

December 14, 2021

JN 21503

Frank Imani
POB 655
Mercer Island, WA 98040

Subject: **Geotechnical Engineering Study**
Proposed Residence
2405 - 74th Avenue Southeast
Mercer Island, Washington

Dear Mr. Imani:

via email:

This report presents the findings and recommendations of our geotechnical engineering study for the proposed residence to be constructed at 2405 - 74th Avenue Southeast. The undersigned associate visited the subject site on December 1, 2021. The purpose of this visit was to observe the existing site conditions, excavate a series of test holes, and to develop opinions regarding the soil and the new residence that will be constructed on the site. The recommendations and conclusions presented in this report are professional opinions based on the visual observations made during our site visit and on previous experience with similar projects.


We were provided with a preliminary plans for the proposed residence that indicates that the project involves the construction of a new home in the same basic footprint of the existing house. The new house will have a basement that daylight to the east just like the existing house and will have a basement finished floor elevation similar to that of the existing house. We understand that the site is within mapped erosion, seismic, and potential slide critical areas by the City of Mercer Island. No steep slopes are mapped on or adjacent to the site.

If the scope of the project changes from what we have described above, we should be provided with revised plans in order to determine if modifications to the recommendations and conclusions of this report are warranted.

SITE CONDITIONS

The subject site is developed with a centrally located one story house with a full basement that daylight to the east. The property slopes gently to moderately down from west to east. On the western portion of the property, there is a 4-foot cut rockery below a sloped area. This entire slope system is about 5 to 9 feet tall. A flat grass yard is below this slope adjacent to the house, and the yard, in turn, slopes off to a lower yard area to the east of the house. The northeastern portion of the lower yard descends to the adjacent street in a 7 to 9 foot slope that is grass covered. The site is landscaped. Surrounding properties are similar residential properties. No indications of slope instability or erosion were observed during our visit to the site.

Our understanding of the subsurface conditions at the site is based on the observations made during our recent site visit and on experience gained from other projects in the site vicinity. Our exploration program was based on the proposed construction, anticipated subsurface conditions and those encountered during exploration, and the scope of work outlined in our proposal. During our visits, we excavated two test pits with a small excavator at site. (as depicted below):



TP-1 (sod)

- 0.0' - 5.0' Tan silt FILL, low plasticity, very moist, loose (FILL)
- 5.0' - 6.0' Remnant Topsoil
- 6.0' - 8.0' Tan, sandy SILT, low plasticity, moist, loose to medium-dense [ML]
- becomes medium-dense to dense at 7 feet.

Test Pit terminated at 8 feet.
No groundwater seepage encountered.

TP2 (sod)

- 0.0' - 1.0' Topsoil
- 1.0' - 5.0' Tan sandy SILT, low plasticity, moist, loose [ML]
- becomes loose to medium dense at 3 feet
- 5.0' - 7.0' Gray-brown SILT, slightly plastic moist, hard [ML]

Test Pit terminated at 7 feet.
No groundwater seepage encountered.

Our exploration program was based on the proposed construction, anticipated subsurface conditions and those encountered during exploration, and the scope of work outlined in our proposal.

The test holes were excavated on December 1, 2021 with a small trackhoe. A geotechnical engineer from our staff conducted the excavation process, logged the test holes, and obtained representative samples of the soil encountered.

Soil and Groundwater Conditions

The test pits revealed a native soil profile of loose to medium-dense weathered sandy silts that became dense/hard at about 5 to 7 feet below existing grades. The eastern, downslope test pit revealed about 5 feet of loose fill overlying the native soil horizon.

No obstructions were revealed by our explorations; but debris, buried utilities, and old foundation and slab elements are commonly encountered on sites that have had previous development.

No groundwater was observed in our test pits, but groundwater levels vary seasonally with rainfall and other factors. Our test pits were excavated in an extended wet period, but the soils are poorly drained so perched groundwater would be anticipated in the wet season and following wet weather.

The stratification lines on the logs represent the approximate boundaries between soil types at the exploration locations. The actual transition between soil types may be gradual, and subsurface conditions can vary between exploration locations. The logs provide specific subsurface information only at the locations tested. The relative densities and moisture descriptions indicated on the test hole logs are interpretive descriptions based on the conditions observed during excavation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

GENERAL

THIS SECTION CONTAINS A SUMMARY OF OUR STUDY AND FINDINGS FOR THE PURPOSES OF A GENERAL OVERVIEW ONLY. MORE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS ARE CONTAINED IN THE REMAINDER OF THIS REPORT. ANY PARTY RELYING ON THIS REPORT SHOULD READ THE ENTIRE DOCUMENT.

The test pits conducted for this study in the area of the new home encountered native, dense/hard silt beneath a layer of fill and/or loose native soils about 5 to 7 feet below the ground surface. These dense/hard soils will provide bearing for the new house. Some overexcavation will likely be necessary in the west crawlspace and on the eastern, downslope side of the residence to expose the hard soils. These overexcavations can be backfilled to the proposed footing grades with compacted quarry spalls or other properly compacted imported granular fill.

Based on the soils encountered in our explorations, a temporary excavation inclination of no steeper than a 1:1 (Horizontal:Vertical) is appropriate for this project. We do not recommend that vertical excavations be made on, or near the shared property lines, or near the base of the upslope rockery. Based on the 6.5+ foot setback and 4 foot cut for the crawlspace/stairs it appears that the cuts can be kept away from the rockery. If the excavation cannot be maintained within the property boundaries at the previously mentioned inclination, or excavation easements cannot be obtained, then temporary shoring will be needed to facilitate property line excavations. We can provide more precise recommendations once a preliminary design has been completed.

A geotechnical consideration for development of this site is the high silt content of the site soils. These fine-grained, silty soils are sensitive to moisture, which makes them impossible to adequately compact for structural use. The on-site soils are not acceptable for reuse as structural fill beneath foundations and due to their poor drainage, should not be used as basement wall backfill. Imported granular fill will be needed for structural fill and wall backfill.

The soils that underlie the site consist of fine-grained silt, which has essentially no permeability. The high fines content of the silt will stop the downward percolation of stormwater following rain events. Considering this, it is our professional opinion that concentrated infiltration or dispersion systems for managing onsite stormwater should not be used. Any attempt to infiltrate large quantities of collected stormwater would likely result in early failure of the system and would cause surface flooding on the lot and surrounding properties. All stormwater discharge should be tightlined offsite to the appropriate facilities.

The erosion control measures needed during the site development will depend heavily on the weather conditions that are encountered. We anticipate that a silt fence will be needed around the downslope sides of any cleared areas. Existing pavements, ground cover, and landscaping should be left in place wherever possible to minimize the amount of exposed soil. Rocked staging areas and construction access roads should be provided to reduce the amount of soil or mud carried off the property by trucks and equipment. Trucks should not be allowed to drive off of the rock-covered areas. Cut slopes and soil stockpiles should be covered with plastic during wet weather. Following clearing or rough grading, it may be necessary to mulch or hydroseed bare areas that will not be immediately covered with landscaping or an impervious surface. On most construction projects, it is necessary to periodically maintain or modify temporary erosion control measures to address specific site and weather conditions.

In order to satisfy the City of Mercer Island's (*statement of risk*) requirements, we make the following statement:

In our judgment, the development practices that we have recommended in this report with regard to excavation, grading, erosion control, foundation design and construction will render the anticipated new construction as safe with regards to the seismic /potential slide / erosion hazards as if it were not located in a geologic hazard area.

The drainage and/or waterproofing recommendations presented in this report are intended only to prevent active seepage from flowing through concrete walls or slabs. Even in the absence of active seepage into and beneath structures, water vapor can migrate through walls, slabs, and floors from the surrounding soil, and can even be transmitted from slabs and foundation walls due to the concrete curing process. Water vapor also results from occupant uses, such as cooking, cleaning, and bathing. Excessive water vapor trapped within structures can result in a variety of undesirable conditions, including, but not limited to, moisture problems with flooring systems, excessively moist air within occupied areas, and the growth of molds, fungi, and other biological organisms that may be harmful to the health of the occupants. The designer or architect must consider the potential vapor sources and likely occupant uses, and provide sufficient ventilation, either passive or mechanical, to prevent a build up of excessive water vapor within the planned structure.

Geotech Consultants, Inc. should be allowed to review the final development plans to verify that the recommendations presented in this report are adequately addressed in the design. Such a plan review would be additional work beyond the current scope of work for this study, and it may include revisions to our recommendations to accommodate site, development, and geotechnical constraints that become more evident during the review process.

We recommend including this report, in its entirety, in the project contract documents. This report should also be provided to any future property owners so they will be aware of our findings and recommendations.

SEISMIC CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the International Building Code (IBC), the site class within 100 feet of the ground surface is best represented by Site Class Type D (Stiff Soil). The soils beneath the site are not susceptible to seismic liquefaction under the ground motions of the MCE due to the absence of near-surface groundwater and the hard/silty nature of the native soils.


Sections 1803.5 of the IBC and 11.8 of ASCE 7 require that other seismic-related geotechnical design parameters (seismic surcharge for retaining wall design and slope stability) include the potential effects of the Design Earthquake. The peak ground acceleration for the Design Earthquake is defined in Section 11.2 of ASCE 7 as two-thirds (2/3) of the MCE peak ground acceleration.

CONVENTIONAL FOUNDATIONS

In areas where overexcavation is feasible, the proposed structure can be supported on conventional continuous footings bearing on hard native soils; or compacted structural fill placed above undisturbed, stiff, native silts, or on or on lean (1.5 -sack) concrete fill placed above this competent native soil. See the section entitled **General Earthwork and Structural Fill** for recommendations regarding the placement and compaction of structural fill beneath structures. Adequate compaction of structural fill should be verified with frequent density testing during fill placement. Prior to placing structural fill beneath foundations, the excavation should be observed by the geotechnical engineer to document that adequate bearing soils have been exposed. We recommend that continuous and individual spread footings have minimum widths of 16 and 24 inches, respectively. Exterior footings should also be bottomed at least 18 inches below the lowest adjacent finish ground surface for protection against frost and erosion. The local building codes should be reviewed to determine if different footing widths or embedment depths are required. Footing subgrades must be cleaned of loose or disturbed

soil prior to pouring concrete. Depending upon site and equipment constraints, this may require removing the disturbed soil by hand.

Depending on the final site grades, overexcavation may be required below the footings to expose competent native soil. Unless lean concrete is used to fill an overexcavated hole, the overexcavation must be at least as wide at the bottom as the sum of the depth of the overexcavation and the footing width. For example, an overexcavation extending 2 feet below the bottom of a 2-foot-wide footing must be at least 4 feet wide at the base of the excavation. If lean concrete is used, the overexcavation need only extend 6 inches beyond the edges of the footing. See adjacent detail.



An allowable bearing pressure of **2,500 pounds per square foot (psf)** is appropriate for footings supported as described above.

A one-third increase in this design bearing pressure may be used when considering short-term wind or seismic loads. For the above design criteria, it is anticipated that the total post-construction settlement of footings founded on competent native soil, or on structural fill up to 5 feet in thickness, will be less than one inch, with differential settlements on the order of one half inch in a distance of 50 feet along a continuous footing with a uniform load.

Lateral loads due to wind or seismic forces may be resisted by friction between the foundation and the bearing soil, or by passive earth pressure acting on the vertical, embedded portions of the foundation. For the latter condition, the foundation must be either poured directly against relatively level, undisturbed soil or be surrounded by level structural fill. We recommend using the following ultimate values for the foundation's resistance to lateral loading:

PARAMETER	ULTIMATE VALUE
Coefficient of Friction	0.40
Passive Earth Pressure	250 pcf

Where: (i) pcf is pounds per cubic foot, and (ii) passive earth pressure is computed using the equivalent fluid density.

If the ground in front of a foundation is loose or sloping, the passive earth pressure given above will not be appropriate. We recommend maintaining a safety factor of at least 1.5 for the foundation's resistance to lateral loading, when using the above ultimate values.

FOUNDATION AND RETAINING WALLS

Retaining walls backfilled on only one side should be designed to resist the lateral earth pressures imposed by the soil they retain. The following recommended parameters are for walls that restrain level backfill:

PARAMETER	Value
Active Earth Pressure *	35 pcf
Passive Earth Pressure	250 pcf
Soil Unit Weight	130 pcf

Where: pcf is Pounds per Cubic Foot, and Active and Passive Earth Pressures are computed using the Equivalent Fluid Pressures.

*** For a restrained wall that cannot deflect at least 0.002 times its height, a uniform lateral pressure equal to 10 psf times the height of the wall should be added to the above active equivalent fluid pressure. This applies only to walls with level backfill.**

The design values given above do not include the effects of any hydrostatic pressures behind the walls and assume that no surcharges, such as those caused by slopes, vehicles, or adjacent foundations will be exerted on the walls. If these conditions exist, those pressures should be added to the above lateral soil pressures. Where sloping backfill is desired behind the walls, we will need to be given the wall dimensions and the slope of the backfill in order to provide the appropriate design earth pressures. The surcharge due to traffic loads behind a wall can typically be accounted for by adding a uniform pressure equal to 2 feet multiplied by the above active fluid density. Heavy construction equipment should not be operated behind retaining and foundation walls within a distance equal to the height of a wall, unless the walls are designed for the additional lateral pressures resulting from the equipment.

The values given above are to be used to design only permanent foundation and retaining walls that are to be backfilled, such as conventional walls constructed of reinforced concrete or masonry. It is not appropriate to use the above earth pressures and soil unit weight to back-calculate soil strength parameters for design of other types of retaining walls, such as soldier pile, reinforced earth, modular or soil nail walls. We can assist with design of these types of walls, if desired.

The passive pressure given is appropriate only for a shear key poured directly against undisturbed native soil, or for the depth of level, well-compacted fill placed in front of a retaining or foundation wall. The values for friction and passive resistance are ultimate values and do not include a safety factor. Restrained wall soil parameters should be utilized the wall and reinforcing design for a distance of 1.5 times the wall height from corners or bends in the walls, or from other points of restraint. This is intended to reduce the amount of cracking that can occur where a wall is restrained by a corner.

Wall Pressures Due to Seismic Forces

Per IBC Section 1803.5.12, a seismic surcharge load need only be considered in the design of walls over 6 feet in height. A seismic surcharge load would be imposed by adding a uniform lateral pressure to the above-recommended active pressure. The recommended seismic surcharge pressure for this project is **8H** pounds per square foot (psf), where **H** is the design retention height of the wall. Using this increased pressure, the safety factor against sliding and overturning can be reduced to 1.2 for the seismic analysis.

Retaining Wall Backfill and Waterproofing

Backfill placed behind retaining or foundation walls should be coarse, free-draining structural fill containing no organics. This backfill should contain no more than 5 percent silt or clay particles and have no gravel greater than 4 inches in diameter. The percentage of particles passing the No. 4 sieve should be between 25 and 70 percent. A minimum 12-inch width of free-draining gravel or drainage composite similar to Miradrain 6000 should be placed against the backfilled retaining walls. The gravel or drainage composites should be hydraulically connected to the foundation drain system. Free draining backfill or gravel should be used for the entire width of the backfill where seepage is encountered. The later section entitled ***Drainage Considerations*** should also be reviewed for recommendations related to subsurface drainage behind foundation and retaining walls.

The purpose of these backfill requirements is to ensure that the design criteria for a retaining wall are not exceeded because of a build-up of hydrostatic pressure behind the wall. Also, subsurface drainage systems are not intended to handle large volumes of water from surface runoff. The top 12 to 18 inches of the backfill should consist of a compacted, relatively impermeable soil or topsoil, or the surface should be paved. The ground surface must also slope away from backfilled walls at one to 2 percent to reduce the potential for surface water to percolate into the backfill.

Water percolating through pervious surfaces (pavers, gravel, permeable pavement, etc.) must also be prevented from flowing toward walls or into the backfill zone. Foundation drainage and waterproofing systems are not intended to handle large volumes of infiltrated water. The compacted subgrade below pervious surfaces and any associated drainage layer should therefore be sloped away. Alternatively, a membrane and subsurface collection system could be provided below a pervious surface.

It is critical that the wall backfill be placed in lifts and be properly compacted, in order for the above-recommended design earth pressures to be appropriate. The recommended wall design criteria assume that the backfill will be well-compacted in lifts no thicker than 12 inches. The compaction of backfill near the walls should be accomplished with hand-operated equipment to prevent the walls from being overloaded by the higher soil forces that occur during compaction. The section entitled ***General Earthwork and Structural Fill*** contains additional recommendations regarding the placement and compaction of structural fill behind retaining and foundation walls.

The above recommendations are not intended to waterproof below-grade walls, or to prevent the formation of mold, mildew, or fungi in interior spaces. Over time, the performance of subsurface drainage systems can degrade, subsurface groundwater flow patterns can change, and utilities can break or develop leaks. Therefore, waterproofing should be provided where future seepage through the walls is not acceptable. This typically includes limiting cold-joints and wall penetrations and using bentonite panels or membranes on the outside of the walls. There are a variety of different waterproofing materials and systems, which should be installed by an experienced contractor familiar with the anticipated construction and subsurface conditions. Applying a thin coat of asphalt emulsion to the outside face of a wall is not considered waterproofing and will only help to reduce moisture generated from water vapor or capillary action from seeping through the concrete. As with any project, adequate ventilation of basement and crawl space areas is important to prevent a buildup of water vapor that is commonly transmitted through concrete walls from the surrounding soil, even when seepage is not present. This is appropriate even when waterproofing is applied to the outside of foundation and retaining walls. We recommend that you contact an experienced envelope consultant if detailed recommendations or specifications related to waterproofing design or minimizing the potential for infestations of mold and mildew are desired.

SLABS-ON-GRADE

The building floors can be constructed as slabs-on-grade atop competent native soil, or on structural fill. The subgrade soil must be in a firm, non-yielding condition at the time of slab construction or underslab fill placement. Any soft areas encountered should be excavated and replaced with select, imported structural fill.

Even where the exposed soils appear dry, water vapor will tend to naturally migrate upward through the soil to the new constructed space above it. This can affect moisture-sensitive flooring, cause imperfections or damage to the slab, or simply allow excessive water vapor into the space above the slab. All interior slabs-on-grade should be underlain by a capillary break drainage layer consisting of a minimum 4-inch thickness of clean gravel or crushed rock that has a fines content (percent passing the No. 200 sieve) of less than 3 percent and a sand content (percent passing the No. 4 sieve) of no more than 10 percent. Pea gravel or crushed rock are typically used for this layer.

As noted by the American Concrete Institute (ACI) in the *Guides for Concrete Floor and Slab Structures*, proper moisture protection is desirable immediately below any on-grade slab that will be covered by tile, wood, carpet, impermeable floor coverings, or any moisture-sensitive equipment or products. ACI recommends a minimum 10-mil thickness vapor retarder for better durability and long-term performance than is provided by 6-mil plastic sheeting that has historically been used. A vapor retarder is defined as a material with a permeance of less than 0.3 perms, as determined by ASTM E 96. It is possible that concrete admixtures may meet this specification, although the manufacturers of the admixtures should be consulted. Where vapor retarders are used under slabs, their edges should overlap by at least 6 inches and be sealed with adhesive tape. The sheeting should extend to the foundation walls for maximum vapor protection.

If no potential for vapor passage through the slab is desired, a vapor *barrier* should be used. A vapor barrier, as defined by ACI, is a product with a water transmission rate of 0.01 perms when tested in accordance with ASTM E 96. Reinforced membranes having sealed overlaps can meet this requirement.

We recommend that the contractor, the project materials engineer, and the owner discuss these issues and review recent ACI literature and ASTM E-1643 for installation guidelines and guidance on the use of the protection/blotter material.

EXCAVATIONS AND SLOPES

Temporary excavation slopes should not exceed the limits specified in local, state, and national government safety regulations. Also, temporary cuts should be planned to provide a minimum 1 to 2 feet of space for construction of foundations, walls, and drainage. Temporary cuts to a maximum overall depth of about 4 feet may be attempted vertically in unsaturated soil if there are no indications of slope instability. However, vertical cuts should not be made near property boundaries, or existing utilities and structures. We do not recommend that vertical cuts not be made at the base of sloped cuts. Based upon Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 296, Part N, the soil at the subject site would generally be classified as Type B. Therefore, temporary cut slopes greater than 4 feet in height should not be excavated at an inclination steeper than 1:1 (Horizontal:Vertical), extending continuously between the top and the bottom of a cut.

The above-recommended temporary slope inclination is based on the conditions exposed in our explorations, and on what has been successful at other sites with similar soil conditions. It is possible that variations in soil and groundwater conditions will require modifications to the inclination at which temporary slopes can stand. Temporary cuts are those that will remain unsupported for a relatively short duration to allow for the construction of foundations, retaining walls, or utilities. Temporary cut slopes should be protected with plastic sheeting during wet weather. It is also important that surface runoff be directed away from the top of temporary slope cuts. Cut slopes should also be backfilled or retained as soon as possible to reduce the potential for instability. Please note that loose soil can cave suddenly and without warning. Excavation, foundation, and utility contractors should be made especially aware of this potential danger. These recommendations may need to be modified if

the area near the potential cuts has been disturbed in the past by utility installation, or if settlement-sensitive utilities are located nearby.


All permanent cuts into native soil should be inclined no steeper than 2.5:1 (H:V). To reduce the potential for shallow sloughing, fill must be compacted to the face of these slopes. This can be accomplished by overbuilding the compacted fill and then trimming it back to its final inclination. Adequate compaction of the slope face is important for long-term stability and is necessary to prevent excessive settlement of patios, slabs, foundations, or other improvements that may be placed near the edge of the slope.

Water should not be allowed to flow uncontrolled over the top of any temporary or permanent slope. All permanently exposed slopes should be seeded with an appropriate species of vegetation to reduce erosion and improve the stability of the surficial layer of soil.

DRAINAGE CONSIDERATIONS

Footing drains should be used where: (1) crawl spaces or basements will be below a structure; (2) a slab is below the outside grade; or (3) the outside grade does not slope downward from a building. Drains should also be placed at the base of all earth-retaining walls. These drains should be surrounded by at least 6 inches of 1-inch-minus, washed rock that is encircled with non-woven, geotextile filter fabric (Mirafi 140N, Supac 4NP, or similar material). At its highest point, a perforated pipe invert should be at least 6 inches below the bottom of a slab floor or the level of a crawl space. The discharge pipe for subsurface drains should be sloped for flow to the outlet point. Roof and surface water drains must not discharge into the foundation drain system. A typical footing drain detail is embedded on this page. For the best long-term performance, perforated PVC pipe is recommended for all subsurface drains. Clean-outs should be provided for potential future flushing or cleaning of footing drains.

Drainage inside the building's footprint should also be provided where (1) a crawl space or slab will slope or be lower than the surrounding ground surface, (2) an excavation encounters significant seepage, or (3) an excavation for a building will be close to the expected high groundwater elevations. We can provide recommendations for interior drains, should they become necessary, during excavation and foundation construction.



As a minimum, a vapor retarder, as defined in the **Slabs-On-Grade** section, should be provided in any crawl space area to limit the transmission of water vapor from the underlying soils. Crawl space grades are sometimes

left near the elevation of the bottom of the footings. As a result, an outlet drain is recommended for all crawl spaces to prevent an accumulation of any water that may bypass the footing drains. Providing a few inches of free draining gravel underneath the vapor retarder is also prudent to limit the potential for seepage to build up on top of the vapor retarder.

No groundwater was observed during our field work. If seepage is encountered in an excavation, it should be drained from the site by directing it through drainage ditches, perforated pipe, or French drains, or by pumping it from sumps interconnected by shallow connector trenches at the bottom of the excavation.

The excavation and site should be graded so that surface water is directed off the site and away from the tops of slopes. Water should not be allowed to stand in any area where foundations, slabs, or pavements are to be constructed. Final site grading in areas adjacent to the townhomes should slope away at least one to 2 percent, except where the area is paved. Surface drains should be provided where necessary to prevent ponding of water behind foundation or retaining walls. A discussion of grading and drainage related to pervious surfaces near walls and structures is contained in the **Foundation and Retaining Walls** section.

GENERAL EARTHWORK AND STRUCTURAL FILL

All building and pavement areas should be stripped of surface vegetation, topsoil, organic soil, and other deleterious material. The stripped or removed materials should not be mixed with any materials to be used as structural fill, but they could be used in non-structural areas, such as landscape beds.

Structural fill is defined as any fill, including utility backfill, placed under, or close to, a building, or in other areas where the underlying soil needs to support loads. All structural fill should be placed in horizontal lifts with a moisture content at, or near, the optimum moisture content. The optimum moisture content is that moisture content that results in the greatest compacted dry density. The moisture content of fill is very important and must be closely controlled during the filling and compaction process. As discussed in the **General** section, the on-site soils are not suitable for reuse as structural fill, due to its high fines content, moisture sensitivity, and difficulty achieving adequate compaction even under ideal site conditions. Imported, clean, angular crushed rock such as ballast rock or quarry spalls should be used if structural fill is needed beneath the foundations.

The allowable thickness of the fill lift will depend on the material type selected, the compaction equipment used, and the number of passes made to compact the lift. The loose lift thickness should not exceed 12 inches, but should be thinner if small, hand-operated compactors are used. We recommend testing structural fill as it is placed. If the fill is not sufficiently compacted, it should be recompacted before another lift is placed. This eliminates the need to remove the fill to achieve the required compaction. The following table presents recommended levels of relative compaction for compacted fill:

LOCATION OF FILL PLACEMENT	Minimum Relative Compaction
Beneath slabs or walkways	95%
Filled slopes and behind retaining walls	90%
Beneath pavements	95% for upper 12 inches of subgrade; 90% below that level

Where: Minimum Relative Compaction is the ratio, expressed in percentages, of the compacted dry density to the maximum dry density, as determined in accordance with ASTM Test Designation D 1557-91 (Modified Proctor).

LIMITATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based on site conditions as they existed at the time of our exploration and assume that the soil and groundwater conditions encountered in the test borings are representative of subsurface conditions on the site. If the subsurface conditions encountered during construction are significantly different from those observed in our explorations, we should be advised at once so that we can review these conditions and reconsider our recommendations where necessary. Unanticipated conditions are commonly encountered on construction sites and cannot be fully anticipated by merely taking samples in test borings. Subsurface conditions can also vary between exploration locations. Such unexpected conditions frequently require making additional expenditures to attain a properly constructed project. It is recommended that the owner consider providing a contingency fund to accommodate such potential extra costs and risks. This is a standard recommendation for all projects.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of Frank Imani and his representatives, for specific application to this project and site. Our conclusions and recommendations are professional opinions derived in accordance with our understanding of current local standards of practice, and within the scope of our services. No warranty is expressed or implied. The scope of our services does not include services related to construction safety precautions, and our recommendations are not intended to direct the contractor's methods, techniques, sequences, or procedures, except as specifically described in our report for consideration in design. Our services also do not include assessing or minimizing the potential for biological hazards, such as mold, bacteria, mildew, and fungi in either the existing or proposed site development.

ADDITIONAL SERVICES

In addition to reviewing the final plans, Geotech Consultants, Inc. should be retained to provide geotechnical consultation, testing, and observation services during construction. This is to confirm that subsurface conditions are consistent with those indicated by our exploration, to evaluate whether earthwork and foundation construction activities comply with the general intent of the recommendations presented in this report, and to provide suggestions for design changes in the event subsurface conditions differ from those anticipated prior to the start of construction. However, our work would not include the supervision or direction of the actual work of the contractor and its employees or agents. Also, job and site safety, and dimensional measurements, will be the responsibility of the contractor.

During the construction phase, we will provide geotechnical observation and testing services when requested by you or your representatives. Please be aware that we can only document site work we actually observe. It is still the responsibility of your contractor or on-site construction team to verify that our recommendations are being followed, whether we are present at the site or not.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service on this project. Please contact us if you have any questions, or if we can be of further assistance.

Respectfully submitted,

GEOTECH CONSULTANTS, INC.



12/14/21

James H. Strange, Jr., P.E.
Associate

JHS:kg