Appendix D-1

Geotechnical Investigation

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot NWC West Nance Street and North Webster Avenue, Perris, California, for Lake Creek Industrial, LLC

Southern California Geotechnical

June 2022

GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION
PROPOSED MAINTENANCE BUILDING AND PARKING LOT

NWC West Nance Street and North Webster Avenue
Perris, California
for
Lake Creek Industrial, LLC

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

June 8, 2022

Lake Creek Industrial, LLC
1302 Brittany Cross Road
Santa Ana, California 92705

Attention: Mr. Mike Tonkonogy
Manager

Project No.: **22G184-1**

Subject: **Geotechnical Investigation**
Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
NWC West Nance Street and North Webster Avenue
Perris, California

Gentlemen:

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

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

Respectfully Submitted,

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL, INC.

Joseph Lozano Leon
Staff Engineer

Robert G. Trazo, GE 2655
Principal Engineer

Distribution: (1) Addressee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Geotechnical Design Considerations

- All of the borings encountered disturbed alluvium, extending to depths of 2½ to 3± feet below the existing site grades.
- The disturbed alluvial soils are underlain by younger or older alluvium, which possesses varying strengths and densities. The results of laboratory testing indicate that the near-surface soils within the upper 5 to 6± feet possess a potential for moderate to severe collapse when exposed to moisture infiltration as well as excessive consolidation when exposed to load increases in the range of those that will be exerted by the new foundations.
- The near-surface soils, in their present condition, are not considered suitable to support the foundation loads of the new building, and could result in excessive post-construction settlements.
- The conceptual site plan for the proposed development indicates that the proposed building will be located 1± foot from the property line. The contractor should take all necessary provisions to protect any improvements on the adjacent property. Specialized grading techniques, such as A-B-C slot cuts, will be required for the construction of the building walls within these areas. In addition, the foundations for these walls should be designed using a reduced allowable bearing pressure.

Site Preparation

- Initial site preparation should include stripping of any surficial vegetation. The surficial vegetation, and any organic soils should be properly disposed of off-site.
- Remedial grading should be performed within the proposed building area in order to remove any soils disturbed during stripping and a portion of the near-surface native alluvium. The soils within the proposed building area should be overexcavated to a depth of 5 feet below existing grade and to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed building pad subgrade elevations. Within the influence zones of the new foundations, the overexcavation should extend to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade.
- The overexcavation areas should extend at least 5 feet beyond the building and foundation perimeters, and to an extent equal to the depth of fill placed below the foundation bearing grade, whichever is greater.
- After overexcavation has been completed, the subgrade soils should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to identify any additional soils that should be overexcavated. The resulting subgrade should then be scarified to a depth of 12 inches, moisture conditioned or air dried to 2 to 4 percent above optimum, and recompacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.
- The new pavement and flatwork subgrade soils are recommended to be scarified to a depth of 12± inches, moisture conditioned and recompacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

Building Foundations

- Conventional shallow foundations, supported in newly placed compacted fill.
- 2,500 lbs/ft^2 maximum allowable soil bearing pressure.
- 1,500 lbs/ft^2 if the full recommended lateral extent of remedial grading cannot be achieved.
- Reinforcement consisting of at least four (4) No. 5 rebars (2 top and 2 bottom) in strip footings, due to the presence of low expansive soils. Additional reinforcement may be necessary for structural considerations.

Building Floor Slab

- Conventional Slab-on-Grade: minimum 6 inches thick.
- Modulus of Subgrade Reaction: k = 100 psi/in.
- Minimum slab reinforcement: Reinforcement of the floor slab should consist of No. 3 bars at 18-inches on center in both directions due to presence of low expansive soils.
- The actual thickness and reinforcement of the floor slab should be determined by the structural engineer.

Pavement Design Recommendations

ASPHALT PAVEMENTS (R=37)					
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	5	6	8	9	11
Compacted Subgrade	12	12	12	12	12

PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENTS (R=37)				
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. 22P221, dated April 21, 2022. 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 site is located at the northwest corner of West Nance Street and North Webster Avenue in Perris, California. The site is bounded to the northwest by a vacant lot, to the south by West Nance Street, and to the east by North Webster Avenue. The general location of the site is illustrated on the Site Location Map, included as Plate 1 in Appendix A of this report.

The site consists of seven (7) contiguous parcels, which total 5.26± acres in size. The project site is vacant and undeveloped. The ground surface consists of tilled soil with sparse native grass and weed growth.

Detailed topographic information was not available at the time of this report. Based on elevations obtained from Google Earth, and visual observations made at the time of the subsurface investigation, the overall site topography gently slopes downward to the east at a gradient of less than 1 percent.

3.2 Proposed Development

Based on the site plan, identified as Scheme 01 dated May 26, 2022, prepared by LHA, the site will be developed with a maintenance building, approximately 11,700 ft^2 in size located in the western area of the site. It should be noted that the northwestern corner of the building will be constructed in close proximity, 1± foot away, to the property line. The remaining areas of the site will be developed as an asphaltic concrete (AC) or a Portland cement concrete (PCC) parking lot. Landscaped areas and concrete flatwork are also expected to be included throughout the site.

Detailed information regarding the proposed maintenance building is currently unavailable. It is assumed that the new building will be a single-story structure of tilt-up concrete or masonry block construction, typically supported on a conventional shallow foundation system. Maximum column and wall loads for this structure are assumed to be in the range of 50 kips and 2 to 3 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 assumed topography, cuts and fills of up to 3± feet are expected to be necessary to achieve the proposed site grades. It should be noted that this estimate does not include any remedial grading recommendations which are presented in a subsequent section of this report.

4.0 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

4.1 Scope of Exploration/Sampling Methods

The subsurface exploration conducted for this project consisted of six (6) borings (identified as Boring Nos. B-1 through B-6) advanced to depths of 4½ to 20± feet below the existing site grades. All of the borings were logged during drilling by a member of our staff.

The borings, with the exception of Boring No. B-3, were advanced with hollow-stem augers, by a conventional truck-mounted drilling rig. Boring No. B-3 was advanced using manually-operated hand auger equipment. Representative bulk and relatively undisturbed soil samples were taken during drilling. Relatively undisturbed soil samples were taken with a split barrel "California Sampler" containing a series of one inch long, 2.416± inch diameter brass rings. This sampling method is described in ASTM Test Method D-3550. In-situ samples were also taken using a 1.4± inch inside diameter split spoon sampler, in general accordance with ASTM D-1586. Both of these samplers are driven into the ground with successive blows of a 140-pound weight falling 30 inches. The blow counts obtained during driving are recorded for further analysis. Bulk samples were collected in plastic bags to retain their original moisture content. The relatively undisturbed ring samples were placed in molded plastic sleeves that were then sealed and transported to our laboratory.

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

4.2 Geotechnical Conditions

Disturbed Alluvium

Soils classified as disturbed alluvium were encountered at the ground surface at all of the boring locations. The disturbed alluvium generally consists of medium dense silty sands and clay sands, with occasional dense clayey sands and hard sandy clays, extending to depths of 2½ to 3± feet below the existing site grades. These soils possess relative similarity to the underlying alluvial soils and a slight mottled appearance, resulting in their classification as disturbed alluvium.

Younger Alluvium

Native younger alluvium was encountered beneath the disturbed alluvium at Boring Nos. B-5 and B-6, extending to depths of 6½ to 10± feet below the existing site grades. The younger alluvium generally consists of loose to medium dense clayey sands and silty sands.

Older Alluvium

Native older alluvium was encountered beneath the disturbed alluvium at Boring Nos. B-1 through B-4, and beneath the younger alluvium at Boring No. B-5, extending to at least the maximum depth explored of 20± feet below the existing site grades. The older alluvium generally consists of medium dense to dense clayey sands and silty sands and very stiff to hard sandy clays.

Groundwater

Free water was not encountered during the drilling of any of the borings. Based on the moisture content of the recovered soil samples and the lack of free water in the borings, the static groundwater table is at a greater depth than 20± feet below existing site grades.

As a part of our research, we reviewed available groundwater data in order to determine groundwater levels for the site. Water level data was obtained from the California Department of Water Resources Water Data Library website, https://wdl.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/. Two (2) monitoring wells on record (identified as Local Well Names: EMWD12471 and EMWD12474) are located within 1,000± feet of the site. Water level readings within these monitoring wells indicate a high groundwater level of 65± feet below the ground surface in March 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. The 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 were 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 has been tested for its maximum dry density and optimum moisture content. The results have been obtained using the Modified Proctor procedure, per ASTM D-1557 and are presented on 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 expansion index (EI) testing are as follows:

Sample Identification	Expansion Index	Expansive Potential
B-1 @ 0 to 5 feet	21	Low
B-5 @ 0 to 5 feet	35	Low

Soluble Sulfates

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

Sample Identification	Soluble Sulfates (%)	Sulfate Classification
B-5 @ 0 to 5 feet	0.003	Not Applicable (S0)

Corrosivity Testing

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

Sample Identification	Saturated Resistivity (ohm-cm)	pH	Chlorides (mg/kg)	Nitrates (mg/kg)
B-5 @ 0 to 5 feet	5,628	8.1	7.9	4.7

R-value

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

Sample ID	R-Value
B-4 @ 0 to 5 feet	37

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

6.1 Seismic Design Considerations

The subject site is located in an area which is subject to strong ground motions due to earthquakes. The performance of a site-specific seismic hazards analysis was beyond the scope of this investigation. However, numerous faults capable of producing significant ground motions are located near the subject site. Due to economic considerations, it is not generally considered reasonable to design a structure that is not susceptible to earthquake damage. Therefore, significant damage to structures may be unavoidable during large earthquakes. The proposed 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. In addition, our review of the Riverside County RCIT GIS website indicates that the site is not located within a Riverside County 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 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. Based on Map Number 06065C1430H, dated August 18, 2014, prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Maps, the project site is in an area of undetermined flood hazard, Zone D.

Seismic Design Parameters

The 2019 California Building Code (CBC) provides procedures for earthquake resistant structural design that include considerations for on-site soil conditions, occupancy, and the configuration of the structure including the structural system and height. The seismic design parameters presented below are based on the soil profile and the proximity of known faults with respect to the subject site.

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

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

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

2019 CBC SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS

Parameter		Value
Mapped Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	S_S	1.500
Mapped Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	S_1	0.578
Site Class	---	D
Site Modified Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	S_{MS}	1.500
Site Modified Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	S_{M1}	0.995
Design Spectral Acceleration at 0.2 sec Period	S_{DS}	1.000
Design Spectral Acceleration at 1.0 sec Period	S_{D1}	0.664

It should be noted that the site coefficient F_v and the parameters S_{M1} and S_{D1} were not included in the SEAOC/OSHPD Seismic Design Maps Tool output for the 2019 CBC. We calculated these parameters-based on Table 1613.2.3(2) in Section 16.4.4 of the 2019 CBC using the value of S_1 obtained from the Seismic Design Maps Tool, assuming that a site-specific ground motion hazards analysis is not required for the proposed building at this site.

Liquefaction

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

The Riverside County RCIT GIS website indicates that the subject site is located within a zone of low liquefaction susceptibility. In addition, the subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations are not considered to be conducive to liquefaction. Based on the mapping performed by the county of Riverside and the lack of a historic high ground water table within the upper 50± feet of the ground surface, liquefaction is not considered to be a design concern for this project.

6.2 Geotechnical Design Considerations

General

All of the borings encountered disturbed alluvium, extending to depths of 2½ to 3± feet below the existing site grades. These soils are underlain by younger or older alluvium. The near-surface younger and older alluvium possesses varying strengths and densities. The results of laboratory testing indicate that the near-surface soils within the upper 5 to 6± feet possess a potential for moderate to severe collapse when exposed to moisture infiltration as well as excessive consolidation when exposed to load increases in the range of those that will be exerted by the new foundations. By visual examination, the majority of the near-surface samples also possess calcareous nodules and veining throughout, and appear to be weakly cemented. Cemented soils with low relative densities are generally prone to settlement due to collapse when inundated with water. Based on these conditions, remedial grading will be necessary to remove the upper portion of the near-surface native alluvial soils, and any soils disturbed during the stripping process, and replace these materials as compacted structural fill soils. The remedial grading will also serve to create more uniform support characteristics across the proposed building pad area.

The site plan indicates that the northwestern corner of the proposed building will be located 1± foot from the property line. The contractor should take all necessary provisions to protect any improvements on the adjacent property. Specialized grading techniques, such as A-B-C slot cuts, will be required for the construction of the northwestern corner of the building. In addition, the foundations for these walls should be designed using a reduced allowable bearing pressure.

Settlement

The recommended remedial grading will remove the potentially collapsible/compressible near-surface native alluvium, and replace these materials as compacted structural fill. The native soils that will remain in place below the recommended depth of overexcavation will not be subject to significant stress increases from the foundations of the new structure. Provided that the recommended remedial grading is completed, the post-construction static settlements of the proposed structure are expected to be less than 1.0 and 0.5 inches for total and differential settlements of shallow foundations, respectively.

Expansion

Laboratory testing performed on representative samples of the near-surface soils indicates that these materials possess a low expansion potential (EI = 21 and 35). Based on the presence of expansive soils at this site, care should be given to proper moisture conditioning of all building pad subgrade soils to a moisture content of 2 to 4 percent above the ASTM D-1557 optimum during site grading. In addition to adequately moisture conditioning the subgrade soils and fill soils during grading, special care must be taken to maintaining moisture content of these soils at 2 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content. This will require the contractor to frequently moisture condition these soils throughout the grading process, unless grading occurs during a period of relatively wet weather. Civil and structural design considerations are presented in Section 6.4 of this report.

Soluble Sulfates

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

Corrosion Potential

The results of laboratory testing indicate that the on-site soils possess a saturated resistivity of 5,628 ohm-cm, and a pH value of 8.1. 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 and pH are two of the five factors that enter into the evaluation procedure. Redox potential, relative soil moisture content and sulfides are also included. Although sulfide testing was not part of the scope of services for this project, we have evaluated the corrosivity characteristics of the on-site soils using resistivity, pH and moisture content. Based on these factors, and utilizing the DIPRA procedure, the on-site soils are not considered to be corrosive to ferrous pipes. Therefore, corrosion protection is not expected to be required for cast iron or ductile iron pipes.

Based on American Concrete Institute (ACI) Publication 318 Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete and Commentary, reinforced concrete that is exposed to external sources of chlorides requires corrosion protection for the steel reinforcement contained within the concrete. ACI 318 defines concrete exposed to moisture and an external source of chlorides as "severe" or exposure category C2. ACI 318 does not clearly define a specific chloride concentration at which contact with the adjacent soil will constitute a "C2" or severe exposure. However, the Caltrans Memo to Designers 10-5, Protection of Reinforcement Against Corrosion Due to Chlorides, Acids and Sulfates, dated June 2010, indicates that soils possessing chloride concentrations greater than 500 mg/kg are considered to be corrosive to reinforced concrete. The results of the laboratory testing indicate chloride concentrations of 7.9 mg/kg. Although the soils contain some chlorides, we do not expect that the chloride concentrations of the tested soils are high enough to constitute a "severe" or C2 chloride exposure. Therefore, a chloride exposure category of C1 is considered appropriate for this site.

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 4.7 mg/kg. Based on this test result, the on-site soils are not considered to be corrosive to copper pipe.

Since SCG does not practice in the area of corrosion engineering, we recommend that the client contact a corrosion engineer to provide a more thorough evaluation of these test results.

Shrinkage/Subsidence

Removal and recompaction of the near-surface fill and younger alluvial soils is estimated to result in an average shrinkage of 1 to 10 percent. Where very dense/hard older alluvium is excavated and replaced as fill, bulking of 1 to 5 percent should be expected. It should be noted that these shrinkage and bulking estimates are based on dry density testing performed on small-diameter samples taken at the boring locations. If a more accurate and precise shrinkage estimate is desired, SCG can perform a shrinkage study involving several excavated test-pits where in-place densities are determined using in-situ testing methods instead of laboratory density testing on small-diameter samples. Please contact SCG for details and a cost estimate regarding a shrinkage study, if desired.

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

Grading and Foundation Plan Review

It is recommended that we be provided with copies of the finalized grading and foundation plans, when they become available, for review with regard to the conclusions, recommendations, and assumptions contained within this report.

6.3 Site Grading Recommendations

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

Site Stripping

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

Treatment of Existing Soils: Maintenance Building Pad

Remedial grading should be performed within the proposed building area in order to remove the existing any soils disturbed during striping, and a portion of the near-surface native alluvium. 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 grades and to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed building pad subgrade elevations, whichever is greater. The depth of the overexcavation should also extend to a depth sufficient to remove any undocumented fill soils and soils disturbed during site striping. Within the influence zones of the new foundations, the overexcavation should extend to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade.

The overexcavation areas should extend at least 5 feet beyond the building and foundation perimeters, and to an extent equal to the depth of fill placed below the foundation bearing grade, whichever is greater. If the proposed structure incorporates any exterior columns (such as for a canopy or overhang) the area of overexcavation should also encompass these areas. The site plan for the proposed development indicates that the northwestern corner of building will be constructed 1± foot from the property line. The contractor should take all necessary provisions to protect any improvements on the adjacent property. **Specialized grading techniques, such as A-B-C slot cuts, may be required for the construction of the proposed building footings where the recommended remedial grading cannot be achieved. In addition, the proposed building foundations, in areas where the recommended remedial grading cannot be achieved, should be designed using a reduced allowable bearing pressure.**

Following completion of the overexcavation, the subgrade soils within the overexcavation areas should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to verify their suitability to serve as the structural fill subgrade, as well as to support the foundation loads of the new structure. This evaluation should include proofrolling and probing to identify any soft, loose, or otherwise unstable soils that must be removed. Some localized areas of deeper excavation may be required if any artificial fill or loose, porous, or low-density native soils are encountered at the base of the overexcavation.

After a suitable overexcavation subgrade has been achieved, the exposed soils should be scarified to a depth of at least 12 inches and moisture conditioned to achieve a moisture content of 2 to 4 percent above optimum moisture content. The subgrade soils should then be recompacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

The building pad area may then be raised to grade with previously excavated soils or imported, very low expansive structural fill. All structural fill soils present within the proposed building area should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.

<u>Treatment of Existing Soils: Retaining Walls and Site Walls</u>

The existing soils within the areas of any proposed retaining walls and site walls should be overexcavated to a depth of 3 feet below foundation bearing grade and replaced as compacted structural fill as discussed above for the proposed building pad. Any undocumented fill soils or disturbed native alluvium within any of these foundation areas should be removed in their entirety. The overexcavation areas should extend at least 3 feet beyond the foundation perimeters, and to an extent equal to the depth of fill below the new foundations. Any erection pads for tilt-up concrete walls are considered to be part of the foundation system. Therefore, these overexcavation recommendations are applicable to erection pads. The overexcavation subgrade soils should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer prior to scarifying, moisture conditioning to within 2 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, and recompacting the upper 12 inches of exposed subgrade soils. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

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

<u>Treatment of Existing Soils: Retaining Walls and Site Walls</u>

The existing soils within the areas of any proposed retaining walls and site walls should be overexcavated to a depth of 2 feet below foundation bearing grade and replaced as compacted structural fill as discussed above for the proposed building pad. Any undocumented fill soils or disturbed native alluvium within any of these foundation areas should be removed in their entirety. The overexcavation areas should extend at least 4 feet beyond the foundation perimeters, and to an extent equal to the depth of fill below the new foundations. Any erection pads for tilt-up concrete walls are considered to be part of the foundation system. Therefore, these overexcavation recommendations are applicable to erection pads. The overexcavation subgrade soils should be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer prior to scarifying, moisture conditioning to within 2 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, and recompacting the upper 12 inches of exposed subgrade soils. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

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

Treatment of Existing Soils: Parking and Drive Areas

Based on economic considerations, overexcavation of the existing near-surface existing 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 operations.

The geotechnical engineer should then evaluate the subgrade to identify any areas of additional unsuitable soils. Any such materials should be removed to a level of firm and unyielding soil. The exposed subgrade soils should then be scarified to a depth of 12± inches, moisture conditioned to 2 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, and recompacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. Based on the presence of variable strength surficial soils throughout the site, it is expected that some isolated areas of additional overexcavation may be required to remove zones of lower strength, unsuitable soils.

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

Treatment of Existing Soils: Flatwork Areas

Subgrade preparation in the new flatwork areas should initially consist of removal of all soils disturbed during stripping 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 or air dried to 2 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 subject site, it is expected that some isolated areas of additional overexcavation may be required to remove zones of lower strength, unsuitable soils.

As noted previously, the subject site is underlain by low expansive soils. Support of new flatwork on low expansive soils carries additional risk with respect to flatwork movement and potential distress. This report provides recommendations for moisture conditioning and additional steel reinforcement in the flatwork areas in order to minimize the potential effects of the expansive soils. However, if additional protection is desired, the client should consider the placement of a 2-foot-thick layer of non-expansive soil beneath all flatwork.

Fill Placement

- Fill soils should be placed in thin (6± inches), near-horizontal lifts, moisture conditioned (or air dried) to 2 to 4 percent above the optimum moisture content, and compacted.
- On-site soils may be used for fill provided they are cleaned of any debris to the satisfaction of the geotechnical engineer.
- All grading and fill placement activities should be completed in accordance with the requirements of the 2019 CBC and the grading code of the city of Perris and/or the county of Riverside.
- All fill soils should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. Fill soils should be well mixed.
- Compaction tests should be performed periodically by the geotechnical engineer as random verification of compaction and moisture content. These tests are intended to aid the contractor. Since the tests are taken at discrete locations and depths, they may not be indicative of the entire fill and therefore should not relieve the contractor of his responsibility to meet the job specifications.

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 should be compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. As an alternative, a clean sand (minimum Sand Equivalent of 30) may be placed within trenches and compacted in place (jetting or flooding is not recommended). Compacted trench backfill should conform to the requirements of the local grading code, and more restrictive requirements may be indicated by the city of Perris and/or the county of Riverside. 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 (horizontal to vertical) 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.

Any soils used to backfill voids around subsurface utility structures, such as manholes or vaults, should be placed as compacted structural fill. If it is not practical to place compacted fill in these areas, then such void spaces may be backfilled with lean concrete slurry. Uncompacted pea gravel or sand is not recommended for backfilling these voids since these materials have a potential to settle and thereby cause distress of pavements placed around these subterranean structures.

6.4 Construction Considerations

Excavation Considerations

The near-surface soils generally consist of moderate strength clayey sands and silty sands, with occasional sandy clays. These materials may be subject to minor to moderate caving within shallow excavations. Where caving does occur, flattened excavation slopes may be sufficient to provide excavation stability. On a preliminary basis, the inclination of temporary slopes should not exceed 2h:1v. Temporary excavations into older alluvium or clayey soils may be laid back at a 1.5h:1v, at the discretion of the geotechnical engineer at the time of grading. Deeper excavations may require some form of external stabilization such as shoring or bracing. Maintaining adequate moisture content within the near-surface soils will improve excavation stability. All excavation activities on this site should be conducted in accordance with Cal-OSHA regulations.

Construction activities for the northwestern corner of the proposed building will require excavation in close proximity to the property line. The contractor should take all necessary provisions to protect the adjacent improvements. During initial grading operations, no soil should be removed from a zone defined by a 1h:1v downward projection from a point beginning 1 foot beyond the edge of any existing improvements. During remedial grading, slot cutting procedures will likely be required. The grading contractor, based on their experience with similar projects, should verify the applicable width and depth of the slot cuts. Due to the granular composition of the on-site soils, vertical slot cuts may be susceptible to sloughing. A-B-C slot cuts on 6 to 8-foot centers are generally accepted grading methods. However, determination of the safe slot cut depth is the responsibility of the contractor. The geotechnical engineer should observe the conditions at the time of site grading. A reduced soil bearing pressure will be required for the design of the proposed perimeter wall footings within these areas.

Moisture Sensitive Subgrade Soils

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

If the construction schedule dictates that site grading will occur during a period of wet weather, allowances should be made for costs and delays associated with drying the on-site soils or import of a drier, less moisture sensitive fill material. Grading during wet or cool weather may also increase the depth of overexcavation in the pad area as well as the need for a stabilization layer.

Expansive Soils

The near-surface soils within the subject site have been determined to possess a low expansion potential. Therefore, care should be given to proper moisture conditioning of all subgrade soils to a moisture content of 2 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum during site grading. All imported fill soils should have very low expansive (EI < 20) characteristics. **In addition to adequately moisture conditioning the subgrade soils and fill soils during grading, special care must be taken to maintain the moisture content of these soils at 2 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum. This will require the contractor to frequently moisture condition these soils throughout the grading process, unless grading occurs during a period of relatively wet weather**.

Due to the presence of expansive soils at this site, provisions should be made to limit the potential for surface water to penetrate the soils immediately adjacent to the new structure. These provisions should include directing surface runoff into rain gutters and area drains, reducing the extent of landscaped areas around the structure, and sloping the ground surface away from the building. Where possible, it is recommended that landscaped planters not be located immediately adjacent to the proposed building. If landscaped planters around the building are necessary, it is recommended that drought tolerant plants or a drip irrigation system be utilized, to minimize the potential for deep moisture penetration around the structure. Presented below is a list of additional soil moisture control recommendations that should be considered by the owner, developer, and civil engineer:

- Ponding and areas of low flow gradients in unpaved walkways, grass and planter areas should be avoided. In general, minimum drainage gradients of 2 percent should be maintained in unpaved areas.
- Bare soil within five feet of proposed structure should be sloped at a minimum five percent gradient away from the structure (about three inches of fall in five feet), or the same area could be paved with a minimum surface gradient of one percent. Pavement is preferable.
- Decorative gravel ground cover tends to provide a reservoir for surface water and may hide areas of ponding or poor drainage. Decorative gravel is, therefore, not recommended and should not be utilized for landscaping unless equipped with a subsurface drainage system designed by a licensed landscape architect.
- Positive drainage devices, such as graded swales, paved ditches, and catch basins should be installed at appropriate locations within the area of proposed development.
- Concrete walks and flatwork should not obstruct the free flow of surface water to the appropriate drainage devices.
- Area drains should be recessed below grade to allow free flow of water into the drain. Concrete or brick flatwork joints should be sealed with mortar or flexible mastic.
- Gutter and downspout systems should be installed to capture all discharge from roof areas. Downspouts should discharge directly into a pipe or paved surface system to be conveyed off-site.
- Enclosed planters adjoining, or in close proximity to the proposed structure, should be sealed at the bottom and provided with subsurface collection systems and outlet pipes.
- Depressed planters should be raised with soil to promote runoff (minimum drainage gradient two percent or five percent, see above), and/or equipped with area drains to eliminate ponding.
- Drainage outfall locations should be selected to avoid erosion of slopes and/or properly armored to prevent erosion of graded surfaces. No drainage should be directed over or towards adjoining slopes.
- All drainage devices should be maintained on a regular basis, including frequent observations during the rainy season to keep the drains free of leaves, soil and other debris.

- Landscape irrigation should conform to the recommendations of the landscape architect and should be performed judiciously to preclude either soaking or excessive drying of the foundation soils. This should entail regular watering during the drier portions of the year and little or no irrigation during the rainy season. Automatic sprinkler systems should, therefore, be switched to manual operation during the rainy season. Good irrigation practice typically requires frequent application of limited quantities of water that are sufficient to sustain plant growth, but do not excessively wet the soils. Ponding and/or run-off of irrigation water are indications of excessive watering.

Other provisions, as determined by the landscape architect or civil engineer, may also be appropriate.

Groundwater

The static groundwater table is considered to exist at a depth greater than 20± feet or more below existing grade. 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 any undocumented fill soils and a portion of the near-surface alluvial soils. These new structural fill soils are expected to extend to a depth of at least 3 feet below proposed foundation bearing grade, underlain by 1± foot of additional soil that has been densified and moisture conditioned in place. Based on this subsurface profile, the proposed structure may be supported on conventional shallow foundations.

Foundation Design Parameters

New square and rectangular footings may be designed as follows:

- Maximum, net allowable soil bearing pressure: 2,500 lbs/ft^2.

- Maximum, net allowable soil bearing pressure: 1,500 lbs/ft^2 if the full recommended lateral extent of remedial grading cannot be achieved.

- Minimum wall/column footing width: 14 inches/24 inches.

- Minimum longitudinal steel reinforcement within strip footings: Four (4) No. 5 rebars (2 top and 2 bottom), due to the presence of low expansive soils. Additional reinforcement may be necessary for structural considerations.

- Minimum foundation embedment: 12 inches into suitable structural fill soils, and at least 18 inches below adjacent exterior grade. Interior column footings may be placed immediately beneath the floor slab.

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

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

Foundation Construction

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

The foundation subgrade soils should also be properly moisture conditioned to 2 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 static 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, under static conditions. 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 slab 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: 275 lbs/ft^3
- Friction Coefficient: 0.28

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

6.6 Floor Slab Design and Construction

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

- Minimum slab thickness: 6 inches.
- Modulus of Subgrade Reaction: 100 psi/in.
- Minimum slab reinforcement: No. 3 bars at 18-inches on-center, in both directions, due to presence of low expansive soils. 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 then minimum slab underlayment should consist of a moisture vapor barrier constructed below the entire slab area where such moisture sensitive floor coverings are expected. The moisture vapor barrier should meet or exceed the Class A rating as defined by ASTM E 1745-97 and have a permeance rating less than 0.01 perms as described in ASTM E 96-95 and ASTM E 154-88. A polyolefin material such as 15 mil Stego® Wrap Vapor Barrier or equivalent will meet these specifications. The moisture vapor barrier should be properly constructed in accordance with all applicable manufacturer specifications. Given that a rock free subgrade is anticipated and that a capillary break is not required, sand below the barrier is not required. The need for sand and/or the amount of sand above the moisture vapor barrier should be specified by the structural engineer or concrete contractor. The selection of sand above the barrier is not a geotechnical engineering issue and hence outside our purview. Where moisture sensitive floor coverings are not anticipated, the vapor barrier may be eliminated.
- Moisture condition the floor slab subgrade soils to 2 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum moisture content, to a depth of 12 inches. The moisture content of the floor slab subgrade soils should be verified by the geotechnical engineer within 24 hours prior to concrete placement.
- Proper concrete curing techniques should be utilized to reduce the potential for slab curling or the formation of excessive shrinkage cracks.
- The floor slab should be structurally connected to the foundations as detailed by the structural engineer.

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

6.7 Exterior Flatwork Design and Construction

Subgrades which will support new exterior slabs-on-grade for sidewalks, patios, and other concrete flatwork, should be prepared in accordance with the recommendations contained in the ***Grading Recommendations*** section of this report. Based on geotechnical considerations, exterior slabs on grade may be designed as follows:

- Minimum slab thickness: 4½ inches.
- Minimum slab reinforcement: No. 3 bars at 18 inches on center, in both directions.
- The flatwork at building entry areas should be structurally connected to the perimeter foundation that is recommended to span across the door opening. This recommendation is designed to reduce the potential for differential movement at this joint.
- Moisture condition the slab subgrade soils to at least 2 to 4 percent of optimum moisture content, to a depth of at least 12 inches. Adequate moisture conditioning should be verified by the geotechnical engineer 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.
- Control joints should be provided at a maximum spacing of 8 feet on center in two directions for slabs and at 6 feet on center for sidewalks. Control joints are intended to direct cracking. Minor cracking of exterior concrete slabs on grade should be expected.

Expansion or felt joints should be used at the interface of exterior slabs on grade and any fixed structures to permit relative movement.

6.8 Retaining Wall Design and Construction

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

Retaining Wall Design Parameters

Based on the soil conditions encountered at the boring locations, the following parameters may be used in the design of new retaining walls for this site. The following parameters assume that only the on-site soils will be utilized for retaining wall backfill. The near-surface soils generally consist of clayey sands and silty sands, with occasional sandy clays. Based on their classification, the sandy materials are expected to possess a friction angle of at least 30 degrees when compacted to at least 90 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. Soils consisting of sandy clays likely possess lower strengths and should not be used to backfill retaining walls.

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 Clayey Sands and Silty Sands
Internal Friction Angle (ϕ)		30°
Unit Weight		135 lbs/ft^3
Equivalent Fluid Pressure:	Active Condition (level backfill)	45 lbs/ft^3
	Active Condition (2h:1v backfill)	73 lbs/ft^3
	At-Rest Condition (level backfill)	68 lbs/ft^3

The walls should be designed using a soil-footing coefficient of friction of 0.28 and an equivalent passive pressure of 275 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 underlain by at least 3 feet of newly placed structural fill. Foundations to support new retaining walls should be designed in accordance with the general Foundation Design Parameters presented in a previous section of this report.

Seismic Lateral Earth Pressures

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

Backfill Material

On-site soils may be used to backfill the retaining walls, provided that they are very low expansive (EI < 20) sandy soils. All backfill material placed within 3 feet of the back wall-face should have a particle size no greater than 3 inches. The retaining wall backfill materials should be well graded. It is recommended that a minimum 1-foot thick layer of free-draining granular material (less than 5 percent passing the No. 200 sieve) be placed against the face of the retaining walls. This material should extend from the top of the retaining wall footing to within 1 foot of the ground surface on the back side of the retaining wall. This material should be approved by the geotechnical engineer. In lieu of the 1-foot thick layer of free-draining material, a properly installed prefabricated drainage composite such as the MiraDRAIN 6000XL (or approved equivalent), which is specifically designed for use behind retaining walls, may be used. If the layer of free-draining material is not covered by an impermeable surface, such as a structure or pavement, a 12-inch thick layer of a low permeability soil should be placed over the backfill to reduce surface water migration to the underlying soils. The layer of free draining granular material should be separated from the backfill soils by a suitable geotextile, approved by the geotechnical engineer.

All retaining wall backfill should be placed and compacted under engineering controlled conditions in the necessary layer thicknesses to ensure an in-place density between 90 and 93 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by the Modified Proctor test (ASTM D1557). 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 2-inch diameter holes in the wall situated slightly above the ground surface elevation on the exposed side of the wall and at an approximate 10-foot on-center spacing. Alternatively, 4-inch diameter holes at an approximate 20-foot on-center spacing can be used for this type of drainage system. In addition, 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. The actual design of this type of system should be determined by the civil engineer to verify that the drainage system possesses the adequate capacity and slope for its intended use.

Weep holes or a footing drain will not be required for building stem walls.

6.9 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 clayey sands and silty sands, with occasional sandy clays. These soils are generally considered to possess good pavement support characteristics. Based on the R-value testing performed as part of our scope for this project, the subsequent pavement designs are based upon an R-value of 37. 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 the completion of rough grading to verify the R-value of the as-graded parking subgrade.

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=37)					
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	5	6	8	9	11
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 batch plant-reported maximum density. 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=37)				
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. The maximum joint spacing within all of the PCC pavements is recommended to be equal to or less than 30 times the pavement thickness. Any reinforcement within the PCC pavements should be determined by the project structural engineer.

7.0 GENERAL COMMENTS

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A



SOURCE: USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS OF THE STEELE PEAK QUADRANGLE AND THE PERRIS QUADRANGLE, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, 2021.

SITE LOCATION MAP	
PROPOSED MAINTENANCE BUILDING AND PARKING LOT	
PERRIS, CALIFORNIA	
SCALE: 1" = 2000'	SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
DRAWN: JLL CHKD: RGT	
SCG PROJECT 22G184-1	
PLATE 1	

GEOTECHNICAL LEGEND

APPROXIMATE BORING LOCATION

NOTE: SITE PLAN PROVIDED BY THE CLIENT.

BORING LOCATION PLAN

PROPOSED MAINTENANCE BUILDING AND PARKING LOT

PERRIS, CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1" = 80'

DRAWN: JLL

CHKD: RGT

SCG PROJECT 22G184-1

PLATE 2

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL

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	GRAVEL AND GRAVELLY SOILS	CLEAN GRAVELS		GW	WELL-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES
		(LITTLE OR NO FINES)		GP	POORLY-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES
	MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION RETAINED ON NO. 4 SIEVE	GRAVELS WITH FINES		GM	SILTY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - SILT MIXTURES
		(APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		GC	CLAYEY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - CLAY MIXTURES
MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS LARGER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	SAND AND SANDY SOILS	CLEAN SANDS		SW	WELL-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SANDS, LITTLE OR NO FINES
		(LITTLE OR NO FINES)		SP	POORLY-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SAND, LITTLE OR NO FINES
	MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION PASSING ON NO. 4 SIEVE	SANDS WITH FINES		SM	SILTY SANDS, SAND - SILT MIXTURES
		(APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		SC	CLAYEY SANDS, SAND - CLAY MIXTURES
FINE GRAINED SOILS	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
MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS SMALLER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	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.: 22G184-1
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot
LOCATION: Perris, California

DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 8 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
	X	66	4.5		DISTURBED ALLUVIUM: Light Brown to Brown fine to medium Sandy Clay, little Silt, slightly cemented, trace Calcareous nodules, hard-damp	123	6					EI = 21 @ 0-5 feet
	X	39			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, little Silt, slightly cemented, little Calcareous nodules, medium dense-damp to moist	120	7					
5	X	22			Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace Clay, slightly cemented, trace Calcareous nodules, medium dense-damp to moist	128	8					
	X	34				130	8					
	X	45	4.5		Light Brown to Brown fine Sandy Clay, trace to little medium Sand, little Silt, slightly cemented, trace Calcareous nodules, hard-moist	124	12					
10												

Boring Terminated at 10'

TBL 22G184-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/7/22

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-2

JOB NO.: 22G184-1
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot
LOCATION: Perris, California
DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas
WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 3 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion

SURFACE ELEVATION: --- MSL

FIELD RESULTS						LABORATORY RESULTS						
DEPTH (FEET)	SAMPLE	BLOW COUNT	POCKET PEN. (TSF)	GRAPHIC LOG	DESCRIPTION	DRY DENSITY (PCF)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC LIMIT	PASSING #200 SIEVE (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	COMMENTS
	X	26			DISTURBED ALLUVIUM: Gray Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little Clay, trace Calcareous nodules, slightly cemented, medium dense-damp		5					
5	X	21			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, trace to little Silt, slightly cemented, medium dense-moist		9					
					Boring Terminated at 5'							

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-3

JOB NO.: 22G184-1
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot
LOCATION: Perris, California

DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22
DRILLING METHOD: Hand Auger
LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 3 feet
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
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 (%)	
					DISTURBED ALLUVIUM: Light Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace Clay, medium dense-damp							
							2					
					OLDER ALLUVIUM: Light Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace Clay, medium dense-damp							
							3					
					Boring Terminated at 4.5'							

TBL 22G184-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/7/22

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-4

JOB NO.: 22G184-1	DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 6 feet
LOCATION: Perris, California	LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas	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
	X	21			DISTURBED ALLUVIUM: Gray Brown Clayey fine Sand, little medium Sand, little Silt, trace Calcareous nodules, slightly cemented, medium dense-damp		7					
5	X	25			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, trace Silt, trace coarse Sand, slightly cemented, trace Calcareous nodules, medium dense-damp		5					
	X	36			Brown Clayey fine Sand, little medium Sand, little Silt, trace Calcareous nodules, dense-damp		7					
10	X	29			Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace Clay, medium dense-damp to moist		8					
					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 22G184-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/7/22

BORING NO. B-5

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

JOB NO.: 22G184-1
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot
LOCATION: Perris, California

DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: 16 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
		63			DISTURBED ALLUVIUM: Gray Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, trace Silt, cemented, dense-damp	130	6					EI = 35 @ 0-5 feet
		32			YOUNGER ALLUVIUM: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, little Silt, slightly cemented, little Calcareous nodules, medium dense-damp	118	6					
5		8			Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace coarse Sand, loose-damp	112	4					
		42			OLDER ALLUVIUM: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, trace Silt, trace Calcareous nodules, cemented, medium dense-moist	127	10					
10		59			Brown Silty fine Sand, trace Clay, slightly cemented, dense-damp to moist	128	8					
15		16			Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, trace to little Silt, medium dense-moist to very moist		12					
20		27	3.5		Gray Brown fine Sandy Clay, trace to little Silt, very stiff-moist		14					

Boring Terminated at 20'

TBL 22G184-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/7/22

TEST BORING LOG

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. B-6

JOB NO.: 22G184-1	DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22	WATER DEPTH: Dry
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot	DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger	CAVE DEPTH: 8 feet
LOCATION: Perris, California	LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas	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
					DISTURBED ALLUVIUM: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, medium dense-damp to moist							
	X	10					8					
					YOUNGER ALLUVIUM: Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, little Clay, medium dense-moist to very moist							
	X	11					12					
5												
	X	20					11					
	X	25					8					
10					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 22G184-1.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/7/22

APPENDIX C



Classification: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, little Silt

Boring Number:	B-1	Initial Moisture Content (%)	7
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	12
Depth (ft)	3 to 4	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	119.8
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	133.6
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	2.47

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 1

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL A California Corporation



Classification: Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace Clay

Boring Number:	B-1	Initial Moisture Content (%)	8
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	12
Depth (ft)	5 to 6	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	127.9
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	132.6
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.39

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 2

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation



Classification: Brown Silty fine to medium Sand, trace Clay

Boring Number:	B-1	Initial Moisture Content (%)	8
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	12
Depth (ft)	7 to 8	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	129.6
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	133.1
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.29

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 3

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation



Classification: Light Brown to Brown fine Sandy Clay, trace to little medium Sand, little Silt

Boring Number:	B-1	Initial Moisture Content (%)	12
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	15
Depth (ft)	9 to 10	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	123.5
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	129.6
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.26

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 4

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Consolidation/Collapse Test Results



Classification: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, little Silt

Boring Number:	B-5	Initial Moisture Content (%)	6
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	13
Depth (ft)	3 to 4	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	117.8
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	139.2
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	6.28

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 5

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation



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

Boring Number:	B-5	Initial Moisture Content (%)	4
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	13
Depth (ft)	5 to 6	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	111.5
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	128.3
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	5.67

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 6

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation



Classification: Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, trace Silt

Boring Number:	B-5	Initial Moisture Content (%)	10
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	13
Depth (ft)	7 to 8	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	127.4
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	135.4
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.05

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 7

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation



Classification: Brown Silty fine Sand, trace Clay

Boring Number:	B-5	Initial Moisture Content (%)	8
Sample Number:	---	Final Moisture Content (%)	13
Depth (ft)	7 to 8	Initial Dry Density (pcf)	127.5
Specimen Diameter (in)	2.4	Final Dry Density (pcf)	133.6
Specimen Thickness (in)	1.0	Percent Collapse (%)	0.02

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 8

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation



Soil ID Number	B-5 @ 0 to 5'
Optimum Moisture (%)	8.5
Maximum Dry Density (pcf)	134
Soil Classification	Gray Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand, little Silt

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-1
PLATE C- 9

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.

<u>Compacted Fills</u>

- 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

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	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
DRAWN: JAS CHKD: GKM	
PLATE D-5	



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

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

"GRAVEL" TO MEET FOLLOWING SPECIFICATION OR APPROVED EQUIVALENT:

SIEVE SIZE	MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE PASSING
1 1/2"	100
NO. 4	50
NO. 200	8

SAND EQUIVALENT = MINIMUM OF 50



DETAIL "A"

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

OSHPD

Latitude, Longitude: 33.855852, -117.246015

Date	6/1/2022, 4:09:58 PM
Design Code Reference Document	ASCE7-16
Risk Category	II
Site Class	D - Stiff Soil

Type	Value	Description
S_S	1.5	MCE_R ground motion. (for 0.2 second period)
S_1	0.578	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	0.5	MCE_G peak ground acceleration
F_{PGA}	1.1	Site amplification factor at PGA
PGA_M	0.55	Site modified peak ground acceleration
T_L	8	Long-period transition period in seconds
SsRT	1.55	Probabilistic risk-targeted ground motion. (0.2 second)
SsUH	1.658	Factored uniform-hazard (2% probability of exceedance in 50 years) spectral acceleration
SsD	1.5	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (0.2 second)
S1RT	0.578	Probabilistic risk-targeted ground motion. (1.0 second)
S1UH	0.634	Factored uniform-hazard (2% probability of exceedance in 50 years) spectral acceleration.
S1D	0.6	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (1.0 second)
PGAd	0.5	Factored deterministic acceleration value. (Peak Ground Acceleration)
C_{RS}	0.935	Mapped value of the risk coefficient at short periods
C_{R1}	0.912	Mapped value of the risk coefficient at a period of 1 s

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

SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS - 2019 CBC

PROPOSED MAINTENANCE BUILDING AND PARKING LOT

PERRIS, CALIFORNIA

DRAWN: JLL
CHKD: RGT

SCG PROJECT
22G184-1

PLATE E-1

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL

June 8, 2022

Lake Creek Industrial, LLC
1302 Brittany Cross Road
Santa Ana, California 92705

Attention: Mr. Mike Tonkonogy
Manager

Project No.: **22G184-2**

Subject: **Results of Infiltration Testing**
Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
NWC West Nance Street and North Webster Avenue
Perris, California

Reference: Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot, NWC West Nance Street and North Webster Avenue, Perris, California, prepared for Lake Creek Industrial, LLC, by Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. (SCG), SCG Project No. 22G184-1, dated June 8, 2022.

Dear Mr. Tonkonogy:

In accordance with your request, we have conducted infiltration testing at the subject site. We are pleased to present this report summarizing the results of the infiltration testing and our design recommendations.

Scope of Services

The scope of services performed for this project was in general accordance with our Proposal No. 22P221, dated April 21, 2022. The scope of services included site reconnaissance, subsurface exploration, field testing, and engineering analysis to determine the infiltration rates of the on-site soils. The infiltration testing was performed in general accordance with the guidelines published in Riverside County – Low Impact Development BMP Design Handbook – Section 2.3 of Appendix A, prepared for the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH), dated December, 2013.

Site and Project Description

The site is located at the northwest corner of West Nance Street and North Webster Avenue in Perris, California. The site is bounded to the northwest by a vacant lot, to the south by West Nance Street, and to the east by North Webster Avenue. The general location of the site is illustrated on the Site Location Map, included as Plate 1 of this report.

The site consists of seven (7) contiguous parcels, which total 5.26± acres in size. The project site is vacant and undeveloped. The ground surface consists of tilled soil with sparse native grass and weed growth.

Detailed topographic information was not available at the time of this report. Based on elevations obtained from Google Earth, and visual observations made at the time of the subsurface investigation, the overall site topography gently slopes downward to the east at a gradient of less than 1 percent.

Proposed Development

Based on the site plan, identified as Scheme 01 dated May 26, 2022, prepared by LHA, the site will be developed with a maintenance building, approximately 11,700 ft² in size located in the western area of the site. It should be noted that the northwestern corner of the building will be constructed in close proximity, 1± foot away, to the property line. The remaining areas of the site will be developed as an asphaltic concrete (AC) or a Portland cement concrete (PCC) parking lot. Landscaped areas and concrete flatwork are also expected to be included throughout the site.

We understand that the proposed development may include on-site stormwater infiltration. Based on our experience with similar projects in the area, the infiltration systems are expected to be several detention basins located in the northern and western areas of the site. The bottoms of the basins are expected to be 8 to 10± feet below the existing site grades.

Concurrent Study

SCG concurrently conducted a geotechnical investigation at the subject site, referenced above. As a part of this study, six (6) borings (identified as Boring Nos. B-1 through B-6) were advanced to depths of 4½ to 20± feet below the existing site grades.

Soils classified as disturbed alluvium were encountered at the ground surface at all of the boring locations. The disturbed alluvium generally consists of medium dense silty sands and clay sands, with occasional dense clayey sands and hard sandy clays, extending to depths of 2½ to 3± feet below the existing site grades. Native younger alluvium was encountered beneath the disturbed alluvium at Boring Nos. B-5 and B-6, extending to depths of 6½ to 10± feet. The younger alluvium generally consists of loose to medium dense clayey sands and silty sands. Native older alluvium was encountered beneath the disturbed alluvium at Boring Nos. B-1 through B-4, and beneath the younger alluvium at Boring No. B-5, extending to at least the maximum depth explored of 20± feet. The older alluvium generally consists of medium dense to dense clayey sands and silty sands and very stiff to hard sandy clays.

Groundwater

Free water was not encountered during the drilling of any of the borings. Based on the moisture content of the recovered soil samples and the lack of free water in the borings, the static groundwater table is at a greater depth than 20± feet below existing site grades.

As a part of our research, we reviewed available groundwater data in order to determine groundwater levels for the site. Water level data was obtained from the California Department of Water Resources Water Data Library website, https://wdl.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/. Two (2) monitoring wells on record (identified as Local Well Names: EMWD12471 and EMWD12474) are located within 1,000± feet of the site. Water level readings within these monitoring wells indicate a high groundwater level of 65± feet below the ground surface in March 2022.

Subsurface Exploration

Scope of Exploration

The subsurface exploration conducted for the infiltration testing consisted of four (4) infiltration test borings, advanced to a depth of 10± feet below the existing site grades. The infiltration borings were advanced using a truck-mounted drilling rig, equipped with 8-inch-diameter hollow stem augers and were logged during drilling by a member of our staff. The approximate locations of the infiltration test borings (identified as Infiltration Test Nos. I-1 through I-4) are indicated on the Infiltration Test Location Plan, enclosed as Plate 2 of this report.

Upon the completion of the infiltration borings, the bottom of each test boring was covered with 2± inches of clean ¾-inch gravel. A sufficient length of 3-inch-diameter perforated PVC casing was then placed into each test hole so that the PVC casing extended from the bottom of the test hole to the ground surface. Clean ¾-inch gravel was then installed in the annulus surrounding the PVC casing.

Geotechnical Conditions

Native younger alluvium was encountered at the ground surface at Infiltration Test Nos. I-3 and I-4, extending to depths of 7 to 10± feet below the existing site grades. The younger alluvium generally consists of medium dense silty sands to sandy silts with varying clay content. Native older alluvium was encountered beneath the native younger alluvium at Infiltration Test Nos. I-3 and I-4, and at the ground surface at the remaining infiltration test locations, extending to at least the maximum depth explored of 10± feet. The older alluvium generally consists of medium dense to dense clayey sands, and very stiff to hard sandy clays, with occasional dense silty sands to sandy silts with trace to little clay content. The Boring Logs, which illustrate the conditions encountered at each of the borings, are included with this report.

Infiltration Testing

As previously mentioned, the infiltration testing was performed in general accordance with the Riverside County guidelines: Riverside County – Low Impact Development BMP Design Handbook – Section 2.3 of Appendix A.

Pre-soaking

In accordance with the county infiltration standards all of the infiltration test borings were pre-soaked prior to the infiltration testing. The pre-soaking process consisted of filling the test borings by inverting a full 5-gallon bottle of clear water supported over each hole so that the water level reaches a level of at least 5 times the hole's radius above the gravel at the bottom of each hole. The pre-soaking was completed after all of the water had percolated through each test hole or after 15 hours since initiating the pre-soak. Based on the results of the pre-soaking process, 30-minute readings were utilized during all of the infiltration tests.

Infiltration Testing

Following the pre-soaking process of the infiltration test borings, SCG performed the infiltration testing. Each test hole was filled with water to a depth of at least 5 times the hole's radius above the gravel at the bottom of each test hole. In accordance with the Riverside County guidelines, in areas where "non-sandy soils" were encountered at the bottom of the infiltration test borings (where 6 inches of water did not infiltrate into the surrounding soils in less than 25 minutes for two (2) consecutive readings), readings were taken at 30-minute intervals for a total of 6 hours at the test locations. The water level readings are presented on the spreadsheets enclosed with this report. The infiltration rates for each of the timed intervals are also tabulated on the spreadsheets.

The infiltration rates from the test are tabulated in inches per hour. In accordance with the typically accepted practice, it is recommended that the most conservative reading from the latter part of the infiltration tests be used as the design infiltration rate. The rates are summarized below:

Infiltration Test No.	**Depth (feet)**	**Soil Description**	**Measured Infiltration Rate (inches/hour)**
I-1	10	Gray Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace to little Silt	0.02
I-2	10	Brown Silty fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Silt, little to some Clay	0.02
I-3	10	Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace Silt	0.03
I-4	10	Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace to little Silt	0.02

Laboratory Testing

Moisture Content

The moisture contents for the recovered soil samples within the borings were 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.

Grain Size Analysis

The grain size distribution of selected soils collected from the bottom of each infiltration test boring have been determined using a range of wire mesh screens. These tests were performed in general accordance with ASTM D-422 and/or ASTM D-1140. The weight of the portion of the sample retained on each screen is recorded and the percentage finer or coarser of the total weight is calculated. The results of these tests are presented on Plates C-1 through C-4 of this report.

Design Recommendations

Four (4) infiltration tests were performed at the subject site. As noted above, the calculated infiltration rates at the infiltration test locations range between 0.02 and 0.03 inches per hour.

The major factors affecting the lack of infiltration at these locations are the presence of alluvial soils consisting of very stiff to hard sandy clays, and medium dense to dense clayey sands and silty sands to sandy silts with varying clay content. **Based on these conditions and the results of infiltration testing, infiltration is not recommended at this site due to the poor draining qualities of the on-site native soils.**

Although infiltration is not considered feasible at the site, the client may desire to use storm water disposal systems that do not rely on infiltration at this site. The design of storm water disposal systems should be performed by the project civil engineer, in accordance with the City of Perris and/or County of Riverside guidelines. It is recommended any such systems be designed and constructed to facilitate removal of silt and clay, or other deleterious materials from any water that may enter the system. The presence of such materials would decrease the flow rates through the system. It should be noted that the recommended infiltration rates are based on infiltration testing at four (4) discrete locations and that the overall infiltration rates of the proposed infiltration systems could vary considerably.

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, structural engineer, and/or civil engineer. The design of the proposed storm water infiltration system is the responsibility of the civil engineer. The role of the geotechnical engineer is limited to determination of infiltration rate only. By using the design infiltration rate contained herein, the civil engineer agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the geotechnical engineer for all aspects of the design and performance of the proposed storm water infiltration system. 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 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 testing 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.

Closure

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

Respectfully Submitted,

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL, INC.

Joseph Lozano Leon
Staff Engineer

Robert G. Trazo, GE 2655
Principal Engineer

Distribution: (1) Addressee

Enclosures: Plate 1 - Site Location Map
Plate 2 - Infiltration Test Location Plan
Boring Log Legend and Logs (6 pages)
Infiltration Test Results Spreadsheets (4 pages)
Grain Size Distribution Graphs (4 pages)



SOURCE: USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS OF THE STEELE PEAK QUADRANGLE AND THE PERRIS QUADRANGLE, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, 2021.

SITE LOCATION MAP	
PROPOSED MAINTENANCE BUILDING AND PARKING LOT	
PERRIS, CALIFORNIA	
SCALE: 1" = 2000'	SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
DRAWN: JLL CHKD: RGT	
SCG PROJECT 22G184-2	
PLATE 1	



GEOTECHNICAL LEGEND

- APPROXIMATE INFILTRATION TEST LOCATION
- APPROXIMATE BORING LOCATION FROM CONCURRENT STUDY (SCG PROJECT NO. 22G184-1)

NOTE: SITE PLAN PROVIDED BY THE CLIENT.

INFILTRATION TEST LOCATION PLAN

PROPOSED MAINTENANCE BUILDING AND PARKING LOT

PERRIS, CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1" = 80'

DRAWN: JLL
CHKD: RGT

SCG PROJECT 22G184-2

PLATE 2

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL

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	GRAVEL AND GRAVELLY SOILS	CLEAN GRAVELS		GW	WELL-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES
		(LITTLE OR NO FINES)		GP	POORLY-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES
	MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION RETAINED ON NO. 4 SIEVE	GRAVELS WITH FINES		GM	SILTY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - SILT MIXTURES
		(APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		GC	CLAYEY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - CLAY MIXTURES
MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS LARGER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	SAND AND SANDY SOILS	CLEAN SANDS		SW	WELL-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SANDS, LITTLE OR NO FINES
		(LITTLE OR NO FINES)		SP	POORLY-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SAND, LITTLE OR NO FINES
	MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION PASSING ON NO. 4 SIEVE	SANDS WITH FINES		SM	SILTY SANDS, SAND - SILT MIXTURES
		(APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		SC	CLAYEY SANDS, SAND - CLAY MIXTURES
FINE GRAINED SOILS	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
MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS SMALLER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	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. I-1

JOB NO.: 22G184-2
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot
LOCATION: Perris, California

DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: ---
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
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 (%)	
					OLDER ALLUVIUM: Brown Clayey fine Sand, little Silt, trace medium Sand, cemented, medium dense-moist							
5	X	22					9					
					Gray Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace to little Silt, slightly cemented, dense to hard-damp							
10	X	30	4.5				8			49		
					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 22G184-2.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/8/22

TEST BORING LOG

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. I-2

JOB NO.: 22G184-2
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot
LOCATION: Perris, California
DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas
WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: ---
READING TAKEN: At Completion

FIELD RESULTS					DESCRIPTION	LABORATORY RESULTS						COMMENTS
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 (%)	
					OLDER ALLUVIUM: Brown fine Sandy Clay, trace Silt, trace medium Sand, very stiff-moist							
	X	17	4.5				13					
5												
					Brown Silty fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Silt, little to some Clay, dense-moist							
	X	40					11			57		
10												
					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 22G184-2.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/8/22

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. I-3

JOB NO.: 22G184-2
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot
LOCATION: Perris, California
DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas
WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: ---
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
					<u>YOUNGER ALLUVIUM:</u> Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, trace Clay, trace Calcareous nodules, medium dense-damp to moist							
	X	18					9					
5												
					<u>OLDER ALLUVIUM:</u>Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace Silt, dense to hard-moist							
	X	34	4.0				10			48		
10												
					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 22G184-2.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/8/22

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

BORING NO. I-4

JOB NO.: 22G184-2
PROJECT: Prop. Maintenance Bldg. & Parking Lot
LOCATION: Perris, California

DRILLING DATE: 5/6/22
DRILLING METHOD: Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: Daryl Kas

WATER DEPTH: Dry
CAVE DEPTH: ---
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
					YOUNGER ALLUVIUM: Brown Silty fine Sand to fine Sandy Silt, trace medium Sand, medium dense-damp							
	X	10					8					
5												
					Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace to little Silt, medium dense to very stiff-moist							
	X	20	4.5				11			53		
10					Boring Terminated at 10'							

TBL 22G184-2.GPJ SOCALGEO.GDT 6/8/22

TEST BORING LOG

INFILTRATION CALCULATIONS

Project Name	Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Project Location	Perris, California
Project Number	22G184-2
Engineer	Michelle Esparza

Test Hole Radius	4	(in)
Test Depth	10.00	(ft)

Infiltration Test Hole	I-1

Soil Criteria Test

Interval Number		Time	Time Interval (min)	Water Depth (ft)	Change in Water Level (in)	Did 6 inches of water seep away in less than 25 minutes?	Sandy Soils or Non-Sandy Soils?
1	Initial	7:30 AM	25.00	7.88	0.24	NO	NON-SANDY SOILS
	Final	7:55 AM		7.90			
2	Initial	7:55 AM	25.00	7.88	0.12	NO	NON-SANDY SOILS
	Final	8:20 AM		7.89			

Test Data

Interval Number		Time	Time Interval (min)	Water Depth (ft)	Change in Water Level (ft)	Average Head Height (ft)	Infiltration Rate Q (in/hr)
1	Initial	8:20 AM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	8:50 AM		7.89			
2	Initial	8:50 AM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	9:20 AM		7.89			
3	Initial	9:20 AM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	9:50 AM		7.89			
4	Initial	9:50 AM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	10:20 AM		7.89			
5	Initial	10:20 AM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	10:50 AM		7.89			
6	Initial	10:50 AM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	11:20 AM		7.89			
7	Initial	11:20 AM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	11:50 AM		7.89			
8	Initial	11:50 AM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	12:20 PM		7.89			
9	Initial	12:20 PM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	12:50 PM		7.89			
10	Initial	12:50 PM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	1:20 PM		7.89			
11	Initial	1:20 PM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	1:50 PM		7.89			
12	Initial	1:50 PM	30.00	7.88	0.01	2.12	0.02
	Final	2:20 PM		7.89			

Per County Standards, Infiltration Rate calculated as follows:

$$\boxed{Q = \frac{\Delta H(60r)}{\Delta t(r + 2H_{avg})}}$$

Where:
- Q = Infiltration Rate (in inches per hour)
- ΔH = Change in Height (Water Level) over the time interval
- r = Test Hole (Borehole) Radius
- Δt = Time Interval
- H_{avg} = Average Head Height over the time interval

INFILTRATION CALCULATIONS

Project Name	Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Project Location	Perris, California
Project Number	22G184-2
Engineer	Michelle Esparza

Test Hole Radius	4	(in)
Test Depth	10.00	(ft)

Infiltration Test Hole	I-2

Soil Criteria Test

Interval Number		Time	Time Interval (min)	Water Depth (ft)	Change in Water Level (in)	Did 6 inches of water seep away in less than 25 minutes?	Sandy Soils or Non-Sandy Soils?
1	Initial	7:35 AM	25.00	7.96	0.24	NO	NON-SANDY SOILS
	Final	8:00 AM		7.98			
2	Initial	8:00 AM	25.00	7.96	0.12	NO	NON-SANDY SOILS
	Final	8:25 AM		7.97			

Test Data

Interval Number		Time	Time Interval (min)	Water Depth (ft)	Change in Water Level (ft)	Average Head Height (ft)	Infiltration Rate Q (in/hr)
1	Initial	8:25 AM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	8:55 AM		7.97			
2	Initial	8:55 AM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	9:25 AM		7.97			
3	Initial	9:25 AM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	9:55 AM		7.97			
4	Initial	9:55 AM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	10:25 AM		7.97			
5	Initial	10:25 AM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	10:55 AM		7.97			
6	Initial	10:55 AM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	11:25 AM		7.97			
7	Initial	11:25 AM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	11:55 AM		7.97			
8	Initial	11:55 AM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	12:25 PM		7.97			
9	Initial	12:25 PM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	12:55 PM		7.97			
10	Initial	12:55 PM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	1:25 PM		7.97			
11	Initial	1:25 PM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	1:55 PM		7.97			
12	Initial	1:55 PM	30.00	7.96	0.01	2.04	0.02
	Final	2:25 PM		7.97			

Per County Standards, Infiltration Rate calculated as follows:

$$Q = \frac{\Delta H(60r)}{\Delta t(r + 2H_{avg})}$$

Where:
- Q = Infiltration Rate (in inches per hour)
- ΔH = Change in Height (Water Level) over the time interval
- r = Test Hole (Borehole) Radius
- Δt = Time Interval
- H_{avg} = Average Head Height over the time interval

INFILTRATION CALCULATIONS

Project Name	Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Project Location	Perris, California
Project Number	22G184-2
Engineer	Michelle Esparza

Test Hole Radius	4	(in)
Test Depth	10.00	(ft)

Infiltration Test Hole	I-3

Soil Criteria Test

Interval Number		Time	Time Interval (min)	Water Depth (ft)	Change in Water Level (in)	Did 6 inches of water seep away in less than 25 minutes?	Sandy Soils or Non-Sandy Soils?
1	Initial	7:40 AM	25.00	7.83	0.24	NO	NON-SANDY SOILS
	Final	8:05 AM		7.85			
2	Initial	8:05 AM	25.00	7.83	0.24	NO	NON-SANDY SOILS
	Final	8:30 AM		7.85			

Test Data

Interval Number		Time	Time Interval (min)	Water Depth (ft)	Change in Water Level (ft)	Average Head Height (ft)	Infiltration Rate Q (in/hr)
1	Initial	8:30 AM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	9:00 AM		7.85			
2	Initial	9:00 AM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	9:30 AM		7.85			
3	Initial	9:30 AM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	10:00 AM		7.85			
4	Initial	10:00 AM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	10:30 AM		7.85			
5	Initial	10:30 AM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	11:00 AM		7.85			
6	Initial	11:00 AM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	11:30 AM		7.85			
7	Initial	11:30 AM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	12:00 PM		7.85			
8	Initial	12:00 PM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	12:30 PM		7.85			
9	Initial	12:30 PM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	1:00 PM		7.85			
10	Initial	1:00 PM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	1:30 PM		7.85			
11	Initial	1:30 PM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	2:00 PM		7.85			
12	Initial	2:00 PM	30.00	7.83	0.02	2.16	0.03
	Final	2:30 PM		7.85			

Per County Standards, Infiltration Rate calculated as follows:

$$\boxed{Q = \frac{\Delta H(60r)}{\Delta t(r + 2H_{avg})}}$$

Where: Q = Infiltration Rate (in inches per hour)
ΔH = Change in Height (Water Level) over the time interval
r = Test Hole (Borehole) Radius
Δt = Time Interval
H_{avg} = Average Head Height over the time interval

INFILTRATION CALCULATIONS

Project Name	Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Project Location	Perris, California
Project Number	22G184-2
Engineer	Michelle Esparza

Test Hole Radius	4	(in)
Test Depth	10.00	(ft)

Infiltration Test Hole	I-4

Soil Criteria Test

Interval Number		Time	Time Interval (min)	Water Depth (ft)	Change in Water Level (in)	Did 6 inches of water seep away in less than 25 minutes?	Sandy Soils or Non-Sandy Soils?
1	Initial	7:45 AM	25.00	8.04	0.12	NO	NON-SANDY SOILS
	Final	8:10 AM		8.05			
2	Initial	8:10 AM	25.00	8.04	0.12	NO	NON-SANDY SOILS
	Final	8:35 AM		8.05			

Test Data

Interval Number		Time	Time Interval (min)	Water Depth (ft)	Change in Water Level (ft)	Average Head Height (ft)	Infiltration Rate Q (in/hr)
1	Initial	8:35 AM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	9:05 AM		8.05			
2	Initial	9:05 AM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	9:35 AM		8.05			
3	Initial	9:35 AM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	10:05 AM		8.05			
4	Initial	10:05 AM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	10:35 AM		8.05			
5	Initial	10:35 AM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	11:05 AM		8.05			
6	Initial	11:05 AM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	11:35 AM		8.05			
7	Initial	11:35 AM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	12:05 PM		8.05			
8	Initial	12:05 PM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	12:35 PM		8.05			
9	Initial	12:35 PM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	1:05 PM		8.05			
10	Initial	1:05 PM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	1:35 PM		8.05			
11	Initial	1:35 PM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	2:05 PM		8.05			
12	Initial	2:05 PM	30.00	8.04	0.01	1.96	0.02
	Final	2:35 PM		8.05			

Per County Standards, Infiltration Rate calculated as follows:

$$\boxed{Q = \frac{\Delta H(60r)}{\Delta t(r + 2H_{avg})}}$$

Where:
- Q = Infiltration Rate (in inches per hour)
- ΔH = Change in Height (Water Level) over the time interval
- r = Test Hole (Borehole) Radius
- Δt = Time Interval
- H_{avg} = Average Head Height over the time interval

Grain Size Distribution



Sample Description	I-1 @ 8½'
Soil Classification	Gray Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace coarse Sand, trace to little Silt

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-2
PLATE C- 1

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Grain Size Distribution



Sample Description	I-2 @ 8½'
Soil Classification	Brown Silty fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Silt, little to some Clay

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-2
PLATE C- 2

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Grain Size Distribution



Sample Description	I-3 @ 8½'
Soil Classification	Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace coarse Sand, trace Silt

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-2
PLATE C- 3

SoCalGeo SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation

Grain Size Distribution



Sample Description	I-4 @ 8½'
Soil Classification	Brown Clayey fine to medium Sand to fine to medium Sandy Clay, trace to little Silt

Proposed Maintenance Building and Parking Lot
Perris, California
Project No. 22G184-2
PLATE C- 4

SoCalGeo
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GEOTECHNICAL
A California Corporation