

CSP 25-011 South Texas ISD Athletic Field Mercedes Site Architect Project NO: S2000724

Addendum #2

We are issuing this addendum to address the following:

This addendum is issued for the purpose of modifying the plans and specifications for South Texas ISD Athletic Fields – Mercedes Site CSP 25-011. Please see page 2-81.

<u>Please, sign, date, and submit this addendum with your proposal response.</u> We look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.

South Texas ISD - Purchasing Department

MARCO ANTONIO LARA, JR., ED.D. Superintendent EFRAIN GARZA Deputy Superintendent June 19, 2024 South Texas ISD Athletic Fields – Mercedes Site CSP 25-011

GOMEZ MENDEZ SAENZ, INC. 1150 PAREDES LINE RD. BROWNSVILLE, TEXAS 78526 (956) 546-0110

ADDENDUM NO. 2



A. PURPOSE AND INTENT

This addendum is issued for the purpose of modifying the plans and specifications for *South Texas ISD Athletic Fields – Mercedes Site CSP 25-011.*

This addendum shall become part of the contract and all CONTRACTORS shall be bound by its content. All aspects of the specifications and drawings not covered herein shall remain the same. The General Conditions and the Special Conditions of the specifications shall govern all parts of the work and apply in full force to this Addendum.

B. SCOPE

I. CLARIFICATIONS:

1. Track Sports Surface – Contractors can also provide *Plexitrac Accelerator by California Sports Surfaces.* Contact Gary Heffers, ICP Building Solutions Group <u>gherrers@icpgroup.com</u>

II. SPECIFICATIONS:

- 1. Section 003132 Geotechnical Data
 - a. Section 003132 Geotechnical Data attached to this Addendum shall be ADDED to Construction Documents.
- 2. <u>Section 321800 Athletic Surface Coating System for Concrete Tennis Court</u>
 - Subject to compliance with this section: California Sports Surfaces, a division of ICP Group, Plexipave System shall be an approved manufacturer and product. Contact Gary Heffers, ICP Building Solutions Group <u>gherrers@icpgroup.com</u>

II. PLANS:

- 1. Med High Civil Sheets
 - a. DELETE previously issued C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5 sheets and REPLACE with Sheets C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5 Sheets attached to this Addendum.
- 2. Science Academy Civil Sheets
 - a. DELETE previously issued C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5 sheets and REPLACE with Sheets C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5 Sheets attached to this Addendum.

- 3. <u>Mercedes Landscape Sheets</u>
 - a. REVISIONS to Sheet L2.01, L3.01, L5.01 and L5.02.
 - b. DELETE previously issued Sheet L2.02 and REPLACE with Sheet L2.02 attached to this Addendum.

End of Addendum 2

DOCUMENT 003132 - GEOTECHNICAL DATA

1.1 GEOTECHNICAL DATA

- A. This Document with its referenced attachments is part of the Procurement and Contracting Requirements for Project. They provide Owner's information for Bidders' convenience and are intended to supplement rather than serve in lieu of Bidders' own investigations. They are made available for Bidders' convenience and information. This Document and its attachments are not part of the Contract Documents.
- B. Because subsurface conditions indicated by the soil borings are a sampling in relation to the entire construction area, and for other reasons, the Owner, the Architect, the Architect's consultants, and the firm reporting the subsurface conditions do not warranty the conditions below the depths of the borings or that the strata logged from the borings are necessarily typical of the entire site. Any party using the information described in the soil borings and geotechnical report shall accept full responsibility for its use.
- C. Soil-boring data for Project, obtained by MEG Engineering, dated June 19, 2024 is available for viewing as appended to this Document.
- D. A geotechnical investigation report for Project, prepared by MEG Engineering, dated June 19, 2024 is available for viewing as appended to this Document.
 - 1. The opinions expressed in this report are those of a geotechnical engineer and represent interpretations of subsoil conditions, tests, and results of analyses conducted by a geotechnical engineer. Owner is not responsible for interpretations or conclusions drawn from the data.
 - 2. Any party using information described in the geotechnical report shall make additional test borings and conduct other exploratory operations that may be required to determine the character of subsurface materials that may be encountered.

END OF DOCUMENT 003132

MEG GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT

PROPOSED SOUTH TEXAS ISD SCIENCE ACADEMY NEW SPORTS FIELDS

MERCEDES, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS



Geotechnical Engineering • Construction Materials Engineering & Testing Environmental • Consulting • Forensics

GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED SOUTH TEXAS ISD SCIENCE ACADEMY NEW SPORTS FIELDS MERCEDES, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

Prepared For David Monreal GMS Architects

MEG Report No. 01-24-29129

June 19, 2024





MILLENNIUM ENGINEERS GROUP, INC. TBPE FIRM NO. F-3913 5804 N. GUMWOOD AVENUE PHARR, TEXAS 78577 TEL:956-702-8500 FAX:956-702-8140 WWW.MEGENGINEERS.COM



June 19, 2024

David Monreal, AIA GMS Architects 1150 Paredes Line Road Brownsville, TX 78521 (956)546-0110 dmonreal@gmsarchitects.com

Subject: Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Report No. 01-24-29129 Foundation Recommendations Proposed South Texas ISD Science Academy **New Sports Fields** Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas

Dear Mr. Monreal(CLIENT):

Millennium Engineers Group, Inc. is pleased to submit the enclosed geotechnical engineering report that was prepared for the above subject project. This report addresses the procedures and findings of our geotechnical engineering study. Our recommendations should be incorporated into the design and construction documents for the proposed development.

We want to emphasize the importance that all our recommendations presented in this report and/or addendums to this report be followed. We look forward to continuing our involvement in the project by providing construction monitoring in accordance with the report recommendations and materials testing services during construction. We strongly recommend that we be a part of the preconstruction meeting to address any specific issues that are pertinent to this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to be of service to you in this phase of the project and we would like the opportunity to assist you in the upcoming phases of the project. lf you have any questions, please contact our office at the address, telephone, fax or electronic address listed below.

Amos Emerson, P.E. Geotechnical Department Manager



Cordially, Millennium Engineers Group, Inc. TBPE Firm No. F-3913

Page II

Quyet Thang Pham, Ph.D., P.E. Geotechnical Engineer

hand have

The seal appearing on this document was authorized by Quyet Thang Pham, P.E. 131836 on June 19, 2024. Alteration of a sealed document without proper notification to the responsible engineer is an offence under the Texas Engineering Practice Act

Cc: 1 Original and PDF Document

Millennium Engineers Group, Inc. MEG Project No.: 01-24-29129 5804 N. Gumwood Avenue Pharr, Texas 78577 www.megengineers.com Tel:956-702-8500 Fax:956-702-8140 Geotechnical Engineering Construction Material Testing Consulting Forensics



TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
3.0	SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF STUDY	1
4.0	FIELD EXPLORATION PROCEDURES	2
5.0	GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS	
	5.1 Site Description	3
	5.2 Site Geology	
	5.3 Subsurface Conditions	3
	5.4 Groundwater Conditions	4
6.0	LABORATORY TESTSING ANALYSIS	5
	6.1 General	5
	6.2 Moisture Content Testing	5
	6.3 Plasticity Index Testing	5
	6.4 Particle Siza Analysis Testing (Determination of Fines Content	5
7.0	ENGINEERING ANALYSIS	6
	7.1 General	6
	7.2 Soil-Related Movements	7
8.0	CONSIDERATIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION	7

APPENDIX



1.0 INTRODUCTION

Millennium Engineers Group, Inc. (MEG) has completed and is pleased to submit this document that presents our findings as a result of a geotechnical engineering study of this project to our client. The project site is located at 900 Med High Drive in Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas. The project location is shown on the Project Location Map, found in the Appendix section of this report. This report briefly describes the procedures utilized during this study and presents our findings along with our recommendation, for foundation design and construction considerations.

Our scope of services for the project was outlined in MEG proposal No. 01-24-144G, dated May 17, 2024 and approved by David Monreal, AIA on May 20, 2024.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

It is our understanding that the proposed site will accommodate the construction of a new 400-meter athletic track and natural turf areas.

3.0 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

This engineering report has been prepared in accordance with accepted geotechnical engineering practices currently exercised by geotechnical engineers in this area. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made or intended. This report is intended for the exclusive use by the client and client's authorized project team for use in preparing design and construction documents for this project only. This report may only be reproduced in its entirety for inclusion in construction documents. This report in its entirety shall not be reproduced or used for any other purposes without the written consent of our firm. This report may not contain sufficient information for purposes of other parties or other uses and is not intended for use in determining construction means and methods.

The recommendations presented in this report are based on data obtained from the soil borings drilled at this site and our understanding of the project information provided to us by our client and other project team members, and the assumption that site grading will result in only minor changes in the existing topography. Subsurface soil conditions have been observed and interpreted at the boring locations only.

This report may not reflect the actual variations of the subsurface conditions across the subject site. It is important to understand that variations may occur due to real geologic conditions or previous uses of the site. The nature and extent of variations across the subject site may not become evident until specific design locations are identified and/or construction commences. The construction process itself may also alter subsurface conditions. If variations appear evident at the time during the design phase and/or construction phase, we should be notified immediately to determine if our opinions, conclusions and recommendations need to be reevaluated. It may be necessary to perform additional field and laboratory tests and engineering analyses to establish the engineering impact of such variations. These services are additional and are not a part of our project scope.

Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Project No.: 01-24-29129 June 19, 2024



The engineering report was conducted for the proposed project site described in this report. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are not valid for any other project sites. If the project information described in this report is incorrect, is altered, or if new information becomes available, we should be retained to review and modify our recommendations. These services are additional and are not a part of our project scope.

Our scope of services was limited to the proposed work described in this report, and did not address other items or areas. The scope of our geotechnical engineering study does not include environmental assessment of the air, soil, rock or water conditions on or adjacent to the site. No environmental opinions are presented in this report. If the client is concerned with environmental risk at this project site, the client should perform an environmental site assessment.

If final grade elevations are significantly different from existing grades at the time of our field activities (more than plus or minus one (1) foot), our office should be informed about these changes. If desired, we will reexamine our analyses and make supplemental recommendations.

4.0 FIELD EXPLORATION PROCEDURES

Subsurface conditions at the subject site were evaluated by two (2) 10-foot soil borings and four (4) 12-inch soil grab samples. The Borings were drilled at the locations shown on the Borings Location Map, found in the Appendix section of this report. This location is approximate and distances were measured using a measuring wheel, tape, angles, and/or pacing from existing references. The structural soil borings were drilled in general accordance with American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM) D 420 procedures.

As part of our sampling procedures, the samples were collected in general conformance with ASTM D 1586 procedures. Representative portions of the samples were sealed in containers to reduce moisture loss, identified, packaged, and transported to our laboratory for subsequent testing. In the laboratory, each sample was evaluated and visually classified by a member of our Geotechnical Engineering staff. The geotechnical engineering properties of the strata were evaluated by a series of laboratory tests. The results of the laboratory and field-testing are tabulated on the boring logs and Summary of Soil Sample Analyses which are found in the Attachments section of this report.

Standard penetration test results are noted on the boring logs as blows per 12 inches of penetration. Two 6 inch increments are performed for each standard penetration test. The sum of the blows for the two 6 inch increments is considered the "standard penetration resistance value" or "N-value." Where hard or very dense materials were encountered, the tests are terminated as follows: (1) when a total of 50 blows have been applied in any of the 6 inch increments, or (2) when a total of 100 blows have been applied, or (3) when there is no observed advance of the sampler in the application of 10 successive blows. The boring logs in the case of hard or very dense materials will be noted as follows: 50/3", where 50 is the number of blows applied in a total of 7 ½ inches



of penetration, or 10/0", where 10 is the number of blows applied in 0 inches of penetration.

Samples will be retained in our laboratory for 30 days after submittal of this report. Other arrangements may be provided at the request of the Client.

5.0 GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS

5.1 Site Description

The project site is located at 900 Med High Drive in Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas. The project location is shown on the Project Location Map, found in the Appendix section of this report. At the time of our field operations, the subject site can be described as a developed tract of land. The general topography of the site is relatively flat sloping down to the southeast with a visually estimated vertical relief of less than 3 feet. Surface drainage is visually estimated to be poor to fair.

5.2 Site Geology

According to the Soil Survey of Hidalgo County, Texas, published by the United States Department of Agriculture – Soil Conservation Service, the project site appears to be located within the Hidalgo & Raymondville soil associations.

- The Harlingen series consist of deep, moderately well drained clayey soils, surface runoff is very slow and permeability is very slow, nearly level soil is on broad areas of ancient stream terraces. These soils formed in thick beds of clayey alluvium. Slopes range from 0 to 1 percent. Areas are small and irregular in shape and range from 25 to 900 acres. The corresponding soil symbol is 19, Harlingen clay.
- The Raymondville series consist of deep, well drained, clayey soils on uplands, nearly level soil is on plane to slightly concave uplands. These soils formed in calcareous clayey sediments. Slopes are mainly less than 0.5 percent but range from 0 to 1 percent. Areas are irregular in shape and range in size from 50 to 950 acres. Surface runoff is slow and permeability is slow. The corresponding soil symbol is 52, Raymondville clay loam.

5.3 Subsurface Conditions

On the basis of our borings, two (2) generalized strata that possess similar physical and engineering characteristics can describe the subsurface stratigraphy at this site. Table 5.1 summarizes the approximate strata range in our boring logs. These were prepared by visual classification and were aided by laboratory analyses of selected soil samples. The lines designating the interfaces between strata on the boring logs represent approximate boundaries. Transitions between strata may be gradual details for each of the borings can be found on the boring logs in the appendix of this report.



Stratum	Range in Depth, ft ¹	Stratum Description ¹
I	0 – 2	fat CLAY, dk. brown, dry, stiff
II	2 – 10	lean CLAY w/ sand to clayey SAND, brown, dry to moist, soft to very stiff

Note 1: The stratum thickness and depths to strata interfaces are approximate. Our measurements are rounded off to the nearest foot increment and are referenced from ground surface at the time of our drilling activities. Subsurface conditions may vary between the boring locations.

5.4 Groundwater Conditions

The dry auger drilling technique was used to complete the soil borings in an attempt to observe the presence of subsurface water. During our drilling operations we did not encounter the groundwater table below natural ground elevation for short term conditions. Moisture content test exhibited high moisture content at four (4) feet below natural ground elevation. Table 5.2 summarizes the approximate groundwater and cave in depths measured in our explorations. It should be noted that the groundwater level measurements recorded are accurate only for the specific dates on which measurement were obtained and does not show fluctuations throughout the year.

Fluctuations in Groundwater levels are influenced by variations in rainfall and surface water run-off from season to season. The construction process itself may also cause variations in the groundwater level. If the subsurface water elevation is critical to the construction process the contractor should check the subsurface water conditions just prior to construction excavation activities.

Boring	Depth to Subsurface Water, Ft ¹	Depth to Cave-In, Ft ¹
NO.	Time of Drilling	Time of Drilling
B-1	None	10
B-2	None	10

 Table 5.2. Approximate Groundwater and Cave-in Depths.

Note 1: Subsurface water levels and cave-in depths have been rounded to the nearest foot.

Based on the findings in our borings and on our experience in this region, we believe that groundwater seepage may not be encountered during site earthwork activities. If groundwater seepage is encountered during site earthwork activities, it may be controlled using temporary earthen berms and/or conventional sump-and-pump dewatering methods.



5.5 Top Soil Evaluation for Natural Turf Areas

Bulk Samples were taken at four (4) locations in order to perform an analysis of the available macronutrients and micronutrients within the soil samples for the TPSL® Soil Test for Turfgrass, Lawns & Athletic Fields. The locations are denoted on the bore location map presented in APPENDIX B Project Maps. The tests results are presented in APPENDIX F Plant Natural Soils & Soil Composts.

6.0 LABORATORY TESTING ANALYSIS

6.1 General

The analyses presented in this report are applicable specifically to the proposed project. The data gathered from both the field and laboratory testing programs on soil samples obtained from the borings was utilized to establish geotechnical engineering parameters for the proposed project.

6.2 Moisture Content Testing

The moisture content of a soil is defined as the ratio of the weight of the water in the sample to the dry weight of the soil sample expressed as a percentage. The moisture contents for the samples obtained as part of our geotechnical study were performed in accordance with ASTM D2216. The results varied from ten (10) percent to nineteen (19) percent. The boring and corresponding soil samples exhibited dry to moist field moisture conditions. A list of all the moisture contents by corresponding depth can be found on the boring log.

6.3 Plasticity Index Testing

The Plasticity Index (PI) is known as the difference between the liquid limit and the plastic limit of a soil. These limits are commonly referred to as the Atterberg limits, which describe the consistency of soils with respect to their varying moisture contents. The liquid limit is defined as the moisture content at which soil begins to transition from a plastic to a liquid state, and begins to behave as a liquid material. The plastic limit refers to the water content of a soil at the point of transition from a semisolid to a plastic state where soil starts to exhibit plastic behavior. The plasticity index testing performed in accordance with ASTM D4318 shows the range in which a soil acts in a plastic state. Plasticity Index values for the soils samples performed for this report were found to have a value of fifteen (15) to fifty-four (54) percent with a low to high plasticity rate.

6.4 Particle Size Analysis Testing (Determination of Fines Content)

Standard grain size analysis is used to determine the relative proportions of different grain sizes as they are distributed along a range of different sized sieves. The minus 200 sieve analysis is used commonly as a tool for soil classification and identification using the Unified Soil Classification System. Results for this test are reported as a percentage of soil passing the No. 200 sieve, which has openings 0.075mm wide. This test is also used

Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Project No.: 01-24-29129 June 19, 2024



to determine the suitability of soil for construction purposes and to estimate probable seepage through soils. Generally a %- 200 less than 50% indicates a granular non-cohesive to cohesive soil with large amounts of varying sized grains in the soil composition having high seepage potential. Sieve analysis testing was performed in accordance with ASTM D1140. The % -200 soil values for the samples collected ranged from 43% passing (non-cohesive coarse grained materials such as sands) to 84% passing (cohesive fine grained materials such as clays).

7.0 ENGINEERING ANALYSIS

7.1 General

The analysis and recommendations presented in this report are applicable specifically to the proposed foundation structure. The data gathered from both the field and laboratory testing programs on soil samples obtained from the borings was utilized to establish geotechnical engineering parameters to develop recommendations for the proposed structure. The foundation system(s) considered in this report to provide support for the proposed structure must meet two independent criteria. One of the criteria is that the movement below the foundation structure due to compression (consolidation) or expansion (swell) of the underlying soils must be within tolerable limits. This criterion is addressed in the Soil Related Movements section of this report. The other criterion is that the dead and live loads must be distributed appropriately and the foundation structure designed with an acceptable factor of safety to minimize the potential for bearing capacity failure of the underlying soils.

Geotechnical and structural engineers in this general area consider soil movements or Potential Vertical Rise (PVR) of approximately one (1) inch or less to be within acceptable structural design tolerances for most structures but may be different depending on structure use and the desired performance of the foundation. Therefore, movements of the underlying soils are not eliminated and thus one should expect a slab foundation structure to exhibit differential vertical movements. However, structural engineers design slab foundations for the expected magnitude of soil movements without failure of the structure. More stringent soil movement criteria may be established but the owner should consider the exponential increase in cost required to design and construct a structure for such soil movements. Data obtained in this study indicate that the soils at this site have strength characteristics capable of supporting the foundation and structure if designed appropriately. Stratum I is composed of lean clay to sandy lean clay and has a moderate potential to exhibit volumetric changes (contraction and expansion). Stratum II is composed of fat clay and has a high potential to exhibit volumetric changes. The potential for soil volumetric changes is dependent on variations in moisture contents of the underlying soils. Based on this data, this site is suitable for a slab foundation provided the subgrade is modified in accordance with the recommendations established in this report to reduce the potential for these soil volumetric changes.



7.2 Soil-Related Movements for Natural Turf Areas

The anticipated ground movements due to swelling of the underlying soils at this site were estimated for slab foundation construction using the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) procedures of test method TEX-124-E for determining Potential Vertical Rise (PVR). A PVR value of two and a half (2 ½) inches was estimated for the stratigraphic conditions encountered in our subsurface borings. A surcharge of 1 pound per square inch for the concrete slab, an active zone of 10 feet, and dry subsurface moisture conditions were assumed in estimating the above PVR values.

8.0 PROJECT REVIEW AND QUALITY CONTROL

Each project site is unique and it is important that the appropriate design data, construction drawings, specifications, change orders and related documents be reviewed by the respective design and construction professionals participating in this project. The performance of foundations, construction building pads and/or parking areas for this project will depend on correct interpretation of our geotechnical engineering report and proper compliance of and adherence to our geotechnical recommendations and to the construction drawings and specifications.

It is important that **MEG** be provided the opportunity to review the final design and construction documents to check that our geotechnical recommendations are properly interpreted and incorporated in the design and construction documents. We cannot be responsible for misinterpretations of our geotechnical recommendations if we have not had the opportunity to review these documents. This review is an additional service and not part of our project scope.

MEG should be retained to provide construction materials testing and observation services during all phases of the construction process of this project. As the Geotechnical Engineer of Record, it is important to let our technical personnel provide these services to make certain that our recommendations are interpreted properly and to ensure that actual field conditions are those described in our geotechnical report. Since our personnel are familiar with this project, **MEG**'s participation during the construction phase of this project would help mitigate any problems resulting from variations or anomalies in subsurface conditions, which are among the most prevalent on construction projects and often lead to delays, changes, costs overruns, and disputes. If the client does not follow all of our recommendations presented in this report and/or addendums to this report, the client assumes the responsibility and liability of such actions and will hold our firm harmless and without responsibility and liability for client's actions.

A construction testing frequency plan and budget needs to be developed for the required construction materials engineering and testing services for this project. Before construction, we recommend that **MEG**, the project design team members and the project general contractor meet and jointly develop the testing plan and budget, as well as review the testing specifications as it pertains to this project. **A failure to implement a complete testing plan will negate the recommendations provided in this report.**

MEG looks forward to the opportunity to provide continued support on this project.

APPENDIX A CUSTOM SOIL RESOURCE REPORT





USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey National Cooperative Soil Survey 5/22/2024 Page 1 of 3

	MAP L	EGEND	MAP INFORMATION
Area of Int	erest (AOI) Area of Interest (AOI)	Spoil AreaStony Spot	The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:20,000.
Solis ~ Special	Soil Map Unit Polygons Soil Map Unit Lines Soil Map Unit Points Point Features Blowout	 Very Stony Spot Wet Spot Other Special Line Features Water Features 	Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale. Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.
⊍ × ◇ ☆ ☆ ∞ ∧ ≟ ∻ ◎ ○ > + ∵ = ◇ ◇ ∞	Blowout Borrow Pit Clay Spot Closed Depression Gravel Pit Gravelly Spot Landfill Lava Flow Marsh or swamp Mine or Quarry Miscellaneous Water Perennial Water Rock Outcrop Saline Spot Sandy Spot Severely Eroded Spot Sinkhole Slide or Slip Sodic Spot	 Streams and Canals Transportation Rails Interstate Highways US Routes Major Roads Local Roads Background Aerial Photography	 Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements. Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL: Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857) Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required. This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below. Soil Survey Area: Hidalgo County, Texas Survey Area Data: Version 22, Sep 5, 2023 Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger. Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Dec 21, 2021—Mar 2, 2022 The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.



Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI			
19	Harlingen clay	4.8	55.5%			
52	Raymondville clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	3.9	44.5%			
Totals for Area of Interest		8.7	100.0%			

APPENDIX B PROJECT LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHIC AND BOREHOLE LOCATION MAPS







PROJECT TOPOGRAPHY MAP PROPOSED SCIENCE ACADEMY MERCEDES MERCEDES, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERS GROUP, INC 5804 N. GUMWOOD AVENUE PHARR, TEXAS 78577 WWW.MEGENGINEERS.COM TEL: 956-702-8500 FAX: 956-702-8140



SCIENCE ACADEMY MERCEDES MERCEDES, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

WWW.MEGENGINEERS.COM TEL: 956-702-8500 FAX: 956-702-8140

APPENDIX C PROJECT BORING LOGS AND PROFILE



Project Location: Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas

Project Number: 01-24-29129

Date(s) Drilled 5/24/2024	Ļ					Logge	ed By Ayme Guerrero	Checked By Raul Palma							
Drilling Method Straight I	Flight					Drill E Size/	^{it} _{ype} 4" soil bit	Total Depth of Borehole 10 feet bgs							
Drill Rig Type Simco 28	300					Drillin Contr	g _{actor} MEG Drilling	Approximate Surface Elevation							
Groundwater Level and Date Measured	Not E	inco	ounte	red		Samp Metho	^{ling} SPT	Hammer Data	Hammer Data 140 Ib., 30 in. drop, auto trip						
Borehole Backfill Subgrad	de Cut	ting	s			Locat	ion See Boring Location Map								
Elevation (feet) Depth (feet) Depth (feet) Sample Type Sample Number Sampling Resistance, blows/ft Material Type							MATERIAL DESCRIPTION fat CLAY, dk. brown, dry, stiff		Water Content, %	LL, %	PI, %	Percent Fines	UC, ksf		
_	1-	N	1	15			_		10	53	34				
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							lean CLAY w/ sand to fat CLAY, brown, —moist, soft to very stiff —	dry o 	14			69			
							-		13	28	15				
-	8— 9—		4 5	3 7			-		15 15			82			
	10—	\mathbf{P}					BORE TERMINATION						I		
	11 —						—	_							
	12 —						—	_							
-	13—	1					—	_							
	14-														
_	16-						_	_							
_	17—						_	_							
_	18—						_	_							
	19 —						_	_							
-	20 —	$\left \right $					—	_							
	21 —						—	_							
	22 —	1					—	_							
_	23-	1					_	_							
_	24-	1					—	_							
	25-														
	20-						_								
_	28-						_	_							
_	29-						_	_							
_	30 –														
l															

ENGINEERS

Log of Boring B-2 Sheet 1 of 1

Date(s) Drilled 5/24/2024	Ļ					Logge	ed By Ayme Guerrero	Checked	Checked By Raul Palma							
Drilling Method Straight	Flight					Drill E Size/	^{it} _{Type} 4" soil bit	Total De	Total Depth of Borehole 10 feet bgs							
Drill Rig Type Simco 28	300					Drillin Contr	g MEG Drilling	Approximate Surface Elevation								
Groundwater Level	Not E	inco	ounte	red		Samp		Hammer	Hammer 140 lb., 30 in. drop, auto trip							
Borehole Backfill	de Cut	ting	s			Location See Boring Location Map										
Elevation (feet)	Depth (feet)	Sample Type	Sample Number	Sampling Resistance blows/ft	Material Type	Graphic Log	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION		Water Content, %	۲۲' %	PI, %	Percent Fines	UC, ksf			
_	1-	Ŋ	1	15	СН		fat CLAY, dk. brown, dry, stiff —	_	15	73	54					
-	2		2	22	CL		lean CLAY w/ sand to clayey SAND, bro dry to moist, soft to very stiff	wn,	19							
-	5— 6—		3	11			-		21			84				
-	7- 8-		4	13			-	_	10	29	17					
-	9-	N	5	6			_	_	15			43				
_	10-						BORE TERMINATION									
_	12-						_	_								
_	13—						_	_								
_	14—						_	_								
	15 —						—	_								
	16—	1					—	_								
-	17—	1					_	_								
	18															
_	20-						_	_								
_	21 —						_	_								
_	22-						_	_								
	23—	$\left \right $					_	_								
	24 —						_	_								
–	25 —	$\left \right $						_								
-	26 —	$\left \right $					-	_								
	27 —	$\left \right $					–	_								
-	28—	1					–	_								
-	29-	1														
_	30-															

ENGINEERS

Project: Proposed South Texas ISD Science Academy New Sport Fields

Project Location: Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas

Project Number: 01-24-29129

Key to Log of Boring Sheet 1 of 1

Elevation (feet) Depth (feet) Samole Type	Sample Number	Sampling Resistance, blows/ft	Material Type	Graphic Log	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION		Water Content, %	LL, %	PI, %	Percent Fines	UC, ksf		
1 2 3	3 4	5	6	7	8		9	10	11	12	13		
COLUMN DESCRIPTION	<u> 15</u>												
 Elevation (feet): Elevation (MSL, feet). Depth (feet): Depth in feet below the ground surface. Sample Type: Type of soil sample collected at the depth interval shown. Sample Number: Sample identification number. Sampler one foot (or distance shown) beyond seating interval using the hammer identified on the boring log. Material Type: Type of material encountered. MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: Description of material encountered. Material Type: Type of material encountered. MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: Description of material encountered. 													
FIELD AND LABORATO	RY TE	ST ABE	BREVIA	TIONS									
CHEM: Chemical tests to COMP: Compaction test CONS: One-dimensional LL: Liquid Limit, percent	consoli	s corros dation t	ivity est		PI: Plasticity Index, pe SA: Sieve analysis (p UC: Unconfined comp WA: Wash sieve (per	ercent ercent passir pressive strer cent passing	ng No ngth t No. 2	o. 200 S est, Qu 200 Sie	Sieve) I, in ksf ve)				
MATERIAL GRAPHIC S	YMBOL	S											
Fat CLAY, CLAY	w/SANE	D, SANI	DY CLAY	Y (CH	Lean CLAY, Cl	LAY w/SAND to Sandy CL4	D, SAN AY (S	NDY CI 6C-CL)	_AY (CL)			
TYPICAL SAMPLER GR	APHIC	SYMB	<u>ols</u>			OTHER G	RAPH	IC SYI	MBOLS				
Auger sampler		Grab	Sample		2-inch-OD unlined split spoon (SPT)	—⊻ Water —≚ Water	level (level ((at time o (after wa	of drilling, iting, AW	ATD))			
3-inch-OD California w brass rings	v/	2.5-ir Califo	nch-OD I prnia w/	Modifi brass	s Shelby Tube (Thin-walled, fixed head)	Minor o √ stratun — – Inferre	change n ed/grad	e in mat	erial prop	erties wit	hin a rata		
CME Sampler		Pitch	er Samp		-?- Querie	ed cont	tact betv	veen strat	a				
	L	_											
1: Soil classifications are bas	ed on th	e Unified	d Soil Cla	ssificat	ystem. Descriptions and stratum lines ar	re interpretive.	and a	ctual lith	ologic ch	anges ma	ay be		

2: Descriptions on these logs apply only at the specific boring locations and at the time the borings were advanced. They are not warranted to be representative of subsurface conditions at other locations or times.



APPENDIX D SUMMARY OF SOIL SAMPLE ANALYSIS





Summary of Soil Sample Analyses

Project Name: Proposed South Texas ISD Science Academy New Sport Fields

	Sample	Blows						Shear	Sulfate	
Boring	Depth	Per	Moisture	Liquid	Plastic	Plasticity	-200%	Strength	Content	USCS
No.	(ft)	(ft)	Content	Limit	Limit	Index	Sieve	(tsf)	(ppm)	
B-1	.5 - 2	15	10	53	18	34			20	СН
	2.5 - 4	18	14				69			
	4.5 - 6	3	13	28	13	15				CL
	6.5 - 8	3	15				82			
	8.5 - 10	7	15							
B-2	.5 - 2	15	15	73	19	54			40	СН
	2.5 - 4	22	19							
	4.5 - 6	11	21				84			
	6.5 - 8	13	10	29	12	17				CL
	8.5 - 10	6	15				43			

APPENDIX E LABORATORY AND FIELD PROCEDURES





Laboratory and Field Test Procedures

Soil Classification Per ASTM D2487-93:

This soil-testing standard was used for classifying soils according to the Unified Soil Classification System. The soil classifications of the earth materials encountered are as noted in the attached boring logs.

Soil Water Content Per ASTM D2216-92:

This test determines the water content of soil or rock expressed as a percentage of the solid mass of the soil. The test results are listed under **MC** in the attached boring logs.

Soil Liquid Limit Per ASTM D4318-93:

The soil Liquid Limit identifies the upper limit soil water content at which the soil changes from a moldable (plastic) physical state to a liquid state. The Liquid Limit water content is expressed as a percentage of the solid mass of the soil. The test results are listed under **LL** in the attached boring logs.

Soil Plastic Limit Per ASTM D4318-93:

The soil Plastic Limit identifies lower limit soil water content at which the soil changes from a moldable (plastic) physical state to a non-moldable (semi-solid) physical state. The Plastic Limit water content is expressed as a percentage of the solid mass of the soil. The test results are listed under **PL** in the attached boring logs.

Plasticity Index Per ASTM D4318-93:

This is the numeric difference between the Liquid Limit and Plastic Limit. This index also defines the range of water content over which the soil-water system acts as a moldable (plastic) material. Higher Plasticity Index (PI) values indicate that the soil has a greater ability to change in soil volume or shrink and swell with lower or higher water contents, respectively. The test results are listed under **PI** in the attached boring logs.

Standard Penetration Test (SPT) and Split Spoon Sampler (SS) per ASTM D 1586:

This is the standard test method for both the penetration test and split-barrel (spoon) sampling of soils. This sampling method is used for soils or rock too hard for sampling using Shelby Tubes. The method involves penetration of a split spoon sampler into the soil or rock through successive blows of a 140-pound hammer in a prescribed manner.

Blow Counts (N) per ASTM D 1586:

This is the number of blows required to drive a Split Spoon Sampler by means of a 140 pound hammer for a distance of 12 inches in accordance with the variables stated in the test procedures.

Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Project No.: 01-24-29129 June 19, 2024



Shelby Tube (ST) per ASTM D 1587:

This procedure is for using a thin-walled metal tube to recover relatively undisturbed soil samples suitable for laboratory tests of physical properties.

Dry Density (DD) per ASTM D 2937:

This procedure is for the determination of in-place density of soil. The test results are measured in pounds per cubic foot, pcf.

Unconfined Compression Test (Uc) per ASTM D 2166:

This test method covers the determination of the unconfined compressive strength of cohesive soil in the undisturbed, remolded, or compacted condition, using strain-controlled application of the axial load.

Minus No. 200 Sieve per ASTM D 1140:

This test method covers determination of the amount of material finer than a Number 200 sieve by washing. The results are stated as a percent of the total dry weight of the sample.

Pocket Penetrometer (PP):

This test method is an accepted modification of ASTM D 1558 test method for establishing the moisture-penetration resistance relationships of fine-grained soils. The test results are measured in tons per square foot, tsf. The strength values provided by this method should be considered qualitatively.

Rock Quality Designation (RQD):

The measure of the quality of a rock mass defined by adding intact rock core pieces greater than four inches in length by the total length of core advance.

Recovery Ratio (REC):

The Recovery Ratio is equal to the total length of core recovered divided by the total length of core advance.

Boring Logs:

This is a summary of the above-described information at each boring location.

APPENDIX F PLANT NATURAL SOILS & SOIL COMPOSTS



Client #: 4564

Lab #: 73376 - 73379 Client: Millennium Engineers Group, Inc Leticia Puentes

Field: Science Academy Mercedes, Texas Crop: Grasses-Turf ,

Date: June 7, 2024



Low

Optimal

Marginal

Hiah



			Parts Per Million (ppm)																			
			Free	Perce	nt - (%)		Salts	Ammonium	Nitrate	Phosphate	Pota	ssium	Soc	lium	Cal	cium	Magn	esium	Water Sol	uble - W.S.		
Sample Identification Text. Lime CO3 CO3 CO3 CO3		Lime	Organic Matter		рН	E.C.	NH₄-N	NO ₃ -N	P ₂ O ₅		K Na		Ca		Mg		Bicarbonates	Sulfates	Rat	tios		
			CO ₃	Total	Active	Std Unit	mmhos/cm	lbs/ac	lbs/ac	lbs/ac	H ₂ O	CO ₂ *	H ₂ O	CO ₂ *	H ₂ O	CO ₂ *	H ₂ O	CO ₂ *	HCO ₃	SO ₄ - S	Na:Ca	Na:Mg
1	G-1	3	Н		1.73	8.04	1.15		20	6	12	68	221	274	53	1328	9	122		7	5	31
2	G-2	4	н		1.63	8.23	1.05		2	5	7	57	243	294	11	1372	7	119		6	27	43
3	G-3	5	н		2.04	7.98	1.66		3	8	1	38	338	374	47	1143	10	122		5	8	39
4	G-4	5	Vh		1.82	8.12	1.27		2	5	4	32	284	349	41	1267	7	121		6	8	53
	Optimal-General			2.8-4.8	2.8-4.8	6.3-6.8	0.18-1.00		35-90	50-100	75-100	80-125	< 100	< 175	60-120	300-800	13-20	60-100	< 150	25-55	2 - 6	5 - 8

*SALT CATIONS: H₂O = *Immediately Available* (water soluble extract); CO₂ [Plants' roots give off CO₂] = *Available Reserve* (carbonic acid extract). Plant Natural[™] Extraction calibrates well to plant uptake (availability). These values are the nutrients available in the sample provided to our lab. Availability ratings have been calibrated by multiple plant analyses (crop logging) during a growing season by numerous crops on hundreds of fields both domestic and foreign. TPS Lab is guided by *ASK THE PLANT*® with precision sampling and lab methods. Was this a COMPOSITE SAMPLE, representative of your plants' major root zone provided? Rev032118

			Parts Per Million (ppm)														
				MI	CRONUTRIENTS	Hot Water	Calcium	Chloride	W.S.	Sol	vita						
Sa	ample Identification	Zinc	Iron	Manganese	Copper	Cobalt	Molybdenum	Selenium	Nickel	Boron	Silicon	Aluminum	Chlorides	Burst	SLAN		
_		Zn	Fe	Mn	Cu	Co	Мо	Se	Ni	В	Si	AI	CI	C-CO ₂			
1	G-1	0.66	12.50	5.66	1.25					1.34							
2	G-2	0.53	11.32	4.30	1.31					1.77							
3	G-3	0.66	11.12	4.54	1.35					2.06							
4 G-4		0.50	10.57	4.20	1.25					1.62							
	Optimal-General	3.10 - 6.10	11.10 - 18.10	10.10 - 15.10	2.60 - 3.60	15.00 - 40.00	1.50 - 2.00	1.50 - 2.00	5.00 - 7.00	1.30 - 2.00	60 - 100	< 6	20 - 200	> 82			

Client #: 4564 Lab #: 73376 - 73379

Client: Millennium Engineers Group, Inc

Leticia Puentes Field: Science Academy Mercedes, Texas

Crop: Grasses-Turf,

Date: June 7, 2024





ESTABLISHED 1938 4915 West Monte Cristo Road Edinburg, Texas 78541 956-383-0739 TPSLab.com • AskThePlant.com

		Most crop nutrie	These fertilizer guidelines are ANNUAL RATES to be applied in multiple split applications over the entire growing season.																					
s	ample Identification	Plant Remov	Total Nutrient Plant Uptake Ibs/1000 sqft			Fertilizer Guidelines For Maximum Economic Yields Recommendations Ibs/1000 sqft										Ounces per Acre								
		Plant/Crop	Yield	Ν	P_2O_5	K ₂ O	Mg	Gypsum	Lime	Sulfur	Ν	P_2O_5	K_2O^*	Mg	Zn*	Fe*	Mn*	Cu*	В*	Co	Мо	Se	Ni	Si
1	G-1	Grasses-Turf	4.05 lbs	5.06	1.35	4.05	0.34			2-3X	5.18	1.62	1.11		0.11		0.07	0.07						
2	G-2	Grasses-Turf	4.05 lbs	5.06	1.35	4.05	0.34			2-3x	5.74	1.64	1.72		0.14		0.07	0.05						
3	G-3	Grasses-Turf	4.05 lbs	5.06	1.35	4.05	0.34			2-3x	5.67	1.57	2.76		0.11		0.07	0.05						1
4	G-4	Grasses-Turf	4.05 lbs	5.06	1.35	4.05	0.34			2-3X	5.78	1.64	3.09		0.14	0.05	0.07	0.07						
							•														-	-		_

Fertilizer Recommendations (N-P-K) are adjusted to reflect efficiency of recovery by plant and Estimated Nitrogen Release from Organic Matter. ENR estimates a 60% mineralization with optimum microbial activity, moisture and temperature.

 Micronutrient recommendations may have to be adjusted according to method of application and chieation of products. Ask The Plant® can determine actual plant uptake of these nutrients during the growing season.
 * Potassium recommendations are for a rebuilding program and should be applied in split applications over a few years. We dorecommend at least a 1:1 ratio of N:K2O each year during the rebuilding phase.
 Subsolis: While most plant roots feed in the 4 to 12 inch depth, the next 12-24 inches may also be a major contributor. For the most accurate soil test recommendations, sample topsoil and subsol separately in 12 inch increments.
 A detailed write-up of interpretations and recommendations for this soil report is available upon request of item SAO-00. Refer to fee schedule for current price.

Soll INOCULANTS - Activators (in the absence of adequate soil humus or in sterile conditions) of soil inoculants/ compost teas containing naturally occurring beneficial soil micro-organisms and/or enzymes, hormones, polymers, wetting agents and carboxyl's may improve nutrient uptake and the soil's physical condition (tilth) for better plant performance, possibly disease resistance and salt leaching. Feeding microbes with humic substances, carbohydrates, and other organic materials aid soil tilth and releases soil nutrients while helping some bacteria fix atmospheric N. [A combination of products may be best – follow product labels on your own test plots for the most effective products.]

CALCIUM - Samples 1, 2, 3, 4: SULFUR use recommended rate at least 2 or 3 times a year. (S effect lasts only 45-90 days in most cases.) Sulfur improves the physical condition (tilth) of the soil for better water and root penetration and increase nutrient availability. Sulfur activates Ca and Mg by solubilizing them to the available water (H2O) soluble form. Soluble Ca helps sodium to leach. S can also release P and Micronutrients.

SODIUM - Samples 2, 3, 4: Soil analysis excessively high extractable (CO2 Na) Sodium that needs soil treatment and thorough leaching of harmful Sodium. Irrigation water may be the source – a water analysis is recommended to verify. INTERNAL DRAINAGE is the major requirement for leaching salts. Take an in depth 4 foot soil profile in 1 foot increments for soil suitability determination for natural percolation or if drainage tiles are needed. An outlet is needed for drain water. Apply a Soil Inoculant (Microbes) at the label recommended rate for the 1st application + 1 qt/A Humic Acid + 1 qt/A Molasses (energy) and/or fish follow on a 4-6 week schedule with ½ or ¼ of above rates. Use Good Water Management by soaking thoroughly but as infrequently as possible to physically push salts down away from the major root zone. Deep watering can help prevent surface salt build up by leaching soluble salts from previous irrigation.

MEG GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT

PROPOSED SOUTH TEXAS ISD MED HIGH NEW SPORTS FIELDS

MERCEDES, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS



Geotechnical Engineering • Construction Materials Engineering & Testing Environmental • Consulting • Forensics
GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED SOUTH TEXAS ISD MED HIGH NEW SPORTS FIELDS MERCEDES, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

> Prepared For David Monreal GMS Architects

MEG Report No. 01-24-29130

June 19, 2024





MILLENNIUM ENGINEERS GROUP, INC. TBPE FIRM NO. F-3913 5804 N. GUMWOOD AVENUE PHARR, TEXAS 78577 TEL:956-702-8500 FAX:956-702-8140 WWW.MEGENGINEERS.COM



June 19, 2024

David Monreal, AIA GMS Architects 1150 Paredes Line Road Brownsville, TX 78521 (956)546-0110 dmonreal@gmsarchitects.com

Subject: Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Report No. 01-24-29130 Foundation Recommendations Proposed South Texas ISD Med High **New Sports Fields** Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas

Dear Mr. Monreal(CLIENT):

Millennium Engineers Group, Inc. is pleased to submit the enclosed geotechnical engineering report that was prepared for the above subject project. This report addresses the procedures and findings of our geotechnical engineering study. Our recommendations should be incorporated into the design and construction documents for the proposed development.

We want to emphasize the importance that all our recommendations presented in this report and/or addendums to this report be followed. We look forward to continuing our involvement in the project by providing construction monitoring in accordance with the report recommendations and materials testing services during construction. We strongly recommend that we be a part of the preconstruction meeting to address any specific issues that are pertinent to this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to be of service to you in this phase of the project and we would like the opportunity to assist you in the upcoming phases of the project. lf you have any questions, please contact our office at the address, telephone, fax or electronic address listed below.

Amos Emerson, P.E. Geotechnical Department Manager



Cordially, Millennium Engineers Group, Inc. TBPE Firm No. F-3913

Page II

Quyet Thang Pham, Ph.D., P.E. Geotechnical Engineer

amt have

The seal appearing on this document was authorized by Quyet Thang Pham, P.E. 131836 on June 19, 2024. Alteration of a sealed document without proper notification to the responsible engineer is an offence under the Texas Engineering Practice Act

Cc: 1 Original and PDF Document

Millennium Engineers Group, Inc. MEG Project No.: 01-24-29130 5804 N. Gumwood Avenue Pharr, Texas 78577 www.megengineers.com Tel:956-702-8500 Fax:956-702-8140 Geotechnical Engineering Construction Material Testing Consulting Forensics



TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
3.0	SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF STUDY	1
4.0	FIELD EXPLORATION PROCEDURES	2
5.0	GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS	
	5.1 Site Description	
	5.2 Site Geology	3
	5.3 Subsurface Conditions	3
	5.4 Groundwater Conditions	4
6.0	LABORATORY TESTSING ANALYSIS	5
	6.1 General	5
	6.2 Moisture Content Testing	5
	6.3 Plasticity Index Testing	5
	6.4 Particle Siza Analysis Testing (Determination of Fines Content	5
7.0	ENGINEERING ANALYSIS	6
	7.1 General	6
	7.2 Soil-Related Movements	6
8.0	CONSIDERATIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION	7

APPENDIX

Page III



1.0 INTRODUCTION

Millennium Engineers Group, Inc. (MEG) has completed and is pleased to submit this document that presents our findings as a result of a geotechnical engineering study of this project to our client. The project site is located at 700 Med High Drive in Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas. The project location is shown on the Project Location Map, found in the Appendix section of this report. This report briefly describes the procedures utilized during this study and presents our findings along with our recommendation, for foundation design and construction considerations.

Our scope of services for the project was outlined in MEG proposal No. 01-24-145G, dated May 17, 2024 and approved by David Monreal, AIA on May 20, 2024.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

It is our understanding that the proposed site will accommodate the construction of a new 400-meter athletic track and natural turf areas.

3.0 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

This engineering report has been prepared in accordance with accepted geotechnical engineering practices currently exercised by geotechnical engineers in this area. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made or intended. This report is intended for the exclusive use by the client and client's authorized project team for use in preparing design and construction documents for this project only. This report may only be reproduced in its entirety for inclusion in construction documents. This report in its entirety shall not be reproduced or used for any other purposes without the written consent of our firm. This report may not contain sufficient information for purposes of other parties or other uses and is not intended for use in determining construction means and methods.

The recommendations presented in this report are based on data obtained from the soil borings drilled at this site and our understanding of the project information provided to us by our client and other project team members, and the assumption that site grading will result in only minor changes in the existing topography. Subsurface soil conditions have been observed and interpreted at the boring locations only.

This report may not reflect the actual variations of the subsurface conditions across the subject site. It is important to understand that variations may occur due to real geologic conditions or previous uses of the site. The nature and extent of variations across the subject site may not become evident until specific design locations are identified and/or construction commences. The construction process itself may also alter subsurface conditions. If variations appear evident at the time during the design phase and/or construction phase, we should be notified immediately to determine if our opinions, conclusions and recommendations need to be reevaluated. It may be necessary to perform additional field and laboratory tests and engineering analyses to establish the engineering impact of such variations. These services are additional and are not a part of our project scope.



The engineering report was conducted for the proposed project site described in this report. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are not valid for any other project sites. If the project information described in this report is incorrect, is altered, or if new information becomes available, we should be retained to review and modify our recommendations. These services are additional and are not a part of our project scope.

Our scope of services was limited to the proposed work described in this report, and did not address other items or areas. The scope of our geotechnical engineering study does not include environmental assessment of the air, soil, rock or water conditions on or adjacent to the site. No environmental opinions are presented in this report. If the client is concerned with environmental risk at this project site, the client should perform an environmental site assessment.

If final grade elevations are significantly different from existing grades at the time of our field activities (more than plus or minus one (1) foot), our office should be informed about these changes. If desired, we will reexamine our analyses and make supplemental recommendations.

4.0 FIELD EXPLORATION PROCEDURES

Subsurface conditions at the subject site were evaluated by two (2) 10-foot soil borings and four (4) 12-inch soil grab samples. The Borings were drilled at the locations shown on the Borings Location Map, found in the Appendix section of this report. This location is approximate and distances were measured using a measuring wheel, tape, angles, and/or pacing from existing references. The structural soil borings were drilled in general accordance with American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM) D 420 procedures.

As part of our sampling procedures, the samples were collected in general conformance with ASTM D 1586 procedures. Representative portions of the samples were sealed in containers to reduce moisture loss, identified, packaged, and transported to our laboratory for subsequent testing. In the laboratory, each sample was evaluated and visually classified by a member of our Geotechnical Engineering staff. The geotechnical engineering properties of the strata were evaluated by a series of laboratory tests. The results of the laboratory and field-testing are tabulated on the boring logs and Summary of Soil Sample Analyses which are found in the Attachments section of this report.

Standard penetration test results are noted on the boring logs as blows per 12 inches of penetration. Two 6 inch increments are performed for each standard penetration test. The sum of the blows for the two 6 inch increments is considered the "standard penetration resistance value" or "N-value." Where hard or very dense materials were encountered, the tests are terminated as follows: (1) when a total of 50 blows have been applied in any of the 6 inch increments, or (2) when a total of 100 blows have been applied, or (3) when there is no observed advance of the sampler in the application of 10 successive blows. The boring logs in the case of hard or very dense materials will be noted as follows: 50/3", where 50 is the number of blows applied in 3 inches of



penetration, or $100/7\frac{1}{2}$ " where 100 is the number of blows applied in a total of 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches of penetration, or 10/0", where 10 is the number of blows applied in 0 inches of penetration.

Samples will be retained in our laboratory for 30 days after submittal of this report. Other arrangements may be provided at the request of the Client.

5.0 GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS

5.1 Site Description

The project site is located at 700 Med High Drive in Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas. The project location is shown on the Project Location Map, found in the Appendix section of this report. At the time of our field operations, the subject site can be described as a developed tract of land. The general topography of the site is relatively flat sloping down to the northeast with a visually estimated vertical relief of less than 3 feet. Surface drainage is visually estimated to be poor to fair.

5.2 Site Geology

According to the Soil Survey of Hidalgo County, Texas, published by the United States Department of Agriculture – Soil Conservation Service, the project site appears to be located within the Raymondville soil association.

• The Raymondville series consist of deep, well drained, clayey soils on uplands, nearly level soil is on plane to slightly concave uplands. These soils formed in calcareous clayey sediments. Slopes are mainly less than 0.5 percent but range from 0 to 1 percent. Areas are irregular in shape and range in size from 50 to 950 acres. Surface runoff is slow and permeability is slow. The corresponding soil symbol is 52, Raymondville clay loam.

5.3 Subsurface Conditions

On the basis of our borings, two (2) generalized strata that possess similar physical and engineering characteristics can describe the subsurface stratigraphy at this site. Table 5.1 summarizes the approximate strata range in our boring logs. These were prepared by visual classification and were aided by laboratory analyses of selected soil samples. The lines designating the interfaces between strata on the boring logs represent approximate boundaries. Transitions between strata may be gradual details for each of the borings can be found on the boring logs in the appendix of this report.



Stratum	Range in Depth, ft ¹	- Stratum Description ¹
I	0 – 4	fat CLAY, brown, dry, stiff
II	4 – 10	clayey SAND, brown, dry to moist, soft to stiff

Note 1: The stratum thickness and depths to strata interfaces are approximate. Our measurements are rounded off to the nearest foot increment and are referenced from ground surface at the time of our drilling activities. Subsurface conditions may vary between the boring locations.

5.4 Groundwater Conditions

The dry auger drilling technique was used to complete the soil borings in an attempt to observe the presence of subsurface water. During our drilling operations we did not encounter the groundwater table below natural ground elevation for short term conditions. Moisture content test exhibited high moisture content at eight (8) feet below natural ground elevation. Table 5.2 summarizes the approximate groundwater and cave in depths measured in our explorations. It should be noted that the groundwater level measurements recorded are accurate only for the specific dates on which measurement were obtained and does not show fluctuations throughout the year.

Fluctuations in Groundwater levels are influenced by variations in rainfall and surface water run-off from season to season. The construction process itself may also cause variations in the groundwater level. If the subsurface water elevation is critical to the construction process the contractor should check the subsurface water conditions just prior to construction excavation activities.

Boring No.	Depth to Subsurface Water, Ft ¹ Time of Drilling	Depth to Cave-In, Ft ¹ Time of Drilling
B-1	None	None
B-2	None	None

Table 5.2. Approximate Groundwater and Cave-in Depths.

Note 1: Subsurface water levels and cave-in depths have been rounded to the nearest foot.

Based on the findings in our borings and on our experience in this region, we believe that groundwater seepage may not be encountered during site earthwork activities. If groundwater seepage is encountered during site earthwork activities, it may be controlled using temporary earthen berms and/or conventional sump-and-pump dewatering methods.

5.5 Top Soil Evaluation

Bulk Samples were taken at four (4) locations in order to perform an analysis of the available macronutrients and micronutrients within the soil samples for the TPSL® Soil

Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Project No.: 01-24-29130 June 19, 2024



Test for Turfgrass, Lawns & Athletic Fields. The locations are denoted on the bore location map presented in APPENDIX B Project Maps. The tests results are presented in APPENDIX F Plant Natural Soils & Soil Composts.

6.0 LABORATORY TESTING ANALYSIS

6.1 General

The analyses presented in this report are applicable specifically to the proposed project. The data gathered from both the field and laboratory testing programs on soil samples obtained from the borings was utilized to establish geotechnical engineering parameters for the proposed project.

6.2 Moisture Content Testing

The moisture content of a soil is defined as the ratio of the weight of the water in the sample to the dry weight of the soil sample expressed as a percentage. The moisture contents for the samples obtained as part of our geotechnical study were performed in accordance with ASTM D2216. The results varied from nine (9) percent to eighteen (18) percent. The boring and corresponding soil samples exhibited dry to moist field moisture conditions. A list of all the moisture contents by corresponding depth can be found on the boring log.

6.3 Plasticity Index Testing

The Plasticity Index (PI) is known as the difference between the liquid limit and the plastic limit of a soil. These limits are commonly referred to as the Atterberg limits, which describe the consistency of soils with respect to their varying moisture contents. The liquid limit is defined as the moisture content at which soil begins to transition from a plastic to a liquid state, and begins to behave as a liquid material. The plastic limit refers to the water content of a soil at the point of transition from a semisolid to a plastic state where soil starts to exhibit plastic behavior. The plasticity index testing performed in accordance with ASTM D4318 shows the range in which a soil acts in a plastic state. Plasticity Index values for the soils samples performed for this report were found to have a value of seven (7) to forty-two (42) percent with a low to moderate plasticity rate.

6.4 Particle Size Analysis Testing (Determination of Fines Content)

Standard grain size analysis is used to determine the relative proportions of different grain sizes as they are distributed along a range of different sized sieves. The minus 200 sieve analysis is used commonly as a tool for soil classification and identification using the Unified Soil Classification System. Results for this test are reported as a percentage of soil passing the No. 200 sieve, which has openings 0.075mm wide. This test is also used to determine the suitability of soil for construction purposes and to estimate probable seepage through soils. Generally a %- 200 less than 50% indicates a granular non-cohesive to cohesive soil with large amounts of varying sized grains in the soil composition having high seepage potential. Sieve analysis testing was performed in

Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Project No.: 01-24-29130 June 19, 2024



accordance with ASTM D1140. The % -200 soil values for the samples collected ranged from 37% passing (non-cohesive coarse grained materials such as sands) to 66% passing (cohesive fine grained materials such as clays).

7.0 ENGINEERING ANALYSIS

7.1 General

The analysis and recommendations presented in this report are applicable specifically to the proposed foundation structure. The data gathered from both the field and laboratory testing programs on soil samples obtained from the borings was utilized to establish geotechnical engineering parameters to develop recommendations for the proposed structure. The foundation system(s) considered in this report to provide support for the proposed structure must meet two independent criteria. One of the criteria is that the movement below the foundation structure due to compression (consolidation) or expansion (swell) of the underlying soils must be within tolerable limits. This criterion is addressed in the Soil Related Movements section of this report. The other criterion is that the dead and live loads must be distributed appropriately and the foundation structure designed with an acceptable factor of safety to minimize the potential for bearing capacity failure of the underlying soils.

Geotechnical and structural engineers in this general area consider soil movements or Potential Vertical Rise (PVR) of approximately one (1) inch or less to be within acceptable structural design tolerances for most structures but may be different depending on structure use and the desired performance of the foundation. Therefore, movements of the underlying soils are not eliminated and thus one should expect a slab foundation structure to exhibit differential vertical movements. However, structural engineers design slab foundations for the expected magnitude of soil movements without failure of the structure. More stringent soil movement criteria may be established but the owner should consider the exponential increase in cost required to design and construct a structure for such soil movements. Data obtained in this study indicate that the soils at this site have strength characteristics capable of supporting the foundation and structure if designed appropriately. Stratum I is composed of lean clay to sandy lean clay and has a moderate potential to exhibit volumetric changes (contraction and expansion). Stratum II is composed of fat clay and has a high potential to exhibit volumetric changes. The potential for soil volumetric changes is dependent on variations in moisture contents of the underlying soils. Based on this data, this site is suitable for a slab foundation provided the subgrade is modified in accordance with the recommendations established in this report to reduce the potential for these soil volumetric changes.

7.2 Soil-Related Movements

The anticipated ground movements due to swelling of the underlying soils at this site were estimated for slab foundation construction using the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) procedures of test method TEX-124-E for determining Potential Vertical Rise (PVR). A PVR value of two and a half (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) inches was estimated for the stratigraphic conditions encountered in our subsurface borings. A surcharge of 1 pound per square



inch for the concrete slab, an active zone of 10 feet, and dry subsurface moisture conditions were assumed in estimating the above PVR values.

8.0 PROJECT REVIEW AND QUALITY CONTROL

Each project site is unique and it is important that the appropriate design data, construction drawings, specifications, change orders and related documents be reviewed by the respective design and construction professionals participating in this project. The performance of foundations, construction building pads and/or parking areas for this project will depend on correct interpretation of our geotechnical engineering report and proper compliance of and adherence to our geotechnical recommendations and to the construction drawings and specifications.

It is important that **MEG** be provided the opportunity to review the final design and construction documents to check that our geotechnical recommendations are properly interpreted and incorporated in the design and construction documents. We cannot be responsible for misinterpretations of our geotechnical recommendations if we have not had the opportunity to review these documents. This review is an additional service and not part of our project scope.

MEG should be retained to provide construction materials testing and observation services during all phases of the construction process of this project. As the Geotechnical Engineer of Record, it is important to let our technical personnel provide these services to make certain that our recommendations are interpreted properly and to ensure that actual field conditions are those described in our geotechnical report. Since our personnel are familiar with this project, **MEG**'s participation during the construction phase of this project would help mitigate any problems resulting from variations or anomalies in subsurface conditions, which are among the most prevalent on construction projects and often lead to delays, changes, costs overruns, and disputes. If the client does not follow all of our recommendations presented in this report and/or addendums to this report, the client assumes the responsibility and liability of such actions and will hold our firm harmless and without responsibility and liability for client's actions.

A construction testing frequency plan and budget needs to be developed for the required construction materials engineering and testing services for this project. Before construction, we recommend that **MEG**, the project design team members and the project general contractor meet and jointly develop the testing plan and budget, as well as review the testing specifications as it pertains to this project. **A failure to implement a complete testing plan will negate the recommendations provided in this report.**

MEG looks forward to the opportunity to provide continued support on this project.

APPENDIX A CUSTOM SOIL RESOURCE REPORT





Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey National Cooperative Soil Survey

Area of Interest (AOI) Spoil Area Area of Interest (AOI) Stony Spot Soils Very Stony Spot Soil Map Unit Polygons Wet Spot Soil Map Unit Lines Other Soil Map Unit Points Special Line Features Soil Map Unit Points Special Line Features Blowout Water Features Soirow Pit Transportation Clay Spot Hails Closed Depression Interstate Highways	The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:20,000. Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale. Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cau misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more det scale. Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map
Soils Very Stony Spot Soil Map Unit Polygons Wet Spot Soil Map Unit Lines Other Soil Map Unit Points Special Line Features Special Point Features Special Line Features Blowout Water Features Blowout Streams and Canals Streams and Canals Transportation Clay Spot Hertow Clay Spot Hertow Clay Spot Hertow Streams and Canals Streams and Canals Streams and Streams a	Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale. Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cau misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more det scale. Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map
Image: Stravel Pit with the second secon	 measurements. Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL: Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857) Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mer projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such a Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required. This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified d of the version date(s) listed below. Soil Survey Area: Hidalgo County, Texas Survey Area Data: Version 22, Sep 5, 2023 Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger. Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Dec 21, 2021-2, 2022 The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines w compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor



Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
52	Raymondville clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	11.2	100.0%
Totals for Area of Interest		11.2	100.0%

APPENDIX B PROJECT LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHIC AND BOREHOLE LOCATION MAPS









FAX: 956-702-8140

MEG PROJECT: 01-24-29130 / DATE: 6/17/2024 / APPROVED BY: A. PALMA / DRAWN BY: L. PUENTES

MERCEDES, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

APPENDIX C PROJECT BORING LOGS AND PROFILE



Date(s) Drilled 5/24/2024	Ļ					Logge	d By Ayme Guerrero	Checked	Checked By Raul Palma						
Drilling Method Straight	Flight					Drill B Size/1	^{it} _{Vpe} 4" soil bit	Total De of Boreh	Total Depth of Borehole 10 feet bgs						
Drill Rig Type Simco 28	300					Drillin Contr	g actor MEG Drilling	Approximate Surface Elevation							
Groundwater Level	Not E	inco	ounter	red		Samp		Hammer	Hammer 140 lb., 30 in. drop, auto trip						
Borehole Backfill	de Cut	ting	s			Location See Boring Location Map									
Elevation (feet)	⊃ Depth (feet) I	Sample Type	Sample Number	Sampling Resistance blows/ft	Material Type	Graphic Log	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION		Water Content, %	RL, %	PI, %	Percent Fines	UC, ksf		
	1— 2— 3—		1	14	СН		fat CLAY, brown, dry, stiff — —	-	13	57	40	66			
_	4—	N	2		SC		clavey SAND, brown, dry to moist, loose	to	13			00			
-	5 — 6 —		3	4			—med. dense —	° –	9						
-	7— 8—		4	5			-	-	12			37			
_	9— 10—	N	5	8					14	18	7				
_	11 —						BORE TERMINATION	_							
—	12 —						_	_							
_	13—						_	_							
_	14 — 15 —						_								
_	16-						_	_							
_	17 —						_	_							
_	18—						_	_							
_	19 —						—	_							
_	20-						_	_							
	21 -						_								
_	23-						_	_							
_	24 —						_	_							
_	25 —						_	_							
_	26 —						—	_							
-	27 —	1					_	_							
	28- 29-]					_								
_	30 -														

ENGINEERS

Date(s) Drilled 5/24/2024						Logge	d By Ayme Guerrero	Checked By Raul Palma							
Drilling Method Straight I	light					Drill B Size/1	^{it} _{ype} 4" soil bit	Total De of Boreh	otal Depth f Borehole 10 feet bgs						
Drill Rig Type Simco 28	800					Drillin Contra	g actor MEG Drilling	Approxir Surface	Approximate Surface Elevation						
Groundwater Level and Date Measured	Not E	nco	ounter	red		Samp Metho	^{ling} d(s) SPT	^{mer} 140 lb., 30 in. drop, auto trip							
Borehole Backfill Subgrad	de Cutt	ing	S			Locat	on See Boring Location Map								
and Date Measured Borehole Backfill Subgrad	Not E E (1)	Diversion of the second	s January Janu	2 Page 2	20 D A Material Type	Graphic Log	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION MATERIAL DESCRIPTION fat CLAY, brown, dry, stiff clayey SAND, brown, dry to moist, loose med. dense BORE TERMINATION BORE TERMINATION	Data	140 13 13 14 12 13 18 18	22 22	1. drop,	Auto trip	UC, ksf		
							_	_							
	29 — 30 —														
	20						_ // E G								

ENGINEERS

Project: Proposed South Texas ISD Med High New Sport Fields Project Location: Mercedes, Hidalgo County, Texas

Project Number: 01-24-29130

Key to Log of Boring Sheet 1 of 1

									-	-					
Elevation (feet)	Depth (feet)	Sample Type	Sample Number	Sampling Resistance, blows/ft	Material Type	Graphic Log	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Water Content, %	rr, %	PI, %	Percent Fines	UC, ksf			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13			
COLUMN DESC	RIPTIC	ONS	<u>i</u>												
 Elevation (feet): Elevation (MSL, feet). Depth (feet): Depth in feet below the ground surface. Sample Type: Type of soil sample collected at the depth interval shown. Sample Number: Sample identification number. Sampler one foot (or distance shown) beyond seating interval using the hammer identified on the boring log. Material Type: Type of material encountered. MATERIAL DESCRIPTION: Description of material encountered. May include consistency, moisture, color, and other descriptive text. Water Content, %: Water content of the soil sample, expressed as percentage of dry weight of sample. LL, %: Liquid Limit, expressed as a water content. Hermit And Content, %: Water content of the soil sample, expressed as percentage of dry weight of sample. LL, %: Liquid Limit, expressed as a water content. PI, %: Plasticity Index, expressed as a water content. PI, %: Plasticity Index, expressed as a water content. PI, %: Plasticity Index, expressed as a water content. PI, %: Plasticity Index, expressed as a water content. PI, %: Plasticity Index, expressed as a water content. PI, %: Plasticity Index, expressed as a water content. Pi, %: Plasticity Index, expressed as a water content. Pi, %: State Content, %: Uc, %: Unconfined compressive strength, in kips per square foot. 															
FIELD AND LAE	BORAT	OR	Y TE	ST ABE	BREVIA	TION									
CHEM: Chemica COMP: Compac CONS: One-dim LL: Liquid Limit,	al tests tion tes ension percen	to a st al co t	ssess onsoli	s corros	iivity test		PI: Plasticity Index, percent SA: Sieve analysis (percent pa UC: Unconfined compressive s WA: Wash sieve (percent pass	ssing N strength sing No.	lo. 200 S test, Qu 200 Sie	Sieve) u, in ksf eve)					
MATERIAL GRA	APHIC	SYI	MBOL	<u>_S</u>											
Fat CLAY	Ί, CLAΥ	r∕w/	SANE	D, SANI	DY CLA	Y (C⊦	Clayey SAND (SC)								
TYPICAL SAMP	LER G	RA	PHIC	SYMB	OLS		OTHER		HIC SY	MBOLS					
Auger sample Bulk Sample 3-inch-OD Ca brass rings CME Sample	er alifornia r	ı w/		Grab Hanc 2.5-ir Calife Pitch	Sample I auger s nch-OD ornia w/ er Samp	sampl Modif brass ble	2-inch-OD unlined split spoon (SPT) -Ξ W X Texas Cone Penetrometer Mi X Shelby Tube (Thin-walled, fixed head) Inf -?- Que -?- Que	ater leve ater leve nor char atum erred/gra ueried co	GRAPHIC SYMBOLS ter level (at time of drilling, ATD) ter level (after waiting, AW) nor change in material properties within a atum erred/gradational contact between strata eried contact between strata						
GENERAL NOT	<u>ES</u>														

Soil classifications are based on the Unified Soil Classification System. Descriptions and stratum lines are interpretive, and actual lithologic changes may be gradual. Field descriptions may have been modified to reflect results of lab tests.
 Descriptions on these logs apply only at the specific boring locations and at the time the borings were advanced. They are not warranted to be representative

of subsurface conditions at other locations or times.



APPENDIX D SUMMARY OF SOIL SAMPLE ANALYSIS



Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Project No.: 01-24-29130 June 19, 2024



					-					
	Sample	Blows						Shear	Sulfate	
Boring	Depth	Per	Moisture	Liquid	Plastic	Plasticity	-200%	Strength	Content	USCS
No.	(ft)	(ft)	Content	Limit	Limit	Index	Sieve	(tsf)	(ppm)	
B-1	.5 - 2	14	13	57	17	40			20	СН
	2.5 - 4	13	13				66			
	4.5 - 6	4	9							
	6.5 - 8	5	12				37			
	8.5 - 10	8	14	18	11	7				CL
					_	_				
B-2	.5 - 2	14	13	58	17	42			20	СН
	2.5 - 4	9	11							
	4.5 - 6	6	12				46			
	6.5 - 8	4	13	22	11	12				CL
	8.5 - 10	5	18				49			

Summary of Soil Sample Analyses Project Name: Proposed South Texas ISD Med High New Sport Fields

APPENDIX E LABORATORY AND FIELD PROCEDURES





Laboratory and Field Test Procedures

Soil Classification Per ASTM D2487-93:

This soil-testing standard was used for classifying soils according to the Unified Soil Classification System. The soil classifications of the earth materials encountered are as noted in the attached boring logs.

Soil Water Content Per ASTM D2216-92:

This test determines the water content of soil or rock expressed as a percentage of the solid mass of the soil. The test results are listed under **MC** in the attached boring logs.

Soil Liquid Limit Per ASTM D4318-93:

The soil Liquid Limit identifies the upper limit soil water content at which the soil changes from a moldable (plastic) physical state to a liquid state. The Liquid Limit water content is expressed as a percentage of the solid mass of the soil. The test results are listed under **LL** in the attached boring logs.

Soil Plastic Limit Per ASTM D4318-93:

The soil Plastic Limit identifies lower limit soil water content at which the soil changes from a moldable (plastic) physical state to a non-moldable (semi-solid) physical state. The Plastic Limit water content is expressed as a percentage of the solid mass of the soil. The test results are listed under **PL** in the attached boring logs.

Plasticity Index Per ASTM D4318-93:

This is the numeric difference between the Liquid Limit and Plastic Limit. This index also defines the range of water content over which the soil-water system acts as a moldable (plastic) material. Higher Plasticity Index (PI) values indicate that the soil has a greater ability to change in soil volume or shrink and swell with lower or higher water contents, respectively. The test results are listed under **PI** in the attached boring logs.

Standard Penetration Test (SPT) and Split Spoon Sampler (SS) per ASTM D 1586:

This is the standard test method for both the penetration test and split-barrel (spoon) sampling of soils. This sampling method is used for soils or rock too hard for sampling using Shelby Tubes. The method involves penetration of a split spoon sampler into the soil or rock through successive blows of a 140-pound hammer in a prescribed manner.

Blow Counts (N) per ASTM D 1586:

This is the number of blows required to drive a Split Spoon Sampler by means of a 140 pound hammer for a distance of 12 inches in accordance with the variables stated in the test procedures.

Geotechnical Engineering Report MEG Project No.: 01-24-29130 June 19, 2024



Shelby Tube (ST) per ASTM D 1587:

This procedure is for using a thin-walled metal tube to recover relatively undisturbed soil samples suitable for laboratory tests of physical properties.

Dry Density (DD) per ASTM D 2937:

This procedure is for the determination of in-place density of soil. The test results are measured in pounds per cubic foot, pcf.

Unconfined Compression Test (Uc) per ASTM D 2166:

This test method covers the determination of the unconfined compressive strength of cohesive soil in the undisturbed, remolded, or compacted condition, using strain-controlled application of the axial load.

Minus No. 200 Sieve per ASTM D 1140:

This test method covers determination of the amount of material finer than a Number 200 sieve by washing. The results are stated as a percent of the total dry weight of the sample.

Pocket Penetrometer (PP):

This test method is an accepted modification of ASTM D 1558 test method for establishing the moisture-penetration resistance relationships of fine-grained soils. The test results are measured in tons per square foot, tsf. The strength values provided by this method should be considered qualitatively.

Rock Quality Designation (RQD):

The measure of the quality of a rock mass defined by adding intact rock core pieces greater than four inches in length by the total length of core advance.

Recovery Ratio (REC):

The Recovery Ratio is equal to the total length of core recovered divided by the total length of core advance.

Boring Logs:

This is a summary of the above-described information at each boring location.

APPENDIX F PLANT NATURAL SOILS & SOIL COMPOSTS



Client #: 4564

Date: June 7, 2024

Lab #: 73372 - 73375 Client: Millennium Engineers Group, Inc Leticia Puentes Field: Med High Mercedes, Texas Crop: Grasses-Turf,



Low

Optimal

Marginal

Hiah



	Refer to guide * Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Mimics plant roots natural extraction											Parts Per Million (ppm)										
			Free	Perce	nt - (%)		Salts	Ammonium	Nitrate	Phosphate	Potas	ssium	Sod	lium	Cal	cium	Magn	esium	Water Solu	uble - W.S.		
Sample Identification		Text.	Lime	Organic Matter		рН	E.C.	NH₄-N	H ₄ -N NO ₃ -N	P ₂ O ₅	ĸ		Na		Ca		Mg		Bicarbonates	Sulfates	Rat	tios
	-		CO3	Total	Active	Std Unit	mmhos/cm	lbs/ac	lbs/ac	lbs/ac	H ₂ O	CO ₂ *	H ₂ O	CO ₂ *	H ₂ O	CO ₂ *	H ₂ O	CO ₂ *	HCO ₃	SO ₄ - S	Na:Ca	Na:Mg
1	G-1	5	L		1.71	7.95	0.85		1	7	17	78	127	169	60	1439	11	135		5	3	16
2	G-2	5	L		1.71	7.91	0.78		5	6	19	77	84	110	74	1422	11	125		5	2	10
3	G-3	5	н		2.46	8.04	0.82		2	5	49	135	77	98	68	1502	10	122		5	1	10
4	G-4	5	Н		2.55	8.06	0.72		5	12	32	105	76	86	54	1503	8	109		5	2	11
	Optimal-General			2.8-4.8	2.8-4.8	6.3-6.8	0.18-1.00		35-90	50-100	75-100	80-125	< 100	< 175	60-120	300-800	13-20	60-100	< 150	25-55	2 - 6	5 - 8

*SALT CATIONS: H₂O = *Immediately Available* (water soluble extract); CO₂ [Plants' roots give off CO₂] = *Available Reserve* (carbonic acid extract). Plant Natural[™] Extraction calibrates well to plant uptake (availability). These values are the nutrients available in the sample provided to our lab. Availability ratings have been calibrated by multiple plant analyses (crop logging) during a growing season by numerous crops on hundreds of fields both domestic and foreign. TPS Lab is guided by ASK THE PLANT® with precision sampling and lab methods. Was this a COMPOSITE SAMPLE, representative of your plants' major root zone provided? Rev032118

			Parts Per Million (ppm)												
			Hot Water	Calcium Chloride		W.S.	Sol	vita							
S	ample Identification	Zinc	Iron	Manganese	Copper	Cobalt	Molybdenum	Selenium	Nickel	Boron	Silicon	Aluminum	Chlorides	Burst	SLAN
		Zn	Fe	Mn	Cu	Co	Мо	Se	Ni	В	Si	AI	CI	C-CO ₂	
1	G-1	0.80	12.07	5.55	1.18					1.25					
2	G-2	0.62	11.42	5.94	1.10					1.16					
3	G-3	0.67	9.31	6.32	1.11					1.30					
4	G-4	0.83	4.63	6.20	0.87					0.51					
	Optimal-General	3.10 - 6.10	11.10 - 18.10	10.10 - 15.10	2.60 - 3.60	15.00 - 40.00	1.50 - 2.00	1.50 - 2.00	5.00 - 7.00	1.30 - 2.00	60 - 100	< 6	20 - 200	> 82	

Client #: 4564 Lab #: 73372 - 73375

Client: Millennium Engineers Group, Inc Leticia Puentes Field: Med High Mercedes, Texas

Crop: Grasses-Turf, Date: June 7, 2024





956-383-0739 TPSLab.com • AskThePlant.com

	, .																							
		Most crop nutrie	ent removal rates a	re from In	nternation	al Plant Nutrition	Institute.	These	e fertilize	r guideli	nes are	ANNUA	L RATES	to be a	pplied i	n multip	ole split	applica	tions ov	er the e	entire g	rowing	season.	
s	ample Identification	Plant Removal Rates Total Nutrient Plant Uptake Ibs/1000 sqft					Fertilizer Guidelines For Maximum Economic Yields Recommendations lbs/1000 sqft Ounces per Acr										r Acre							
		Plant/Crop	Yield	Ν	P_2O_5	K ₂ O	Mg	Gypsum	Lime	Sulfur	Ν	P_2O_5	K ₂ O*	Mg	Zn*	Fe*	Mn*	Cu*	B*	Co	Мо	Se	Ni	Si
1	G-1	Grasses-Turf	4.05 lbs	5.06	1.35	4.05	0.34			2-3X	5.84	1.59	0.55		0.11		0.07	0.07	0.02					
2	G-2	Grasses-Turf	4.05 lbs	5.06	1.35	4.05	0.34			2-3X	5.74	1.62	0.61		0.11		0.07	0.07	0.02					
3	G-3	Grasses-Turf	4.05 lbs	5.06	1.35	4.05	0.34			2-3X	5.57	1.64			0.11	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.02					
4	G-4	Grasses-Turf	4.05 lbs	5.06	1.35	4.05	0.34			2-3X	5.48	1.47			0.11	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.03					

Fertilizer Recommendations (N-P-K) are adjusted to reflect efficiency of recovery by plant and Estimated Nitrogen Release from Organic Matter. ENR estimates a 60% mineralization with optimum microbial activity, moisture and temperature. Micronutrient recommendations may have to be adjusted according to method of application and chleation of products. Ask The Plant* can determine actual plant uptake of these nutrients during the growing season. * Potassium recommendations are for a rebuilding program and should be applied in split applications over a few years. We do recommend at least a 1:1 ratio of N:K2O each year during the rebuilding phase. Subsoils: While most plant roots feed in the 4 to 12 inch depth, the next 12-24 inches may also be a major contributor. For the most accurate soil test recommendations, sample topsoil and subsoil separately in 12 inch increments. A detailed write-up of interpretations and recommendations for this soil report is available upon request of item SAO-00. Refer to fee schedule for current price.

SOIL INOCULANTS - Activators (in the absence of adequate soil humus or in sterile conditions) of soil inoculants/ compost teas containing naturally occurring beneficial soil micro-organisms and/or enzymes, hormones, polymers, wetting agents and carboxyl's may improve nutrient uptake and the soil's physical condition (tilth) for better plant performance, possibly disease resistance and salt leaching. Feeding microbes with humic substances, carbohydrates, and other organic materials aid soil tilth and releases soil nutrients while helping some bacteria fix atmospheric N. [A combination of products may be best – follow product labels on your own test plots for the most effective products.]

CALCIUM - Samples 1, 2, 3, 4: SULFUR use recommended rate at least 2 or 3 times a year. (S effect lasts only 45-90 days in most cases.) Sulfur improves the physical condition (tilth) of the soil for better water and root penetration and increase nutrient availability. Sulfur activates Ca and Mg by solubilizing them to the available water (H2O) soluble form. Soluble Ca helps sodium to leach. S can also release P and Micronutrients.





SITE PLAN

C2





SCALE: 1" = 40'



ALTERATION OF A SEALED DOCUMENT WITHOUT PROPER NOTIFICATION TO THE RESPONSIBLE ENGINEER IS AN OFFENSE UNDER THE TEXAS ENGINEERING PRACTICE LAW





SCALE: 1" = 40'



ALTERATION OF A SEALED DOCUMENT WITHOUT PROPER NOTIFICATION TO THE RESPONSIBLE ENGINEER IS AN OFFENSE UNDER THE TEXAS ENGINEERING PRACTICE LAW

GMS ARCHITECTS SOUTH TEXAS 2826 (356) 546-0110 fax (356) 546-0110 fax (356) 546-0110 fax (356) 546-0110 SOUTH TEXAS 2826 (356) 546-0110 fax (356) 546-0110 SUBBLETER STATES SUBBLETER	#1	REVIS Addend	IONS lum #1	BY C.P
South texas 78526 (956) 546-0110 fax (956) 546-0110				
South texas 78526 (956) 546-0110 fax (956) 546-0100 fax (956) fax (956) fa				
NEW SPORT FIELDS AT MERCEDES CAMPUS NEW SPORT FIELDS AT MERCEDES CAMPUS NEW SPORT FIELDS AT MERCEDES CAMPUS	GM :	S ARC		CTS
SOUTH TEXAS ISD NEW SPORT FIELDS AT MERCEDES CAMPUS	(95 fax	brown texas 56) 5 (956)	546-01	10 0196
		TH TEXAS ISD	ELDS AT MERCEDES CAMPUS	

C Copyright 2024
Gomez Mendez Saenz Inc.
Architects-Planners
Interior Designers
Date:
JUNE 18, 2024
Scale:
As Noted
Project Architect:
David Monreal, AIA
Jrawn By:
Sheet:
DRAINAGE AND GRADING
$\cap 2$
63









LEGEND

SEDIMENT CONTROL FENCE

-SOCK FOR INLET

- CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE

- SEDIMENT CONTROL FENCE FOR OUTFALLS



TEXAS ENGINEERING PRACTICE LAW

TEMPORARY SEDIMENT CONTROL FENCE

4" SAND BEDDING CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH LATEST REGULATIONS AS SET FORTH IN <u>AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT</u> (ADA).

PROVIDE DROP CURBS AT INTERSECTIONS.

CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY EXISTENCE AND LOCATION OF EXISTING UTILITY LINES WITH APPROPRIATE COMPANIES TO AVOID PLACING SIDEWALKS ON TOP OF LINES.

SIDEWALK CONCRETE SHALL BE 5 SACK CEMENT MIX AND SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF 3000 psi.

SIDEWALK GRADIENT SHALL NOT EXCEED 1:20.

MINIMUM 5'-0" WIDE SIDEWALK.

SIDEWALK NOTES:

CLEAR



EXPANSION JOINT EVERY 30'

PLAN

VARIES

SLOPE: 1/4" PER FT.

4 4 . . .







SECTION "A-A"

SPACING





NOTE: ALL STEEL TO BE No. 4 BARS @ 12" SPACING IN BOTH DIRECTIONS INLET GRATE and FRAME TO BE "ALAMO" PATTERN 847-02 CLEAR OPEINING LENGTH OF FRAME – 29 1/4" CLEAR OPENING WIDTH OF FRAME – 17" TOTAL WEIGHT FRAME AND GRATE – 240 lbs.



STANDARD STORM SEWER PRE-CAST CONCRETE MANHOLE



b) WHERE PLASTICITY IS GREA THAN 20 MECHANICAL TAMP IN 6-8" LAYERS

TYPE "C-C" GRATED INLET (TWO GRATES PER INLET)

 FIELD DRAINAGE NOTES AFTER EXCAVATION OF EXISTING SOIL TO THE PROPER ELEVATIONS REQUIRED THE NEWS SUBGRADE WILL BE SHAPED AND COMPACTED TO DESIGNED DENSITY WITH A 0.5% SLOPE TO ALLOW FOR DRAINAGE. A NEW CONCRETE CURB AND NAILER WILL BE INSTALLED AROUND THE PERIMETER TO PROVIDE A SECURE EDGE FOR FASTENING THE SYNTHETIC TURF. IN ALL CASES THE NAILER AND STONE ARE AT THE SAME ELEVATION. A GEOTEXTILE FABRIC WILL BE PLACED OVER THE SUBGRADE, AND COMPOSITE DRAINS WILL BE NOTALLED AT 30 FEET ON CENTER AT A 45 DEGREE ANGLE TO THE FIELD REFER TO THE FIELD DRAINAGE PLAN. (HERRINGBONE DESIGN) THE COMPOSITE DRAINS WILL DRAIN TO AN B' (MIN) PERIMETER COLLECTOR WHICH WILL BE CONNECTED TO THE EXISTING DRAINAGE SYSTEM. FREE DRAINING AGGREGATE SHALL BE PLACED OVER THE COMPOSITE DRAINS AND THE PERIMETER COLLECTORS AND FINE GRADED FOR A FIELD WITH A 0.5% SLOPE. ALL PIPE SIZING SHALL BE COMPLETED BY A QUALIFIED CIVIL ENGINEER. 	No.REVISIONSBY#1Addendum #1C.P.Image: Constraint of the second secon
Image: Stratu 20 Image: Stratu 20 Image: Stratu 20	SOUTH TEXAS ISD BOUTH TEXAS ISD NEW SPORT FIELDS AT MERCEDES CAMPUS RECEDES CAMPUS
MELDEN & HUNT, INC. TEXAS REGISTRATION F-1435 KELLEY A. HELLER-VELA 97421 VONAL KELLEY A. HELLER-VELA 97421 KELLEY A. HELLER-VELA THE SEAL APPEARING ON THIS DOCUMENT WAS AUTHORIZED BY KELLEY A. HELLER-VELA, P.E. 97421	© Copyright 2024 Gomez Mendez Saenz Inc. Architects-Planners Interior Designers Date: JUNE 18, 2024 Scale: As Noted Project Architect: David Monreal, AIA Drawn By: IO Job No. STISD SPORTS FIELDS Sheet:

CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

C5

WITHOUT PROPER NOTIFICATION TO THE RESPONSIBLE ENGINEER

IS AN OFFENSE UNDER THE TEXAS ENGINEERING PRACTICE LAW








No. REVISIONS

#1 Addendum #1

GMS ARCHITECTS

1150 paredes line rd. brownsville texas 78526 (956) 546-0110 fax (956) 546-0196

BY

C.P.



MED

HIGH

MERCEDES CSP 25-011

LEY A. HELLER-VEL THE SEAL APPEARING ON THIS DOCUMENT WAS AUTHORIZED BY KELLEY A. HELLER-VELA, P.E. 97421 Scale ALTERATION OF A SEALED DOCUMENT WITHOUT PROPER NOTIFICATION TO THE RESPONSIBLE ENGINEER IS AN OFFENSE UNDER THE TEXAS ENGINEERING PRACTICE LAW Job No. PROPOSED SITE C2

MELDEN & HUNT, INC. TEXAS REGISTRATION F-1435

×

97421







M







| for steel posts).



TEXAS ENGINEERING PRACTICE LAW

UTILITY LINES WITH APPROPRIATE COMPANIES TO AVOID PLACING SIDEWALKS ON TOP OF LINES. PROVIDE DROP CURBS AT INTERSECTIONS. 4" SAND BEDDING CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH LATEST REGULATIONS AS SET FORTH IN <u>AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT</u> (ADA).

CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY EXISTENCE AND LOCATION OF EXISTING

SIDEWALK CONCRETE SHALL BE 5 SACK CEMENT MIX AND SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF 3000 psi.

SIDEWALK GRADIENT SHALL NOT EXCEED 1:20.

MINIMUM 5'-0" WIDE SIDEWALK.

SIDEWALK NOTES:





EXPANSION JOINT EVERY 30'



(TWO GRATES PER INLET)



TYPE "B" INLET



SECTION "A-A"





SECTION "B-B"

CLEAR OPENING WIDTH OF FRAME – 17" TOTAL WEIGHT FRAME AND GRATE - 240 lbs.

<u>NOTE:</u> ALL STEEL TO BE No. 4 BARS @ 12" SPACING IN BOTH DIRECTIONS INLET GRATE and FRAME TO BE "ALAMO" PATTERN 847-02 CLEAR OPEINING LENGTH OF FRAME - 29 1/4"





















CSP 25-011 South Texas ISD Athletic Field Mercedes Site Architect Project NO: S2000724

Addendum # 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDUM # 2

Company Name: _____

Company Representative: _____

Company Representative Signature: _____

Phone Number: _____

Date: _____