

# **Geotechnical Engineering Report**

### Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project Acampo, California

December 14, 2018 Terracon Project No. NA185174

### **Prepared for:**

Lodi Unified School District Lodi, California

### **Prepared by:**

Terracon Consultants, Inc. Lodi, California



Facilities

Geotechnical

Materials

December 14, 2018

Lodi Unified School District 1305 E. Vine Street Lodi, California 95240



Attn: Leonard Kahn

- P: (209) 331-7122
- E: lkahn@lodiusd.net
- Re: Geotechnical Engineering Report Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project 4600 Acampo Road Acampo, California Terracon Project No. NA185174

Dear Mr. Kahn:

We have completed the Geotechnical Engineering services for the above referenced project. This study was performed in general accordance with Terracon Proposal No. PNA185174 dated October 26, 2018. This report presents the findings of the subsurface exploration and provides geotechnical recommendations concerning earthwork and the design and construction of foundations, floor slabs, and pavements for the proposed project.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you on this project. If you have any questions concerning this report or if we may be of further service, please contact us.

Sincerely, Terracon Consultants, Inc.

Patrick C. Dell, Senior Associate Geotechnical Engineer 2186 Geotechnical Department Manager Garret S.H. Hubbart, Principal Geotechnical Engineer 2588 Office Manager

Terracon Consultants, Inc.902 Industrial WayLodi, California 95240P (209) 367 3701F (209) 333 8303terracon.com

# **REPORT TOPICS**

INTRODUCTION	1
SITE CONDITIONS	1
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERIZATION	3
GEOTECHNICAL OVERVIEW	3
EARTHWORK	3
SHALLOW FOUNDATIONS	7
FIRE WATER TANK FOUNDATIONS	9
SEISMIC CONSIDERATIONS	. 10
	. 11
FLOOR SUPPORT	. 12
CORROSIVITY	.17
GENERAL COMMENTS	.17

**Note:** This report was originally delivered in a web-based format. **Orange Bold** text in the report indicates a referenced section heading. The PDF version also includes hyperlinks which direct the reader to that section and clicking on the *GeoReport* logo will bring you back to this page. For more interactive features, please view your project online at <u>client.terracon.com</u>.

# **ATTACHMENTS**

EXPLORATION AND TESTING PROCEDURES SITE LOCATION AND EXPLORATION PLANS EXPLORATION RESULTS SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Note: Refer to each individual Attachment for a listing of contents.

# Geotechnical Engineering Report Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project 4600 Acampo Road Acampo, California Terracon Project No. NA185174 December 14, 2018

### INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of our subsurface exploration and geotechnical engineering services performed for the proposed relocatable buildings project to be located at 4600 Acampo Road in Acampo, California. The purpose of these services is to provide information and geotechnical engineering recommendations relative to:

- Subsurface soil conditions
- Groundwater conditions
- Site preparation and earthwork
- Seismic site classification per 2016 CBC
- Foundation design and construction
- Floor slab design and construction
- Excavation considerations
- Pavement recommendations

The geotechnical engineering Scope of Services for this project included the advancement of six (6) test borings to depths ranging from approximately 6½ to 11½ feet below existing site grades.

Maps showing the site and boring locations are shown in the **Site Location** and **Exploration Plan** sections, respectively. The results of the laboratory testing performed on soil samples obtained from the site during the field exploration are included on the boring logs in the **Exploration Results** section.

## SITE CONDITIONS

The following description of site conditions is derived from our site visit in association with the field exploration and our review of publicly available geologic and topographic maps.

Item	Description	
Parcel Information	The project is located at 4600 Acampo Road in Acampo, California.	
Existing Improvements	The project site is currently an operating elementary school with buildings, pavements, and landscaped areas.	
Current Ground Cover	Pavement and lawn.	

#### **Geotechnical Engineering Report**

Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project Acampo, California December 14, 2018 Terracon Project No. NA185174



Item	Description	
Existing Topography	The project site is relatively flat.	

# **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Our initial understanding of the project was provided in our proposal and was discussed during project planning. A period of collaboration has transpired since the project was initiated, and our final understanding of the project conditions is as follows:

ltem	Description	
Information Provided	The information regarding the planned construction was provided to us in an email from Stephen Henry with Henry & Associates Architects. The email was received on October 23, 2018. Mr. Henry provided a preliminary site development plan in his email. On December 11, 2018 we were provided with the tank design drawings sheets F1.0 and F1.1 prepared by Sauers Engineering Inc. dated 10/30/18 and the civil drawings prepared by Warren Consulting Engineers, Inc. dated 10/30/18.	
Project Description	We understand the project will consist of moving 8 relocatable classroom buildings at Houston Middle School to a different location onsite, to the east of the existing campus. The parking lot and bus lane will be expanded, and a fire water tank will be added towards the south end of the campus.	
Proposed Structures	Eight (8) relocatable classroom buildings, one (1) 20,000-gallon fire water tank, 24 feet in diameter and 12 feet tall.	
Building Construction	Relocatable buildings will be placed on wood foundations and floors will be supported on compacted aggregate base pads. The water tank will be constructed on a 26-foot diameter concrete slab-on-grade pad.	
Finished Floor Elevation	Unknown.	
Maximum Loads	<ul> <li>Buildings:</li> <li>Columns: 10 to 20 kips</li> <li>Walls: 1 to 2 kips per linear foot (klf)</li> <li>Slabs: 150 pounds per square foot (psf)</li> <li>Water Tank:</li> <li>Area load: 750 psf</li> </ul>	
Grading/Slopes	Up to 2 feet of cut and 2 feet of fill may be required to provide level pads for the structures.	
Pavements	Expanded parking lot and bus lane. Bus traffic will be about 10 bus trips per day.	
Estimated Start of Construction	Unknown.	



# **GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERIZATION**

We have developed a general characterization of the subsurface conditions based upon our review of the subsurface exploration, laboratory data, geologic setting and our understanding of the project.

The near surface soils encountered in our borings consisted of very loose to medium dense silty sand and sandy silt that extended to depths of between 3½ and 7 feet below the existing ground surface (bgs). These soils were underlain by interbedded layers of medium dense to very dense silty sand which was weakly cemented in places and medium dense sandy silt that extended to the maximum depths explored.

Conditions encountered at each exploration point are indicated on the individual logs. The individual logs can be found in the **Exploration Results** section.

## **GEOTECHNICAL OVERVIEW**

The near surface silty and sandy soils are loose to medium dense. In order to provide uniform support for the relocatable classroom buildings, all foundations should bear on a minimum of 18 inches of compacted native soil or non-expansive engineered fill. The mat slab foundation for the fire water tank should bear on 12 inches of Class 2 aggregate base overlying 18 inches of compacted native soil. Additional site preparation recommendations, including subgrade improvement and fill placement, are provided in the **Earthwork** section.

The **Pavements** section addresses the design of pavement systems.

The General Comments section provides an understanding of the report limitations.

### EARTHWORK

Earthwork is anticipated to include clearing and grubbing, excavations, and fill placement. The following sections provide recommendations for use in the preparation of specifications for the work. Recommendations include critical quality criteria, as necessary, to render the site in the state considered in our geotechnical engineering evaluation for foundations, floor slabs, and pavements.

#### **Site Preparation**

Prior to placing fill, existing vegetation and root mat should be removed. Complete stripping of the topsoil should be performed in the proposed structures and parking/driveway areas.



The subgrade should be proofrolled with an adequately loaded vehicle such as a fully-loaded tandem-axle dump truck or water truck. The proofrolling should be performed under the direction of the Geotechnical Engineer. Areas excessively deflecting under the proofroll should be delineated and subsequently addressed by the Geotechnical Engineer. Such areas should either be removed and replaced with engineered fill or modified by stabilizing with lime or cement or utilization of a geotextile. Excessively wet or dry material should either be removed, or moisture conditioned and recompacted.

### **Fill Material Types**

All fill materials should be inorganic soils free of vegetation, debris, and fragments larger than three inches in size. Pea gravel or other similar non-cementitious, poorly-graded materials should not be used as fill or backfill without the prior approval of the geotechnical engineer.

Imported earth materials for use as engineered fill should be pre-approved by our representative prior to construction. Imported non-expansive soils may be used as fill material for the following:

n

- n general site grading
- n foundation areas
- n slab-on-grade floor
- n pavement subgrade
- foundation backfill
- n trench backfill
- n exterior slabs-on-grade

Soils for use as compacted engineered fill material within the proposed building and tank areas should conform to non-expansive materials as indicated in the following recommendations:

	Percent Finer by Weight
<u>Gradation</u>	<u>(ASTM C 136)</u>
3"	
No. 4 Sieve	
No. 200 Sieve	
n Liquid Limit	30 (max)
n Plasticity Index	10 (max)
n Maximum Expansive Index*	20 (max)
*ASTM D 4829	

The on-site sands should meet the specifications above. Engineered fill should be placed and compacted in horizontal lifts, using equipment and procedures that will produce recommended moisture contents and densities throughout the lift. Fill lifts should not exceed ten inches in loose thickness.



### **Fill Compaction Requirements**

Recommended compaction and moisture content criteria for engineered fill materials are as follows:

	Per the Modified Proctor Test (ASTM D 1557)		
Material Type and Location	Minimum Compaction	Range of Moisture Contents for Compaction above Optimum	
	Requirement (%)	Minimum	Maximum
On-site sandy soils and Low volume change (non-expansive) imported fill:			
Beneath foundations:	90	0%	+3%
Beneath floors	90	0%	+3%
Beneath pavements	95	0%	+3%
Miscellaneous backfill:	90	0%	+3%
Utility Trenches*:	90	0%	+4%
Bottom of native soil excavation receiving fill:	90	+1%	+4%

\*The upper 12 inches beneath pavement should be compacted to 95% of the maximum dry density as determined in the ASTM D1557 test method.

We recommend that compacted native soil or any engineered fill be tested for moisture content and relative compaction during placement. Should the results of the in-place density tests indicate the specified moisture content or compaction requirements have not been met, the area represented by the test should be reworked and retested as required until the specified moisture content and relative compaction requirements are achieved.

#### **Utility Trench Backfill**

Utility trenches are a common source of water infiltration and migration. Utility trenches penetrating beneath the buildings should be effectively sealed to restrict water intrusion and flow through the trenches, which could migrate below the buildings. The trench should provide an effective trench plug that extends at least 5 feet from the face of the building exterior. The plug material should consist of cementitious flowable fill or low permeability clay. The trench plug material should be placed to surround the utility line. If used, the clay trench plug material should be placed to comply with the water content and compaction recommendations for structural fill stated previously in this report.

### **Grading and Drainage**

All grades must provide effective drainage away from the buildings during and after construction and should be maintained throughout the life of the structures. Water retained next to the buildings



can result in soil movements greater than those discussed in this report. Greater movements can result in unacceptable differential floor slab and/or foundation movements, cracked slabs and walls, and roof leaks. The roofs should have gutters/drains with downspouts that discharge onto splash blocks at a distance of at least 10 feet from the buildings.

Exposed ground should be sloped and maintained at a minimum 5% away from the buildings for at least 10 feet beyond the perimeter of the buildings. Locally, flatter grades may be necessary to transition ADA access requirements for flatwork. After building construction and landscaping have been completed, final grades should be verified to document effective drainage has been achieved. Grades around the structures should also be periodically inspected and adjusted, as necessary, as part of the structures' maintenance program. Where paving or flatwork abuts the structures, a maintenance program should be established to effectively seal and maintain joints and prevent surface water infiltration.

#### Earthwork Construction Considerations

Shallow excavations for the proposed structures are anticipated to be accomplished with conventional construction equipment. Upon completion of filling and grading, care should be taken to maintain the subgrade water content prior to construction of floor slabs. Construction traffic over the completed subgrades should be avoided. The site should also be graded to prevent ponding of surface water on the prepared subgrades or in excavations. Water collecting over or adjacent to construction areas should be removed. If the subgrade desiccates, saturates, or is disturbed, the affected material should be removed, or the materials should be scarified, moisture conditioned, and recompacted prior to floor slab construction.

As a minimum, excavations should be performed in accordance with OSHA 29 CFR, Part 1926, Subpart P, "Excavations" and its appendices, and in accordance with any applicable local, and/or state regulations.

Construction site safety is the sole responsibility of the contractor who controls the means, methods, and sequencing of construction operations. Under no circumstances shall the information provided herein be interpreted to mean Terracon is assuming responsibility for construction site safety, or the contractor's activities; such responsibility shall neither be implied nor inferred.

#### **Construction Observation and Testing**

The earthwork efforts should be monitored under the direction of the Geotechnical Engineer. Monitoring should include documentation of adequate removal of vegetation and topsoil, proofrolling, and mitigation of areas delineated by the proofroll to require mitigation.

Each lift of compacted fill should be tested, evaluated, and reworked, as necessary, until approved by the Geotechnical Engineer prior to placement of additional lifts. Each lift of fill should be tested



for density and water content at a frequency of at least one test for every 1,500 square feet of compacted fill in the building areas and 2,500 square feet in pavement areas. One density and water content test should be performed for every 12-inch thick lift for every 50 linear feet of compacted utility trench backfill.

In areas of foundation excavations, the bearing subgrade should be evaluated under the direction of the Geotechnical Engineer. If unanticipated conditions are encountered, the Geotechnical Engineer should prescribe mitigation options.

In addition to the documentation of the essential parameters necessary for construction, the continuation of the Geotechnical Engineer into the construction phase of the project provides the continuity to maintain the Geotechnical Engineer's evaluation of subsurface conditions, including assessing variations and associated design changes.

# SHALLOW FOUNDATIONS

If the site has been prepared in accordance with the requirements noted in **Earthwork**, the following design parameters are applicable for shallow foundations. Foundations for the relocatable buildings may be designed in accordance with the following recommendations.

Item	Description	
Maximum Net Allowable Bearing pressure <sup>1, 2</sup>	2,000 psf	
Required Bearing Stratum <sup>3</sup>	18 inches of compacted native soil or non-expansive engineered fill	
Minimum Foundation Dimensions	Columns: 36 inches Continuous: 12 inches	
Maximum Foundation Dimensions	Columns: 60 inches Continuous: 36 inches	
Ultimate Passive Resistance <sup>4</sup> (equivalent fluid pressures)	350 pcf	
Ultimate Coefficient of Sliding Friction <sup>5</sup>	0.40	
Minimum Embedment below Finished Grade <sup>6</sup>	12 inches	
Estimated Total Settlement from Structural Loads <sup>2</sup>	Less than about 1 inch	
Estimated Differential Settlement <sup>2, 7</sup>	About 1/2 of total settlement	

#### **Building Design Parameters – Compressive Loads**

#### **Geotechnical Engineering Report** Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project Acampo, California December 14, 2018 Terracon Project No. NA185174



	Item	Description	
1.	<ol> <li>The maximum net allowable bearing pressure is the pressure in excess of the minimum surrounding overburden pressure at the footing base elevation. An appropriate factor of safety has been applied. Values assume that exterior grades are relatively flat adjacent to the structure.</li> </ol>		
2.	2. Values provided are for maximum loads noted in Project Description.		
3.	3. Unsuitable or soft soils should be over-excavated and replaced per the recommendations presented in the Earthwork.		
4.	Use of passive earth pressures require th nearly vertical and the concrete placed removed and compacted structural fill be	e sides of the excavation for the spread footing foundation to be neat against these vertical faces or that the footing forms be placed against the vertical footing face.	
5.	Can be used to compute sliding resistance be neglected for foundations subject to n friction to resist lateral movement, the coe	e where foundations are placed on suitable soil/materials. Should et uplift conditions. If passive resistance is combined with base efficient of sliding friction should be reduced by 25 percent.	
6.	Embedment necessary to minimize the e maintain depth below the lowest adjacent	ffects of seasonal water content variations. For sloping ground, exterior grade within 5 horizontal feet of the structure.	
7.	Differential settlements are as measured	over a span of 40 feet.	

#### **Foundation Construction Considerations**

As noted in **Earthwork**, the footing excavations should be evaluated under the direction of the Geotechnical Engineer. The base of all foundation excavations should be free of water and loose soil, prior to placing foundations. The foundations should be placed soon after excavating to reduce bearing soil disturbance. Care should be taken to prevent wetting or drying of the bearing materials during construction. Excessively wet or dry material or any loose/disturbed material in the bottom of the footing excavations should be removed/reconditioned before foundations are placed.

If unsuitable bearing soils are encountered at the base of the planned footing excavation, the excavation should be extended deeper to suitable soils, and the footings could bear directly on these soils at the lower level or on lean concrete backfill placed in the excavations. This is illustrated on the sketch below.





Over-excavation for structural fill placement below footings should be conducted as shown below. The over-excavation should be backfilled up to the footing base elevation with engineered fill placed as recommended in the **Earthwork** section.



To ensure foundations have adequate support, special care should be taken when footings are located adjacent to trenches. The bottom of such footings should be at least 1 foot below an imaginary plane with an inclination of 1.5 horizontal to 1.0 vertical extending upward from the nearest edge of the adjacent trench.

## FIRE WATER TANK FOUNDATIONS

If the site has been prepared in accordance with the requirements noted in **Earthwork**, the following design parameters are applicable for the tank mat foundation. The mat slab foundation for the fire water tank may be designed in accordance with the following recommendations.

Building Desigr	Parameters -	<b>Compressive Loads</b>
-----------------	--------------	--------------------------

Item	Description
Maximum Net Allowable Bearing pressure <sup>1, 2</sup>	1,500 psf
Required Bearing Stratum <sup>3</sup>	18 inches of compacted native soil
Mat Slab Foundation Support	12 inches compacted Class 2 aggregate base
Ultimate Passive Resistance <sup>4</sup> (equivalent fluid pressures)	350 pcf
Ultimate Coefficient of Sliding Friction <sup>5</sup>	0.40
Minimum Embedment below Finished Grade <sup>6</sup>	12 inches

#### **Geotechnical Engineering Report**

Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project Acampo, California December 14, 2018 Terracon Project No. NA185174



	Item	Description	
Estimated Total Settlement from Structural Loads <sup>2</sup> Less than about 1 i		Less than about 1 inch	
Estimated Differential Settlement <sup>2, 7</sup> About ½ of total settlement		About 1/2 of total settlement	
<ol> <li>The maximum net allowable bearing pressure is the pressure in excess of the minimum surrounding overburden pressure at the footing base elevation. An appropriate factor of safety has been applied. Values assume that exterior grades are relatively flat adjacent to the structure.</li> </ol>			
2.	Values provided are for maximum loads noted in Project Description.		
3.	Unsuitable or soft soils should be over-excavated and replaced per the recommendations presented in the Earthwork.		
4.	4. Use of passive earth pressures require the sides of the excavation for the mat slab foundation to be nearly vertical and the concrete placed neat against these vertical faces or that the footing forms be removed and compacted structural fill be placed against the vertical footing face.		
5.	Can be used to compute sliding resistance be neglected for foundations subject to n friction to resist lateral movement, the coe	e where foundations are placed on suitable soil/materials. Should et uplift conditions. If passive resistance is combined with base officient of sliding friction should be reduced by 25 percent.	

- 6. Embedment necessary to minimize the effects of seasonal water content variations. For sloping ground, maintain depth below the lowest adjacent exterior grade within 5 horizontal feet of the structure.
- 7. Differential settlements are as measured over a span of 40 feet.

### SEISMIC CONSIDERATIONS

The seismic design requirements for the project are based on Seismic Design Category. Site Classification is required to determine the Seismic Design Category for a structure. The Site Classification is based on the upper 100 feet of the site profile defined by a weighted average value of either shear wave velocity, standard penetration resistance, or undrained shear strength in accordance with Section 20.4 of ASCE 7-10.

#### **Geotechnical Engineering Report**

Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project Acampo, California December 14, 2018 - Terracon Project No. NA185174

Description	Value
2016 California Building Code Site Classification (CBC) <sup>1</sup>	D <sup>2</sup>
Site Latitude	38.1743° N
Site Longitude	121.2604° W
$S_s$ Spectral Acceleration for a Short Period	0.703g
S1 Spectral Acceleration for a 1-Second Period	0.291g
Fa Site Coefficient for a Short Period	1.238
$F_v$ Site Coefficient for a 1-Second Period	1.819
$S_{\ensuremath{Ms}}$ Maximum Considered Spectral Response Acceleration for a Short Period	0.870g
$S_{\ensuremath{M1}\xspace}$ Maximum Considered Spectral Response Acceleration for a 1-Second Period	0.529g
S <sub>DS</sub> Design Spectral Acceleration for a Short Period <sup>3</sup>	0.580g

 S<sub>D1</sub> Spectral Acceleration for a 1-Second Period <sup>3</sup>
 0.352g

 PGA<sub>M</sub> Peak Ground Acceleration
 0.317g

1. Seismic site classification in general accordance with the 2016 California Building Code, which refers to ASCE 7-10 with March 2013 errata.

- 2. The 2016 California Building Code (CBC) uses a site profile extending to a depth of 100 feet for seismic site classification. Borings at this site were extended to a maximum depth of 11½ feet. The site properties below the boring depth to 100 feet were estimated based on our experience and knowledge of geologic conditions of the general area. Additional deeper borings or geophysical testing may be performed to confirm the conditions below the current boring depth.
- 3. These values were obtained using online seismic design maps and tools provided by the USGS (<u>http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/designmaps/</u>).

# LIQUEFACTION

Liquefaction is a mode of ground failure that results from the generation of high pore water pressures during earthquake ground shaking, causing loss of shear strength. Liquefaction is typically a hazard where loose sandy soils or non-plastic fine-grained soils exist below groundwater. The California Geologic Survey (CGS) has designated certain areas within California as potential liquefaction hazard zones. These are areas considered at a risk of liquefaction-related ground failure during a seismic event, based upon mapped surficial deposits and the presence of a relatively shallow water table. The project site is not located within a liquefaction hazard zone mapped by the CGS.

Due to the historical "high" depth to groundwater being greater than 50 feet below the existing grade, in our opinion the potential for liquefaction to occur at this site is low. Accordingly, potential other effects of liquefaction, such as lateral spreading, etc. are low.

erracon

GeoReport



Given the relative density of the soils encountered in our borings, the potential for dry sand settlement to occur and negatively affect the buildings is considered low and not a concern in the design of these buildings.

# **FLOOR SUPPORT**

#### **Floor Support Design Parameters**

Item	Description					
Floor Slab Support <sup>1</sup>	Minimum 4 inches of free-draining (less than 6% passing the U.S. No. 200 sieve) crushed drain rock.					
	t least 12 inches of compacted native soil or engineered fill					
Estimated Modulus of Subgrade Reaction <sup>2</sup>	150 pounds per square inch per inch (psi/in) for point loads					
1. Floor slabs should b slab cracking cause	be structurally independent of building footings or walls to reduce the possibility of floor dynamics of dynamics of the stab and foundation.					
2. Modulus of subgrace condition, the requi	de reaction is an estimated value based upon our experience with the subgrade rements noted in Earthwork, and the floor slab support as noted in this table. It is					

The use of a vapor retarder should be considered beneath concrete slabs on grade covered with wood, tile, carpet, or other moisture sensitive or impervious coverings, or when the slab will support equipment sensitive to moisture. When conditions warrant the use of a vapor retarder, the slab designer should refer to ACI 302 and/or ACI 360 for procedures and cautions regarding the use and placement of a vapor retarder.

provided for point loads. For large area loads the modulus of subgrade reaction would be lower.

Saw-cut control joints should be placed in the slab to help control the location and extent of cracking. For additional recommendations refer to the ACI Design Manual. Joints or cracks should be sealed with a water-proof, non-extruding compressible compound specifically recommended for heavy duty concrete pavement and wet environments.

Where floor slabs are tied to perimeter walls or turn-down slabs to meet structural or other construction objectives, our experience indicates differential movement between the walls and slabs will likely be observed in adjacent slab expansion joints or floor slab cracks beyond the length of the structural dowels. The Structural Engineer should account for potential differential settlement through use of sufficient control joints, appropriate reinforcing or other means.

#### Floor Slab Construction Considerations

Finished subgrade, within and for at least 10 feet beyond the floor slab, should be protected from traffic, rutting, or other disturbance and maintained in a relatively moist condition until floor slabs are constructed. If the subgrade should become damaged or desiccated prior to construction of floor



slabs, the affected material should be removed, and structural fill should be added to replace the resulting excavation. Final conditioning of the finished subgrade should be performed immediately prior to placement of the floor slab support course.

The Geotechnical Engineer should approve the condition of the floor slab subgrades immediately prior to placement of the floor slab support course, reinforcing steel, and concrete. Attention should be paid to high traffic areas that were rutted and disturbed earlier, and to areas where backfilled trenches are located.

### PAVEMENTS

#### **General Pavement Comments**

Pavement designs are provided for the traffic conditions and pavement life conditions as noted in **Project Description** and in the following sections of this report. A critical aspect of pavement performance is site preparation. Pavement designs, noted in this section, must be applied to the site, which has been prepared as recommended in the **Earthwork** section.

#### **Pavement Design Parameters**

Design of Asphaltic Concrete (AC) pavements are based on the procedures in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, 2012 edition. Design of Portland Cement Concrete (PCC) pavements are based upon American Concrete Institute (ACI) 330R-01; Guide for Design and Construction of Concrete Parking Lots.

One sample of the near surface soils was obtained from the proposed expanded parking lot and bus lane area and tested to determine its Resistance Value (R-value). The test produced an R-value of 30. A design R-value of 30 was used for the AC and PCC pavement designs. We are providing pavement recommendations for traffic indices (TI) between 5.0 and 7.5. If different traffic loading or traffic index is required, our office shall be contacted to prepare additional pavement sections. The project civil engineer should be afforded the opportunity to determine the most appropriate traffic index (TI) for the project.

#### **Pavement Section Thicknesses**

The following table provides options for AC and PCC Sections:

#### **Geotechnical Engineering Report**

Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project Acampo, California December 14, 2018 Terracon Project No. NA185174



Conventional Asphaltic Concrete Design											
	Thickness (inches)										
Layer	TI=5.0 <sup>1</sup>	TI=7.5 <sup>1</sup>									
AC <sup>2</sup>	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5							
Aggregate Base	5.5	7.5	9.5	10.5							

1. See <u>Project Description</u> for more specifics regarding traffic classifications.

2. All materials should meet the current California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standard Specifications, latest edition.

Portland Cement Concrete Design											
	Thickness (inches)										
Layer	TI=5.0 <sup>1</sup>	TI=7.5 <sup>1</sup>									
PCC	5.0	5.0	5.5	6.0							
Aggregate Base	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0							

1. See <u>Project Description</u> for more specifics regarding traffic classifications.

2. All materials should meet the current California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standard Specifications, latest edition.

The estimated pavement sections provided in this report are minimums for the assumed design criteria, and as such, periodic maintenance should be expected. Areas for parking of heavy vehicles, concentrated turn areas, and start/stop maneuvers could require thicker pavement sections. Edge restraints (i.e. concrete curbs or aggregate shoulders) should be planned along curves and areas of maneuvering vehicles. A maintenance program including surface sealing, joint cleaning and sealing, and timely repair of cracks and deteriorated areas will increase the pavement's service life. As an option, thicker sections could be constructed to decrease future maintenance.

Concrete for rigid pavements should have a minimum 28-day compressive strength of 4,000 psi and be placed with a maximum slump of 4 inches. Although not required for structural support, a minimum 4-inch thick base course layer is recommended to help reduce potential for slab curl, shrinkage cracking, and subgrade pumping through joints. Proper joint spacing will also be required to prevent excessive slab curling and shrinkage cracking. Joints should be sealed to prevent entry of foreign material and dowelled where necessary for load transfer.



Where practical, we recommend early-entry cutting of crack-control joints in PCC pavements. Cutting of the concrete in its "green" state typically reduces the potential for micro-cracking of the pavements prior to the crack control joints being formed, compared to cutting the joints after the concrete has fully set. Micro-cracking of pavements may lead to crack formation in locations other than the sawed joints, and/or reduction of fatigue life of the pavement.

Pavement design methods are intended to provide structural sections with adequate thickness over a subgrade such that wheel loads are reduced to a level the subgrade can support.

Openings in pavements, such as decorative landscaped areas, are sources for water infiltration into surrounding pavement systems. Water can collect in the islands and migrate into the surrounding subgrade soils thereby degrading support of the pavement. This is especially applicable for islands with raised concrete curbs, irrigated foliage, and low permeability near-surface soils. The civil design for the pavements with these conditions should include features to restrict or to collect and discharge excess water from the islands. Examples of features are edge drains connected to the storm water collection system, longitudinal subdrains, or other suitable outlet and impermeable barriers preventing lateral migration of water such as a cutoff wall installed to a depth below the pavement structure.

Dishing in parking lots surfaced with ACC is usually observed in frequently-used parking stalls (such as near the front of buildings) and occurs under the wheel footprint in these stalls. The use of higher-grade asphaltic cement, or surfacing these areas with PCC, should be considered. The dishing is exacerbated by factors such as irrigated islands or planter areas, sheet surface drainage to the front of structures, and placing the ACC directly on a compacted clay subgrade.

Rigid PCC pavements will perform better than ACC in areas where short-radii turning and braking are expected (i.e. entrance/exit aprons) due to better resistance to rutting and shoving. In addition, PCC pavement will perform better in areas subject to large or sustained loads. An adequate number of longitudinal and transverse control joints should be placed in the rigid pavement in accordance with ACI and/or AASHTO requirements. Expansion (isolation) joints must be full depth and should only be used to isolate fixed objects abutting or within the paved area.

PCC pavement details for joint spacing, joint reinforcement, and joint sealing should be prepared in accordance with American Concrete Institute (ACI 330R-01 and ACI 325R.9-91). PCC pavements should be provided with mechanically reinforced joints (doweled or keyed) in accordance with ACI 330R-01.

#### **Pavement Drainage**

Pavements should be sloped to provide rapid drainage of surface water. Water allowed to pond on or adjacent to the pavements could saturate the subgrade and contribute to premature



pavement deterioration. In addition, the pavement subgrade should be graded to provide positive drainage within the granular base section. Appropriate sub-drainage or connection to a suitable daylight outlet should be provided to remove water from the granular subbase.

The pavement surfacing and adjacent sidewalks should be sloped to provide rapid drainage of surface water. Water should not be allowed to pond on or adjacent to these grade-supported slabs, since this could saturate the subgrade and contribute to premature pavement or slab deterioration.

The pavement surfacing and adjacent sidewalks should be sloped to provide rapid drainage of surface water. Water should not be allowed to pond on or adjacent to t slabs, since it could saturate the subgrade and contribute to premature pavement or slab deterioration.

#### **Pavement Maintenance**

The pavement sections represent minimum recommended thicknesses and, as such, periodic maintenance should be anticipated. Therefore, preventive maintenance should be planned and provided for through an on-going pavement management program. Maintenance activities are intended to slow the rate of pavement deterioration and to preserve the pavement investment. Maintenance consists of both localized maintenance (e.g. crack and joint sealing and patching) and global maintenance (e.g. surface sealing). Preventive maintenance is usually the priority when implementing a pavement maintenance program. Additional engineering observation is recommended to determine the type and extent of a cost-effective program. Even with periodic maintenance, some movements and related cracking may still occur and repairs may be required.

Pavement performance is affected by its surroundings. In addition to providing preventive maintenance, the civil engineer should consider the following recommendations in the design and layout of pavements:

- Final grade adjacent to paved areas should slope down from the edges at a minimum 2%.
- Subgrade and pavement surfaces should have a minimum 2% slope to promote proper surface drainage.
- Install below pavement drainage systems surrounding areas anticipated for frequent wetting.
- Install joint sealant and seal cracks immediately.
- Seal all landscaped areas in or adjacent to pavements to reduce moisture migration to subgrade soils.
- Place compacted, low permeability backfill against the exterior side of curb and gutter.



# CORROSIVITY

The table below lists the results of laboratory soluble sulfate, soluble chloride, electrical resistivity, and pH testing performed on one sample obtained from boring B2 at a depth of 1 foot. The values may be used to estimate potential corrosive characteristics of the on-site soils with respect to contact with the various underground materials which will be used for project construction.

Corrosivity Test Results Summary									
Boring	Sample Depth (feet)	Soil Description	Soluble Sulfate (ppm)	Soluble Chloride (ppm)	Electrical Resistivity (Ω-cm)	рН			
B4	1-2½	Silty Sand	63	88	10670	8.63			

The sulfate test results indicate that the soil from boring B2 classifies as Class S0 according to Table 19.3.1.1 of ACI 318-14. This indicates that the sulfate level is negligible when considering corrosion to concrete.

The chloride test results indicate that the soils have a relatively low chloride content present. According to Table 19.3.1.1 of ACI 318-14, the soil should not be considered an external source of chloride (i.e. sea water, etc.) to concrete foundations. Consequently, chloride classes of C0 and C1 should be used where applicable. C0 is defined as, "Concrete dry or protected from moisture" and C1 is defined as, "Concrete exposed to moisture but not to an external source of chlorides". For the amount of chlorides allowed in concrete mix designs, Table 19.3.2.1 of ACI 318-14 shall be adhered to as appropriate.

Based on the results of the sulfate content test results, ACI 318-14, Section 19.3 does not specify the type of cement or a maximum water-cement ratio for concrete for sulfate Class S0. For further information, see ACI 318-14, Section 19.3.

## **GENERAL COMMENTS**

Our analysis and opinions are based upon our understanding of the project, the geotechnical conditions in the area, and the data obtained from our site exploration. Natural variations will occur between exploration point locations or due to the modifying effects of construction or weather. The nature and extent of such variations may not become evident until during or after construction. Terracon should be retained as the Geotechnical Engineer, where noted in this report, to provide observation and testing services during pertinent construction phases. If variations appear, we can provide further evaluation and supplemental recommendations. If variations are noted in the absence of our observation and testing services on-site, we should be immediately notified so that we can provide evaluation and supplemental recommendations.



Our Scope of Services does not include either specifically or by implication any environmental or biological (e.g., mold, fungi, bacteria) assessment of the site or identification or prevention of pollutants, hazardous materials or conditions. If the owner is concerned about the potential for such contamination or pollution, other studies should be undertaken.

Our services and any correspondence or collaboration through this system are intended for the sole benefit and exclusive use of our client for specific application to the project discussed and are accomplished in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practices with no third-party beneficiaries intended. Any third-party access to services or correspondence is solely for information purposes to support the services provided by Terracon to our client. Reliance upon the services and any work product is limited to our client and is not intended for third parties. Any use or reliance of the provided information by third parties is done solely at their own risk. No warranties, either express or implied, are intended or made.

Site characteristics as provided are for design purposes and not to estimate excavation cost. Any use of our report in that regard is done at the sole risk of the excavating cost estimator as there may be variations on the site that are not apparent in the data that could significantly impact excavation cost. Any parties charged with estimating excavation costs should seek their own site characterization for specific purposes to obtain the specific level of detail necessary for costing. Site safety, and cost estimating including, excavation support, and dewatering requirements/design are the responsibility of others. If changes in the nature, design, or location of the project are planned, our conclusions and recommendations shall not be considered valid unless we review the changes and either verify or modify our conclusions in writing.

ATTACHMENTS



# **EXPLORATION AND TESTING PROCEDURES**

#### **Field Exploration**

Number of Borings	Boring Depth (feet)	Planned Location
5	11½	Planned building and water tank areas
1	6 ½	Planned parking lot expansion and bus lane area

**Boring Layout and Elevations:** Unless otherwise noted, Terracon personnel provided the boring layout. Coordinates were obtained with a handheld GPS unit (estimated horizontal accuracy of about  $\pm 10$  feet) and approximate elevations were obtained by interpolation from Google Earth<sup>TM</sup> aerial photos. If elevations and a more precise boring layout are desired, we recommend borings be surveyed.

**Subsurface Exploration Procedures:** We advanced the borings with a truck-mounted rotary drill rig using continuous flight hollow stem augers. Samples were obtained at depths of 1 and 5 feet and at intervals of 5 feet thereafter. In the split-barrel sampling procedure, a 2.5-inch outer diameter split-barrel sampling spoon was driven into the ground by a 140-pound automatic hammer falling a distance of 30 inches. The number of blows required to advance the sampling spoon the last 12 inches of a normal 18-inch penetration was recorded as the blow counts. Tube-lined, split-barrel sampling procedures are similar to standard split spoon (SPT) sampling procedure; however, blow counts are not equivalent to SPT blow counts. We observed and recorded groundwater levels during drilling and sampling. For safety purposes, all borings were backfilled with auger cuttings or neat cement grout after their completion.

The sampling depths, penetration distances, and other sampling information was recorded on the field boring logs. The samples were placed in appropriate containers and taken to our soil laboratory for testing and classification by a Geotechnical Engineer. Our exploration team prepared field boring logs as part of the drilling operations. These field logs included visual classifications of the materials encountered during drilling and our interpretation of the subsurface conditions between samples. Final boring logs were prepared from the field logs. The final boring logs represent the Geotechnical Engineer's interpretation of the field logs and include modifications based on observations and tests of the samples in our laboratory.

#### Laboratory Testing

The project engineer reviewed the field data and assigned laboratory tests to understand the engineering properties of the various soil strata, as necessary, for this project. Procedural standards noted below are for reference to methodology in general. In some cases, variations to methods were applied because of local practice or professional judgment. Standards noted below



include reference to other, related standards. Such references are not necessarily applicable to describe the specific test performed.

- ASTM D2216 Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass
- ASTM D4318 Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils
- ASTM D1140 Standard Test Method for Determining the Amount of Material Finer than No. 200 Sieve by Soil Washing
- Corrosivity Test

The laboratory testing program included examination of soil samples by an engineer. Based on the material's texture and plasticity, we described and classified the soil samples in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System.

# SITE LOCATION AND EXPLORATION PLANS

### Contents:

Site Location Plan Exploration Plan

Note: All attachments are one page unless noted above.

#### SITE LOCATION

Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project 
Acampo, California
December 14, 2018
Terracon Project No. NA185174





#### **EXPLORATION PLAN**

Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project 
Acampo, California
December 14, 2018 
Terracon Project No. NA185174





DIAGRAM IS FOR GENERAL LOCATION ONLY, AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES

MAP PROVIDED BY MICROSOFT BING MAPS

# **EXPLORATION RESULTS**

#### **Contents:**

Boring Logs (B-1 through B-6) Resistance Value Test Result Corrosivity Test Results

Note: All attachments are one page unless noted above.

			BORING L	OG NC	). B′	1			F	Page 1 of	1
PR	OJECT:	Houston Middle School Relo Buildings Project	ocatable	CLIENT:	Lodi Lodi,	Unifie CA	d School Distric	t		-	
SIT	E:	4600 Acampo Road Acampo, CA			·						
GRAPHIC LOG	LOCATIO Latitude: 38	N See Exploration Plan 3.1745° Longitude: -121.26°	Approximate Surface E	Elev: 62 (Ft.) +/-	DEPTH (Ft.)	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS	FIELD TEST RESULTS	WATER CONTENT (%)	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pcf)	Atterberg Limits	PERCENT FINES
	SILT	Y SAND (SM), fine to medium grained	, brown, loose								
					-	-	3-3-4	9	113		
					-	-					
	light	brown, medium dense		55.5+/	5 -		5-6-6	8	113		
	Stratificati	on lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition	may be gradual.			Hami	ner Type: Automatic				
Advan	cement Met	nod:	See Exploration and Te	stina Procedure	s for a	Notes	:				
6" H Aband Bori	onment Met	Auger nod: I with soil cuttings upon completion.	description of field and I used and additional data See Supporting Informa symbols and abbreviation Elevations estimated us	laboratory proce a (If any). ition for explana ons. sing Google Earl	tion of						
	WATE	ER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS				Boring	Started: 11-02-2018	Borir	ng Com	pleted: 11-02-	2018
	Groundv	vater not encountered		900		Drill Ria: CME-75 Driller: R Anderson			nderson		
	902 Industrial Way Lodi, CA			strial Way i, CA		Project No.: NA185174					

				BORING L	OG NC	). B2	2				F	Page 1 of <sup>2</sup>	1
	PR	OJECT:	Houston Middle School Reloc	atable	CLIENT:	Lodi Lodi	Unifi CA	ed	School Distrie	ct		-	
	SI	ſE:	4600 Acampo Road Acampo, CA			Loui,	0/1						
	GRAPHIC LOG	LOCATION	See Exploration Plan 1743° Longitude: -121.2604°	Approximate Surface E	Elev: 62 (Ft.) +/-	DEPTH (Ft.)	NATER LEVEL BSERVATIONS	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD TEST RESULTS	WATER CONTENT (%)	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pcf)	Atterberg Limits LL-PL-PI	ERCENT FINES
		DEPTH	<b>PY SILT (ML)</b> , fine to medium grained, b	El prown, very loose	LEVATION (Ft.)		-0	0		_			
r 12/10/18						-	_	V	2-1-2	14	117		
L_DATATEMPLATE.GD1						-	_						
UIL.GPJ TERRACON		. mediu	um dense, rust mottling			5 -	_	X	2-4-4	16	114	NP	61
RELOCATABLES B			<u>∕ SAND (SM)</u> , fine to medium grained, c ∋ to weakly cemented	orange brown, mediu	54+/- m	-	_						
10 WELL NA185174						10-	_						
RT LOG-N		11.5			50 5+/-	-	-	À	11-44-50/4"	12	122		
M ORIGINAL REPORT. GEO SMA	<u></u>	Borin	g Terminated at 11.5 Feet			-							
ARATED FRC		Stratificatio	on lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition m	ay be gradual.			Har	nmer	Type: Automatic				
NOT VALID IF SEP,	Advan 6" H Aband	Icement Methodology Andread An Andread Andread And	od: od:	See Exploration and Te description of field and l used and additional data See Supporting Informa symbols and abbreviation	sting Procedures laboratory proce a (If any). tion for explanat ons.	s for a dures ion of	Note	es:					
LOG IS	con	ng backfilled npletion.		Elevations estimated us	ing Google Eart	h		. 61					0010
BORING		Groundw	ater not encountered	ller	900	Π	Borinç Drill F	y Star Rig: C	ME-75	Drill	er: R. A	pieted: 11-02- nderson	2018
THIS				902 Indus Lodi	sulai Way i, CA		Projec	ct No.	: NA185174				

			BORING L	OG NC	). B3	3				F	Page 1 of 2	1
PR	OJECT:	Houston Middle School Reloca Buildings Project	atable	CLIENT:	Lodi Lodi,	Unifi CA	ied S	School Distrie	ct			
SIT	ſE:	4600 Acampo Road Acampo, CA										
GRAPHIC LOG	LOCATION	V See Exploration Plan .1743° Longitude: -121.2601°	Approximate Surface E	ilev: 62 (Ft.) +/-	DEPTH (Ft.)	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD TEST RESULTS	WATER CONTENT (%)	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pcf)	Atterberg Limits LL-PL-PI	PERCENT FINES
	SAN	DY SILT (ML), fine to medium grained, b	rown, loose									
					-	-		3-3-4	9	103		55
						-						
	medi	um dense			-	-	M	4-7-7	13	107		
	light l	prown, rust mottling			-							
	8.5 SILT rust n	<u><b>′ SAND (SM)</b></u> , fine to medium grained, b nottling	rown, medium dense	53.5+/ e,	-	_						
	11.5			50.5+/	10 -	-		8-18-24	14	118		
	Borir	ng Terminated at 11.5 Feet										
	Stratificatio	on lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition ma	ay be gradual.			Har	mmer	Iype: Automatic				
Advan 6" H	cement Meth Iollow Stem A	od: Auger	See Exploration and Tes description of field and la used and additional data See Supporting Informat	sting Procedure aboratory proce a (If any). tion for explanat	s for a dures tion of	Note	es:					
Abandonment Method: Boring backfilled with cement-bentonite grout upon completion.			h									
	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS Groundwater not encountered		Boring Started: 11-02-2018 Boring Completed: 11-02			oleted: 11-02-2	2018					
						Drill Rig: CME-75 Driller: R. Anderson						
			902 Indus Lodi	strial Way , CA		Proje	ct No.:	NA185174				

	BORING LOG NO. B4 Page 1 of 1											
PR	OJECT:	Houston Middle School Reloc Buildings Project	atable	CLIENT:	Lodi Lodi,	Unifi CA	ied	School Distric	ct			
SIT	ſE:	4600 Acampo Road Acampo, CA										
GRAPHIC LOG	LOCATION	See Exploration Plan 1743° Longitude: -121.2599°	Surface	e Elev.: 62 (Ft.)	DEPTH (Ft.)	WATER LEVEL DBSERVATIONS	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD TEST RESULTS	WATER CONTENT (%)	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pcf)	ATTERBERG LIMITS LL-PL-PI	PERCENT FINES
	DEPTH	<u>/ SAND (SM)</u> , fine to medium grained, b	EL prown, very loose	EVATION (Ft.)			0,					а.
					-	-		2-1-2	12	106		
					- 5 -	-						
	very l	oose			-	-		1-1-2	14	114		
	mediu	um dense		50.5	10-	-		3-3-6	18			
	Bonn	g Terminaleu al TI.S Feel										
Stratification lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition may be gradual.					Hai	mmer	Type: Automatic					
Advan 6" H Aband Bori com	Icement Meth Hollow Stem A Ionment Meth ing backfilled	od: Auger od: with cement-bentonite grout upon	See Exploration and Tee description of field and la used and additional data See Supporting Informal symbols and abbreviatio Elevations estimated us	sting Procedures aboratory proce a (If any). tion for explanat ons. ing Google Eart	o for a dures ion of	Note	es:					
	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS		_	Borin	g Star	ted: 11-02-2018	Borir	ng Com	oleted: 11-02-2	2018		
	Groundwater not encountered		900	Π	Drill Rig: CME-75 Driller: R. Anderson			nderson				
	902 Industrial Way Lodi, CA			strial Way , CA		Proje	ct No.	: NA185174				

			BORING L	OG NC	). B	5				F	Page 1 of	1
PF	ROJECT:	Houston Middle School Re Buildings Project	locatable	CLIENT:	Lodi Lodi,	Unifi CA	ed S	chool Distr	ict		-	
SI	TE:	4600 Acampo Road Acampo, CA										
GRAPHIC LOG	LOCATION Latitude: 38 DEPTH SILT	N See Exploration Plan .1743° Longitude: -121.2596° <u>Y SAND (SM)</u> , fine to medium grain	Approximate Surface B El ed, brown, loose	Elev: 62 (Ft.) +/- LEVATION (Ft.)	DEPTH (Ft.)	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD TEST RESULTS	WATER CONTENT (%)	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pcf)	ATTERBERG LIMITS LL-PL-PI	PERCENT FINES
Т 12/10/18					-	_		2-2-2	15	99		
LATE.GD	3.5			58.5+/								
0N_DATATEMF	rust r	DY <u>SILT (ML)</u> , fine to medium grain nottling	ed, light tan, medium der	nse,	-							
JIL.GPJ TERRACC					- 5	_		12-21-15	25	94		
185174 RELOCATABLES BI	8.0 SILT mottli dense	<u>Y SAND (SM)</u> , fine to medium grain ing e to weakly cemented	ed, orange brown, rust	54+/		-						
RT LOG-NO WELL NA	11.5			50.5+/	10-	-		9-22-43	14	122		
FROM ORIGINAL REPORT. GEO SMA	Borir	ng Terminated at 11.5 Feet										
ARATED F	Stratificatio	on lines are approximate. In-situ, the transiti	on may be gradual.			Han	nmer T	ype: Automatic				
Adva 6" Aban Bo col	ncement Meth Hollow Stem / donment Meth rring backfilled mpletion.	iod: Auger nod: with cement-bentonite grout upon	See Exploration and Te description of field and used and additional dat See Supporting Informa symbols and abbreviati Elevations estimated us	sting Procedure laboratory proce a (If any). ation for explanations. sing Google Eart	s for a dures tion of th	Note	IS:					
	WATE Groundw	R LEVEL OBSERVATIONS				Boring	g Starte	d: 11-02-2018	Borii	ng Com	pleted: 11-02-	2018
THIS BOF			902 Indu Lod	Strial Way		Drill R Projec	tig: CM	E-75 NA185174	Drill	er: R. A	nderson	

	BORING LOG NO. B6 Page 1 of 1											
PR	OJECT:	Houston Middle School Reloc Buildings Project	atable	CLIENT:	Lodi U Lodi,	Unifi CA	ied	School Distric	ct			
SIT	E:	4600 Acampo Road Acampo, CA										
GRAPHIC LOG	LOCATION	See Exploration Plan 1735° Longitude: -121.2603°	Surface	e Elev.: 62 (Ft.)	DEPTH (Ft.)	VATER LEVEL BSERVATIONS	AMPLE TYPE	FIELD TEST RESULTS	WATER CONTENT (%)	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pcf)	ATTERBERG LIMITS LL-PL-PI	ERCENT FINES
	DEPTH SILTY	<b>′ SAND (SM)</b> , fine to medium grained, b	EL prown, medium dense	EVATION (Ft.) e		-0	ω					Ē
					-	-		5-5-4	9	115		44
					-	-						
					5-	-		8-8-10	6	111		
	mediu	im dense			-	_						
					_	-						
	orang 11.5	e brown, medium dense		50.5	10-	-		7-9-11	11	113		
	Borin	g Terminated at 11.5 Feet										
Stratification lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition may be gradual.				Har	mmer	Type: Automatic						
Advancement Method: 6" Hollow Stem Auger See Exploration and Testing Procedure description of field and laboratory proce used and additional data (If any).			for a dures	Note	es:							
Abandonment Method:         See Supporting Information for explanation           Boring backfilled with cement-bentonite grout upon completion.         See Supporting Information for explanation			וט ווט ז				-					
	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS Groundwater not encountered				Boring Started: 11-02-2018 Boring Completed: 11-02-20				2018			
			902 Indus			Drill Rig: CME-75 Driller: R. Anderson						
			Lodi	, CA		Proje	ct No.	: NA185174				







Terracon Consultants, Inc. 902 Industrial Way Lodi, California P [209] 367 3701 F [209] 333 8303 terracon.com

### **CHEMICAL LABORATORY TEST REPORT**

 Project Number:
 NA185174

 Service Date:
 12/13/18

 Report Date:
 12/14/18

 Task:
 Comparison

#### Client

Lodi Unified School District Lodi, CA

Sample Submitted By: Terracon (NA)

**Date Received:** 12/12/2018

Lab No.: 18-1506

Sample Number	1
Sample Location	B4
Sample Depth (ft.)	1.0-2.5
pH Analysis, ASTM G 51	8.63
Water Soluble Sulfate (SO4), ASTM C 1580 (mg/kg)	63
Sulfides, AWWA 4500-S D, (mg/kg)	Nil
Chlorides, ASTM D 512, (mg/kg)	88
Red-Ox, AWWA 2580, (mV)	+686
Total Salts, AWWA 2520 B, (mg/kg)	209
Resistivity, ASTM G 57, (ohm-cm)	10670

# **Results of Corrosion Analysis**

**Analyzed By:** Trisha Campo

Chemist

The tests were performed in general accordance with applicable ASTM, AASHTO, or DOT test methods. This report is exclusively for the use of the client indicated above and shall not be reproduced except in full without the written consent of our company. Test results transmitted herein are only applicable to the actual samples tested at the location(s) referenced and are not necessarily indicative of the properties of other apparently similar or identical materials.



#### Project

Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project

# SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### **Contents:**

General Notes Unified Soil Classification System

Note: All attachments are one page unless noted above.

# GENERAL NOTES

DESCRIPTION OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Houston Middle School Relocatable Buildings Project Acampo, CA December 14, 2018 Terracon Project No. NA185174



SAMPLING	WATER LEVEL	FIELD TESTS		
	Water Initially Encountered	N	Standard Penetration Test Resistance (Blows/Ft.)	
Modified California Ring Sampler	✓       Water Level After a         Specified Period of Time         ✓       Water Level After         a Specified Period of Time		Hand Penetrometer	
			Torvane	
	Water levels indicated on the soil boring logs are	(DCP)	Dynamic Cone Penetrometer	
	indicated. Groundwater level variations will occur over time. In low permeability soils, accurate determination of groundwater levels is not		Unconfined Compressive Strength	
	possible with short term water level observations.	(PID)	Photo-Ionization Detector	
		(OVA)	Organic Vapor Analyzer	

#### DESCRIPTIVE SOIL CLASSIFICATION

Soil classification is based on the Unified Soil Classification System. Coarse Grained Soils have more than 50% of their dry weight retained on a #200 sieve; their principal descriptors are: boulders, cobbles, gravel or sand. Fine Grained Soils have less than 50% of their dry weight retained on a #200 sieve; they are principally described as clays if they are plastic, and silts if they are slightly plastic or non-plastic. Major constituents may be added as modifiers and minor constituents may be added according to the relative proportions based on grain size. In addition to gradation, coarse-grained soils are defined on the basis of their in-place relative density and fine-grained soils on the basis of their consistency.

#### LOCATION AND ELEVATION NOTES

Unless otherwise noted, Latitude and Longitude are approximately determined using a hand-held GPS device. The accuracy of such devices is variable. Surface elevation data annotated with +/- indicates that no actual topographical survey was conducted to confirm the surface elevation. Instead, the surface elevation was approximately determined from topographic maps of the area.

STRENGTH TERMS						
RELATIVE DENSITY OF COARSE-GRAINED SOILS (More than 50% retained on No. 200 sieve.)			CONSISTENCY OF FINE-GRAINED SOILS (50% or more passing the No. 200 sieve.) Consistency determined by laboratory shear strength testing, field visual-manual			
Descriptive Term (Density)	Standard Penetration or N-Value Blows/Ft.	Ring Sampler Blows/Ft.	Descriptive Term (Consistency)	Unconfined Compressive Strength Qu, (tsf)	l penetration resistance Standard Penetration or N-Value Blows/Ft.	Ring Sampler Blows/Ft.
Very Loose	0 - 3	0 - 6	Very Soft	less than 0.25	0 - 1	< 3
Loose	4 - 9	7 - 18	Soft	0.25 to 0.50	2 - 4	3 - 4
Medium Dense	10 - 29	19 - 58	Medium Stiff	0.50 to 1.00	4 - 8	5 - 9
Dense	30 - 50	59 - 98	Stiff	1.00 to 2.00	8 - 15	10 - 18
Very Dense	> 50	> 99	Very Stiff	2.00 to 4.00	15 - 30	19 - 42
			Hard	> 4.00	> 30	> 42

RELATIVE PROPORTION	S OF SAND AND GRAVEL	RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF FINES		
Descriptive Term(s) of other constituents	Percent of Dry Weight	Descriptive Term(s) of other constituents	Percent of Dry Weight	
Trace	<15	Trace	<5	
With	15-29	With	5-12	
Modifier	>30	Modifier	>12	
GRAIN SIZE TERMINOLOGY		PLASTICITY DESCRIPTION		
Major Component of Sample	Particle Size	Term	Plasticity Index	
Boulders	Over 12 in. (300 mm)	Non-plastic	0	
Cobbles	12 in. to 3 in. (300mm to 75mm)	Low	1 - 10	
Gravel	3 in. to #4 sieve (75mm to 4.75 mm)	Medium	11 - 30	
Sand	#4 to #200 sieve (4.75mm to 0.075mm	High	> 30	
Silt or Clay	Passing #200 sieve (0.075mm)			

#### UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

# Terracon GeoReport

			Soil Classification		
Criteria for Assign	ing Group Symbols	and Group Names	Using Laboratory Tests A	Group Symbol	Group Name <sup>B</sup>
<b>Coarse-Grained Soils:</b> More than 50% retained on No. 200 sieve	<b>Gravels:</b> More than 50% of coarse fraction retained on No. 4 sieve	Clean Gravels:	Cu <sup>3</sup> 4 and 1 £ Cc £ 3 <sup>E</sup>	GW	Well-graded gravel F
		Less than 5% fines <sup>C</sup>	Cu < 4 and/or [Cc<1 or Cc>3.0] <sup>E</sup>	GP	Poorly graded gravel F
		Gravels with Fines:	Fines classify as ML or MH	GM	Silty gravel <sup>F, G, H</sup>
		More than 12% fines <sup>C</sup>	Fines classify as CL or CH	GC	Clayey gravel <sup>F, G, H</sup>
	Sands: 50% or more of coarse fraction passes No. 4 sieve	Clean Sands:	Cu <sup>3</sup> 6 and 1 £ Cc £ 3 <sup>E</sup>	SW	Well-graded sand
		Less than 5% fines D	Cu < 6 and/or [Cc<1 or Cc>3.0] <sup>E</sup>	SP	Poorly graded sand <sup>I</sup>
		Sands with Fines: More than 12% fines <sup>D</sup>	Fines classify as ML or MH	SM	Silty sand <sup>G, H, I</sup>
			Fines classify as CL or CH	SC	Clayey sand <sup>G, H, I</sup>
Fine-Grained Soils: 50% or more passes the No. 200 sieve	<b>Silts and Clays:</b> Liquid limit less than 50	Inorganic:	PI > 7 and plots on or above "A"	CL	Lean clay <sup>K</sup> , L, M
			PI < 4 or plots below "A" line <sup>J</sup>	ML	Silt <sup>K</sup> , L, M
		Organic:	Liquid limit - oven dried	< 0.75 OL	Organic clay <sup>K, L, M, N</sup>
			Liquid limit - not dried		Organic silt <sup>K, L, M, O</sup>
	<b>Silts and Clays:</b> Liquid limit 50 or more	Inorganic:	PI plots on or above "A" line	СН	Fat clay <sup>K</sup> , L, M
			PI plots below "A" line	MH	Elastic Silt <sup>K, L, M</sup>
		Organic:	Liquid limit - oven dried	< 0.75 OH	Organic clay <sup>K, L, M, P</sup>
			Liquid limit - not dried		Organic silt <sup>K</sup> , L, M, Q
Highly organic soils:	Primarily organic matter, dark in color, and organic odor			PT	Peat

A Based on the material passing the 3-inch (75-mm) sieve.

<sup>B</sup> If field sample contained cobbles or boulders, or both, add "with cobbles or boulders, or both" to group name.

- <sup>C</sup> Gravels with 5 to 12% fines require dual symbols: GW-GM well-graded gravel with silt, GW-GC well-graded gravel with clay, GP-GM poorly graded gravel with silt, GP-GC poorly graded gravel with clay.
- <sup>D</sup> Sands with 5 to 12% fines require dual symbols: SW-SM well-graded sand with silt, SW-SC well-graded sand with clay, SP-SM poorly graded sand with silt, SP-SC poorly graded sand with clay.

$$= D_{60}/D_{10}$$
 Cc  $= \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{40} \times D_{60}}$ 

E Cu

F If soil contains <sup>3</sup> 15% sand, add "with sand" to group name.

<sup>G</sup> If fines classify as CL-ML, use dual symbol GC-GM, or SC-SM.

- <sup>H</sup> If fines are organic, add "with organic fines" to group name.
- <sup>1</sup> If soil contains <sup>3</sup> 15% gravel, add "with gravel" to group name.
- <sup>J</sup> If Atterberg limits plot in shaded area, soil is a CL-ML, silty clay.
- <sup>K</sup> If soil contains 15 to 29% plus No. 200, add "with sand" or "with gravel," whichever is predominant.
- L If soil contains <sup>3</sup> 30% plus No. 200 predominantly sand, add "sandy" to group name.
- <sup>M</sup>If soil contains <sup>3</sup> 30% plus No. 200, predominantly gravel, add "gravelly" to group name.
- NPI <sup>3</sup> 4 and plots on or above "A" line.
- $^{\circ}$  PI < 4 or plots below "A" line.
- P PI plots on or above "A" line.
- <sup>Q</sup>PI plots below "A" line.



