sup>
	At-Rest Condition (level backfill)	64 lbs/ft <sup>3</sup>

The walls should be designed using a soil-footing coefficient of friction of 0.30 and an equivalent passive pressure of 300 lbs/ft<sup>3</sup>. The structural engineer should incorporate appropriate factors of safety in the design of the retaining walls.

The active earth pressure may be used for the design of retaining walls that do not directly support structures or support soils that in turn support structures and which will be allowed to deflect. The at-rest earth pressure should be used for walls that will not be allowed to deflect such as those which will support foundation bearing soils, or which will support foundation loads directly.

Where the soils on the toe side of the retaining wall are not covered by a "hard" surface such as a structure or pavement, the upper 1 foot of soil should be neglected when calculating passive resistance due to the potential for the material to become disturbed or degraded during the life of the structure.

#### Retaining Wall Foundation Design

The retaining wall foundations should be underlain by at least 3 feet of newly placed structural fill. Foundations to support new retaining walls should be designed in accordance with the general Foundation Design Parameters presented in a previous section of this report.

#### Seismic Lateral Earth Pressures

In accordance with the 2019 CBC, any retaining walls more than 6 feet in height must be designed for seismic lateral earth pressures. If walls 6 feet or more are required for this site, the



geotechnical engineer should be contacted for supplementary seismic lateral earth pressure recommendations.

### Backfill Material

On-site soils may be used to backfill the retaining walls. However, all backfill material placed within 3 feet of the back-wall face should have a particle size no greater than 3 inches. The retaining wall backfill materials should be well graded.

It is recommended that a minimum 1 foot thick layer of free-draining granular material (less than 5 percent passing the No. 200 sieve) be placed against the face of the retaining walls. This material should extend from the top of the retaining wall footing to within 1 foot of the ground surface on the back side of the retaining wall. This material should be approved by the geotechnical engineer. In lieu of the 1 foot thick layer of free-draining material, a properly installed prefabricated drainage composite such as the MiraDRAIN 6000XL (or approved equivalent), which is specifically designed for use behind retaining walls, may be used. If the layer of free-draining material is not covered by an impermeable surface, such as a structure or pavement, a 12-inch thick layer of a low permeability soil should be placed over the backfill to reduce surface water migration to the underlying soils. The layer of free draining granular material should be separated from the backfill soils by a suitable geotextile, approved by the geotechnical engineer.

All retaining wall backfill should be placed and compacted under engineering controlled conditions in the necessary layer thicknesses to ensure an in-place density between 90 and 93 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by the Modified Proctor test (ASTM D1557-91). Care should be taken to avoid over-compaction of the soils behind the retaining walls, and the use of heavy compaction equipment should be avoided.

### Subsurface Drainage

As previously indicated, the retaining wall design parameters are based upon drained backfill conditions. Consequently, some form of permanent drainage system will be necessary in conjunction with the appropriate backfill material. Subsurface drainage may consist of either:

- A weep hole drainage system typically consisting of a series of 4-inch diameter holes in the wall situated slightly above the ground surface elevation on the exposed side of the wall and at an approximate 8-foot on-center spacing. The weep holes should include a pocket of gravel, 2± cubic feet in size, surrounded by a geotextile fabric, at each weep hole location.
- A 4-inch diameter perforated pipe surrounded by 2 cubic feet of gravel per linear foot of drain placed behind the wall, above the retaining wall footing. The gravel layer should be wrapped in a suitable geotextile fabric to reduce the potential for migration of fines. The footing drain should be extended to daylight or tied into a storm drainage system.



## **6.8 Pavement Design Parameters**

Site preparation in the pavement area should be completed as previously recommended in the ***Site Grading Recommendations*** section of this report. The subsequent pavement recommendations assume proper drainage and construction monitoring, and are based on either PCA or CALTRANS design parameters for a twenty (20) year design period. However, these designs also assume a routine pavement maintenance program to obtain the anticipated 20-year pavement service life.

### **Pavement Subgrades**

It is anticipated that the new pavements will be primarily supported on a layer of compacted structural fill, consisting of scarified, thoroughly moisture conditioned and recompacted existing soils. The near surface soils generally consist of silty sands, sands, and sandy silts. Based on their classification, these materials are expected to possess good pavement support characteristics with estimated R-values ranging from 40 to 60. Based on the slight variation of the on-site soils, the subsequent pavement design is based upon an assumed R-value of 40. Any fill material imported to the site should have support characteristics equal to or greater than that of the on-site soils and be placed and compacted under engineering-controlled conditions. It is recommended that R-value testing be performed after completion of rough grading in order to verify the as-graded pavement support subgrades.

### **Asphaltic Concrete**

Presented below are the recommended thicknesses for new flexible pavement structures consisting of asphaltic concrete over a granular base. The pavement designs are based on the traffic indices (TI's) indicated. The client and/or civil engineer should verify that these TI's are representative of the anticipated traffic volumes. If the client and/or civil engineer determine that the expected traffic volume will exceed the applicable traffic index, we should be contacted for supplementary recommendations. The design traffic indices equate to the following approximate daily traffic volumes over a 20-year design life, assuming six operational traffic days per week.

<b>Traffic Index</b>	<b>No. of Heavy Trucks per Day</b>
4.0	0
5.0	1
6.0	3
7.0	11
8.0	35
9.0	93

For the purpose of the traffic volumes indicated above, a truck is defined as a 5-axle tractor trailer unit with one 8-kip axle and two 32-kip tandem axles. All of the traffic indices allow for 1,000 automobiles per day.

<b>ASPHALT PAVEMENTS (R= 40)</b>					
<b>Materials</b>	<b>Thickness (inches)</b>				
	Auto Parking (TI = 4.0)	Auto Drive Lanes (TI = 5.0)	Truck Traffic		
			(TI = 6.0)	(TI = 7.0)	(TI = 8.0)
Asphalt Concrete	3	3	3½	4	5
Aggregate Base	3	4	6	7	8
Compacted Subgrade	12	12	12	12	12

The aggregate base course should be compacted to at least 95 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. The asphaltic concrete should be compacted to at least 95 percent of the Marshall maximum density, as determined by ASTM D-2726. The aggregate base course may consist of crushed aggregate base (CAB) or crushed miscellaneous base (CMB), which is a recycled gravel, asphalt and concrete material. The gradation, R-Value, Sand Equivalent, and Percentage Wear of the CAB or CMB should comply with appropriate specifications contained in the current edition of the "Greenbook" Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction.

#### Portland Cement Concrete

The preparation of the subgrade soils within concrete pavement areas should be performed as previously described for proposed asphalt pavement areas. The minimum recommended thicknesses for the Portland Cement Concrete pavement sections are as follows:

<b>PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENTS (R=40)</b>				
<b>Materials</b>	<b>Thickness (inches)</b>			
	Auto Parking & Drives (TI = 5.0)	Truck Traffic		
		(TI =6.0)	(TI =7.0)	(TI =8.0)
PCC	5	5	5½	6½
Compacted Subgrade (95% minimum compaction)	12	12	12	12

The concrete should have a 28-day compressive strength of at least 3,000 psi. The maximum joint spacing within all of the PCC pavements is recommended to be equal to or less than 30 times the pavement thickness. The actual joint spacing and reinforcing of the Portland cement concrete pavements should be determined by the structural engineer.

## 7.0 GENERAL COMMENTS

---


This report has been prepared as an instrument of service for use by the client, in order to aid in the evaluation of this property and to assist the architects and engineers in the design and preparation of the project plans and specifications. This report may be provided to the contractor(s) and other design consultants to disclose information relative to the project. However, this report is not intended to be utilized as a specification in and of itself, without appropriate interpretation by the project architect, civil engineer, and/or structural engineer. The reproduction and distribution of this report must be authorized by the client and Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. Furthermore, any reliance on this report by an unauthorized third party is at such party's sole risk, and we accept no responsibility for damage or loss which may occur. The client(s)' reliance upon this report is subject to the Engineering Services Agreement, incorporated into our proposal for this project.

The analysis of this site was based on a subsurface profile interpolated from limited discrete soil samples. While the materials encountered in the project area are considered to be representative of the total area, some variations should be expected between boring locations and sample depths. If the conditions encountered during construction vary significantly from those detailed herein, we should be contacted immediately to determine if the conditions alter the recommendations contained herein.

This report has been based on assumed or provided characteristics of the proposed development. It is recommended that the owner, client, architect, structural engineer, and civil engineer carefully review these assumptions to ensure that they are consistent with the characteristics of the proposed development. If discrepancies exist, they should be brought to our attention to verify that they do not affect the conclusions and recommendations contained herein. We also recommend that the project plans and specifications be submitted to our office for review to verify that our recommendations have been correctly interpreted.

The analysis, conclusions, and recommendations contained within this report have been promulgated in accordance with generally accepted professional geotechnical engineering practice. No other warranty is implied or expressed.

# APPENDIX A



# LEGEND

 SITES 3 & 4

SOURCE: USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP OF THE FONTANA QUADRANGLE, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, 2018.



## SITE LOCATION MAP

PROPOSED COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

BLOOMINGTON, CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1" = 2000'

DRAWN: PM

CHKD: RGT


SCG PROJECT 20G172-5

PLATE 1



SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL





**GEOTECHNICAL LEGEND**

- APPROXIMATE BORING LOCATION
- PREVIOUS BORING LOCATION  
(SCG PROJECT NO. 20G172-4)









NOTE: CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN PREPARED BY AO.

<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN</b>	
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BLOOMINGTON, CALIFORNIA	
SCALE: 1" = 180'	 <b>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL</b>
DRAWN: PM	
CHKD: RGT	
SCG PROJECT 20G172-5	
PLATE 2	



# APPENDIX B

# BORING LOG LEGEND

SAMPLE TYPE	GRAPHICAL SYMBOL	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION
AUGER		SAMPLE COLLECTED FROM AUGER CUTTINGS, NO FIELD MEASUREMENT OF SOIL STRENGTH. (DISTURBED)
CORE		ROCK CORE SAMPLE: TYPICALLY TAKEN WITH A DIAMOND-TIPPED CORE BARREL. TYPICALLY USED ONLY IN HIGHLY CONSOLIDATED BEDROCK.
GRAB		SOIL SAMPLE TAKEN WITH NO SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT, SUCH AS FROM A STOCKPILE OR THE GROUND SURFACE. (DISTURBED)
CS		CALIFORNIA SAMPLER: 2-1/2 INCH I.D. SPLIT BARREL SAMPLER, LINED WITH 1-INCH HIGH BRASS RINGS. DRIVEN WITH SPT HAMMER. (RELATIVELY UNDISTURBED)
NSR		NO RECOVERY: THE SAMPLING ATTEMPT DID NOT RESULT IN RECOVERY OF ANY SIGNIFICANT SOIL OR ROCK MATERIAL.
SPT		STANDARD PENETRATION TEST: SAMPLER IS A 1.4 INCH INSIDE DIAMETER SPLIT BARREL, DRIVEN 18 INCHES WITH THE SPT HAMMER. (DISTURBED)
SH		SHELBY TUBE: TAKEN WITH A THIN WALL SAMPLE TUBE, PUSHED INTO THE SOIL AND THEN EXTRACTED. (UNDISTURBED)
VANE		VANE SHEAR TEST: SOIL STRENGTH OBTAINED USING A 4 BLADED SHEAR DEVICE. TYPICALLY USED IN SOFT CLAYS-NO SAMPLE RECOVERED.

## COLUMN DESCRIPTIONS

### DEPTH:

Distance in feet below the ground surface.

### SAMPLE:

Sample Type as depicted above.

### BLOW COUNT:

Number of blows required to advance the sampler 12 inches using a 140 lb hammer with a 30-inch drop. 50/3" indicates penetration refusal (>50 blows) at 3 inches. WH indicates that the weight of the hammer was sufficient to push the sampler 6 inches or more.

### POCKET PEN.:

Approximate shear strength of a cohesive soil sample as measured by pocket penetrometer.

### GRAPHIC LOG:

Graphic Soil Symbol as depicted on the following page.

### DRY DENSITY:

Dry density of an undisturbed or relatively undisturbed sample in lbs/ft<sup>3</sup>.

### MOISTURE CONTENT:

Moisture content of a soil sample, expressed as a percentage of the dry weight.

### LIQUID LIMIT:

The moisture content above which a soil behaves as a liquid.

### PLASTIC LIMIT:

The moisture content above which a soil behaves as a plastic.

### PASSING #200 SIEVE:

The percentage of the sample finer than the #200 standard sieve.

### UNCONFINED SHEAR:

The shear strength of a cohesive soil sample, as measured in the unconfined state.












# SOIL CLASSIFICATION CHART

MAJOR DIVISIONS			SYMBOLS		TYPICAL DESCRIPTIONS
			GRAPH	LETTER	
COARSE GRAINED SOILS  MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS LARGER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	GRAVEL AND GRAVELLY SOILS  MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION RETAINED ON NO. 4 SIEVE	CLEAN GRAVELS  (LITTLE OR NO FINES)		GW	WELL-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES
				GP	POORLY-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES
		GRAVELS WITH FINES  (APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		GM	SILTY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - SILT MIXTURES
				GC	CLAYEY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - CLAY MIXTURES
	SAND AND SANDY SOILS  MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION PASSING ON NO. 4 SIEVE	CLEAN SANDS  (LITTLE OR NO FINES)		SW	WELL-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SANDS, LITTLE OR NO FINES
				SP	POORLY-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SAND, LITTLE OR NO FINES
		SANDS WITH FINES  (APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		SM	SILTY SANDS, SAND - SILT MIXTURES
				SC	CLAYEY SANDS, SAND - CLAY MIXTURES
FINE GRAINED SOILS  MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS SMALLER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	SILTS AND CLAYS  LIQUID LIMIT LESS THAN 50			ML	INORGANIC SILTS AND VERY FINE SANDS, ROCK FLOUR, SILTY OR CLAYEY FINE SANDS OR CLAYEY SILTS WITH SLIGHT PLASTICITY
				CL	INORGANIC CLAYS OF LOW TO MEDIUM PLASTICITY, GRAVELLY CLAYS, SANDY CLAYS, SILTY CLAYS, LEAN CLAYS
				OL	ORGANIC SILTS AND ORGANIC SILTY CLAYS OF LOW PLASTICITY
	SILTS AND CLAYS  LIQUID LIMIT GREATER THAN 50			MH	INORGANIC SILTS, MICACEOUS OR DIATOMACEOUS FINE SAND OR SILTY SOILS
				CH	INORGANIC CLAYS OF HIGH PLASTICITY
				OH	ORGANIC CLAYS OF MEDIUM TO HIGH PLASTICITY, ORGANIC SILTS
HIGHLY ORGANIC SOILS			PT	PEAT, HUMUS, SWAMP SOILS WITH HIGH ORGANIC CONTENTS	


















NOTE: DUAL SYMBOLS ARE USED TO INDICATE BORDERLINE SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS



JOB NO.: 20G172-5				DRILLING DATE: 2/10/21				WATER DEPTH: Dry				
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development				DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger				CAVE DEPTH: 5 feet				
LOCATION: Bloomington, California				LOGGED BY: Jose Zuniga				READING TAKEN: At Completion				
FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
5		7			FILL: Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium Sand, trace fine to coarse Gravel, loose-moist	101	9					No Sample Recovery
		14			ALLUVIUM: Gray Brown fine to medium Sand, trace Silt, loose to medium dense-damp	97	3					
		18										
		35			Light Gray Gravelly fine to coarse Sand, trace fine to coarse Gravel, medium dense to dense-dry to damp	124	2					
		50										
10							1					Disturbed Sample
15		36			Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, little fine to coarse Gravel, dense-dry to damp		2					
20		14			Light Brown fine Sandy Silt, medium dense-very moist		15					
Boring Terminated at 20'												

TBL 20G172-5.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 2/25/21













JOB NO.: 20G172-5				DRILLING DATE: 2/10/21				WATER DEPTH: Dry				
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development				DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger				CAVE DEPTH: 4 feet				
LOCATION: Bloomington, California				LOGGED BY: Jose Zuniga				READING TAKEN: At Completion				
FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG		DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL							
		5			MULCH: 4-inch thick Mulch layer	103	8					No Sample Recovery
		5			FILL: Dark Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, loose-damp to moist	99	13					
5		4			FILL: Dark Gray Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, loose-moist to very moist	101	18					
		23			POSSIBLE FILL: Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, loose-very moist							
		23			ALLUVIUM: Gray Brown Gravelly fine to coarse Sand, trace Silt, medium dense-damp	122	2					
10												
		37				119	3					
15												
		45				119	3					
20												
					Boring Terminated at 20'							

TBL 20G172-5.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 2/25/21




JOB NO.: 20G172-5	DRILLING DATE: 2/10/21	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 4 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Jose Zuniga	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
5		5			<u>FILL</u> : Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, loose-damp to moist	104	7					Disturbed Sample
		14			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Light Brown fine to medium Sand, trace Silt, little fine to coarse Gravel, loose to medium dense-dry to damp	113	3					
		19				98	3					
		23					1					
		14			Gray Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, loose-moist	108	7					
15		84/11"			Gray Brown fine to coarse Sand, little fine to coarse Gravel, dense to very dense-damp		2					
		40				2						
	Boring Terminated at 20'											

TBL 20G172-5.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 2/25/21

# APPENDIX

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: FILL: Dark Brown Silty fine to medium Sand


Boring Number:	B-14	Initial Moisture Content (%)	8
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	18
Depth (ft)	1 to 2	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	103.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	108.6
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.82

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-5  
**PLATE C- 1**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: FILL: Dark Gray Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt


Boring Number:	B-14	Initial Moisture Content (%)	13
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	16
Depth (ft)	3 to 4	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	99.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	107.7
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.50

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-5  
**PLATE C- 2**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: POSSIBLE FILL: Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt

Boring Number:	B-14	Initial Moisture Content (%)	18
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	18
Depth (ft)	5 to 7	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	101.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	106.9
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.13


Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
 Bloomington, California  
 Project No. 20G172-5  
**PLATE C- 3**



**SOUTHERN  
 CALIFORNIA  
 GEOTECHNICAL**  
*A California Corporation*



### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Gravy Brown Gravelly fine to coarse Sand, trace Silt

Boring Number:	B-14	Initial Moisture Content (%)	2
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	12
Depth (ft)	9 to 10	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	110.5
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	117.8
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.91

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-5  
**PLATE C- 4**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

# APPENDIX

## **GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS**

These grading guide specifications are intended to provide typical procedures for grading operations. They are intended to supplement the recommendations contained in the geotechnical investigation report for this project. Should the recommendations in the geotechnical investigation report conflict with the grading guide specifications, the more site specific recommendations in the geotechnical investigation report will govern.

### **General**

- The Earthwork Contractor is responsible for the satisfactory completion of all earthwork in accordance with the plans and geotechnical reports, and in accordance with city, county, and applicable building codes.
- The Geotechnical Engineer is the representative of the Owner/Builder for the purpose of implementing the report recommendations and guidelines. These duties are not intended to relieve the Earthwork Contractor of any responsibility to perform in a workman-like manner, nor is the Geotechnical Engineer to direct the grading equipment or personnel employed by the Contractor.
- The Earthwork Contractor is required to notify the Geotechnical Engineer of the anticipated work and schedule so that testing and inspections can be provided. If necessary, work may be stopped and redone if personnel have not been scheduled in advance.
- The Earthwork Contractor is required to have suitable and sufficient equipment on the job-site to process, moisture condition, mix and compact the amount of fill being placed to the approved compaction. In addition, suitable support equipment should be available to conform with recommendations and guidelines in this report.
- Canyon cleanouts, overexcavation areas, processed ground to receive fill, key excavations, subdrains and benches should be observed by the Geotechnical Engineer prior to placement of any fill. It is the Earthwork Contractor's responsibility to notify the Geotechnical Engineer of areas that are ready for inspection.
- Excavation, filling, and subgrade preparation should be performed in a manner and sequence that will provide drainage at all times and proper control of erosion. Precipitation, springs, and seepage water encountered shall be pumped or drained to provide a suitable working surface. The Geotechnical Engineer must be informed of springs or water seepage encountered during grading or foundation construction for possible revision to the recommended construction procedures and/or installation of subdrains.

### **Site Preparation**

- The Earthwork Contractor is responsible for all clearing, grubbing, stripping and site preparation for the project in accordance with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineer.
- If any materials or areas are encountered by the Earthwork Contractor which are suspected of having toxic or environmentally sensitive contamination, the Geotechnical Engineer and Owner/Builder should be notified immediately.

- Major vegetation should be stripped and disposed of off-site. This includes trees, brush, heavy grasses and any materials considered unsuitable by the Geotechnical Engineer.
- Underground structures such as basements, cesspools or septic disposal systems, mining shafts, tunnels, wells and pipelines should be removed under the inspection of the Geotechnical Engineer and recommendations provided by the Geotechnical Engineer and/or city, county or state agencies. If such structures are known or found, the Geotechnical Engineer should be notified as soon as possible so that recommendations can be formulated.
- Any topsoil, slopewash, colluvium, alluvium and rock materials which are considered unsuitable by the Geotechnical Engineer should be removed prior to fill placement.
- Remaining voids created during site clearing caused by removal of trees, foundations basements, irrigation facilities, etc., should be excavated and filled with compacted fill.
- Subsequent to clearing and removals, areas to receive fill should be scarified to a depth of 10 to 12 inches, moisture conditioned and compacted
- The moisture condition of the processed ground should be at or slightly above the optimum moisture content as determined by the Geotechnical Engineer. Depending upon field conditions, this may require air drying or watering together with mixing and/or discing.

#### Compacted Fills

- Soil materials imported to or excavated on the property may be utilized in the fill, provided each material has been determined to be suitable in the opinion of the Geotechnical Engineer. Unless otherwise approved by the Geotechnical Engineer, all fill materials shall be free of deleterious, organic, or frozen matter, shall contain no chemicals that may result in the material being classified as "contaminated," and shall be very low to non-expansive with a maximum expansion index (EI) of 50. The top 12 inches of the compacted fill should have a maximum particle size of 3 inches, and all underlying compacted fill material a maximum 6-inch particle size, except as noted below.
- All soils should be evaluated and tested by the Geotechnical Engineer. Materials with high expansion potential, low strength, poor gradation or containing organic materials may require removal from the site or selective placement and/or mixing to the satisfaction of the Geotechnical Engineer.
- Rock fragments or rocks less than 6 inches in their largest dimensions, or as otherwise determined by the Geotechnical Engineer, may be used in compacted fill, provided the distribution and placement is satisfactory in the opinion of the Geotechnical Engineer.
- Rock fragments or rocks greater than 12 inches should be taken off-site or placed in accordance with recommendations and in areas designated as suitable by the Geotechnical Engineer. These materials should be placed in accordance with Plate D-8 of these Grading Guide Specifications and in accordance with the following recommendations:
  - Rocks 12 inches or more in diameter should be placed in rows at least 15 feet apart, 15 feet from the edge of the fill, and 10 feet or more below subgrade. Spaces should be left between each rock fragment to provide for placement and compaction of soil around the fragments.
  - Fill materials consisting of soil meeting the minimum moisture content requirements and free of oversize material should be placed between and over the rows of rock or

concrete. Ample water and compactive effort should be applied to the fill materials as they are placed in order that all of the voids between each of the fragments are filled and compacted to the specified density.

- Subsequent rows of rocks should be placed such that they are not directly above a row placed in the previous lift of fill. A minimum 5-foot offset between rows is recommended.
- To facilitate future trenching, oversized material should not be placed within the range of foundation excavations, future utilities or other underground construction unless specifically approved by the soil engineer and the developer/owner representative.
- Fill materials approved by the Geotechnical Engineer should be placed in areas previously prepared to receive fill and in evenly placed, near horizontal layers at about 6 to 8 inches in loose thickness, or as otherwise determined by the Geotechnical Engineer for the project.
- Each layer should be moisture conditioned to optimum moisture content, or slightly above, as directed by the Geotechnical Engineer. After proper mixing and/or drying, to evenly distribute the moisture, the layers should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry density in compliance with ASTM D-1557-78 unless otherwise indicated.
- Density and moisture content testing should be performed by the Geotechnical Engineer at random intervals and locations as determined by the Geotechnical Engineer. These tests are intended as an aid to the Earthwork Contractor, so he can evaluate his workmanship, equipment effectiveness and site conditions. The Earthwork Contractor is responsible for compaction as required by the Geotechnical Report(s) and governmental agencies.
- Fill areas unused for a period of time may require moisture conditioning, processing and recompaction prior to the start of additional filling. The Earthwork Contractor should notify the Geotechnical Engineer of his intent so that an evaluation can be made.
- Fill placed on ground sloping at a 5-to-1 inclination (horizontal-to-vertical) or steeper should be benched into bedrock or other suitable materials, as directed by the Geotechnical Engineer. Typical details of benching are illustrated on Plates D-2, D-4, and D-5.
- Cut/fill transition lots should have the cut portion overexcavated to a depth of at least 3 feet and rebuilt with fill (see Plate D-1), as determined by the Geotechnical Engineer.
- All cut lots should be inspected by the Geotechnical Engineer for fracturing and other bedrock conditions. If necessary, the pads should be overexcavated to a depth of 3 feet and rebuilt with a uniform, more cohesive soil type to impede moisture penetration.
- Cut portions of pad areas above buttresses or stabilizations should be overexcavated to a depth of 3 feet and rebuilt with uniform, more cohesive compacted fill to impede moisture penetration.
- Non-structural fill adjacent to structural fill should typically be placed in unison to provide lateral support. Backfill along walls must be placed and compacted with care to ensure that excessive unbalanced lateral pressures do not develop. The type of fill material placed adjacent to below grade walls must be properly tested and approved by the Geotechnical Engineer with consideration of the lateral earth pressure used in the design.

### Foundations

- The foundation influence zone is defined as extending one foot horizontally from the outside edge of a footing, and proceeding downward at a ½ horizontal to 1 vertical (0.5:1) inclination.
- Where overexcavation beneath a footing subgrade is necessary, it should be conducted so as to encompass the entire foundation influence zone, as described above.
- Compacted fill adjacent to exterior footings should extend at least 12 inches above foundation bearing grade. Compacted fill within the interior of structures should extend to the floor subgrade elevation.

### Fill Slopes

- The placement and compaction of fill described above applies to all fill slopes. Slope compaction should be accomplished by overfilling the slope, adequately compacting the fill in even layers, including the overfilled zone and cutting the slope back to expose the compacted core
- Slope compaction may also be achieved by backrolling the slope adequately every 2 to 4 vertical feet during the filling process as well as requiring the earth moving and compaction equipment to work close to the top of the slope. Upon completion of slope construction, the slope face should be compacted with a sheepsfoot connected to a sideboom and then grid rolled. This method of slope compaction should only be used if approved by the Geotechnical Engineer.
- Sandy soils lacking in adequate cohesion may be unstable for a finished slope condition and therefore should not be placed within 15 horizontal feet of the slope face.
- All fill slopes should be keyed into bedrock or other suitable material. Fill keys should be at least 15 feet wide and inclined at 2 percent into the slope. For slopes higher than 30 feet, the fill key width should be equal to one-half the height of the slope (see Plate D-5).
- All fill keys should be cleared of loose slough material prior to geotechnical inspection and should be approved by the Geotechnical Engineer and governmental agencies prior to filling.
- The cut portion of fill over cut slopes should be made first and inspected by the Geotechnical Engineer for possible stabilization requirements. The fill portion should be adequately keyed through all surficial soils and into bedrock or suitable material. Soils should be removed from the transition zone between the cut and fill portions (see Plate D-2).

### Cut Slopes


- All cut slopes should be inspected by the Geotechnical Engineer to determine the need for stabilization. The Earthwork Contractor should notify the Geotechnical Engineer when slope cutting is in progress at intervals of 10 vertical feet. Failure to notify may result in a delay in recommendations.
- Cut slopes exposing loose, cohesionless sands should be reported to the Geotechnical Engineer for possible stabilization recommendations.
- All stabilization excavations should be cleared of loose slough material prior to geotechnical inspection. Stakes should be provided by the Civil Engineer to verify the location and dimensions of the key. A typical stabilization fill detail is shown on Plate D-5.

- Stabilization key excavations should be provided with subdrains. Typical subdrain details are shown on Plates D-6.


#### Subdrains

- Subdrains may be required in canyons and swales where fill placement is proposed. Typical subdrain details for canyons are shown on Plate D-3. Subdrains should be installed after approval of removals and before filling, as determined by the Soils Engineer.
- Plastic pipe may be used for subdrains provided it is Schedule 40 or SDR 35 or equivalent. Pipe should be protected against breakage, typically by placement in a square-cut (backhoe) trench or as recommended by the manufacturer.
- Filter material for subdrains should conform to CALTRANS Specification 68-1.025 or as approved by the Geotechnical Engineer for the specific site conditions. Clean  $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch crushed rock may be used provided it is wrapped in an acceptable filter cloth and approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. Pipe diameters should be 6 inches for runs up to 500 feet and 8 inches for the downstream continuations of longer runs. Four-inch diameter pipe may be used in buttress and stabilization fills.

### CUT LOT




### CUT/FILL LOT (TRANSITION)



\*SEE TEXT OF REPORT FOR SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION.  
ACTUAL DEPTH OF OVEREXCAVATION MAY BE GREATER.

TRANSITION LOT DETAIL	
GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS	
NOT TO SCALE	 <b>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL</b>
DRAWN: JAS	
CHKD: GKM	
PLATE D-1	





**FILL ABOVE CUT SLOPE DETAIL**  
**GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS**


NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS  
 CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-2



**SOUTHERN  
 CALIFORNIA  
 GEOTECHNICAL**



PIPE MATERIAL
ADS (CORRUGATED POLETHYLENE)
TRANSITE UNDERDRAIN
PVC OR ABS: SDR 35
SDR 21

DEPTH OF FILL OVER SUBDRAIN
8
20
35
100

**SCHEMATIC ONLY  
NOT TO SCALE**

### CANYON SUBDRAIN DETAIL GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS


NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS  
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-3



SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL



NOTE:  
BENCHING SHALL BE REQUIRED  
WHEN NATURAL SLOPES ARE  
EQUAL TO OR STEEPER THAN 5:1  
OR WHEN RECOMMENDED BY  
THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER.

# FILL ABOVE NATURAL SLOPE DETAIL GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS


NOT TO SCALE


DRAWN: JAS  
CHKD: GKM


PLATE D-4



SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL



STABILIZATION FILL DETAIL	
GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS	
NOT TO SCALE	 <b>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL</b>
DRAWN: JAS CHKD: GKM	
PLATE D-5	




"FILTER MATERIAL" TO MEET FOLLOWING SPECIFICATION OR APPROVED EQUIVALENT: (CONFORMS TO EMA STD. PLAN 323)

SIEVE SIZE	PERCENTAGE PASSING
1"	100
3/4"	90-100
3/8"	40-100
NO. 4	25-40
NO. 8	18-33
NO. 30	5-15
NO. 50	0-7
NO. 200	0-3

"GRAVEL" TO MEET FOLLOWING SPECIFICATION OR APPROVED EQUIVALENT:

SIEVE SIZE	MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE PASSING
1 1/2"	100
NO. 4	50
NO. 200	8
SAND EQUIVALENT = MINIMUM OF 50	

OUTLET PIPE TO BE CONNECTED TO SUBDRAIN PIPE WITH TEE OR ELBOW



DETAIL "A"

FILTER MATERIAL - MINIMUM OF FIVE CUBIC FEET PER FOOT OF PIPE. SEE ABOVE FOR FILTER MATERIAL SPECIFICATION.

ALTERNATIVE: IN LIEU OF FILTER MATERIAL FIVE CUBIC FEET OF GRAVEL PER FOOT OF PIPE MAY BE ENCASED IN FILTER FABRIC. SEE ABOVE FOR GRAVEL SPECIFICATION.

FILTER FABRIC SHALL BE MIRAFI 140 OR EQUIVALENT. FILTER FABRIC SHALL BE LAPPED A MINIMUM OF 12 INCHES ON ALL JOINTS.

MINIMUM 4-INCH DIAMETER PVC SCH 40 OR ABS CLASS SDR 35 WITH A CRUSHING STRENGTH OF AT LEAST 1,000 POUNDS, WITH A MINIMUM OF 8 UNIFORMLY SPACED PERFORATIONS PER FOOT OF PIPE INSTALLED WITH PERFORATIONS ON BOTTOM OF PIPE. PROVIDE CAP AT UPSTREAM END OF PIPE. SLOPE AT 2 PERCENT TO OUTLET PIPE.

NOTES:

1. TRENCH FOR OUTLET PIPES TO BE BACKFILLED WITH ON-SITE SOIL.

**SLOPE FILL SUBDRAINS**  
**GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS**

NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS  
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-6



SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL



MINIMUM ONE FOOT THICK LAYER OF  
LOW PERMEABILITY SOIL IF NOT  
COVERED WITH AN IMPERMEABLE SURFACE

MINIMUM ONE FOOT WIDE LAYER OF  
FREE DRAINING MATERIAL  
(LESS THAN 5% PASSING THE #200 SIEVE)

OR

PROPERLY INSTALLED PREFABRICATED DRAINAGE COMPOSITE  
(MiraDRAIN 6000 OR APPROVED EQUIVALENT).

FILTER MATERIAL - MINIMUM OF TWO  
CUBIC FEET PER FOOT OF PIPE. SEE  
BELOW FOR FILTER MATERIAL SPECIFICATION.

ALTERNATIVE: IN LIEU OF FILTER MATERIAL  
TWO CUBIC FEET OF GRAVEL  
PER FOOT OF PIPE MAY BE ENCASED  
IN FILTER FABRIC. SEE BELOW FOR  
GRAVEL SPECIFICATION.

FILTER FABRIC SHALL BE MIRAFL 140  
OR EQUIVALENT. FILTER FABRIC SHALL  
BE LAPPED A MINIMUM OF 6 INCHES  
ON ALL JOINTS.

MINIMUM 4-INCH DIAMETER PVC SCH 40 OR ABS CLASS SDR 35 WITH  
A CRUSHING STRENGTH OF AT LEAST 1,000 POUNDS, WITH A MINIMUM  
OF 8 UNIFORMLY SPACED PERFORATIONS PER FOOT OF PIPE INSTALLED  
WITH PERFORATIONS ON BOTTOM OF PIPE. PROVIDE CAP AT UPSTREAM  
END OF PIPE. SLOPE AT 2 PERCENT TO OUTLET PIPE.

"FILTER MATERIAL" TO MEET FOLLOWING SPECIFICATION  
OR APPROVED EQUIVALENT: (CONFORMS TO EMA STD. PLAN 323)

SIEVE SIZE	PERCENTAGE PASSING
1"	100
3/4"	90-100
3/8"	40-100
NO. 4	25-40
NO. 8	18-33
NO. 30	5-15
NO. 50	0-7
NO. 200	0-3

"GRAVEL" TO MEET FOLLOWING SPECIFICATION OR  
APPROVED EQUIVALENT:

SIEVE SIZE	MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE PASSING
1 1/2"	100
NO. 4	50
NO. 200	8
SAND EQUIVALENT = MINIMUM OF 50	

### RETAINING WALL BACKDRAINS GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS



NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS  
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-7



SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL



**PLACEMENT OF OVERSIZED MATERIAL  
GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS**

NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: PM  
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-8



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**

# APPENDIX





Latitude, Longitude: 34.054093, -117.412815



Date	2/25/2021, 12:30:24 PM
Design Code Reference Document	ASCE7-16
Risk Category	III
Site Class	D - Stiff Soil

Type	Value	Description
S <sub>S</sub>	1.5	MCE <sub>R</sub> ground motion. (for 0.2 second period)
S <sub>1</sub>	0.6	MCE <sub>R</sub> ground motion. (for 1.0s period)
S <sub>MS</sub>	1.5	Site-modified spectral acceleration value
S <sub>M1</sub>	null -See Section 11.4.8	Site-modified spectral acceleration value
S <sub>DS</sub>	1	Numeric seismic design value at 0.2 second SA
S <sub>D1</sub>	null -See Section 11.4.8	Numeric seismic design value at 1.0 second SA

Type	Value	Description
SDC	null -See Section 11.4.8	Seismic design category
F <sub>a</sub>	1	Site amplification factor at 0.2 second
F <sub>v</sub>	null -See Section 11.4.8	Site amplification factor at 1.0 second
PGA	0.61	MCE <sub>G</sub> peak ground acceleration
F <sub>PGA</sub>	1.1	Site amplification factor at PGA
PGA <sub>M</sub>	0.67	Site modified peak ground acceleration
T <sub>L</sub>	12	Long-period transition period in seconds
SsRT	1.889	Probabilistic risk-targeted ground motion. (0.2 second)
SsUH	2.028	Factored uniform-hazard (2% probability of exceedance in 50 years) spectral acceleration
SsD	1.5	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (0.2 second)
S1RT	0.715	Probabilistic risk-targeted ground motion. (1.0 second)
S1UH	0.789	Factored uniform-hazard (2% probability of exceedance in 50 years) spectral acceleration.
S1D	0.6	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (1.0 second)
PGA <sub>d</sub>	0.61	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (Peak Ground Acceleration)
C <sub>RS</sub>	0.932	Mapped value of the risk coefficient at short periods
C <sub>R1</sub>	0.906	Mapped value of the risk coefficient at a period of 1 s

SOURCE: SEAOC/OSHDP Seismic Design Maps Tool  
<<https://seismicmaps.org/>>



**SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS - 2019 CBC**

PROPOSED COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

BLOOMINGTON, CALIFORNIA

DRAWN: PM  
CHKD: RGT

SCG PROJECT  
20G172-5

PLATE E-1



SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL

# APPENDIX



JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 16 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					LABORATORY RESULTS							COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
					<u>FILL</u> : Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace fine to coarse Gravel, loose to medium dense-damp	110	4					
						111	3					
5		29			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Light Gray Brown fine to coarse Sand, little fine to coarse Gravel, trace Silt, medium dense-dry to damp	117	2					
		27			@ 7', some fine to coarse Gravel	114	2					
10		19			Gray Brown Silty fine Sand, trace to little medium to coarse Sand, little fine to coarse Gravel, trace fine root fibers, medium dense-damp to moist	109	8					
15		36			Gray Brown fine to coarse Sand, little to some Silt, little fine to coarse Gravel, occasional Cobbles, dense to very dense-dry to damp		2					
20		58					3					
25		54					2					
30		57					3					
Boring Terminated at 30'												

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20



JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 8 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
		9			<u>FILL</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, loose-damp		5					
		16			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Gray Brown fine to medium sand, little coarse Sand, little Silt, little fine to coarse Gravel, occasional Cobbles, loose to medium dense-dry		2					
5		10					2					
		29					2					
10												
		22					2					
15												
		30/11"			@ 18.5', some coarse Sand, little fine Gravel, very dense-damp		3					
20												
					Boring Terminated at 20'							

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20



JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: ---
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
5  <												

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20





















JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 8 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS					COMMENTS	
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)		ORGANIC CONTENT (%)
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
5  <												

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20



JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 22 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS		
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)			
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL														
5		12			<u>FILL</u> : Light Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, trace medium to coarse Sand, medium dense-damp	105	4							
		11			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Gray fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, trace fine to coarse Gravel, trace to little Silt, medium dense-dry to damp	103	2							
		14			Gray Brown fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, little to some fine to coarse Gravel, trace Silt, loose-dry to damp	108	2							
		50/2"			Brown Gravelly fine to coarse Sand, trace to little Silt, very dense-dry		2							
		53			@ 9', occasional Cobbles	107	1							
	15			25		Gray Brown fine to coarse Sand, trace to little Silt, trace to little fine to coarse Gravel, occasional Cobbles, medium dense-dry to damp		2						
		20			54		@ 18.5', dense-damp		3					
				25		20		Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, trace medium Sand, trace Clay, medium dense-moist		11				
30		26			@ 28.5', no Clay		9							
	Boring Terminated at 30'													

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ, SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20





JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 2 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG		DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL							
5   												

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20



JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 7 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS	
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)		
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL								
5   													

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20

















JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 10 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG		DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL							
5		30			<u>FILL</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, little medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense to dense-dry to damp		2					
		16			@ 3.5', little fine to coarse Gravel		2					
		22			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, little to some medium to coarse Sand, medium dense-damp		4					
		23					3					
10					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20



JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 4 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG		DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL							
5		11			<u>FILL</u> : Light Brown fine Sandy Silt, trace medium to coarse Sand, medium dense-dry		2					
		22			@ 3.5', trace fine Gravel		1					
		37			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Light Brown fine Sandy Silt, little medium to coarse Sand, little fine to coarse Gravel, occasional Cobbles, dense-dry		1					
		12			Light Gray Brown fine to medium Sand, some Silt, trace to little coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense-dry		1					
		47			Light Gray Brown Silty fine Sand, some medium to coarse Sand, some fine to coarse Gravel, occasional Cobbles, very dense-dry to damp		2					
15					Light Gray Brown fine Sandy Silt, little medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, occasional Cobbles, very dense-dry		1					
20		74										
					Boring Terminated at 20'							

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20



JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 6 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					LABORATORY RESULTS							COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL							
5		6			<u>POSSIBLE FILL</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, loose-damp		5					
		12			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, little medium to coarse Sand, trace to little fine to coarse Gravel, medium dense-damp		4					
		28					2					
		29					2					
10					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20











JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 6 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					LABORATORY RESULTS							COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL							
5		5			<u>FILL:</u> Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, trace medium to coarse Sand, loose-damp		5					
		14					5					
		14			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> Brown Gray Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense-dry to damp		1					
		19					3					
10					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20



JOB NO.: 20G172-4	DRILLING DATE: 9/15/20	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Development	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 9 feet
LOCATION: Bloomington, California	LOGGED BY: Ryan Bremer	READING TAKEN: At Completion


FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
5		10		<u>FILL</u> : Light Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, trace medium to coarse Sand, trace fine to coarse Gravel, loose to medium dense-damp		3						
		16		<u>ALLUVIUM</u> Light Brown Silty fine Sand, some medium to coarse Sand, little fine to coarse Gravel, occasional Cobbles, medium dense to dense-dry to damp		2						
		40			1							
		18		Light Gray Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, some fine to coarse Gravel, medium dense-dry		1						
		75		@ 13.5', little to some fine to coarse Gravel, very dense-dry		2						
15												
20		47		@ 18.5', little fine to coarse Gravel, dense-dry		2						
Boring Terminated at 20'												

TBL 20G172-4.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 10/26/20



# APPENDIX

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: FILL: Brown Silty fine Sand, trace to little medium Sand


Boring Number:	B-1	Initial Moisture Content (%)	3
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	14
Depth (ft)	3	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	111.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	114.8
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.03

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C- 1**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Light Gray Brown fine to coarse Sand, little fine to coarse Gravel, trace Silt


Boring Number:	B-1	Initial Moisture Content (%)	2
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	11
Depth (ft)	5	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	117.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	123.5
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.63

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C- 2**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Light Gray Brown fine to coarse Sand, little fine to coarse Gravel, trace Silt


Boring Number:	B-1	Initial Moisture Content (%)	2
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	13
Depth (ft)	7	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	114.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	120.9
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.46

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C- 3**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Gray Brown Silty fine Sand, trace to little medium to coarse Sand


Boring Number:	B-1	Initial Moisture Content (%)	8
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	18
Depth (ft)	9	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	109.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	117.2
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.11

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C- 4**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: FILL: Light Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt


Boring Number:	B-5	Initial Moisture Content (%)	4
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	17
Depth (ft)	1	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	103.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	108.2
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.63

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C- 5**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Gray Brown fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand

Boring Number:	B-5	Initial Moisture Content (%)	2
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	20
Depth (ft)	3	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	103.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	108.0
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.73


Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C- 6**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation



### Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Gray Brown fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand


Boring Number:	B-5	Initial Moisture Content (%)	2
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	10
Depth (ft)	5	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	108.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	111.2
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.77

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C- 7**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
A California Corporation

# Moisture/Density Relationship ASTM D-1557




Soil ID Number	B-1 @ 0-5'
Optimum Moisture (%)	7
Maximum Dry Density (pcf)	132
Soil Classification	Brown Sity fine to coarse Sand, trace fine to coarse Gravel

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C-8**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
*A California Corporation*

# Moisture/Density Relationship ASTM D-1557



Soil ID Number	B-4 @ 0-5'
Optimum Moisture (%)	9
Maximum Dry Density (pcf)	124.5
Soil Classification	Light Brown fine Sandy Silt, trace medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel

Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development  
Bloomington, California  
Project No. 20G172-4  
**PLATE C-9**



**SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
GEOTECHNICAL**  
*A California Corporation*