GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION
PHELAN 20 INDUSTRIAL BUILDING

Phelan Road, 650± feet East of Los Banos Avenue
Hesperia, California
for
Cambria 60 Partners LLC

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

May 23, 2023

Cambria 60 Partners LLC
14180 Dallas Parkway, Suite 730
Dallas, Texas 75254

Attention: Mr. Ron Rakunas

Project No.: **23G131-1**

Subject: **Geotechnical Investigation**
Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Phelan Road, 650± feet east of Los Banos Avenue
Hesperia, California

Mr. Rakunas:

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

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

Respectfully Submitted,

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL, INC.

Pablo Montes Jr.
Project 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

4.0 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION 5

4.1 Scope of Exploration/Sampling Methods 5
4.2 Geotechnical Conditions 5

5.0 LABORATORY TESTING 7

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 9

6.1 Seismic Design Considerations 9
6.2 Geotechnical Design Considerations 11
6.3 Site Grading Recommendations 14
6.4 Construction Considerations 17
6.5 Foundation Design and Construction 17
6.6 Floor Slab Design and Construction 19
6.7 Retaining Wall Design and Construction 19
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.

Site Preparation Recommendations

- Site stripping will be necessary to remove the dense native grass and shrub growth which is present throughout the majority of the site. Trees and their associated root masses should be removed in their entirety. All vegetation and any organic topsoil should be removed during site stripping.
- The soils encountered at the boring locations consist of younger native alluvium, underlain by older alluvium. The near-surface younger alluvium generally possesses varying densities and low strengths. The results of laboratory testing indicate that some of the near-surface alluvium possesses unfavorable consolidation/collapse characteristics. Based on these considerations, remedial grading is recommended to be performed within the proposed building area in order to remove a portion of the near-surface native alluvium and replace these materials as compacted structural fill.
- The existing soils within the proposed building area should be overexcavated to a depth of 5 feet below existing grades and to a depth of 3 feet below proposed pad grades. The proposed foundation influence zones should be overexcavated to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade. The overexcavation should also extend to a sufficient depth to remove any variability in the soils.
- 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 achieve a moisture content of 0 to 4 percent above optimum moisture, 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 recompacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

Building Foundation Recommendations

- Spread footing foundations, supported in newly placed structural fill soils.
- Maximum, net allowable soil bearing pressure: 3,000 lbs/ft^2.
- Reinforcement consisting of at least two (2) No. 5 rebars (1 top and 1 bottom) in strip footings. Additional reinforcement may be necessary for structural considerations.

Building Floor Slab Recommendations

- Conventional Slab on Grade, at least 6 inches thick
- Modulus of Subgrade Reaction: k = 150 psi/in
- Reinforcement is not considered to be necessary for geotechnical considerations.
- The actual thickness and reinforcement of the floor slab should be determined by the structural engineer, based on the imposed slab loading.

Pavements

ASPHALT PAVEMENTS (R=40)					
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	4	6	7	8	10
Compacted Subgrade	12	12	12	12	12

PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENTS (R=40)				
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. 23P122R2, dated March 30, 2023. 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 Phelan Road, 650± feet east of Los Banos Avenue in Hesperia, California. The site is bounded to the north by Phelan Road, to the west by a vacant lot and a single-family residence, and to the south and east by vacant parcels. The Oro Grande Wash is located to the southeast of the property. The general location of the site is illustrated on the Site Location Map, included as Plate 1 of this report.

The site consists of a rectangular-shaped parcel, 19.3± acres in size. The site is vacant and undeveloped. Ground surface cover throughout the site consists of exposed soils with moderate to heavy native grass, weed and shrub growth. Small trees are also present throughout the site in sparse concentration.

Detailed topographic information was obtained from a schematic site plan, prepared by RGA. Based on the elevation data provided on that plan, the overall site topography generally slopes downward to the northeast at a gradient of 2± percent. The Oro Grande Wash is located to the southeast of the property. The bottom of the Oro Grande Wash extends approximately 50 to 60± feet below the adjacent site grades. A descending slope extends from the site downward to the wash at an inclination of approximately 4h:1v (horizontal to vertical).

3.2 Proposed Development

Based on the site plan that was provided to our office, the site will be developed with one (1) industrial building, 420,000± ft² in size. The building will be located in the west-central area of the site, with dock-high doors along a portion of the east building wall. The building will be surrounded by asphaltic concrete pavements in the automobile parking and drive areas, Portland cement concrete pavements in the truck court, and areas of concrete flatwork and landscape planters.

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 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 100 kips and 4 to 7 kips per linear foot, respectively.

No significant amounts of below-grade construction, such as basements or crawl spaces, are expected to be included in the proposed development. Based on the existing site topography, cuts and fills of 7 to 15± feet will be necessary to achieve the proposed site grades. It is expected that cut slopes and fill slopes along with new retaining walls will be required in order to achieve the new site grades.

4.0 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

4.1 Scope of Exploration/Sampling Methods

The subsurface exploration performed for this project consisted of seven (7) borings (identified as Boring Nos. B-1 through B-7) advanced to depths of 15 to 25± feet below the existing site grades. All of the borings were logged during drilling by a member of our staff.

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

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

4.2 Geotechnical Conditions

Younger Alluvium

All of the borings encountered native younger alluvial soils at the ground surface, extending to depths ranging from 5½ to 12± feet below existing site grades. These soils generally consist of very loose to medium dense silty fine sands, varying medium to coarse sand, clay and gravel content.

Older Alluvium

Native older alluvium was encountered beneath the younger alluvium at all of the boring locations, extending to at least the maximum explored depth of 25± feet below existing site grades. The older alluvial soils consist of medium dense to very dense silty fine to coarse sands with occasional clayey fine to coarse sands, with varying gravel content. Some of the samples of the older alluvial soils were weakly cemented.

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 table is considered to have existed at a depth in excess of 30± feet at the time of the subsurface exploration.

As part of our research, we also reviewed recent groundwater data available for wells within the vicinity of the site. Recent water level data was obtained from the California Department of Water Resources website, http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/. The nearest monitoring well with available records in this database is located 800 feet to the southeast, adjacent to the Oro Grande Wash. Water level readings within this monitoring well indicates a groundwater level of 658± feet below the ground surface in September 2022.

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-8 in Appendix C of this report.

Maximum Dry Density and Optimum Moisture Content

One representative bulk sample of the near-surface soils has been tested to determine 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 Plate C-9 in Appendix C of this report. This test is generally used to compare the in-situ densities of undisturbed field samples, and for later compaction testing. Additional testing of other soil types or soil mixes may be necessary at a later date.

Expansion Index

The expansion potential of the on-site soils was determined in general accordance with ASTM D-4829. The testing apparatus is designed to accept a 4-inch diameter, 1-in high, remolded sample. The sample is initially remolded to 50± 1 percent saturation and then loaded with a surcharge

equivalent to 144 pounds per square foot. The sample is then inundated with water and allowed to swell against the surcharge. The resultant swell or consolidation is recorded after a 24-hour period. The results of the EI testing are as follows:

Sample Identification	Expansion Index	Expansive Potential
B-7 @ 1 to 5 feet	0	Non-Expansive

Soluble Sulfates

A representative sample of the near-surface soils has been submitted to a subcontracted analytical laboratory for evaluation 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 result of the soluble sulfate testing is presented below, and are discussed further in a subsequent section of this report.

Sample Identification	Soluble Sulfates (%)	Severity
B-1 @ 1 to 5 feet	<0.001	Not Applicable (S0)

Corrosivity Testing

A representative bulk sample of the near-surface soils was submitted to a subcontracted corrosion engineering laboratory to determine if the near-surface soils possess corrosive characteristics with respect to common construction materials. The corrosivity testing included a determination of the electrical resistivity, pH, and chloride and nitrate concentrations of the soils, as well as other tests. The results of some of these tests are presented below.

Sample Identification	Minimum Resistivity (ohm-cm)	pH	Chlorides (mg/kg)	Nitrates (mg/kg)	Sulfides (mg/kg)	Redox Potential (mV)
B-1 @ 1 to 5 feet	13,400	8.2	14.5	9.0	1.3	140

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

6.1 Seismic Design Considerations

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

Faulting and Seismicity

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

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

Seismic Design Parameters

The 2022 California Building Code (CBC) provides procedures for earthquake resistant structural design that include considerations for on-site soil conditions, occupancy, and the configuration of the structure including the structural system and height. The seismic design parameters presented below are based on the soil profile and the proximity of known faults with respect to the subject site. Based on the anticipated adoption of the 2022 California Building Code (CBC) on January 1, 2023, we expect that the proposed development will be designed in accordance with the 2022 CBC.

The 2022 CBC Seismic Design Parameters have been generated using the SEAOC/OSHPD Seismic Design Maps Tool, a web-based software application available at the website www.seismicmaps.org. This software application calculates seismic design parameters in accordance with several building code reference documents, including ASCE 7-16, upon which the 2022 CBC is based. The application utilizes a database of risk-targeted maximum considered earthquake (MCE_R) site accelerations at 0.01-degree intervals for each of the code documents. The table below was created using data obtained from the application. The output generated from this program is attached to this letter.

The 2022 CBC states that for Site Class D sites with a mapped S1 value greater than 0.2, a site-specific ground motion analysis may be required in accordance with Section 11.4.8 of ASCE 7-16. Supplement 3 to ASCE 7-16 modifies Section 11.4.8 of ASCE 7-16 and states that "a ground motion hazard analysis is not required where the value of the parameter SM1 determined by Eq. (11.4-2) is increased by 50% for all applications of SM1 in this Standard. The resulting value of the parameter SD1 determined by Eq. (11.4-4) shall be used for all applications of SD1 in this Standard."

The seismic design parameters presented in the table below were calculated using the site coefficients (Fa and Fv) from Tables 1613.2.3(1) and 1613.2.3(2) presented in Section 16.4.4 of the 2022 CBC. It should be noted that the site coefficient Fv and the parameters SM1 and SD1 were not included in the SEAOC/OSHPD Seismic Design Maps Tool output for the ASCE 7-16 standard. We calculated these parameters-based on Table 1613.2.3(2) in Section 16.4.4 of the 2022 CBC using the value of S1 obtained from the Seismic Design Maps Tool. **The values of SM1 and SD1 tabulated below** were evaluated using equations 11.4-2 and 11.4-4 of ASCE 7-16 (Equations 16-20 and 16-23, respectively, of the 2022 CBC) and **do not include a 50 percent increase.** As discussed above, if a ground motion hazard analysis has not been performed, SM1 and SD1 must be increased by 50 percent for all applications with respect to ASCE 7-16.

2022 CBC SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS

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

*Note: These values must be increased by 50 percent if a site-specific ground motion hazard analysis has not been performed. However, this increase is not expected to affect the design of the structure type proposed for this site. This assumption should be confirmed by the project structural engineer. The values presented in the table above do not include a 50-percent increase.

Liquefaction

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

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has not yet conducted 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 FH05 for the Baldy Mesa 7.5-Minute Quadrangle 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, the subsurface profile identified in this report, which includes moderate to high strength older alluvium, and the lack of a historic high groundwater table within the upper 50± feet, liquefaction is not considered to be a design concern for this project.

6.2 Geotechnical Design Considerations

General

The near-surface soils encountered at the boring locations consist of native younger alluvium, which possesses variable densities and strengths. The results of laboratory testing indicate that some of the near-surface soils possess unfavorable consolidation/collapse characteristics. Based on their variable strengths and densities and their potential for collapse, the near-surface younger

alluvial soils, in their present condition, are not considered suitable for the support of the new foundations and floor slab. The younger alluvial soils are underlain by moderate strength older alluvium which possesses more favorable consolidation/collapse characteristics. Remedial grading is recommended within the area of the proposed building, in order to remove and replace a portion of the near-surface younger alluvial soils as compacted structural fill.

Settlement

Laboratory testing indicates that some samples of soils taken from the near-surface native alluvial soils possess a minor collapse potential when exposed to moisture infiltration. The proposed remedial grading will remove the near-surface collapsible native soils from within the proposed building area. Therefore, following completion of the recommended grading, post-construction settlements are expected to be within tolerable limits.

Expansion

Laboratory testing performed on a representative sample of the near surface soils indicates that these materials possess a non-expansion potential (EI = 0). Therefore, no design considerations related to expansive soils are considered warranted for this site. It is recommended that additional expansion index testing be conducted at the completion of rough grading to verify the expansion potential of the as-graded building pad.

Soluble Sulfates

The result of the soluble sulfate testing indicates that the tested soil sample possesses a level of soluble sulfates that is considered to be "not applicable" (S0) with respect to the American Concrete Institute (ACI) Publication 318-14 Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete and Commentary, Section 4.3. Therefore, specialized concrete mix designs are not considered to be necessary, with regard to sulfate protection purposes. It is, however, recommended that additional soluble sulfate testing be conducted at the completion of rough grading to verify the soluble sulfate concentrations of the soils which are present at pad grade within the building expansion area.

Corrosion Potential

The results of laboratory testing indicate that the tested sample of the on-site soils possesses a minimum resistivity of 13,400 ohm-cm, and a pH value of 8.2. These soils possess a redox potential of 140 mV and a sulfide concentration of about 1.3 parts per million. 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, sulfide concentration, redox potential, and moisture content are the five factors that enter into the evaluation procedure. Based on these factors, the on-site soils are not considered to be corrosive to ferrous materials. Therefore, corrosion protection is not expected to be required for cast iron or ductile iron pipes.

A low concentration (14.5 mg/kg) of chlorides was detected in the sample submitted for corrosivity testing. In general, soils possessing chloride concentrations in excess of 500 parts per million (ppm) are considered to be corrosive with respect to steel reinforcement within reinforced

concrete. Based on these test results, the site is considered to have a C1 chloride exposure in accordance with the American Concrete Institute (ACI) Publication 318 Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete and Commentary. Therefore, a specialized concrete mix design for reinforced concrete for protection against chloride exposure is not considered warranted.

Nitrates present in soil can be corrosive to copper tubing at concentrations greater than 50 mg/kg. The tested sample possesses a nitrate concentration of 9.0 mg/kg. Based on this test result, the on-site soils are not considered to be corrosive to copper pipe.

It should be noted that SCG does not practice in the field of corrosion engineering. Therefore, the client may wish to contact a corrosion engineer to provide a more thorough evaluation.

Shrinkage/Subsidence

Removal and recompaction of the near-surface alluvial soils is estimated to result in an average shrinkage of 3 to 11± percent, based on the results of density testing and the assumption that the onsite soils will be compacted to about 92 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. However, the estimated shrinkage of the individual soil layers at the site is highly variable, locally ranging from a minimum shrinkage value of 0 percent to a maximum shrinkage of 16 percent at varying sample depths and locations. It should be noted that the potential shrinkage estimate is based on dry density testing performed on small-diameter samples taken at the boring locations. If a more accurate and precise shrinkage estimate is desired, SCG can perform a shrinkage study involving several excavated test-pits where in-place densities are evaluated 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.

Slope Stability

Newly constructed fill slopes, comprised of properly compacted engineered fill, at inclinations of 2h:1v will possess adequate gross stability. Cut slopes excavated within the existing granular alluvial soils may be subject to surficial instability due to the lack of cohesion within these materials. Therefore, stability fills may be required within these areas. This condition may affect the proposed cut slopes at the site. The need for stability fills should be determined by SCG as part of the future detailed grading plan review.

Grading and Foundation Plan Review

No grading or foundation plans were available at the time of this report. It is therefore recommended that we be provided with copies of the preliminary plans, when they become

available, for review with regard to the conclusions, recommendations, and assumptions contained within this report.

6.3 Site Grading Recommendations

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

Site Stripping

Vegetation including grasses, shrubs, and weeds on the site should be stripped and disposed of off-site. Stripping should include any organic soils and any root masses from trees. 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.

Treatment of Existing Soils: Building Pad

Remedial grading should be performed within the proposed building area in order to remove a portion of the 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 5 feet below existing grade and to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed building pad subgrade elevation, whichever is greater.

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 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade.

The overexcavation area should extend at least 5 feet beyond the building foundations and perimeters. If the proposed structure incorporates any exterior columns (such as for a canopy or overhang) the area of overexcavation should also encompass these areas.

Following completion of the overexcavation, the subgrade soils within the building area should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to verify their suitability to serve as the structural fill subgrade, as well as to support the foundation loads of the new 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 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, moisture conditioned to achieve a moisture content of 0 to 4 percent above optimum moisture content. The moisture conditioning of the overexcavation subgrade soils should be verified by the geotechnical engineer. 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: Cut and Fill Slopes

New cut and fill slopes are expected to be constructed around the perimeter of the project. All slopes should be at a maximum inclination of 2h:1v. A keyway should be excavated at the toe of new fill slopes which are not located in fill areas. The keyway should be at least 15 feet wide and 3 feet deep. The recommended width of the keyway is based on 1.5 times the width of typical grading equipment. If smaller equipment is utilized, a smaller keyway may be suitable, at the discretion of the geotechnical engineer. The base of the keyway should slope at least 1 foot downward into the slope. Following completion of the keyway cut, the subgrade soils should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to verify that the keyway is founded into competent materials. The resulting subgrade soils should then be scarified to a depth of 10 to 12 inches, moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above optimum moisture content and recompacted. During construction of the new fill slope, the existing slope should be benched in accordance with the detail presented on Plate D-4. Benches less than 4 feet in height may be used at the discretion of the geotechnical engineer.

Stability fills for cut slopes will provide a more uniform appearance and allow landscaping on the slope. Should a stability fill for cut slope be necessary, the recommendations for the stability fill will be the same as the recommendations for the fill slopes, mentioned above.

Treatment of Existing Soils: Retaining Walls and Site Walls

The existing soils within the areas of any proposed retaining walls and non-retaining site walls should be overexcavated to a depth of 3 feet below foundation bearing grade and replaced as compacted structural fill, as discussed above for the proposed building pad. Any undocumented fill soils within any of these foundation areas should be removed in their entirety. The overexcavation areas should extend at least 5 feet beyond the foundation perimeters, and to an extent equal to the depth of fill below the new foundations. Any erection pads used to construct the walls are considered to be part of the foundation system with respect to these remedial grading recommendations. 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. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

Treatment of Existing Soils: Parking and Drive Areas

Based on economic considerations, overexcavation of the existing variable strength alluvium soils in the new 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 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. The subgrade soils should then be scarified to a depth of 12± inches, moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above optimum, and recompacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. Based on the presence of variable strength alluvial 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 parking and drive areas assume that the owner and/or developer can tolerate minor amounts of settlement within the proposed parking areas. The grading recommendations presented above do not completely mitigate the extent of existing fill soils and loose native soils in the parking areas. As such, 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 parking and drive areas should be overexcavated to a depth of 2 feet below proposed pavement subgrade elevation, with the resulting soils replaced as compacted structural fill.

Fill Placement

- Fill soils should be placed in thin (6± inches), near-horizontal lifts, moisture conditioned to within 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 2022 CBC and the grading code of the city of Hesperia.
- All fill soils should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.
- Compaction tests should be performed periodically by the geotechnical engineer as random verification of compaction and moisture content. These tests are intended to aid the contractor. Since the tests are taken at discrete locations and depths, they may not be indicative of the entire fill and therefore should not relieve the contractor of his responsibility to meet the job specifications.

Imported Structural Fill

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

Utility Trench Backfill

In general, all utility trench backfill soils should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. It is recommended that materials in excess of 3 inches in size not be used for utility trench backfill. Compacted trench backfill should conform to the requirements of the local grading code, and more restrictive requirements may be indicated by city of Hesperia. 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

Moisture Sensitive Subgrade Soils

Occasional samples of the near-surface soils consist predominately of silty sands. These soils may become unstable if exposed to significant moisture infiltration or disturbance by construction traffic. If grading occurs during a period of relatively wet weather, an increase in subgrade instability in localized areas should also be expected. The site should, therefore, be graded to prevent ponding of surface water and to prevent water from running into excavations.

Excavation Considerations

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

Groundwater

Based on the conditions encountered at the boring locations, the static groundwater table at this site is considered to exist at a depth greater than 25± feet. Therefore, groundwater is not expected to impact the grading or foundation construction activities.

6.5 Foundation Design and Construction

Based on the preceding grading recommendations, it is assumed that the new building pad will be underlain by structural fill soils used to replace the upper portion of the existing variable strength alluvial soils. These new structural fill soils are expected to extend to depths of at least 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade. 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: 3,000 lbs/ft^2.
- Minimum wall/column footing width: 14 inches/24 inches.
- Minimum longitudinal steel reinforcement within strip footings: Two (2) No. 5 rebars (1 top and 1 bottom).
- Minimum foundation embedment: 12 inches into suitable structural fill soils, and at least 18 inches below adjacent exterior grade. Interior column footings may be placed immediately beneath the floor slab.

- It is recommended that the perimeter building foundations be continuous across all exterior doorways. Any flatwork adjacent to the exterior doors should be doweled into the perimeter foundations in a manner determined by the structural engineer.

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

Foundation Construction

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

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

Estimated Foundation Settlements

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

Lateral Load Resistance

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

- Passive Earth Pressure: 300 lbs/ft^3
- Friction Coefficient: 0.30

These are allowable values, and include a factor of safety. When combining friction and passive resistance, the passive pressure component should be reduced by one-third. These values assume that footings will be poured directly against compacted structural fill. The maximum allowable passive pressure is 2,500 lbs/ft^2.

6.6 Floor Slab Design and Construction

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

- Minimum slab thickness: 6 inches.
- Modulus of Subgrade Reaction: k = 150 psi/in
- Minimum slab reinforcement: Reinforcement is not required for geotechnical conditions. The actual floor slab reinforcement should be determined by the structural engineer, based upon the imposed loading.
- Slab underlayment: If moisture sensitive floor coverings will be used the minimum slab underlayment should consist of a moisture vapor barrier constructed below the entire area 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 a 15 mil. Stego® Wrap Vapor Barrier or equivalent will meet these specifications. The moisture vapor barrier should be properly constructed in accordance with all applicable manufacturer specifications. 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.
- Moisture condition the floor slab subgrade soils to 0 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum moisture content, to a depth of 12 inches. The moisture content of the floor slab subgrade soils should be verified by the geotechnical engineer within 24 hours prior to concrete placement.
- Proper concrete curing techniques should be utilized to reduce the potential for slab curling or the formation of excessive shrinkage cracks.

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

6.7 Retaining Wall Design and Construction

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

Retaining Wall Design Parameters

Based on the soil conditions encountered at the boring locations, the following parameters may be used in the design of new retaining walls for this site. We have provided parameters assuming the use of on-site soils for retaining wall backfill. The near-surface soils generally consist of well-silty sands and clayey sands. Based on the results of laboratory testing, these materials re expected to possess an internal angle of friction of at least 32 degrees when compacted to 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

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

RETAINING WALL DESIGN PARAMETERS

Design Parameter		**Soil Type**
		On-Site Silty Sands
Internal Friction Angle (ϕ)		32°
Unit Weight		133 lbs/ft^3
Equivalent Fluid Pressure:	Active Condition (level backfill)	41 lbs/ft^3
	Active Condition (2h:1v backfill)	63 lbs/ft^3
	At-Rest Condition (level backfill)	63 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/ft^3. The structural engineer should incorporate appropriate factors of safety in the design of the retaining walls.

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

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

Retaining Wall Foundation Design

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

Seismic Lateral Earth Pressures

In accordance with the 2022 CBC, any retaining walls more than 6 feet in height must be designed for seismic lateral earth pressures. The recommended seismic pressure distribution is triangular in shape, assumed to occur at the top of the wall, decreasing to 0 at the base of the wall. For a level backfill condition behind the top of the wall, the seismic lateral earth pressure is 18H lbs/ft^2, where H is the overall height of the wall. Where the ground surface above the wall consists of a 2h:1v (horizontal to vertical) sloping condition, the seismic lateral earth pressure is 57H lbs/ft^2. The seismic pressure distribution is based on the Mononobe-Okabe equation, utilizing a design acceleration of 0.368g. The 2022 CBC does not provide definitive guidance on determination of the design acceleration to be used in generating the seismic lateral earth pressure. In accordance with standard geotechnical practice, we have calculated the design acceleration as $^2/_3$ of the PGA_M. However, for combinations of high ground motion and steep slopes above the wall, the Mononobe-Okabe equation gives unrealistic high estimates of active earth pressures. Therefore, the seismic earth pressure for the sloping condition presented above was derived using a design acceleration equal to 50% of the PGA_M.

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 placed against the face on the back side of the retaining walls. This material should extend from the top of the retaining wall footing to within 1 foot of the ground surface on the back side of the retaining wall. 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.

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

Subsurface Drainage

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

- A weep hole drainage system typically consisting of a series of 4-inch diameter holes in the wall situated slightly above the ground surface elevation on the exposed side of the wall and at an approximate 8-foot on-center spacing. The weep holes should include a 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 on-site soils generally consist of silty sands, with varying gravel and clay content. Based on their classification, these materials are expected to possess good to excellent pavement support characteristics, with R-values in the range of 40 to 50. Since R-value testing was not included in the scope of services for this project, the subsequent pavement design is based upon an assumed R-value of 40. Any fill material imported to the site should have support characteristics equal to or greater than that of the on-site soils and be placed and compacted under engineering-controlled conditions. It is recommended that R-value testing be performed after completion of rough grading. Depending upon the results of the R-value testing, it may be feasible to use thinner pavement sections in some areas of the site.

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=40)					
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	4	6	7	8	10
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=40)				
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: USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP OF THE BALDY MESA QUADRANGLE, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, 2021.

SITE LOCATION MAP


PHELAN 20 INDUSTRIAL BUILDING

HESPERIA, CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1" = 2000'	
DRAWN: MK CHKD: RGT	
SCG PROJECT 23G131-1	
PLATE 1	

SoCalGeo

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL



GEOTECHNICAL LEGEND

APPROXIMATE BORING LOCATION

NOTE: CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN PROVIDED BY RGA, OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

BORING LOCATION PLAN




PHELAN 20 INDUSTRIAL BUILDING

HESPERIA, CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1" = 150'	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
DRAWN: MK CHKD: RGT	
SCG PROJECT 23G131-1	
PLATE 2	

APPENDIX B

BORING LOG LEGEND

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

COLUMN DESCRIPTIONS

DEPTH: Distance in feet below the ground surface.

SAMPLE: Sample Type as depicted above.

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

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

GRAPHIC LOG: Graphic Soil Symbol as depicted on the following page.

DRY DENSITY: Dry density of an undisturbed or relatively undisturbed sample in lbs/ft^3.

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

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-1

JOB NO.: 23G131-1
PROJECT: Phelan 20 Industrial Building
LOCATION: Hesperia, California

DRILLING DATE: 4/18/23
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Michelle Krizek

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 19 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS						LABORATORY RESULTS						
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	COMMENTS
		5			ALLUVIUM: Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, trace fine root fibers, very loose to loose-damp	115	6					
		13				115	5					
5		17			Light Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace to little fine Gravel, medium dense-dry		2					Disturbed Sample
		50/5"			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Light Red Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, trace Clay, medium dense to very dense-dry to damp	109	3					
10		25				114	1					
		42			@ 13½ feet, trace to little Clay		4					
15												
		35					3					
20												
		39					3					
25					Boring Terminated at 25 feet							

TBL 23G131-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 5/23/23

TEST BORING LOG

PLATE B-1

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-2

JOB NO.: 23G131-1
PROJECT: Phelan 20 Industrial Building
LOCATION: Hesperia, California

DRILLING DATE: 4/18/23
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Michelle Krizek

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 16 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS						LABORATORY RESULTS						
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	COMMENTS
		8			ALLUVIUM: Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, trace fine to coarse Gravel, loose-damp	119	5					
		12			@ 3 feet, Light Brown, trace Clay	118	6					
5		15			Light Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, medium dense-dry to damp	116	3					
		26			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Light Red Brown Silty fine Sand, little medium Sand, trace Clay, medium dense-damp @ 7 feet, Light Red Brown, trace Clay	120	5					
10		27				121	3					
		27			Red Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, trace to little Clay, medium dense to dense-damp		5					
15												
		30					4					
20					Boring Terminated at 20 feet							

TBL 23G131-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 5/23/23

TEST BORING LOG

PLATE B-2

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-3

JOB NO.: 23G131-1
PROJECT: Phelan 20 Industrial Building
LOCATION: Hesperia, California

DRILLING DATE: 4/18/23
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Michelle Krizek

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 10 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	COMMENTS
		3			ALLUVIUM: Dark Brown Silty fine Sand, little medium to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, trace fine root fibers, very loose to loose-damp		6					
		8					3					
5		31			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Light Red Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, trace Clay, trace to little fine Gravel, medium dense to dense-damp		3					
		39					4					
10												
		26					5					
15					Boring Terminated at 15 feet							

TBL 23G131-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 5/23/23

TEST BORING LOG **PLATE B-3**

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-4

JOB NO.: 23G131-1
PROJECT: Phelan 20 Industrial Building
LOCATION: Hesperia, California

DRILLING DATE: 4/18/23
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Michelle Krizek

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 16 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS						LABORATORY RESULTS						
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	COMMENTS
		14			ALLUVIUM: Dark Brown Silty fine Sand, little medium to coarse Sand, trace Clay, trace fine root fibers, loose to medium dense-damp	125	7					
		24			@ 3 feet, trace fine Gravel	123	8					
5		25			Light Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace to little fine Gravel, medium dense-dry to damp	115	4					
		23				115	2					
10		15				112	3					
		18			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Red Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace Clay, trace to little coarse Sand, trace fine to coarse Gravel, medium dense-damp		7					
15												
		26					7					
20					Boring Terminated at 20 feet							

TBL 23G131-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 5/23/23

TEST BORING LOG

PLATE B-4

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-5

JOB NO.: 23G131-1
PROJECT: Phelan 20 Industrial Building
LOCATION: Hesperia, California

DRILLING DATE: 4/18/23
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Michelle Krizek

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 11 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS						LABORATORY RESULTS						
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	COMMENTS
		3			ALLUVIUM: Dark Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, trace fine root fibers, very loose-damp to moist		7					
		8			Light Red Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, loose-dry to damp		3					
5		8					3					
		24			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Red Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace to little coarse Sand, trace to little fine Gravel, trace to little Clay, medium dense to dense-damp		3					
10												
		32					7					
15					Boring Terminated at 15 feet							

TBL 23G131-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 5/23/23

TEST BORING LOG **PLATE B-5**

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-6

JOB NO.: 23G131-1
PROJECT: Phelan 20 Industrial Building
LOCATION: Hesperia, California

DRILLING DATE: 4/18/23
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Michelle Krizek

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 17 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS						LABORATORY RESULTS						
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	COMMENTS
					ALLUVIUM: Dark Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, trace fine root fibers, loose-damp							
		8				119	6					
		10				118	7					
5		10			Red Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, little fine Gravel, loose-damp	105	5					
		17			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Red Brown fine to coarse Sand, trace Silt, little fine Gravel, medium dense-dry	115	1					
10		25				102	1					
		14					2					
15												
					Red Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, trace Clay, weakly cemented, very dense-damp							
		59					4					
20												
		63					5					
25												
					Boring Terminated at 25 feet							

TBL 23G131-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 5/23/23

TEST BORING LOG

PLATE B-6

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-7

JOB NO.: 23G131-1
PROJECT: Phelan 20 Industrial Building
LOCATION: Hesperia, California

DRILLING DATE: 4/18/23
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Michelle Krizek

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 14 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion


FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	COMMENTS
		9			ALLUVIUM: Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, trace Clay, loose to medium dense-damp		7					EI = 0 @ 1 to 5 feet
		27					4					
5		8			Light Red Brown Silty fine to coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, loose-damp		3					
		24			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Light Red Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, little Clay, little Calcareous nodules, weakly cemented, medium dense-damp		4					
10												
		60			Red Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel, little Silt, weakly cemented, very dense-damp to moist		8					
15												
		23			Red Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, trace Clay, trace fine to coarse Gravel, medium dense-damp		5					
20					Boring Terminated at 20 feet							

TBL 23G131-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 5/23/23

TEST BORING LOG **PLATE B-7**

APPENDIX C

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



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


Boring Number:	B-2	Initial Moisture Content (%)	6
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	11
Depth (ft)	3 to 4	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	118.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	130.1
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	2.71

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C- 1

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



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


Boring Number:	B-2	Initial Moisture Content (%)	3
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	12
Depth (ft)	5 to 6	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	116.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	125.0
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	2.64

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C- 2

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Light Red Brown Silty fine Sand, little medium Sand, trace Clay


Boring Number:	B-2	Initial Moisture Content (%)	5
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	12
Depth (ft)	7 to 8	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	120.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	128.5
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.04

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C- 3

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Light Red Brown Silty fine Sand, little medium Sand, trace Clay


Boring Number:	B-2	Initial Moisture Content (%)	3
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	12
Depth (ft)	9 to 10	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	121.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	132.1
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.23

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C- 4

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Dark Brown Silty fne Sand, little medium to coarse Sand, trace Clay


Boring Number:	B-4	Initial Moisture Content (%)	8
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	10
Depth (ft)	3 to 4	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	123.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	132.9
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.94

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C- 5

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



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


Boring Number:	B-4	Initial Moisture Content (%)	4
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	11
Depth (ft)	5 to 6	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	115.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	123.0
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.02

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C- 6

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



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


Boring Number:	B-4	Initial Moisture Content (%)	2
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	13
Depth (ft)	7 to 8	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	115.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	122.2
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.59

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C- 7

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



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


Boring Number:	B-4	Initial Moisture Content (%)	3
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	14
Depth (ft)	9 to 10	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	112.0
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	120.4
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	1.82

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C- 8

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Moisture/Density Relationship
ASTM D-1557



Soil ID Number	B-1 @ 1-5'
Optimum Moisture (%)	7
Maximum Dry Density (pcf)	136
Soil Classification	Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little coarse Sand, trace fine Gravel

Phelan 20 Industrial Building
Hesperia, California
Project No. 23G131-1

PLATE C-9

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

APPENDIX D

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 ¾-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

SoCalGeo

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL



FILL ABOVE CUT SLOPE DETAIL


GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS

NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-2

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL



PIPE MATERIAL	DEPTH OF FILL OVER SUBDRAIN
ADS (CORRUGATED POLETHYLENE)	8
TRANSITE UNDERDRAIN	20
PVC OR ABS: SDR 35	35
SDR 21	100

SCHEMATIC ONLY
NOT TO SCALE

CANYON SUBDRAIN DETAIL

GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS


NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-3

SoCalGeo

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

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL



STABILIZATION FILL DETAIL


GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS

NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-5

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL




"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



DETAIL "A"

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

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

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

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

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

SLOPE FILL SUBDRAINS

GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS


NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: JAS
CHKD: GKM

PLATE D-6

SoCalGeo

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL



"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

SoCalGeo

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL



Section View



Plan View

PLACEMENT OF OVERSIZED MATERIAL

GRADING GUIDE SPECIFICATIONS

NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN: PM
CHKD: GKM


PLATE D-8

SoCalGeo

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL

APPENDIX E

Latitude, Longitude: 34.42497086, -117.40549142



Date	4/25/2023, 3:48:24 PM
Design Code Reference Document	ASCE7-16
Risk Category	III
Site Class	D - Stiff Soil

Type	Value	Description
S_S	1.5	MCE_R ground motion. (for 0.2 second period)
S_1	0.6	MCE_R ground motion. (for 1.0s period)
S_{MS}	1.5	Site-modified spectral acceleration value
S_{M1}	null -See Section 11.4.8	Site-modified spectral acceleration value
S_{DS}	1	Numeric seismic design value at 0.2 second SA
S_{D1}	null -See Section 11.4.8	Numeric seismic design value at 1.0 second SA

Type	Value	Description
SDC	null -See Section 11.4.8	Seismic design category
F_a	1	Site amplification factor at 0.2 second
F_v	null -See Section 11.4.8	Site amplification factor at 1.0 second
PGA	0.502	MCE_G peak ground acceleration
F_{PGA}	1.1	Site amplification factor at PGA
PGA_M	0.552	Site modified peak ground acceleration
T_L	12	Long-period transition period in seconds
SsRT	1.581	Probabilistic risk-targeted ground motion. (0.2 second)
SsUH	1.706	Factored uniform-hazard (2% probability of exceedance in 50 years) spectral acceleration
SsD	1.5	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (0.2 second)
S1RT	0.616	Probabilistic risk-targeted ground motion. (1.0 second)
S1UH	0.68	Factored uniform-hazard (2% probability of exceedance in 50 years) spectral acceleration.
S1D	0.6	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (1.0 second)
PGAd	0.502	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (Peak Ground Acceleration)
PGA_{UH}	0.677	Uniform-hazard (2% probability of exceedance in 50 years) Peak Ground Acceleration
C_{RS}	0.927	Mapped value of the risk coefficient at short periods
C_{R1}	0.905	Mapped value of the risk coefficient at a period of 1 s
C_V	1.4	Vertical coefficient

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

SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS - 2022 CBC

PHELAN 20 INDUSTRIAL BUILDING

HESPERIA, CALIFORNIA

DRAWN: MK
CHKD: RGT

SCG PROJECT
23G131-1

PLATE E-1

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL