

**GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL
BUILDING**

8978 Haven Avenue
Rancho Cucamonga, California
for
Duke Realty



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**
A California Corporation

November 27, 2018

Duke Realty
200 Spectrum Center Drive, Suite 1600
Irvine, California 92618



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**
A California Corporation

Attention: Mr. Michael Weber
Assistant Development Services Manager

Project No.: **17G192-1R**

Subject: **Geotechnical Investigation**
Proposed Commercial/Industrial Building
8978 Haven Avenue
Rancho Cucamonga, California

Gentlemen:

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

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

Respectfully Submitted,

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL, INC.

Joseph Lozano Leon
Staff Engineer

Robert G. Trazo, M.Sc., GE 2655
Principal Engineer

Distribution: (1) Addressee



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES	3
3.0 SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION	4
3.1 Site Conditions	4
3.2 Proposed Development	4
3.3 Previous Study	5
4.0 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION	6
4.1 Scope of Exploration/Sampling Methods	6
4.2 Geotechnical Conditions	6
5.0 LABORATORY TESTING	8
6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
6.1 Seismic Design Considerations	10
6.2 Geotechnical Design Considerations	12
6.3 Site Grading Recommendations	13
6.4 Construction Considerations	17
6.5 Foundation Design and Construction	18
6.6 Floor Slab Design and Construction	19
6.7 Retaining Wall Design and Construction	20
6.8 Pavement Design Parameters	22
7.0 GENERAL COMMENTS	25
APPENDICES	
A Plate 1: Site Location Map Plate 2: Boring Location Plan	
B Boring Logs	
C Laboratory Test Results	
D Grading Guide Specifications	
E Seismic Design Parameters	

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Geotechnical Design Considerations

- The subsurface exploration for this site included seven (7) borings.
- Artificial fill soils were encountered at several boring locations, extending from the ground surface to depths of 3 to 6½± feet.
- The fill soils and near-surface alluvial soils possess varying strengths and densities. In addition, the existing fill soils are considered to represent undocumented fill. These soils, in their present condition, are not considered suitable for support of the foundation loads of the new structure.
- Remedial grading will be necessary to remove the existing fill soils and a portion of the near-surface alluvial soils and replace them as compacted structural fill.
- Based on laboratory testing performed by NorCal Engineering, the on-site soils are considered to be mildly corrosive to ductile iron pipe.

Site Preparation Recommendations

- Initial site stripping should include removal of any surficial vegetation from the site. Stripping should include any weeds, grasses, shrubs and any organic top soils.
- The site plan provided to our office indicates that the existing building at the subject site will be demolished in order to facilitate the construction of the proposed development. Demolition should include all foundations, floor slabs, pavements, utilities and any other subsurface improvements that will not remain in place with the new development. Debris resultant from demolition should be disposed of off-site. Alternatively, concrete and asphalt debris may be pulverized to a maximum 2-inch particle size, well mixed with the on-site soils, and incorporated into new structural fills. It may also be crushed and made into crushed miscellaneous base (CMB), if desired.
- Remedial grading is recommended to be performed within the proposed building area in order to remove all of the artificial fill soils and a portion of the alluvial soils. The soils present within the proposed building area should be overexcavated to a depth of 3 feet below existing grade and to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed building pad subgrade elevation. The proposed foundation influence zones should also be overexcavated to a depth of at least 2 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade.
- It should be noted that the southeastern corner of the proposed building is located in close proximity, approximately 20 feet, to an existing right-of-way. Specialized grading techniques, such as A-B-C slot cuts, or a reduced bearing pressure for the affected foundations within this area may be required.
- After overexcavation has been completed, the resulting subgrade soils should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to identify any additional soils that should be overexcavated. The resulting soils should be scarified and moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, to a depth of at least 12 inches. The overexcavation subgrade soils should then be recompacted under the observation of the geotechnical engineer. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

- The new pavement and flatwork subgrade soils are recommended to be scarified to a depth of 12± inches, thoroughly moisture conditioned and recompact to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

Foundation Design Recommendations

- Conventional shallow foundations, supported in newly placed compacted fill.
- 2,500 lbs/ft² maximum allowable soil bearing pressure.
- Reinforcement consisting of at least two (2) No. 5 rebars (1 top and 1 bottom) in strip footings. Additional reinforcement may be necessary for structural considerations.

Building Floor Slab Design Recommendations

- Conventional Slab-on-Grade: minimum 5 inch thickness.
- Modulus of Subgrade Reaction: $k = 150$ psi/in.
- Reinforcement is not expected to be necessary for geotechnical considerations.
- The actual thickness and reinforcement of the floor slab should be determined by the structural engineer.

Pavement Design Recommendations

ASPHALT PAVEMENTS (R=50)					
Materials	Thickness (inches)				
	Auto Parking and Auto Drive Lanes (TI = 4.0 to 5.0)	Truck Traffic			
		TI = 6.0	TI = 7.0	TI = 8.0	TI = 9.0
Asphalt Concrete	3	3½	4	5	5½
Aggregate Base	3	4	5	5	7
Compacted Subgrade	12	12	12	12	12

PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENTS (R=50)				
Materials	Thickness (inches)			
	Autos and Light Truck Traffic (TI = 6.0)	Truck Traffic		
		TI = 7.0	TI = 8.0	TI = 9.0
PCC	5	5½	6½	8
Compacted Subgrade (95% minimum compaction)	12	12	12	12

2.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

The scope of services performed for this project was in accordance with our Proposal No. 17P377, dated October 5, 2017. The scope of services included a visual site reconnaissance, subsurface exploration, field and laboratory testing, and geotechnical engineering analysis to provide criteria for preparing the design of the building foundations, building floor slab, and parking lot pavements along with site preparation recommendations and construction considerations for the proposed development. The evaluation of the environmental aspects of this site was beyond the scope of services for this geotechnical investigation.

3.0 SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Site Conditions

The subject site is located on the south side of 8th Street, at the address of 8978 Haven Avenue in Rancho Cucamonga, California. The site is bounded to the north by 8th Street, to the west by a railroad easement, to the south by an industrial facility, and to the east by an auto repair facility and a vacant lot. The general location of the site is illustrated on the Site Location Map, enclosed as Plate 1 in Appendix A of this report.

The subject site is a nearly rectangular-shaped property, 6± acres in size. The site is developed with one (1) industrial building, approximately 20,000 ft² in size, located in the west-central area of the subject site. The building is a single-story structure of metal construction assumed to be supported on conventional shallow foundations with a concrete slab-on-grade floor. The ground surface cover surrounding the building consists of moderately to heavily cracked asphaltic concrete pavements with isolated areas of Portland cement concrete pavements. The remainder of the subject site is being utilized as a trailer parking lot. The ground surface cover for the remainder of the site consists of consists of weathered aggregate base with exposed soil.

Detailed topographic information was not available at the time of this report. However, based on visual observations, the site topography slopes to the south at an estimated gradient of approximately 1 to 2 percent. There was estimated to be 7 to 8± feet of elevation differential across the site.

3.2 Proposed Development

A conceptual site plan, prepared by HPA, Inc., was provided to our office by the client. The plan indicates that the new development will consist of one (1) new commercial/industrial building. The new building will be located in the central area of the site and will have an approximate footprint of 115,897 ft². The new building will be constructed with dock-high doors along the west side of the building. The new building is expected to be surrounded by asphaltic concrete pavements in the parking and drive areas and Portland cement concrete pavements in the loading dock areas. Several landscape planters and concrete flatwork are also expected to be included throughout the site.

Detailed structural information has not been provided. It is assumed that the new building will be a single-story structure of tilt-up concrete construction, typically supported on a conventional shallow foundation system with a concrete slab-on-grade floor. Based on the assumed construction, maximum column and wall loads are expected to be on the order of 80 kips and 3 to 5 kips per linear foot, respectively.

Based on the existing topography, it is expected that cuts and fills of 2 to 3± feet will be necessary to achieve the new site grades. No significant amounts of below grade construction, such as basements or crawl spaces, are expected to be included in the proposed development. It should

be noted that this estimate does not include any remedial grading recommendations which are presented in a subsequent section of this report.

3.3 Previous Study

Prior to the preparation of our report, Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. (SCG) was provided with the following report previously prepared for the subject site by NorCal Engineering (NorCal). A summary of the findings and conclusions of the report are presented below:

Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, Proposed Industrial Warehouse Development, 8978 Haven Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, California, prepared by NorCal for Newcastle Partners, NorCal Project No. 17641-14, dated September 16, 2014.

In 2014, NorCal conducted a geotechnical investigation for the subject site. The previous report was developed using the 2013 California Building Code (CBC). As part of the previous investigation, NorCal excavated six (6) trenches to depths ranging from 5 to 15± feet below the previously existing site grades. NorCal encountered fill and disturbed top soils that consisted of loose silty sands extending to depths of 1 to 3± feet. NorCal reported that native alluvial soils were encountered beneath the fill at all of the exploratory locations. NorCal indicated that the near-surface native soils consisted of medium dense silty sands with gravel. At greater depths, NorCal indicated that the native soils consisted of gravelly sands with cobbles. Groundwater was not encountered during the previous investigation and NorCal indicated that the groundwater was deeper than 15± feet at the time of their investigation.

Laboratory testing performed by NorCal included field moisture content, maximum density tests, expansion index tests, corrosion tests, R-value test, direct shear tests, and consolidation tests. It should be noted that NorCal determined that the on-site soils are mildly corrosive to ductile iron pipe.

The NorCal report stated that the potential for liquefaction at the subject site was considered to be very low due to the depth of groundwater, reportedly to be in excess of 400 feet from ground surface. The NorCal report included recommendations for supporting the proposed building on conventional shallow foundations designed for allowable soil bearing pressures ranging from 2,000 to 3,000 lbs/ft².

4.0 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

4.1 Scope of Exploration/Sampling Methods

The subsurface exploration conducted for this project consisted of seven (7) borings (identified as Boring Nos. B-1 through B-7) advanced to depths of 5 to 25± feet below the existing site grades. All of the borings were logged during drilling by a member of our staff.

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

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

4.2 Geotechnical Conditions

Artificial Fill

Artificial fill soils were encountered at the ground surface at all of the boring locations, with the exception of Boring Nos. B-1 and B-3, extending to depths of 3 to 6½± feet below the existing site grades. The fill soils generally consist of loose to medium dense silty fine sands with varying amounts of medium to coarse sand and fine to coarse gravel. The fill soils possess a disturbed appearance resulting in their classification as artificial fill.

Alluvium

Native alluvium was encountered at the ground surface at Boring Nos. B-1 and B-3 and beneath the artificial fill soils at the remaining boring locations, extending to at least the maximum depth explored of 25± feet below the existing site grades. The near-surface alluvial soils generally consist of medium dense silty fine sands with varying amounts of medium to coarse sand and fine gravel, extending to depths of 6½ to 12± feet. At depths greater than 6½ to 12± feet, the alluvial soils generally consist of medium dense to dense gravelly sands, sands and silty sands, extending to the maximum depth explored of 25± feet. Occasional cobbles were encountered at

several soil strata at Boring Nos. B-1, B-2, B-4, and B-5 at depths as close as of $6\frac{1}{2}\pm$ feet from the ground surface. Boring Nos. B-6 and B-7 encountered layers consisting of loose to medium dense silty fine sands with varying amounts of medium to coarse sand and fine gravel at depths of 3 to $5\pm$ feet.

Groundwater

Free water was not encountered during the drilling of any of the borings. Based on the lack of any water within the borings, and the moisture contents of the recovered soil samples, the static groundwater is considered to have existed at a depth in excess of $25\pm$ feet at the time of the subsurface exploration.

As part of our research, we reviewed available groundwater data in order to determine the historic high groundwater level for the site. The primary reference used to determine the groundwater depths in this area is the California Department of Water Resources website, <http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/>. The nearest monitoring well in this database is located approximately 3,100 feet southwest from the site. Water level readings within this monitoring well indicate high groundwater levels of $326\pm$ feet (November 1989) below the ground surface.

5.0 LABORATORY TESTING

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

Classification

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

Density and Moisture Content

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

Consolidation

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

Maximum Dry Density and Optimum Moisture Content

A representative bulk sample was tested for its maximum dry density and optimum moisture content. The results have been obtained using the Modified Proctor procedure, per ASTM D-1557 and are presented on Sheet C-5 in Appendix C of this report. These tests are generally used to compare the in-situ densities of undisturbed field samples, and for later compaction testing. Additional testing of other soil types or soil mixes may be necessary at a later date.

Soluble Sulfates

Representative samples of the near-surface soils were submitted to a subcontracted analytical laboratory for determination of soluble sulfate content. Soluble sulfates are naturally present in soils, and if the concentration is high enough, can result in degradation of concrete which comes

into contact with these soils. The results of the soluble sulfate testing are presented below, and are discussed further in a subsequent section of this report.

<u>Sample Identification</u>	<u>Soluble Sulfates (%)</u>	<u>Sulfate Classification</u>
B-1 @ 0 to 5 feet	< 0.001	Negligible
B-5 @ 0 to 5 feet	< 0.001	Negligible

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of our review, field exploration, laboratory testing and geotechnical analysis, the proposed development is considered feasible from a geotechnical standpoint. The recommendations contained in this report should be taken into the design, construction, and grading considerations. The recommendations are contingent upon all grading and foundation construction activities being monitored by the geotechnical engineer of record. The Grading Guide Specifications, included as Appendix D, should be considered part of this report, and should be incorporated into the project specifications. The contractor and/or owner of the development should bring to the attention of the geotechnical engineer any conditions that differ from those stated in this report, or which may be detrimental for the development.

6.1 Seismic Design Considerations

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

Faulting and Seismicity

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

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

Seismic Design Parameters

Based on standards in place at the time of this report, the proposed development is expected to be designed in accordance with the requirements of the 2016 edition of the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC provides procedures for earthquake resistant structural design that include considerations for on-site soil conditions, occupancy, and the configuration of the structure including the structural system and height. The seismic design parameters presented below are based on the soil profile and the proximity of known faults with respect to the subject site.

The 2016 CBC Seismic Design Parameters have been generated using U.S. Seismic Design Maps, a web-based software application developed by the United States Geological Survey. This software application, available at the USGS web site, calculates seismic design parameters in accordance with the 2016 CBC, utilizing a database of deterministic site accelerations at 0.01

degree intervals. The table below is a compilation of the data provided by the USGS application. A copy of the output generated from this program is included in Appendix E of this report. A copy of the Design Response Spectrum, as generated by the USGS application is also included in Appendix E. Based on this output, the following parameters may be utilized for the subject site:

2016 CBC SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS

Parameter		Value
Mapped Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	S_S	1.500
Mapped Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	S_1	0.600
Site Class	---	D
Site Modified Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	S_{MS}	1.500
Site Modified Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	S_{M1}	0.900
Design Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	S_{DS}	1.000
Design Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	S_{D1}	0.600

Liquefaction

Liquefaction is the loss of strength in generally cohesionless, saturated soils when the pore-water pressure induced in the soil by a seismic event becomes equal to or exceeds the overburden pressure. The primary factors which influence the potential for liquefaction include groundwater table elevation, soil type and plasticity characteristics, relative density of the soil, initial confining pressure, and intensity and duration of ground shaking. The depth within which the occurrence of liquefaction may impact surface improvements is generally identified as the upper 50 feet below the existing ground surface. Liquefaction potential is greater in saturated, loose, poorly graded fine sands with a mean (d_{50}) grain size in the range of 0.075 to 0.2 mm (Seed and Idriss, 1971). Non-sensitive clayey (cohesive) soils which possess a plasticity index of at least 18 (Bray and Sancio, 2006) are generally not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction, nor are those soils which are above the historic static groundwater table.

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has not yet conducted detailed seismic hazards mapping in the area of the subject site. The general liquefaction susceptibility of the site was determined by research of the San Bernardino County Land Use Plan, General Plan, Geologic Hazard Overlays. Map FH28 indicates that the subject site is not located within an area of liquefaction susceptibility. Based on the mapping performed by the county of San Bernardino and the subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations, liquefaction is not considered to be a design concern for this project.

6.2 Geotechnical Design Considerations

General

The site is generally underlain by artificial fill soils, extending to depths of 3 to 6½± feet below the existing site grades. These soils possess varying strengths and densities. In addition, we have not been provided with documentation regarding the placement of the on-site fill soils. Based on all of these factors, these soils are considered undocumented fill soils. The near-surface alluvial soils also possess varying strengths and densities. Therefore, the existing undocumented fill and the upper portion of the native alluvium are not considered suitable for support of the new structure. Based on these conditions, remedial grading is considered warranted within the proposed building area in order to remove all of the undocumented fill soils in their entirety as well as the upper portion of the near-surface native alluvial soils, and replace them as compacted fill soils.

It should be noted that the southeastern corner of the proposed building is located in close proximity, approximately 20 feet, to an existing right-of-way. Boring No. B-5 was drilled within this area and encountered fill soils extending to a depth of 6½± feet. Based on these conditions, the recommended lateral extent using conventional grading techniques within this area may not be feasible. Specialized grading techniques within the southeastern corner of the proposed building are discussed further in a subsequent section of this report.

Settlement

The recommended remedial grading will remove the existing undocumented fill soils and a portion of the near-surface native alluvial soils and replace these materials as compacted structural fill. The native soils that will remain in place below the recommended depth of overexcavation will not be subject to significant stress increases from the foundations of the new structures. Therefore, following completion of the recommended grading, post-construction settlements are expected to be within tolerable limits.

Expansion

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

Soluble Sulfates

The results of the soluble sulfate testing indicate that the selected samples of the on-site soils contain negligible concentrations of soluble sulfates, in accordance with American Concrete Institute (ACI) guidelines. Therefore, specialized concrete mix designs are not considered to be necessary, with regard to sulfate protection purposes. It is, however, recommended that additional soluble sulfate testing be conducted at the completion of rough grading to verify the soluble sulfate concentrations of the soils which are present at pad grade within the building area.

Shrinkage/Subsidence

Based on the results of the laboratory testing, removal and recompaction of the loose to medium dense near-surface soils, extending to depths of 2½ to 6± feet, is estimated to result in an average shrinkage of 4 to 8 percent. The native medium dense silty sands that will remain in place, at depths greater than 2½ and 6± feet, will likely possess an average shrinkage of 0 to 5 percent. It should be noted that this shrinkage estimate is based on the results of dry density testing performed on small-diameter samples of the existing soils taken at the boring locations. If a more accurate and precise shrinkage estimate is desired, SCG can perform a shrinkage study involving several excavated test-pits where in-place densities are determined using in-situ testing methods instead of laboratory density testing on small-diameter samples. Please contact SCG for details and a cost estimate regarding a shrinkage study, if desired.

Minor ground subsidence is expected to occur in the soils below the zone of removal, due to settlement and machinery working. The subsidence is estimated to be 0.1± feet. This estimate may be used for grading in areas that are underlain by native alluvial soils.

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

Corrosion Potential

Laboratory testing performed by NorCal indicates that the on-site soils possess resistivity values of 2,275 ohm-cm, pH values of 7.1, and chloride content of 249 mg/kg. These test results have been evaluated in accordance with guidelines published by the Ductile Iron Pipe Research Association (DIPRA). The DIPRA guidelines consist of a point system by which characteristics of the soils are used to quantify the corrosivity characteristics of the site. Resistivity, pH, Sulfides, and redox potential are factors that enter into the evaluation procedure. Relative soil moisture content is also considered. **Based on these factors, and utilizing the DIPRA procedure, the on-site soils are considered to be mildly corrosive to ductile iron pipe. Therefore, protection for embedded metal improvements is expected to be required.** Since SCG does not practice in the area of corrosion engineering, the client may also wish to contact a corrosion engineer to provide a more thorough evaluation.

Grading and Foundation Plan Review

Grading and foundation plans were not available at the time of this report. It is therefore recommended that we be provided with copies of the preliminary grading and foundation plans, when they become available, for review with regard to the conclusions, recommendations, and assumptions contained within this report.

6.3 Site Grading Recommendations

The grading recommendations presented below are based on the subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations and our understanding of the proposed development. We recommend that all grading activities be completed in accordance with the Grading Guide

Specifications included as Appendix D of this report, unless superseded by site-specific recommendations presented below.

Site Stripping and Demolition

Initial site stripping should include removal of any surficial vegetation from the site. Stripping should include any weeds, grasses, shrubs and any organic top soils. The actual extent of site stripping should be determined in the field by the geotechnical engineer, based on the organic content and stability of the materials encountered.

The site plan provided to our office indicates that the existing building at the subject site will be demolished in order to facilitate the construction of the proposed development. Demolition should include all foundations, floor slabs, pavements, utilities and any other subsurface improvements that will not remain in place with the new development. Debris resultant from demolition should be disposed of off-site. Alternatively, concrete and asphalt debris may be pulverized to a maximum 2-inch particle size, well mixed with the on-site soils, and incorporated into new structural fills. It may also be crushed and made into crushed miscellaneous base (CMB), if desired.

Treatment of Existing Soils: Building Pad

Remedial grading should be performed within the proposed building pad area in order to remove any soils disturbed during demolition, the existing undocumented fill soils, and the upper portion of the existing near-surface native alluvial soils. Based on conditions encountered at the boring locations, the existing soils within the proposed building area are recommended to be overexcavated to a depth of at least 3 feet below existing grade and to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed building pad subgrade elevations, whichever is greater. **The depth of the overexcavation should also extend to a depth sufficient to remove all undocumented fill soils.** The undocumented fill soils at Boring No. B-5 extend to a depth of $6\frac{1}{2}\pm$ feet. Additional overexcavation should be performed within the influence zones of the new foundations, to provide for a new layer of compacted structural fill extending to a depth of at least 2 feet below proposed bearing grades.

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

Due to the proximity of the proposed building southeastern corner to an existing right-of-way, the overexcavation within this area may require utilizing slot cut (A-B-C slots) excavation techniques. If required, the newly exposed overexcavation subgrade soils for each slot should be evaluated and approved for filling by SCG prior to placement of structural fill. More detailed recommendations regarding slot-cutting procedures are discussed in Section 6.4 of this report. The remainder of the proposed building pad area may be overexcavated using conventional grading techniques. If the full extent of overexcavation is not achieved during grading operations, the affected foundations may need to be re-design using reduced bearing pressures.

Following completion of the overexcavation, the subgrade soils within the overexcavation areas should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to verify their suitability to serve as the

structural fill subgrade, as well as to support the foundation loads of the new structure. This evaluation should include proofrolling and probing to identify any soft, loose or otherwise unstable soils that must be removed. **Some localized areas of deeper excavation may be required if additional fill materials or loose, porous, or low density native soils are encountered at the base of the overexcavation.**

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

Treatment of Existing Soils: Retaining Walls and Site Walls

The existing soils within the areas of proposed retaining and non-retaining site walls should be overexcavated to a depth of at least 2 feet below foundation bearing grade and replaced as compacted structural fill as discussed above for the proposed building pad. Any undocumented fill soils within any of these foundation areas should be removed in their entirety. The overexcavation areas should extend at least 5 feet beyond the foundation perimeters, and to an extent equal to the depth of fill below the new foundations. Please note that erection pads are considered to be part of the foundation system. These overexcavation recommendations apply to erection pads also. The overexcavation subgrade soils should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer prior to scarifying, moisture conditioning, and recompacting the upper 12 inches of exposed subgrade soils, as discussed for the building areas. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

Treatment of Existing Soils: Flatwork, Parking and Drive Areas

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

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

The grading recommendations presented above for the proposed flatwork, parking and drive areas assume that the owner and/or developer can tolerate minor amounts of settlement within the proposed flatwork, parking and drive areas. The grading recommendations presented above do not completely mitigate the extent of existing fill soils that may be present in the flatwork, parking and drive areas. As such, some settlement and associated pavement distress could occur. Typically, repair of such distressed areas involves significantly lower costs than completely mitigating these soils at the time of construction. If the owner cannot tolerate the risk of such

settlements, the flatwork, parking and drive areas should be overexcavated to a depth of 2 feet below proposed pavement subgrade elevation, with the resulting soils replaced as compacted structural fill.

Fill Placement

- Fill soils should be placed in thin ($6\pm$ inches), near-horizontal lifts, moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, and compacted.
- On-site soils may be used for fill provided they are cleaned of any debris to the satisfaction of the geotechnical engineer.
- All grading and fill placement activities should be completed in accordance with the requirements of the 2016 CBC and the grading code of the city of Rancho Cucamonga.
- All fill soils should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. Fill soils should be well mixed.
- Compaction tests should be performed periodically by the geotechnical engineer as random verification of compaction and moisture content. These tests are intended to aid the contractor. Since the tests are taken at discrete locations and depths, they may not be indicative of the entire fill and therefore should not relieve the contractor of his responsibility to meet the job specifications.

Selective Grading and Oversized Material Placement

At some of the boring locations, the existing soils at depths of $6\frac{1}{2}\pm$ feet possess occasional cobbles with varying amounts of fine to coarse gravel. It is expected that large scrapers (Caterpillar 657 or equivalent) will be adequate to move the cobble-containing soils. The proposed grading may require excavation of cobble-containing soils and it may be desirable to selectively grade the proposed building pad area. The presence of particles greater than 3 inches in diameter within the upper 1 to 3 feet of the building pad subgrade will impact the utility and foundation excavations. Depending on the depths of fills required within the proposed parking areas, it may be feasible to sort the on-site soils, placing the materials greater than 3 inches in diameter within the lower depths of the fills, and limiting the upper 1 to 3 feet of soils to materials less than 3 inches in size. Oversized materials could also be placed within the lower depths of the recommended overexcavations. In order to achieve this grading, it would likely be necessary to use rock buckets and/or rock sieves to separate the oversized materials from the remaining soil. Although such selective grading will facilitate further construction activities, it is not considered mandatory and a suitable subgrade could be achieved without such extensive sorting. However, in any case it is recommended that all materials greater than 6 inches in size be excluded from the upper 1 foot of the surface of any compacted fills. The placement of any oversized materials should be performed in accordance with the grading guide specifications included in Appendix D of this report. If disposal of oversized materials is required, rock blankets or windrows should be used and such areas should be observed during construction and placement by a representative of the geotechnical engineer.

Imported Structural Fill

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

Utility Trench Backfill

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

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

6.4 Construction Considerations

Excavation Considerations

The near-surface soils generally consist of silty sands. Some of these materials will likely be subject to minor to moderate caving within shallow excavations, approximately 6½ feet from the ground surface. However, the on-site soils at depths greater than 6½± feet are generally more granular with varying amounts of fine gravel and occasional cobbles. These deeper soils will be subject to caving within excavations. Where caving does occur, flattened excavation slopes may be sufficient to provide excavation stability. On a preliminary basis, the inclination of temporary slopes should not exceed 2h:1v. Deeper excavations may require some form of external stabilization such as shoring or bracing. Maintaining adequate moisture content within the near-surface soils will improve excavation stability. All excavation activities on this site should be conducted in accordance with Cal-OSHA regulations.

Slot Cutting Recommendations

The proposed building southeastern corner is located 20± feet northwest of an existing right-of-way. Due to the fill depth within this area, the lateral extent of overexcavation may be limited. Therefore, depending upon the subsurface conditions encountered during remedial grading procedures, slot cutting may be necessary. The initial phase of excavation is expected to consist of a 2h:1v temporary slope. Small slot cuts may be made at the base of this inclined slope in order to remove all existing low strength, potentially collapsible soils from within the foundation influence zones and to provide the new layer of compacted structural fill beneath the proposed building foundations. The remainder of the proposed building pad area may be overexcavated using conventional grading techniques.

Groundwater

The static groundwater table is considered to have existed at a depth in excess of 25± feet at the time of the subsurface exploration. Therefore, groundwater is not expected to impact the grading or foundation construction activities.

6.5 Foundation Design and Construction

Based on the preceding grading recommendations, it is assumed that the new building pad will be underlain by structural fill soils used to replace the existing fill soils and a portion of the near-surface alluvial soils. These new structural fill soils are expected to extend to depths of at least 2 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade, underlain by $1\pm$ foot of additional soil that has been scarified, moisture conditioned, and recompacted. Based on this subsurface profile, the proposed structure may be supported on conventional shallow foundations.

Foundation Design Parameters

New square and rectangular footings may be designed as follows:

- Maximum, net allowable soil bearing pressure: 2,500 lbs/ft².
- Minimum wall/column footing width: 14 inches/24 inches.
- Minimum longitudinal steel reinforcement within strip footings: Two (2) No. 5 rebars (1 top and 1 bottom).
- Minimum foundation embedment: 12 inches into suitable structural fill soils, and at least 18 inches below adjacent exterior grade. Interior column footings may be placed immediately beneath the floor slab.
- It is recommended that the perimeter building foundations be continuous across all exterior doorways. Any flatwork adjacent to the exterior doors should be doweled into the perimeter foundations in a manner determined by the structural engineer.

The allowable bearing pressures presented above may be increased by 1/3 when considering short duration wind or seismic loads. The minimum steel reinforcement recommended above is based on geotechnical considerations; additional reinforcement may be necessary for structural considerations. The actual design of the foundations should be determined by the structural engineer.

Foundation Construction

The foundation subgrade soils should be evaluated at the time of overexcavation, as discussed in Section 6.3 of this report. It is further recommended that the foundation subgrade soils be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer immediately prior to steel or concrete placement. Soils suitable for direct foundation support should consist of newly placed structural fill, compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. Any unsuitable materials should be removed to a depth of suitable bearing compacted structural fill, with the resulting excavations backfilled with compacted fill soils. As an alternative, lean concrete slurry (500 to 1,500 psi) may be used to backfill such isolated overexcavations.

The foundation subgrade soils should also be properly moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent of the Modified Proctor optimum, to a depth of at least 12 inches below bearing grade. **Since it is typically not feasible to increase the moisture content of the floor slab and foundation**

subgrade soils once rough grading has been completed, care should be taken to maintain the moisture content of the building pad subgrade soils throughout the construction process.

Estimated Foundation Settlements

Post-construction total and differential settlements of shallow foundations designed and constructed in accordance with the previously presented recommendations are estimated to be less than 1.0 and 0.5 inches, respectively. Differential movements are expected to occur over a 30-foot span, thereby resulting in an angular distortion of less than 0.002 inches per inch.

Lateral Load Resistance

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

- Passive Earth Pressure: 300 lbs/ft³
- Friction Coefficient: 0.30

These are allowable values, and include a factor of safety. When combining friction and passive resistance, the passive pressure component should be reduced by one-third. These values assume that footings will be poured directly against compacted structural fill soils. The maximum allowable passive pressure is 3,000 lbs/ft².

6.6 Floor Slab Design and Construction

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

- Minimum slab thickness: 5 inches.
- Modulus of Subgrade Reaction: $k = 150$ psi/in.
- Minimum slab reinforcement: Reinforcement is not considered necessary from a geotechnical standpoint. The actual floor slab reinforcement should be determined by the structural engineer, based on the imposed slab loading.
- Slab underlayment: If moisture sensitive floor coverings will be used then minimum slab underlayment should consist of a moisture vapor barrier constructed below the entire area of the proposed slab where such moisture sensitive floor coverings are anticipated. The moisture vapor barrier should meet or exceed the Class A rating as defined by ASTM E 1745-97 and have a permeance rating less than 0.01 perms as described in ASTM E 96-95 and ASTM E 154-88. A polyolefin material such as Stego®

Wrap Vapor Barrier or equivalent will meet these specifications. The moisture vapor barrier should be properly constructed in accordance with all applicable manufacturer specifications. Given that a rock free subgrade is anticipated and that a capillary break is not required, sand below the barrier is not required. The need for sand and/or the amount of sand above the moisture vapor barrier should be specified by the structural engineer or concrete contractor. The selection of sand above the barrier is not a geotechnical engineering issue and hence outside our purview. Where moisture sensitive floor coverings are not anticipated, the vapor barrier may be eliminated.

- Moisture condition the floor slab subgrade soils to 2 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum moisture content, to a depth of 12 inches. The moisture content of the floor slab subgrade soils should be verified by the geotechnical engineer within 24 hours prior to concrete placement.
- Proper concrete curing techniques should be utilized to reduce the potential for slab curling or the formation of excessive shrinkage cracks.

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

6.7 Retaining Wall Design and Construction

Although not indicated on the site plan, some small (less than 6 feet in height) retaining walls may be required to facilitate the new site grades. The parameters recommended for use in the design of these walls are presented below.

Retaining Wall Design Parameters

Based on the soil conditions encountered at the boring locations, the following parameters may be used in the design of new retaining walls for this site. The following parameters assume that only the on-site soils will be utilized for retaining wall backfill. The near-surface soils generally consist of silty sands. Based on their composition, the on-site soils have been assigned a friction angle of 30 degrees.

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

RETAINING WALL DESIGN PARAMETERS

Design Parameter		Soil Type
		On-site Silty Sands
Internal Friction Angle (ϕ)		30°
Unit Weight		130 lbs/ft ³
Equivalent Fluid Pressure:	Active Condition (level backfill)	43 lbs/ft ³
	Active Condition (2h:1v backfill)	70 lbs/ft ³
	At-Rest Condition (level backfill)	65 lbs/ft ³

The walls should be designed using a soil-footing coefficient of friction of 0.30 and an equivalent passive pressure of 300 lbs/ft³. The structural engineer should incorporate appropriate factors of safety in the design of the retaining walls.

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

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

Seismic Lateral Earth Pressures

In accordance with the CBC, any retaining walls more than 6 feet in height must be designed for seismic lateral earth pressures. If walls 6 feet or more are required for this site, the geotechnical engineer should be contacted for supplementary seismic lateral earth pressure recommendations.

Retaining Wall Foundation Design

The retaining wall foundations should be supported within newly placed compacted structural fill, extending to a depth of at least 2 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade. Foundations to support new retaining walls should be designed in accordance with the general Foundation Design Parameters presented in a previous section of this report.

Backfill Material

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

It is recommended that a properly installed prefabricated drainage composite such as the MiraDRAIN 6000XL (or approved equivalent), which is specifically designed for use behind retaining walls be used. If the drainage composite material is not covered by an impermeable surface, such as a structure or pavement, a 12-inch thick layer of a low permeability soil should be placed over the backfill to reduce surface water migration to the underlying soils. The drainage composite should be separated from the backfill soils by a suitable geotextile, approved by the geotechnical engineer.

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

Subsurface Drainage

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

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

6.8 Pavement Design Parameters

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

Pavement Subgrades

It is anticipated that the new pavements will be primarily supported on a layer of compacted structural fill, consisting of scarified, thoroughly moisture conditioned and recompacted existing soils. The near-surface soils generally consist of silty sands. These soils are generally considered to possess excellent pavement support characteristics, with R-values in the range of 50 to 60. The subsequent pavement design is therefore based upon an assumed R-value of 50. Any fill

material imported to the site should have support characteristics equal to or greater than that of the on-site soils and be placed and compacted under engineering controlled conditions. It is recommended that R-value testing be performed after completion of rough grading to verify that the pavement design recommendations presented herein are valid.

Asphaltic Concrete

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

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

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

ASPHALT PAVEMENTS (R=50)					
Materials	Thickness (inches)				
	Auto Parking and Auto Drive Lanes (TI = 4.0 to 5.0)	Truck Traffic			
		TI = 6.0	TI = 7.0	TI = 8.0	TI = 9.0
Asphalt Concrete	3	3½	4	5	5½
Aggregate Base	3	4	5	5	7
Compacted Subgrade	12	12	12	12	12

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

Portland Cement Concrete

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

PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENTS (R=50)				
Materials	Thickness (inches)			
	Autos and Light Truck Traffic (TI = 6.0)	Truck Traffic		
		TI = 7.0	TI = 8.0	TI = 9.0
PCC	5	5½	6½	8
Compacted Subgrade (95% minimum compaction)	12	12	12	12

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

7.0 GENERAL COMMENTS


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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A



SOURCE: SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
THOMAS GUIDE, 2013



SITE LOCATION MAP
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL BUILDING
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA


SCALE: 1" = 2400'

DRAWN: JLH
CHKD: GKM
SCG PROJECT
17G192-1R




PLATE 1



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**



GEOTECHNICAL LEGEND









-  PROPOSED BORING LOCATION
-  EXISTING STRUCTURE TO BE DEMOLISHED
-  PREVIOUS TRENCH LOCATION PERFORMED BY NORCAL ENGINEERING (NORCAL PROJECT NUMBER 17641-14)

NOTE: SITE PLAN OBTAINED FROM HPA, INC.

BORING LOCATION PLAN	
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL BUILDING	
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA	
SCALE: 1" = 80'	 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
DRAWN: JLH CHKD: GKM	
SCG PROJECT 17G192-1R	
PLATE 2	

APPENDIX B

BORING LOG LEGEND

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

COLUMN DESCRIPTIONS

DEPTH:

Distance in feet below the ground surface.

SAMPLE:

Sample Type as depicted above.

BLOW COUNT:

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

POCKET PEN.:

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

GRAPHIC LOG:

Graphic Soil Symbol as depicted on the following page.

DRY DENSITY:

Dry density of an undisturbed or relatively undisturbed sample in lbs/ft³.

MOISTURE CONTENT:

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

LIQUID LIMIT:

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

PLASTIC LIMIT:

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

PASSING #200 SIEVE:

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

UNCONFINED SHEAR:

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










SOIL CLASSIFICATION CHART

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

NOTE: DUAL SYMBOLS ARE USED TO INDICATE BORDERLINE SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS




JOB NO.: 17G192	DRILLING DATE: 10/19/17	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Bldg	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 17 feet
LOCATION: Rancho Cucamonga, California	LOGGED BY: Jason Hiskey	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	UNCONFINED SHEAR (TSF)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
		21			ALLUVIUM: Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense-damp	110	4					
		21			@ 3 to 4 feet, little medium Sand	111	4					
5		28				112	5					
		41				Light Gray Brown Gravelly fine Sand, little medium to coarse Sand, little Silt, occasional Cobbles, medium dense-damp	112	3				
		22				Light Gray fine to coarse Sand, little fine Gravel, occasional Cobbles, medium dense-dry	116	1				
10												
		14				Brown Silty fine Sand, trace Silt nodules, medium dense-damp		5				
15												
		31				Light Brown to Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, some fine Gravel, dense-damp		5				
20												
		20			Brown fine Sandy Silt, medium dense-moist to very moist		18					
25												
Boring Terminated at 25'												

TBL 17G192.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 11/3/17










JOB NO.: 17G192	DRILLING DATE: 10/19/17	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Bldg	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 12 feet
LOCATION: Rancho Cucamonga, California	LOGGED BY: Jason Hiskey	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	UNCONFINED SHEAR (TSF)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
		5			<u>FILL</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, little fine Gravel, loose-damp		5					
		11			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense-damp		6					
5		21					4					
		24			Gray Brown fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense to very dense-damp		2					
10												
		65			@ 13½ to 15 feet, occasional Cobbles		3					
15												
Boring Terminated at 15'												



TBL 17G192.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 11/3/17



JOB NO.: 17G192		DRILLING DATE: 10/19/17		WATER DEPTH: Dry								
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Bldg		DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger		CAVE DEPTH: 10 feet								
LOCATION: Rancho Cucamonga, California		LOGGED BY: Jason Hiskey		READING TAKEN: At Completion								
FIELD RESULTS					LABORATORY RESULTS							
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	UNCONFINED SHEAR (TSF)	COMMENTS
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL							
5		35			<u>ALLUVIUM:</u> Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, medium dense-damp to moist	111	3					
		16				110	10					
		20				108	7					
		22				116	9					
		17				116	11					
10												
		82/2"										No Sample Recovered
15					Boring Terminated at 15'							



JOB NO.: 17G192	DRILLING DATE: 10/19/17	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Bldg	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 10 feet
LOCATION: Rancho Cucamonga, California	LOGGED BY: Jason Hiskey	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS				GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)			DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	UNCONFINED SHEAR (TSF)	
SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL												
5		24			<u>FILL</u> : Gray Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense-damp		3					
		12			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense-damp to moist		10					
		26					7					
		13					9					
	10											
15		42			Gray fine to coarse Sand, some fine to coarse Gravel, occasional Cobbles, dense-dry		1					
	Boring Terminated at 15'											

TBL 17G192.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 11/3/17



JOB NO.: 17G192 DRILLING DATE: 10/19/17 WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Bldg DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger CAVE DEPTH: 12 feet
LOCATION: Rancho Cucamonga, California LOGGED BY: Jason Hiskey READING TAKEN: At Completion

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

TBL 17G192.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 11/3/17



JOB NO.: 17G192	DRILLING DATE: 10/19/17	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Bldg	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 3 feet
LOCATION: Rancho Cucamonga, California	LOGGED BY: Jason Hiskey	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG		DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	UNCONFINED SHEAR (TSF)	
5		24			<u>FILL</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, mottled, medium dense-damp		4					
		10			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, loose to medium dense-damp		5					
					Boring Terminated at 5'							

TBL 17G192.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 11/3/17




JOB NO.: 17G192	DRILLING DATE: 10/19/17	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Proposed C/I Bldg	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 3 feet
LOCATION: Rancho Cucamonga, California	LOGGED BY: Jason Hiskey	READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					LABORATORY RESULTS							COMMENTS
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	UNCONFINED SHEAR (TSF)	
					SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL							
5		12			<u>FILL</u> : Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium Sand, trace Silt nodules, medium dense-damp		5					
		6			<u>ALLUVIUM</u> : Light Brown Silty fine Sand, trace medium Sand, loose-damp		5					
					Boring Terminated at 5'							

TBL 17G192.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 11/3/17

APPENDIX

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



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


Boring Number:	B-3	Initial Moisture Content (%)	3
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	15
Depth (ft)	1 to 2	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	111.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	116.0
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.13

Proposed C/I Bldg
Rancho Cucamonga, California
Project No. 17G192
PLATE C- 1



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



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


Boring Number:	B-3	Initial Moisture Content (%)	10
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	16
Depth (ft)	3 to 4	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	109.7
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	117.6
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.75

Proposed C/I Bldg
Rancho Cucamonga, California
Project No. 17G192
PLATE C- 2



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



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


Boring Number:	B-3	Initial Moisture Content (%)	7
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	15
Depth (ft)	5 to 6	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	108.4
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	114.3
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.62

Proposed C/I Bldg
Rancho Cucamonga, California
Project No. 17G192
PLATE C- 3



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel


Boring Number:	B-3	Initial Moisture Content (%)	9
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	13
Depth (ft)	7 to 8	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	115.8
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	121.4
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.04

Proposed C/I Bldg
Rancho Cucamonga, California
Project No. 17G192
PLATE C- 4



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**
A California Corporation

Moisture/Density Relationship ASTM D-1557



Soil ID Number	B-3 @ 0 to 5'
Optimum Moisture (%)	10
Maximum Dry Density (pcf)	126.5
Soil Classification	Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel

Proposed C/I Bldg
Rancho Cucamonga, California
Project No. 17G192

PLATE C-5



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**
A California Corporation

APPENDIX

GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS

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

General

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

Site Preparation

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

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

Compacted Fills

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

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

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

Foundations

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

Fill Slopes

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

Cut Slopes


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

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


Subdrains

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

CUT LOT



CUT/FILL LOT (TRANSITION)



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

TRANSITION LOT DETAIL

GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS


NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-1



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**



FILL ABOVE CUT SLOPE DETAIL
GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS


NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS
 CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-2



**SOUTHERN
 CALIFORNIA
 GEOTECHNICAL**



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

DEPTH OF FILL OVER SUBDRAIN
8
20
35
100

**SCHEMATIC ONLY
NOT TO SCALE**

CANYON SUBDRAIN DETAIL GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS


NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-3



**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL**



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

FILL ABOVE NATURAL SLOPE DETAIL GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS


NOT TO SCALE


DRAWN: JAS
CHKD: GKM


PLATE D-4



SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GEOTECHNICAL



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




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

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

"GRAVEL" TO MEET FOLLOWING SPECIFICATION OR APPROVED EQUIVALENT:

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

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



DETAIL "A"

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


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


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

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

NOTES:

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

SLOPE FILL SUBDRAINS	
GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS	
NOT TO SCALE	 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
DRAWN: JAS CHKD: GKM	
PLATE D-6	





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

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


"GRAVEL" TO MEET FOLLOWING SPECIFICATION OR
APPROVED EQUIVALENT:

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

RETAINING WALL BACKDRAINS	
GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS	
NOT TO SCALE	
DRAWN: JAS	
CHKD: GKM	
PLATE D-7	
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL	



Section View



Plan View

PLACEMENT OF OVERSIZED MATERIAL
GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS

NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: PM
 CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-8



**SOUTHERN
 CALIFORNIA
 GEOTECHNICAL**

APPENDIX

Design Maps Summary Report


User-Specified Input

Building Code Reference Document ASCE 7-10 Standard
(which utilizes USGS hazard data available in 2008)

Site Coordinates 34.09077°N, 117.57757°W

Site Soil Classification Site Class D – "Stiff Soil"



Risk Category I/II/III



USGS-Provided Output

$S_s = 1.500\text{ g}$ $S_{MS} = 1.500\text{ g}$ $S_{DS} = 1.000\text{ g}$
 $S_1 = 0.600\text{ g}$ $S_{M1} = 0.900\text{ g}$ $S_{D1} = 0.600\text{ g}$

For information on how the S_s and S_1 values above have been calculated from probabilistic (risk-targeted) and deterministic ground motions in the direction of maximum horizontal response, please return to the application and select the "2009 NEHRP" building code reference document.



SOURCE: U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (USGS)
<<http://geohazards.usgs.gov/designmaps/us/application.php>>



SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS	
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL BUILDING	
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA	
DRAWN: JLH	 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
CHKD: GKM	
SCG PROJECT 17G192-1R	
PLATE E-1	