

GEOTECHNICAL EVALUATION HILLCREST RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA

March 4, 2021 Revised: June 28, 2021

Project No. 1680.021

Prepared For: California Sunshine Development, LLC 444 Airport Blvd., Suite 203 Watsonville, California 95076

Attn: Mr. John Fry

CERTIFICATION

This document is an instrument of service, prepared by or under the direction of the undersigned professionals, in accordance with the current ordinary standard of care. The service specifically excludes the investigation of radon, asbestos, toxic mold and other biological pollutants, and other hazardous materials. The document is for the sole use of the client and consultants on this project. Use by third parties or others is expressly prohibited without written permission. If the project changes, or more than two years have passed since issuance of this report, the findings and recommendations must be reviewed by the undersigned.

MILLER PACIFIC ENGINEERING GROUP (a California corporation)

REVIEWED BY

Benjamin S. Pappas Geotechnical Engineer No. 2786 (Expires 9/30/22) Scott Stephens Geotechnical Engineer No. 2398 (Expires 6/30/21)

GEOTECHNICAL EVALUATION HILLCREST RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 IN	TRODUCTION	1
2.0 PR	ROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
3.0 DC	DCUMENT REVIEW	1
3.1 (Geotechnical Report Review	2
3.2	Civil Plan Review	4
4.0 SI	TE CONDITIONS	4
4.1 I	Regional Geology	4
4.2	Seismicity	5
4.2.1	Active Faults in the Region	5
4.2.2	P Historic Fault Activity	5
4.2.3	Probability of Future Earthquakes	5
4.3	Site History	5
4.4	Subsurface Conditions and Groundwater	6
5.0 GE	EOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION	6
5.1 l	Fault Surface Rupture	6
5.2	Seismic Shaking	6
5.2.1	Deterministic Seismic Hazard Analysis	6
5.2.2	Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis	7
5.3 I	Liquefaction Potential and Related Impacts	8
5.4	Seismically-Induced Ground Settlement	8
5.5 l	Lurching and Ground Cracking	9
5.6	Erosion	9
5.7	Seiche and Tsunami	9
5.8	Flooding1	0
5.9	Expansive Soil1	0
5.10	Settlement/Subsidence1	10
5.11	Slope Instability/Landsliding1	11
6.0 CC	DNCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS1	2
6.1	Site Preparation and Grading	12
6.1.1	Surface Preparation	13
6.1.2	2 Materials1	13
6.1.3	3 Lime Treatment1	13
6.1.4	Compacted Fill1	14
6.1.5	Slopes1	14
6.1.6	Excavations	14
6.2	Seismic Design1	14
6.3	Shallow Foundation Design1	15
6.4 I	Deep Foundation Design1	6
6.5 I	Retaining Wall Design1	17
6.6	Site Drainage Considerations	9
6.7	Underground Utilities1	9
6.8	Asphalt Concrete Pavements1	19

SUPPLEMENTAL GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES	
LIMITATIONS	
LIST OF REFERENCES	22
RES	
Location Map	Figure 1
Plan	2
ional Geologic Map	3
ve Fault Map	4
oric Earthquake Map	5
Height vs. Settlement	6
aining Wall Backdrain	7
	SUPPLEMENTAL GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES LIMITATIONS LIST OF REFERENCES Location Map Plan pional Geologic Map ve Fault Map oric Earthquake Map Height vs. Settlement aining Wall Backdrain

APPENDIX A – PREVIOUS SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

APPENDIX B – SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES

APPENIDX C - EARTHQUAKE (MCE_R) GROUND MOTION HAZARD ANALYSIS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes our Geotechnical Evaluation for the planned Hillcrest Residential Subdivision located on an approximate 12-acre undeveloped lot located on Errington Road in southern Watsonville, California. A Site Location Map is shown on Figure 1. Our services have been provided in accordance with our Agreement dated November 5, 2020. The purpose of our services is to evaluate the site geologic conditions, significant geologic hazards which may affect the project, and provide geotechnical recommendations and design criteria for use in project planning, design and construction. The scope of our services is described in our proposal letter dated October September 28, 2020, and includes the following:

- A brief summary of the geologic setting and seismicity,
- A geologic hazards evaluation and recommended mitigation measures,
- Recommendations for grading (considering value engineering options), including cut slope inclinations, compaction criteria and soil engineering drainage,
- Recommended foundation system, including geotechnical design criteria for shallow and deep foundations,
- Recommendations for retaining walls, including mechanically stabilized earth walls,
- CBC/ASCE seismic design criteria,
- Trench backfill criteria, and
- Access road pavement section.

Phase 1 of our services included a geotechnical peer review of the original subdivision plans, produced by the previous owners, and geotechnical report for the project produced by Cornerstone Earth Group. The results of our review were summarized in a letter dated June 10, 2020, and our opinions / conclusions are summarized in Section 3.0 (below). This report concludes Phase 2 – Geotechnical Evaluation of our services. Future phases of work are anticipated to include a Geotechnical Consultation/Plan Review and Construction Observation and Testing.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Based on our review the preliminary project plans and discussions with you, we understand the existing plan is to construct 144-single-family residences, duplex and townhomes that will be constructed in 5 phases. Significant site grading will be required to develop building pads and allow access to the subdivision. Retaining walls up to 16-feet in height will be constructed along the north and eastern ends of the property to create level areas for a pedestrian trail and "rain-garden". New asphalt paved streets will be constructed to allow access to the residences. New site utilities will also be constructed to provide the subdivision with services. A site plan indicating the approximate extents of the planned improvements is shown on Figure 2.

3.0 DOCUMENT REVIEW

As part our peer review services, we reviewed the project documents that were developed for the previous property owners. This first phase of our work, repeated in the following sections of this report, included reviewing the following documents provided by you:

- Cornerstone Earth Group "Geotechnical Investigation Sunshine Vista Residential Development," February 10, 2017.
- Ifland Engineers, "Sunshine Vista," October 27, 2017, Sheets C2.0, C3.6, C5.0, C5.2, and C9.0.

3.1 <u>Geotechnical Report Review</u>

Previous subsurface exploration by Cornerstone Earth Group and Butano include a total of 22 borings, 11 Cone Penetration Tests (CPTs) and 11 exploratory trenches. Additionally, Cornerstone observed 58-test pits performed by the environmental engineering firm Trinity Source Group. Laboratory testing included moisture content, dry density, percent material passing the #200 sieve, plasticity index and triaxial compression. The boring, CPT and trench logs were provided; however, the logs from the 58-test pits performed by Trinity Source Group were not provided. The results of the previous subsurface explorations are presented in Appendix A.

The Cornerstone report indicates the project site is underlain by 0 to 10-feet of highly expansive fill intermixed with minor to significant amounts of debris consisting of tires, automobile parts, trash, concrete, wood, etc. Very stiff, highly expansive clay underly the fill followed by intermixed layers of very stiff to hard silts with variable amounts of sand, and medium dense to dense silty sands and poorly graded sands.

Cornerstone Earth Group provided various recommendations to develop the project site and construct the proposed improvements. Based on the review of the report, we made the following comments and recommendations:

Slope Stability Analysis – The geotechnical investigation report provides a preliminary slope stability analyses of three cross sections along the northwestern, northeastern, and southeastern corners of the property. The slope stability analyses were performed utilizing the program GSTABL7 and the "Bishop Method" of analysis under both static and pseudo-static conditions. The following recommendations that should be incorporated into the final slope stability analyses.

- 1. An additional section should be analyzed based on the updated grading plans specifically, where significant fills are proposed. The cross section should extend down to the Watsonville Slough to verify adequate slope stability with the planned fill over native soils.
- 2. It appears the soil strength data of the native soils is based on two triaxial compression tests located at Boring 4, approximately 200-feet south and west of the Watsonville Slough. Additional strength data appears to be generated from Pocket Penetrometer tests performed during the exploration. We recommend performing additional subsurface exploration and laboratory strength testing in the lower portions of the property along the Watsonville Slough to identify the soil conditions and determine engineering properties for analyses. Shear strength based on the CPT data should be utilized to evaluate the shear strength of the underlying soils.
- 3. The "Bishop Method" only analyzes circular failures by moment equilibrium when determining the slope stability factor of safety, ignoring the horizontal force equilibrium. We utilized a method that analyzes both the moment and horizontal force equilibrium (i.e., Spencer and Morgenstern & Price methods) and checked for non-circular failure surfaces.

Removal of Existing Fills – The previous report recommends that all the existing fill, 0 to 10-feet thick, should be removed and replaced with compacted fill prior to placing new fill. Although we agree that the existing fill should be removed prior to placing fill if the proposed structures are highly sensitive to settlements, it is our opinion this conclusion is reasonable from a geotechnical standpoint if shallow foundations are utilized to support the structures. Removal

and replacement of the existing fills may not be required if structures are supported on a drilled pier foundation system that extends through the fill, provided there is not an environmental health reason to remove the existing fills and fill is capped with at least three feet of clean soil.

Seismic Design Criteria – The report includes 2016 California Building Code (CBC) seismic design criteria. The 2016 CBC was the governing code at the time the report was published; however, the 2019 CBC was officially adopted in January 2020. 2019 CBC seismic design criteria are presented in Section 6.2.

Foundation Recommendations – The previous geotechnical investigation report recommends the proposed structures to be supported on deepened shallow foundations or post tensioned concrete mat slabs-on-grade. We agree that these two options are feasible. However, if at least the upper three feet of expansive soil is replaced, lime treated, or replaced with compacted nonexpansive imported fill, the shallow foundations would not require deepening.

Deep foundations may be utilized to support the structures; however, deep foundations (i.e., drilled piers, auger-cast piles, helical anchors, torque down piles, etc.) may be difficult to construct if debris is encountered during construction. A site plan could be prepared based on historic stereo paired aerial photos and compared to current topographic maps to aid in determining the location of potential fill and debris.

If used, deep foundations should be interconnected with grade-beams formed on top of void boxes to prevent uplift pressures from expansive soils impacting the structure. If the existing fill and debris has been removed, the deep foundation system may consist of a helical anchor and grade-beam system.

Retaining Walls – The older plans indicate tiered retaining walls up to 13-feet in height will be constructed and backfilled on the north and eastern sides of the property to create level building pads. It is our opinion a mechanically stabilized earth retaining wall system (i.e., Versa-Lok, Keystone, etc.) would be the most cost-effective retaining wall type to support fills. Additionally, wall heights may be reduced by sloping the fills between the tiered walls to 2:1 (horizontal:vertical). Alternatively, retaining walls may be further reduced or eliminated if the residences are constructed partially on sloping ground or bi-level lots, provided they are supported on a deep foundation system.

Pavement Design – The report provides multiple pavement sections for Traffic Indices (T.I.) and assuming an R-Value of 5 for existing subgrade soils. We agree an R-Value of 5 for the existing highly expansive clayey soil condition is appropriate. However, it is our opinion the subgrade R-Value may be increased by either lime treating or removing the existing soils and replacing with imported non-expansive soils. Both options were recommended in the geotechnical investigation report. Additionally, the R-Value may be increased by installing a geotextile on the subgrade level prior to placing baserock. Pavement recommendations are presented in Section 6.8.

3.2 Civil Plan Review

Based on our review of the preliminary site and grading plans, significant site grading would be necessary to develop the site with anticipated cuts up to 10-feet and fills up to 25-feet. Retaining walls up to 13-feet were proposed to support fills along the northern and eastern sides of the property. The previously planned finished grades of the subdivision are fairly level with elevations between 65- and 52-feet above sea-level. A small extension of Loma Vista Drive is planned for access to the future subdivision at the western end of the property.

It is our opinion there could be significant cost savings if the grading plan is modified to allow the site to retain its overall general slope inclination downward from the southwest to the northeast. Moderate site grading would still be required to remove existing fill, if necessary, create roads, and prepare building pads. If this option is pursued the lots would "step-down" with the overall grade. The thick fills and tall retaining walls would not be necessary along the northern and eastern property lines. The residences located on the northern and eastern property lines may consist of split-level homes constructed on grade with some minor site grading required and possibly shorter retaining walls to create level backyard space. These residences may need to be supported on a drilled pier foundation system. Additionally, a sanitary sewer pump may be required to due to grade differences.

4.0 SITE CONDITIONS

We performed a site reconnaissance on December 18, 2020 to observe existing conditions at the site. The project site is located on a relatively level knoll. The area has recently been cleared with a majority of the surface now covered in exposed soil, low grasses, and large shrubs. Mature trees line the northern and eastern perimeter of property lining the bank of the Watsonville Slough that bounds the property along the northern and eastern sides of the site. Existing residential subdivisions are located along the western and southern property lines.

In the proposed building area surface elevations range between 50 to 70-feet above sea-level. The northern and eastern ends of the development area are set atop, up to an existing approximate 10- to 15-feet tall 2:1 (horizontal:vertical). A relatively level "bench", approximately 20 to 50-feet wide, is located below this slope. An additional 10- to 20-foot tall 5:1 to 2:1 slope is located below this intermediate slope and terminates at the Watsonville Slough.

4.1 <u>Regional Geology</u>

The project site lies within the Coast Ranges geomorphic province of California. Regional topography within the Coast Ranges province is characterized by northwest-southeast trending mountain ridges and intervening valleys that parallel the major geologic structures, including the San Andreas Fault System. The province is also generally characterized by abundant landsliding and erosion, owing in part to its typically high levels of precipitation and seismic activity.

As shown on Figure 3, geologic mapping (USGS, 1997), indicates the site is underlain by Quaternary Watsonville Fluvial (map symbol Q_{wf}) and Basin (map symbol Q_b) deposits. Typically, fluvial deposits consist of poorly sorted, semi-consolidated, sand, silt, and gravels deposited by river or stream action. Basin deposits typically consist of highly plastic silty clay with interbedded layers of sands and gravels deposited at base of estuaries, lagoons, lakes, etc.

4.2 <u>Seismicity</u>

The project site is located within a seismically active region that includes the Central and Northern Coast Mountain Ranges. An "active" fault is defined as one that shows displacement within the last 11,000 years and, therefore, is considered more likely to generate a future earthquake than a fault that shows no evidence of recent rupture.

4.2.1 Active Faults in the Region

The California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology has mapped various active and inactive faults in the region (CDMG, 1972 and 2000). These faults are shown in relation to the project site on the Active Fault Map, Figure 4. The Zayante Vergeles Fault is the nearest known active fault and is located approximately 4.3-kilometers (2.7-miles) northeast of the site (Google Earth, 2020).

4.2.2 Historic Fault Activity

Numerous earthquakes have occurred in the region within historic times. A map showing the epicentral locations of significant earthquakes in the Bay Area between 1985 and 2016 is shown on Figure 5.

4.2.3 Probability of Future Earthquakes

The site will likely experience moderate to strong ground shaking from future earthquakes originating on any of several active faults in the San Francisco Bay region. The historical records do not directly indicate either the maximum credible earthquake or the probability of such a future event. To evaluate earthquake probabilities in California, the USGS has assembled a group of researchers into the "Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities" (USGS 2003, 2008; Field et al 2015) to estimate the probabilities of earthquakes on active faults. These studies have been published cooperatively by the USGS, CGS, and Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC) as the Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Versions 1, 2, and 3 (aka UCERF, UCERF2, and UCERF3, respectively). In these studies, potential seismic sources were analyzed considering fault geometry, geologic slip rates, geodetic strain rates, historic activity, micro-seismicity, and other factors to arrive at estimates of earthquakes on a variety of faults in California.

Conclusions from the most recent UCERF3 and USGS (Aagaard, et. al., 2016) indicate the highest probability of a M>6.7 earthquake on any of the active faults in the San Francisco Bay region by 2043 is assigned to the Hayward/Rodgers Creek Fault system, located approximately 67.0-kilometers (41.5-miles) northeast of the site, at 33%. The San Andreas Fault located approximately 8.1-km (5.0-miles) northeast of the site is assigned a 22% probability of rupture resulting in a M>6.7 or greater earthquake. Additional studies by the USGS regarding the probability of large earthquakes in the Bay Area are ongoing. These current evaluations include data from additional active faults and updated geological data.

4.3 <u>Site History</u>

Based on our review of readily available historic aerial photographs (Google Earth, 2021) the site was vacant in 1952. The next available aerial photo taken in 1968 indicates the site had been developed as an automobile salvage yard. The automobile salvage yard remained until 2017 when the automobiles and associated structures were removed from the site, leaving the area denuded of vegetation. Currently vegetation has begun to establish on the project site.

4.4 <u>Subsurface Conditions and Groundwater</u>

Based on our review of the geotechnical investigation, presented in Appendix A, the site is underlain by 0 to 10-feet of highly expansive fill intermixed with minor to significant amounts of debris consisting of tires, automobile parts, trash, concrete, wood, etc. Very stiff, highly expansive clay underly the fill, with intermixed layers of very stiff to hard silts with variable amounts of sand, and medium dense to dense silty sands and poorly graded sands to the maximum depth explored. Laboratory testing to determine soil permeability is beyond our current scope of work; however, the surficial soils consist of highly plastic clays. Typically, highly plastic clay soils exhibit very low infiltration rates and tend to hold and pond surface and subsurface water.

Groundwater was observed during the previous subsurface exploration at a depth of about 30 feet, which corresponds to an elevation of about +0 feet. Groundwater levels typically fluctuate with the seasons with higher levels anticipated during the winter months. Cornerstone Earth Group anticipates the groundwater levels will be dependent on the water level of the adjacent Watsonville Slough with a historic high groundwater level at an elevation of +11 feet.

5.0 <u>GEOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION</u>

The principal geologic hazards which could potentially affect the project site include strong seismic shaking, lurching, slope instability and erosion. Other hazards, such as fault surface rupture, and liquefaction are not considered highly significant at the site. More detailed discussion of each geologic hazard considered, their anticipated impacts, and recommended mitigation measures are discussed below.

5.1 Fault Surface Rupture

Under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the California Geological Survey (CDMG)/California Geologic Survey (CGS) (1972, 2000) produced 1:24,000 scale maps showing all known active faults and defining zones within which special fault studies are required. The project site is not located with an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the nearest known active fault to the site, the Zayante-Vergales, lies approximately 3.8-kilometers (2.4-miles) to the northeast. Therefore, we judge the risk of fault surface rupture at the site is low.

Evaluation:No significant impact.Recommendations:No mitigation measures are anticipated.

5.2 Seismic Shaking

The site will likely experience seismic ground shaking from future earthquakes in the San Francisco Bay Area. Earthquakes along several active faults in the region, as shown on Figure 4, could cause moderate to strong ground shaking at the site.

5.2.1 Deterministic Seismic Hazard Analysis

Deterministic Seismic Hazard Analysis (DSHA) predicts the intensity of earthquake ground motions by analyzing the characteristics of nearby faults, distance to the faults and rupture zones, earthquake magnitudes, earthquake durations, and site-specific geologic conditions. Empirical relations (Abrahamson, Silva & Kamai, Boore, Stewart, Seyhan & Atkinson, Campbell & Borzognia, and Chiou & Youngs, (2014)), for a weathered rock subsurface condition, were utilized to provide approximate estimates of median peak site

accelerations. A summary of the principal active faults affecting the site, their closest distance, moment magnitude of characteristic earthquake, probable median accelerations and plus one standard deviation $(+1\sigma)$, peak ground accelerations (PGA) for earthquakes on faults near the site are shown in Table A.

TABLE A DETERMINISTIC PEAK GROUND ACCELERATION Hillcrest Residential Subdivision <u>Watsonville, California</u>

Fault	Fault <u>Distance¹</u>	Moment <u>Magnitude</u> 1	Median PGA ^{1,2,3,4}	<u>+1σ PGA⁴</u>
Zayante-Vergales	3.8 km	6.9	0.44 g	0.74 g
San Andreas	8.1 km	8.0	0.40 g	0.68 g
Calaveras	8.5 km	6.9	0.33 g	0.56 g
Sargent	14.2 km	6.7	0.23 g	0.40 g
San Gregorio	22.7 km	7.4	0.22 g	0.37 g
Monterey Bay	23.7 km	7.2	0.20 g	0.34 g

Reference:

- 1. Google Earth (2020)
- 2. Abrahamson, Silva and Kamai (2014)
- 3. Boore, Stewart, Seyhan and Atkinson (2014)
- 4. Campbell and Borzognia (2014)
- 5. Chiou and Youngs (2014)
- 6. Values determined using $Vs_{30} = 760$ m/s for Site Class "B"

5.2.2 Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis

Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis (PSHA) analyzes all possible earthquake scenarios while incorporating the probability of each individual event to occur. The probability is determined in the form of the recurrence interval, which is the average time for a specific earthquake acceleration to be exceeded. The design earthquake is not solely dependent on the fault with the closest distance to the site and/or the largest magnitude, but rather the probability of given seismic events occurring on both known and unknown faults.

We calculated the PGA for two separate probabilistic conditions, the 2% chance of exceedance in 50 years (2,475-year statistical return period) and the 10% chance of exceedance in 50 years (475-year statistical return period), utilizing the online USGS Unified Hazard Tool (USGS, 2019). The results of the probabilistic analyses are presented below in Table B.

TABLE B PROBABILISTIC SEISMIC HAZARD ANALYSES Hillcrest Residential Subdivision <u>Watsonville, California</u>

	Statistical <u>Return Period</u>	<u>Magnitude</u>	<u>PGA</u>
2% in 50 years	2,475 years	6.9	0.36 g
10% in 50 years	475 years	7.0	0.21 g

Reference: USGS Unified Hazard Tool, accessed 2020

The potential for strong seismic shaking at the project site is high. Due to its close proximity, the San Andreas Fault (approximately 8.1-kilometers northeast) presents the highest potential for strong ground shaking. The most significant adverse impact associated with strong seismic shaking is potential damage to structures and improvements.

Evaluation:Less than significant with mitigation.Recommendations:Minimum mitigation measures should include designing the structures
and foundations in accordance with the most recent version of the
California Building Code. Recommended seismic coefficients are
provided in Section 6.2 of this report.

5.3 Liquefaction Potential and Related Impacts

Liquefaction refers to the sudden, temporary loss of soil shear strength during strong ground shaking. Liquefaction-related phenomena include liquefaction-induced settlement, flow failure, and lateral spreading. These phenomena can occur where there are saturated, loose, granular deposits. Recent advances in liquefaction studies indicate that liquefaction can occur in granular materials with a high, 35 to 50%, fines content (soil particles that pass the #200 sieve), provided the fines exhibit a plasticity less than 7. The previous subsurface explorations did not encounter loose, granular soils below the groundwater level that would be prone to liquefaction or other liquefaction related phenomena. Additionally, the assumed historic high groundwater level is approximately 50- to 40-feet below the ground surface (elev. +11) in the project development area. Cornerstone Earth Group performed a liquefaction analysis utilizing the CPT data with the results indicating liquefiable soils do not underlie the project site.

Evaluation:No significant impact.Recommendations:No mitigation measures are anticipated.

5.4 Seismically-Induced Ground Settlement

Seismic ground shaking can induce settlement of unsaturated, loose, granular soils. Settlement occurs as the loose soil particles rearrange into a denser configuration when subjected to seismic ground shaking. Varying degrees of settlement can occur throughout a deposit, resulting in differential settlement of structures founded on such deposits. Loose granular soils were not observed in the near-surface soils; therefore, we judge the risk of seismically-induced settlement at the site is low.

Evaluation:Less than significant.Recommendations:No mitigation measures are anticipated.

5.5 Lurching and Ground Cracking

Lurching and associated ground cracking can occur during strong ground shaking generally along the tops of slopes where stiff soils are underlain by soft deposits or along steep slopes or channel banks. As previously discussed, an approximate 5-foot tall 2:1 slopes are proposed as part of the grading plan. As with all slopes located in seismically active areas, there is some risk of ground cracks forming along the crest of these slopes during a strong seismic event. Therefore, we judge lurching and ground cracking is a low moderate geologic hazard at the project site.

Evaluation: Less than significant with mitigation. Recommendations: Mitigation measures include following the setback guidelines outlined in the California Building Code. Per the CBC the bottom elevation of the proposed structural foundations structures should be setback at least 7-feet from any slope face.

5.6 <u>Erosion</u>

Sandy soils on moderate slopes or clayey soils on steep slopes are susceptible to erosion when exposed to concentrated water runoff. While the building sites are located on relatively level ground, the northern and eastern slopes are prone to erosion due to excess surface runoff and concentrated flow. Therefore, the risk of damage due to erosion is generally moderate to high.

Evaluation: Recommendations: Less than significant with mitigation. Special engineering measures include designing a site drainage system to collect surface water and discharging it into an established storm drainage system. The project Civil Engineer is responsible for designing the site drainage system and, an erosion control plan could be developed prior to construction per the current guidelines of the California Stormwater Quality Association's Best Management Practice Handbook.

5.7 Seiche and Tsunami

Seiche and tsunami are short duration earthquake-generated water waves in large, enclosed bodies of water and the open ocean, respectively. The extent and severity of a seiche or tsunami would be dependent upon ground motions and fault offset from nearby active faults. The project site is located within 250-feet of the Watsonville Slough; however, the proposed residential subdivision will be constructed on top of a knoll at elevations between 50- to 70-feet above sea level, well above tsunami and seiche inundation elevations. Therefore, the risk of inundation by seiche or tsunami is low.

Evaluation:Less than significant.Recommendations:No mitigation measures are anticipated.

5.8 <u>Flooding</u>

The residential subdivision is positioned at a relatively high elevation, approximately 50 to 70feet above sea level. FEMA Flood Maps indicate the lower elevations of the property, immediately adjacent to the Watsonville Slough, are prone to flooding. However, these flood areas are more than 100-feet away from proposed improvements. Therefore, we judge widespread flooding is not a significant hazard at the project site. However, whenever new development is performed, localized changes to the existing grades may result in localized flooding.

Evaluation: Recommendations: Less than significant with mitigation. Careful attention should be paid to site grading and drainage design to minimize the effects of potential flooding. The Project Civil Engineer should consider the potential for localized ponding of water and smallscale flooding during the maximum credible rainfall event to design site grades and drainage systems.

5.9 <u>Expansive Soil</u>

Expansive soils will shrink and swell with fluctuations in moisture content and are capable of exerting significant expansion pressures on building foundations, interior floor slabs and exterior flatwork. Distress from expansive soil movement can include cracking of brittle wall coverings (stucco, plaster, drywall, etc.), racked door and/or window frames, and uneven floors and cracked slabs. Flatwork, pavements, and concrete slabs-on-grade are particularly vulnerable to distress due to their low bearing pressures.

Based on the subsurface exploration performed by Cornerstone Earth Group, highly plastic and expansive soils were observed on the property near the ground surface. Additionally, swell pressure tests were performed during the previous geotechnical investigation. The results of the swell testing indicate the expansive soils may exert 1,200 to 3,500 psf on the proposed improvements. Therefore, the risk of expansive soils impacting the project site is high.

Evaluation: Less than significant with mitigation. Recommendations: Foundations should be designed to withstand uplift pressure and seasonal movement from soil swelling and shrinkage. Foundations may consist of shallow foundations, rigid mat slabs, or deeper drilled pier foundations. If drilled piers are used, include void boxes to prevent uplift pressures on grade beams, and extend piers well below the zone of significant moisture fluctuation.

> Alternatively, at least 3-feet of expansive soils should be removed from the structural areas and replaced with select fill (sandy, low plasticity or lime treated clayey on-site soils) and traditional shallow foundations used. The site grading and foundation design recommendations are outlined in Sections 6.1 and 6.3, respectively.

5.10 <u>Settlement/Subsidence</u>

Significant settlement can occur when new loads are placed at sites due to consolidation of soft compressible clays (i.e., Bay Mud) or compression of loose granular soils. Differential settlement may occur where structures span cut/fill transitions or other variable support

conditions. Soft clayey soils were not observed during the previous subsurface exploration performed by Cornerstone Group. However, significant fills, up to 16-feet are planned as part of the residential subdivision which will exert significant stress on the underlying stiff clayey soils. These loads can cause the underlying clay layers to consolidate resulting in settlements at the ground surface. We utilized the available laboratory consolidation data performed by Cornerstone and the computer software Settle3D produced by Rocscience to predict the amount of settlement that may occur over time. A graph indicating the predicted settlement based on fill height is presented on Figure 6.

The predicted settlements indicated on Figure 6 be considered approximate to a degree of accuracy of 25%. The laboratory testing performed by Cornerstone did not include a coefficient of consolidation to determine the time rate of settlement and therefore we cannot provide a time rate estimate; however, we anticipate the predicted settlements will take some time to occur.

In addition to the fill placement causing the underlying soils to consolidate under the large fill loads, the fills over 5-feet in height will consolidate, resulting in surface settlements. A general range of fill settlement is approximately 0.5% to 1% of the fill height. As an example, a 15-foot-tall fill should settle 0.08- to 0.15-feet or 1.0- to 1.8-inches. This settlement typically occurs within 5- to 10-years after the fill has been placed.

Based on our settlement analysis and the anticipated fill heights we judge the risk of site settlement to the residential structures to be low. Hardscaped site improvements overlying the deeper fills, i.e. asphalt streets and parking areas, will experience some additional cracking and additional maintenance should be anticipated.

Evaluation: Less than significant with mitigation. Recommendations: Fills should be prepared and compacted as outlined in the Site Grading section of this report. Additional maintenance may also be required to repair cracks that may appear in the proposed overlying hardscape.

5.11 Slope Instability/Landsliding

Slope instability generally occurs on relatively steep slopes and/or on slopes underlain by weak materials. The project site has experienced previous landslides. As previously discussed, an approximate 10- to 15-foot tall 2:1 slope is located along the northern and eastern ends of the proposed subdivision. We understand this slope will be reduced in height to no greater than 5-feet in height with the addition of level pedestrian areas, rain gardens and tiered site retaining walls. Additionally, a new retaining wall up to 16-feet in height is proposed to bury on-site contaminated soils and create additional level space for recreational and parking space. The weight of this new fill may reduce the stability of the lower areas. Slope stability analysis was performed by Cornerstone Earth Group identified placing additional fill would reduce the overall slope stability.

We performed an updated slope stability analysis on various cross sections generated from the current grading plan and utilizing the stability software SLIDE developed by Rocscience. The "Spencer" slope stability analysis method was utilized to analyze the cross sections. Two of the five sections analyzed, the MSE Wall Section and Section B, indicate placing significant fill on the existing grades. The remaining sections either involved cutting soil away from the slopes or adding minor amounts of fill. Therefore, we performed slope stability analyses on the MSE Sections and Section B. Section B also includes a 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) above the five foot

terraced retaining walls. Therefore, 2 stability analyses were performed on this section, a global analysis and an analysis focused on the 2:1 slope.

For static slope stability analyses, a factor of safety against soil movement above 1.5 is considered appropriate. Under seismic conditions, a factor of safety less than 1.0 indicates some movement may be observed during a strong seismic event. We utilized the procedures outlined by Bray and Travasarou, 2007 to determine the amount of deformation during a strong seismic event. Two deformation result values are determined in the analysis. The smaller value refers to a higher probability of occurrence during a strong seismic event while the larger of the numbers has a lower probability of occurrence. Additionally, the predicted deformations are more likely to occur in smaller amounts throughout the mass that add up to the predicted values rather than the predicted deformation occurring in one location within the mass. The results of our slope stability and slope deformation analyses are presented in Appendix B and summarized below on Table C.

	TA Slope Sta Hillcrest Resid <u>Watsonvi</u>	BLE C Ibility Results Iential Subdivision Ile, California	
Section B (Global) Section B (2:1) Section MSE Wall	<u>Static F.S.</u> 2.00 3.37 1.75	<u>Seismic F.S.</u> 0.75 1.30 0.66	<u>Seismic Deformation¹</u> ~4 – 8-in 0.0-in (F.S. > 1.0) ~6 – 12-in

Notes:

1. Predicted deformations are distributed throughout the landslide mass.

Evaluation: Less than significant with mitigation. Recommendations: Structures should be setback from the slope crests as outlined in the California Building Code. Structures may be constructed within the setback zone provided they are supported on a deep foundation system as described in the Foundation section of this report.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our review of reference material and the previous subsurface exploration and laboratory testing, we conclude that the proposed subdivision is feasible from a geotechnical perspective. The primary geotechnical issues to address in design of the project are providing adequate seismic design, expansive soils, protecting the residential subdivision from potential slope instability and providing uniform foundation support. Specific recommendations and criteria to address these and other geotechnical project facets are presented in the following sections.

6.1 <u>Site Preparation and Grading</u>

Preliminary plans indicate moderate to significant site grading will be performed to develop the project site. Site grading is expected to include creating building pads, creating new streets to allow site access, and constructing new pedestrian paths. The grading recommendations

presented below are appropriate for construction in the late spring through fall months. From winter through the early spring months, on-site soils may be saturated due to rainfall and may be difficult to compact without drying by aeration or the addition of lime and/or cement (or a similar product) to dry the soils. Site preparation and grading should conform to the recommendations and criteria outlined below. General recommendations for wintertime construction are provided later in this report.

6.1.1 <u>Surface Preparation</u>

Clear all trees, brush, roots, over-sized debris, and organic material from areas to be graded. Trees and large shrubs that will be removed (in structural areas) must also include removal of stumps, root balls and roots larger than two inches in diameter. Excavated areas (i.e., old fills and stump removal) should be restored with properly moisture conditioned and compacted fill as described in the following sections. Any loose soil or rock at subgrade will need to be excavated to expose firm natural soils or bedrock. Debris, rocks larger than six inches and vegetation are not suitable for structural fill and should be removed from the site. Alternatively, vegetation strippings may be used in landscape areas. Surface preparation should extend at least 5-feet beyond proposed structures and 3-feet beyond pavement areas.

6.1.2 Materials

Based on previous subsurface explorations, onsite granular soils that exhibit low to medium plasticity and may be suitable for use as fill, provided they meet the criteria for onsite and imported fill material. As previously discussed, highly plastic and expansive soils were also observed on the project site. These plastic and expansive soils are not suitable for fill in structural areas, unless they have been lime/cement treated.

Onsite and import soils shall consist of soil and rock mixtures that: (1) are free of organic material, (2) have a Liquid Limit less than 40 and a Plasticity Index of less than 20, (3) have a maximum particle size of 6 inches, and (4) have more than 50% retained on the No. 200 sieve. Any imported fill material shall be tested and inspected by the project geotechnical engineer to determine its suitability for use as fill material.

6.1.3 Lime Treatment

As previously discussed, expansive soils were encountered on the project site. Lime treatment chemically alters the clay soils resulting in a reduction in their inherent plasticity, a significant reduction in their shrink/swell potential, an improvement to its workability (i.e., compaction), and an increase of its shear strength. If soil treatment is utilized during site grading, in structural areas we recommend at least 5% high calcium lime should be thoroughly mixed to the surficial soils (utilizing a 115 pcf soil density) resulting in a soil pH of at least 12.4 to promote the chemical reaction, to be confirmed with laboratory testing. The depth of treatment in building areas should extend at least 36-inches below the ground surface. The depth of treatment may be reduced to 18-inches in areas where flatwork is proposed. Soil treatment should extend at least 5-feet beyond the area of work where possible. Treated soils should then be compacted to at least 90% relative compaction in structural areas and 95% relative compaction in areas subject to vehicular loads.

6.1.4 Compacted Fill

On-site fill, backfill, and scarified subgrades (8-inches deep) should be conditioned to within 3% of the optimum moisture content. Properly moisture conditioned and cured on-site materials should subsequently be placed in loose horizontal lifts of 8 inches thick or less, and uniformly compacted to a minimum of 90% R.C. Expansive soils should be further moisture conditioned to at least 3% over the optimum moisture content and compacted to between 88 and 92% R.C. To reduce the settlement potential, the compaction of fills taller than 5-feet should be increased to 95% R.C.

Relative compaction, maximum dry density, and optimum moisture content of fill materials should be determined in accordance with ASTM Test Method D 1557, "Moisture-Density Relations of Soils and Soil-Aggregate Mixtures Using a 10-lb. Rammer and 18-in. Drop". Relative compaction should increase to 95% in the upper foot where asphalt pavement is planned.

6.1.5 <u>Slopes</u>

Based on our slope stability analyses and the relatively short fill slopes proposed, roughly 5-feet, we judge a maximum cut and fill slope inclination of 2:1 is appropriate. Although not currently planned, intermediate terraces and surface drainage should be constructed on fill slopes greater than 20-feet in height.

6.1.6 Excavations

The subsurface conditions generally consist of medium stiff to stiff, highly plastic clay. As previously discussed, the site was previously used as an auto salvage yard for over 50-years. Test pits performed by others encountered significant automobile parts including tires, sheet metal and other debris. Although we anticipate the soil will be easily excavated with standard equipment (i.e., excavators, dozers, scrapers, etc.), the contractor should anticipate encountering some large debris that may impact the excavation conditions.

Soils in excavations appear to be Cal-OSHA "Type C" and excavations having a depth of five feet or more, and will be entered by workers must be sloped, braced, or shored in accordance with current Cal-OSHA regulations. All excavations can result in collapse of sidewalls, slopes and/or bottom that could result in injury or death of workers. Therefore, excavations should be evaluated by the Contractor's safety officer and designated competent person prior to workers entering in accordance with current Cal-OSHA regulations.

6.2 <u>Seismic Design</u>

The project site is located in a seismically active area. Therefore, structures should be designed in conformance to the seismic provisions of the most recent (2019) California Building Code (CBC). However, since the goal of the building code is protection of life safety, some structural damage may still occur during strong ground shaking. Based on our review of the subsurface exploration performed by others it is our opinion the site may be classified as a "Stiff Soil Site Class D" site.

Per ASCE 7-16 Section. 11.4.8, a Site-Specific Ground Motion Hazard Analysis shall be performed in accordance with ASCE 7-16 Section 21.2 on sites classified as a "Site Class D" if the S_1 value is greater than or equal to 0.2 g. The S_1 value for the site conditions and location is 0.94 g; therefore, we performed a Site-Specific Ground Motion Hazard Analysis as presented in Appendix C and the results are presented below on Table D.

TABLE D ASCE 7-16 SEISMIC PARAMETERS Hillcrest Residential Subdivision <u>Watsonville, California</u>

Factor Name	Coefficient	ASCE 7-16 <u>Site Specific Value</u>
Site Class ¹	S _{A,B,C,D,E, or F}	S⊳
Spectral Response (short)	SM _S	1.98 g
Spectral Response (1-sec)	SM ₁	1.89 g
Design Spectral Response (short)	SD _S	1.32 g
Design Spectral Response (1-sec)	SD ₁	1.26 g
MCE _G ² PGA adjusted for Site Class	PGA _M	1.24 g

Notes:

- 1. Site Class D Description: Stiff soil profile with shear wave velocities between 600 and 1,200 ft/sec, standard blow counts between 15 and 50 blows per foot, and undrained shear strength between 1,000 and 2,000 psf.
- 2. Maximum Considered Earthquake Geometric Mean.

6.3 Shallow Foundation Design

Based on the subsurface soil conditions, it is our opinion the planned residences may be supported on a shallow foundation system. However, due to the presence of surficial expansive soils, shallow foundations should be designed to withstand seasonal movement. For structures with raised floors, shallow foundation excavations should be designed to be at least 36-inches deep to extend at least 3-feet below the ground surface. The foundation system should be designed as a rigid system to span over 10 feet of non-uniform support within the structure and to cantilever 5 feet at the edges. The over-excavation may then be backfilled with non-expansive soil, as described above, or with cement slurry/control density fill (CDF).

Alternatively, shallow foundations may be constructed on at least 36 inches of select fill or lime treated soils as described above without the need for over-excavated or deepened foundations. Shallow foundations located adjacent to slopes should be deepened as necessary to allow at least 7-feet of horizontal confinement between the bottom of the footing and slope face.

Structures may also be supported on a rigid concrete slab-on-grade. The concrete slabs-ongrade should be designed to withstand seasonal movement due to expansive soils. Post tensioned slabs may be required to provide adequate strength. Shallow foundation and mat slabon-grade design criteria are presented below on Table E.

TABLE E FOUNDATION DESIGN CRITERIA Hillcrest Residential Subdivision <u>Watsonville, California</u>

Shallow Spread Footings

Minimum footing width ¹ :		
One-story structure		12 inches
Two-story structure:		15 inches
Minimum footing depth:	<u>Untreated</u>	Select Fill
•	36 inched	16 inches
Allowable weathered bedrock bearing pressure (dead p	olus live loads) ² :	
Native soils:		1,500 psf
Lime treated soils:		3,500 psf
Base friction coefficient:		0.30
Lateral passive resistance ^{2, 3, 4} :		300 pcf
Mat Slab-on-Grade Criteria		
Minimum thickness:		6-inches
Modulus of subgrade reaction:		100 pci
Edge moisture variation of a		5 0 foot

Edge moisture variation em, Edge	5.0 feet
Edge moisture variation em, Center	10.0 feet
Differential soil movement ym, Edge	0.5 inches
Differential soil movement ym, Center	1.0 inches

Notes:

- 1. Size footing widths to avoid significantly different foundation pressures.
- 2. May increase design values by 1/3 for total design loads including seismic.
- 3. Equivalent Fluid Pressure, not to exceed 3,000 psf.
- 4. Ignore uppermost 6-inches unless concrete or asphalt surfacing exists adjacent to foundation.

6.4 Deep Foundation Design

A drilled pier foundation system extending through the surficial expansive soils and embeds into the underlying stiff soils may also be utilized to support the proposed residential structures. Deep foundations should be spaced more than three pier/pile diameters apart from each other and interconnected with gradebeams. Gradebeams should be constructed on 4-inch-thick cardboard void boxes to prevent uplift pressure underlying expansive soils. Alternatively, gradebeams and drilled piers may be designed to withstand at least 3,500 psf of uplift pressure. Additionally, "mushrooming" of the top of the drilled piers should be prevented to reduce additional uplift pressure. Sonotubes should be utilized in the upper 3-feet if "mushrooming" of the pier tops occurs. Drilled piers may be designed utilizing the parameters outlined on Table F below.

TABLE F DRILLED PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN CRITERIA Hillcrest Residential Subdivision <u>Watsonville, California</u>

Minimum diameter:	16-inches
Skin friction ¹ :	
0 to 3-feet	Neglect
3 to 10-feet	300 psf
10 to 20-feet	750 psf
20 to 30-feet	1,000 psf
Lateral passive resistance ^{2,3,4} :	
0 to 3-feet	Neglect
3 to 10-feet	300 pcf
10 to 20-feet	400 psf
20 to 30-feet	500 psf

Notes:

- 1.) Uplift capacity is equal to 80% of the downward skin resistance.
- 2.) Ignore upper 6-inches unless concrete or asphalt surfacing exists adjacent to foundation.
- 3.) Apply passive resistance over two pier diameters.
- 4.) Lateral pile reduction factors, "P-multipliers" should be included in design when foundations are within groups. P-multipliers are dependent on pier/pile spacing (s) and diameter (d). The following equations should be utilized to calculate the p-multiplier:
 - a. First (Lead) Row Piles: $P_m = 0.26^{1} \ln(s/d) + 0.50 \le 1.0$
 - b. Second Row Piles: $P_m = 0.52*ln(s/d) \le 1.0$
 - c. Third Row or Higher Piles: $P_m = 0.60*ln(s/d) 0.25 \le 1.0$

Alternate deep foundation options are available including helical piles. Helical piles are slender (4inches or less in diameter) steel pipes or shafts that have two or more steel circular plates welded near the tip. The piles are screwed into the ground and extend to a design depth and capacity that is determined in the field during installation. Based on the subsurface conditions we anticipate helical piles should be able to obtain 15 to 20-kips at depths around of 15-feet below the ground surface. Helical piles are typically interconnected with gradebeams and spaced 5 to 10-feet on center. Helical piles provide negligible lateral passive resistance due to the slender nature of the steel rods. Therefore, lateral passive resistance may be obtained from the grade beams. If helical piles are determined to be an economic option, we should be contacted to assist with the design of the foundation system.

6.5 Retaining Wall Design

We anticipate retaining walls up to 16-feet in height will be required to retain the cuts and fills needed to create level pedestrian paths, soil remediation areas, and rain gardens to the north and east of the proposed residences. The 16-foot-tall retaining wall will be located on the northern end of the property and will support the soil remediation soil, while 5-foot tall, tiered retaining walls will be constructed on the northern and eastern ends of the property. The tiered walls will be separated by a level pedestrian path with the upper wall supporting a roughly 5-foot



tall 2:1 slope. We anticipate these walls will be free to rotate at the top, therefore may be designed with "unrestrained" soil lateral earth pressures.

The current plan is to construct the level pedestrian pathway by filling to raise grades. While typical reinforced concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) retaining walls may be utilized to retain the fill, it is our opinion mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) retaining walls with a stacked block face will be more cost effective. MSE walls are constructed by placing layers of compacted fill with interbedded geogrids every 18- to 24-inches. The geogrids are connected to concrete blocks located at the wall face. These walls do not require concrete or steel reinforcement and are built in conjunction with fill placement. Retaining wall design criteria is shown on Table G below.

۔ RETAINING W/ Hillcrest Re <u>Watsor</u>	TABLE G ALL DESIGN CR sidential Subdivis nville, California	ITERIA sion	
Foundations			
See Table D or E			
Unrestrained Earth Pressure ^{1,2} Level Ground: 2:1 Slope:			40 pcf 60 pcf
MSE Wall Design	Unit Weight, γ	Cohesion, c	Friction, ϕ
Reinforced Soil: Retained Soil: Foundation Soil:	120 pcf 110 pcf 110 pcf	N/A N/A 500 psf	30° 30° 30°
Seismic Surcharge ³			10 x H psf

Notes:

- 1. Interpolate earth pressures for intermediate slopes.
- 2. Equivalent fluid pressure.
- 3. Rectangular distribution. The factor of safety for short-term seismic conditions can be reduced to 1.1 or greater. "H" = wall height.

Drainage shall be provided for all retaining walls taller than 3-feet consisting of either ³/₄-inch crushed rock, wrapped within filter fabric, or Caltrans Class 2 permeable material. The seepage should be collected in a 4-inch perforated PVC drain line at the base of the wall. The permeable material shall extend at least 12 inches from the back of the wall and be continuous from the bottom of the wall to within 12 inches of the ground surface. Drainage panels, such as Mirifi 100N, may be utilized. If drainage panels are utilized, the perforated pipe locate at the base of the retaining wall should be surrounded in ³/₄-inch drain rock and wrapped in filter fabric. A schematic retaining wall drainage detail is presented on Figure 7.

Seepage collected in the drain line should be conveyed off-site by gravity in closed pipe to the storm drainage system. The pipe shall have a minimum slope of 1 percent to drain. To maintain the wall drainage system, clean outs shall be installed at the upstream end and at all major changes in direction. Water proofing of any below grade residential walls should be designed by the Architect to prevent moisture infiltration through the wall into living spaces.

6.6 <u>Site Drainage Considerations</u>

Careful consideration should be given to design of new finished grades at the site to ensure positive drainage. We recommend that the building areas be raised slightly and that the adjoining landscaped areas be sloped downward at 5 percent for a distance of at least 5-feet from the perimeter of building foundations. Where hard surfaces, such as concrete or asphalt adjoin foundations, slope these surfaces at least 0.10-feet in the first 5-feet (2 percent). Roof gutter downspouts may discharge onto the pavements but should not discharge onto any landscaped areas. Provide area drains for landscape planters adjacent to buildings and parking areas and collect downspout discharges into a tight pipe collection system. The tight pipe system should discharge at an appropriate location unlikely to result in adverse erosion, preferably into an established municipal storm drain system. If it is not possible to discharge into the City's storm drain system, collected water should be discharged near the base of the slope and spread laterally via dissipators.

6.7 <u>Underground Utilities</u>

Based on previous subsurface explorations performed by others, onsite soils are "Type C" per Cal-OSHA guidelines and will be prone to caving and raveling in open excavations. The Contractor is responsible for site safety and should provide adequate shoring as needed.

Bedding materials for utility pipes should be non-corrosive sand with 90 to 100 percent of particles passing the No. 4 sieve and no more than 15 percent finer than the No. 200 sieve. Provide the minimum bedding beneath the pipe in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendation, typically 3 to 6-inches. Utility excavations should be backfilled with select fill per criteria discussed previously and compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction. In pavement areas, relative compaction should be increased to a minimum of 95 percent in the upper 12-inches.

6.8 Asphalt Concrete Pavements

We have calculated preliminary pavement sections in accordance with Caltrans procedures for flexible pavement design using an assumed R-value of 5. The R-value of the subgrade soils may be increased to 40 provided they are lime treated. We have provided a range of Traffic Indices (TI) from 4 to 7 depending on the expected traffic loads for a twenty-year design life. In general, areas expected to experience loading from heavy vehicles (such as fire lanes, loading dock access roads, trash enclosures, etc.) should be designed using the higher Traffic Index, while parking areas and other lightly-loaded areas can utilize a thinner pavement section based on the lower Traffic Index. Preliminary recommended pavement sections are shown in Table H; these should be verified on the basis of supplemental laboratory testing.

TABLE H PAVEMENT DESIGN CRITERIA Hillcrest Residential Subdivision <u>Watsonville, California</u>

			Untreated Subgrade	Lime Treated Subgrade
	<u>T.I.</u>	Asphalt <u>Concrete</u>	Aggregate <u>Baserock</u>	Aggregate <u>Baserock</u>
Driveways & parking stalls	4.0	2.5-inches	8.0-inches	6.0-inches
Light truck traffic	5.0	3.0-inches	10.0-inches	6.0-inches
Moderate truck traffic	6.0	3.5-inches	13.0-inches	6.0-inches
Heavy truck traffic	7.0	4.0-inches	16.0-inches	8.0-inches

Subgrade preparation for asphalt-paved areas should be performed in accordance with the grading recommendations of this report. The base rock should consist of compacted Class 2 Aggregate Base (Caltrans, 2018), be conditioned to near optimum moisture content, placed in lifts no more than six inches thick, and compacted to achieve at least 95 percent relative compaction and a non-yielding surface when proof-rolled with heavy construction equipment. The subgrade should also be maintained at near-optimum moisture content prior to placement of aggregate base rock. Areas of soft or saturated soils encountered during construction should be excavated and replaced with properly moisture conditioned fill or aggregate base.

7.0 SUPPLEMENTAL GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES

We must review the plans and specifications for the project when they are nearing completion to confirm that the intent of our geotechnical recommendations has been incorporated and provide supplemental recommendations, if needed. During construction, we must observe and test site grading, foundation excavations for the structures and associated improvements to confirm that the soils encountered during construction are consistent with the design criteria.

8.0 <u>LIMITATIONS</u>

We believe this report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practices in the greater Santa Cruz area at the time the report was prepared. This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of California Sunshine Subdivision, LLC and/or their assignees specifically for this project. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made. Our evaluations and recommendations are based on the data performed by others and reviewed by us and our experience with soils in this geographic area.

Our approved scope of work did not include an environmental assessment of the site. Consequently, this report does not contain information regarding the presence or absence of toxic or hazardous wastes.

The evaluations and recommendations do not reflect variations in subsurface conditions that may exist between boring locations or in unexplored portions of the site. Should such variations become apparent during construction, the general recommendations contained within this report will not be considered valid unless MPEG is given the opportunity to review such variations and revise or modify our recommendations accordingly. No changes may be made to the general recommendations contained herein without the written consent of MPEG.

We recommend that this report, in its entirety, be made available to project team members, contractors, and subcontractors for informational purposes and discussion. We intend that the information presented within this report be interpreted only within the context of the report as a whole. No portion of this report should be separated from the rest of the information presented herein. No single portion of this report shall be considered valid unless it is presented with and as an integral part of the entire report.

9.0 LIST OF REFERENCES

Abrahamson, Silva and Kamai, "Summary of the ASK14 Ground Motions Relation for Active Crustal Regions," Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, Spectra Vol 30 Issue 3, August 2014.

Aagard, B.T. et al (2016), "Earthquake Outlook for the San Francisco Bay Region 2014-2043", United States Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2016-3020, Version 1.1, Revised August 2016.

American Society of Civil Engineers, "Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures," (ASCE 7), 2010.

American Society for Testing and Materials, "2016 Annual book of ASTM Standards, Section 4, Construction, Volume 4.08, Soil and Rock; Dimension Stone; Geosynthetics," ASTM, Philadelphia, 2019.

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Geographic Information System, http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation/, 2017.

Boore, Stewart, Seyhan and Atkinson, "NGA-West2 Equations for Predicting PGA, PGV and 5% Damped PSA for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes," Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, Spectra Vol 30 Issue 3, August 2014.

Bray, J.D. & Travasarou, T., "Simplified Procedures for Estimating Earthquake Induced Deviatoric Slope Displacements," Journal of Geotechnical Engineering and Geoenvironmental Engineering, ASCE, V. 133(4), pp. 381-392, April 2007.

California Building Code, 2019 Edition, California Building Standards Commission, Sacramento, California.

California Geologic Survey, CGS Regulatory Maps Geo Application, "Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation" https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/, 2020.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (2000), "Digital Images of Official Maps of Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones of California, Central Coast Region", DMG CD 2000-004.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), "Acceleration Response Spectra (ARS) Online version 2.3.06" http://dap3.dot.ca.gov/ARS_Online/index.php, accessed August 16, 2017.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), "Standard Specifications," 2015.

Campbell and Borzognia, "NGA-West2 Ground Motion Model for the Average Horizontal Components of PGA, GV and 5% Damped Linea Acceleration Response Spectra," Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, Spectra Vol 30 Issue 3, August 2014.

Chiou and Youngs, "Update of the Chiou and Youngs NGA Model for the Averafe Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra," Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, Spectra Vol 30 Issue 3, August 2014.

County of Los Angeles, "Review of Geotechnical Reports Addressing Liquefaction," February 24, 2009.

Field, E.H., Biasi, G.P., Bird, P., Dawson, T.E., Felzer, K.R., Jackson, D.D., Johnson, K.M., Jordan, T.H., Madden, C., Michael, A.J., Milner, K.R., Page, M.T., Parsons, T., Powers, P.M., Shaw, B.E., Thatcher, W.R., Weldon, R.J., II, and Zeng, Y., 2013, Uniform California earthquake rupture forecast, version 3 (UCERF3) – The time-independent model: U.S. Open-File Report 2013–1165, 97 p., California Geological Survey Special Report 228, and Southern California Earthquake Center Publication 1792, http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2013/1165/.

Herzog Geotechnical (2005), "Geotechnical Investigation, Trader Joe's, 7514-7518 Redwood Boulevard, Novato, California", Project No. 1158-01-04, dated July 19, 2005.

Idriss, I.M. & Boulanger, R.W. "Soil Liquefaction during Earthquakes", Earthquake Engineering Research Institute Monograph 12, 2008

Idriss, I.M. & Boulanger, R.W. "SPT-Based Liquefaction Triggering Procedures" Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, University of California at Davis, UCD/GCM-10/02, December 2010.

Miller Pacific Engineering Group, "Geotechnical Peer Review Sunshine Vista Residential Development Watsonville, California," June 10, 2020.

Ozocak, A & Sert, S., "Evaluation of Liquefaction Risk by a revised LPI approach," 2nd International Symposium on Cone Penetration Testing, Huntington Beach, CA, USA. Volume 2&3: Technical Papers, Session 3: Applications, Paper No. 3-30, 2010.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)(2005), Title 29 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1926, 2005.

Structural Engineers Association of California (SEAOC), "Seismic Design Map Tool," https://seismicmaps.org/, accessed November 2020.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)(2017), EPA Map of Radon Zones in California, http://www.epa.gov/radon/states/california.html, accessed August 15, 2017.

United States Geologic Survey, "Geologic Map of Santa Cruz County," Brabb, E., Graham, S., Wentworth, C., Knifong, D., Graymer, R. & Bussenbach, J., Open File Report 97-489, 1997.

United States Geological Survey (2003), "Summary of Earthquake Probabilities in the San Francisco Bay Region, 2002 to 2032," The 2003 Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities, 2003.

United States Geological Survey (2008), "The Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Version 2," The 2007 Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities, Open File Report 2007-1437, 2008.



<u>SITE:</u> LATITUDE, 36.9105° LONGITUDE, -121.7719° $\frac{\text{SITE LOCATION}}{\text{N.T.S.}}$



REFERENCE: Google Earth, 2020

MILLER PACIFIC	504 Redwood Blvd. Suite 220	SITE LOCATION MAP			
ENGINEERING GROUP	Novato, CA 94947 T 415 / 382-3444	Hillcrest Residential Subo Watsonville, Californ	division nia	Drawn BSP	1
A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, © 2018, ALL RIGHTS RESERVED	F 415/382-3450				
FILENAME: 1680.023 Figures_recover.dwg	www.millerpac.com	Project No. 1680.023 Dat	te: 1/09/2021		FIGURE









DATA SOURCE: 1) U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Department of the Interior, "Earthquake Outlook for the San Francisco Bay Region 2014-2043", Map of Known Active Faults in the San Francisco Bay Region, Fact Sheet 2016-3020, Revised August 2016 (ver. 1.1).

MILLER PACIFIC ENGINEERING GROUP	504 Redwood Blvd. Suite 220	ACTIVE FAULT MAP				
	Novato, CA 94947	Hillcrest Residential Subdivision Watsonville. California		Drawn BSP Checked	Δ	
	F 415/382-3450	, -				
FILENAME: 1680.023 Figures_recover.dwg	www.millerpac.com	Project No. 1680.023	Date: 1/09/2021		FIGURE	



MILLER PACIFIC	Suite 220	HISTORIC EARTHQUAKE ACTIVITY			
	Novato, CA 94947	Hillcrest Residential Subdivision Watsonville, California		Drawn	
	T 415 / 382-3444			BSP Checked	
A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, © 2018, ALL RIGHTS RESERVED	F 415 / 382-3450	, -			
FILENAME: 1680.023 Figures_recover.dwg	www.millerpac.com	Project No. 1680.023	Date: 1/09/2021		

5 FIGURE



NOTES:

- 1. Wall drainage should consist of clean, free draining 3/4 inch crushed rock (Class 1B Permeable Material) wrapped in filter fabric (Mirafi 140N or equivalent) or Class 2 Permeable Material. Alternatively, pre-fabricated drainage panels (Miradrain G100N or equivalent), installed per the manufacturers recommendations, may be used in lieu of drain rock and fabric.
- 2. All retaining walls adjacent to interior living spaces shall be water/vapor proofed as specified by the project architect or structural engineer.
- 3. Perforated pipe shall be SCH 40 or SDR 35 for depths less than 20 feet. Use SCH 80 or SDR 23.5 perforated pipe for depths greater than 20 feet. Place pipe perforations down and slope at 1% to a gravity outlet. Alternatively, drainage can be outlet through 3" diameter weep holes spaced approximately 20' apart.
- 4. Clean outs should be installed at the upslope end and at significant direction changes of the perforated pipe. Additionally, all angled connectors shall be long bend sweep connections.
- 5. During compaction, the contractor should use appropriate methods (such as temporary bracing and/or light compaction equipment) to avoid over-stressing the walls. Walls shall be completely backfilled prior to construction in front of or above the retaining wall.
- 6. Refer to the geotechnical report for lateral soil pressures.
- 7. All work and materials shall conform with Section 68, of the latest edition of the Caltrans Standard Specifications.





APPENDIX A: PREVIOUS SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION



APPENDIX A: FIELD INVESTIGATION

The field investigation consisted of a surface reconnaissance and a subsurface exploration program using truck-mounted, hollow-stem auger drilling equipment and 20-ton truck-mounted Cone Penetration Test equipment. Nine 8-inch-diameter exploratory borings were drilled on November 22, 2016, December 21, 2016, and December 28, 2016, to depths of 20½ to 54½ feet. Eleven CPT soundings were also performed in accordance with ASTM D 5778-95 (revised, 2002) on November 12 and 13, 2016, to depths ranging from approximately 21 to 52 feet. In addition to the borings and CPT explorations, we observed 58 test pit excavations performed by Trinity Source Group, Inc. on October 11 to 13, 2016. The depth of test pits ranged up to about 13 feet deep. The approximate locations of exploratory borings, CPTs, and test pits are shown on the Site Plan, Figure 2. The soils encountered were continuously logged in the field by our representative and described in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System (ASTM D2488). Boring logs, as well as a key to the classification of the soil, are included as part of this appendix.

Boring, CPT, and test pit locations were approximated using existing site boundaries, a hand held GPS unit, and other site features as references. Boring and CPT elevations were based on interpolation of the topographic map provided from Ifland engineers. The locations and elevations of the borings and CPTs should be considered accurate only to the degree implied by the method used.

Representative soil samples were obtained from the borings at selected depths. All samples were returned to our laboratory for evaluation and appropriate testing. The standard penetration resistance blow counts were obtained by dropping a 140-pound hammer through a 30-inch free fall. The 2-inch O.D. split-spoon sampler was driven 18 inches and the number of blows was recorded for each 6 inches of penetration (ASTM D1586). 2.5-inch I.D. samples were obtained using a Modified California Sampler driven into the soil with the 140-pound hammer previously described. Relatively undisturbed samples were also obtained with 2.875-inch I.D. Shelby Tube sampler which were hydraulically pushed. Unless otherwise indicated, the blows per foot recorded on the boring log represent the accumulated number of blows required to drive the last 12 inches. The various samplers are denoted at the appropriate depth on the boring logs.

The CPT involved advancing an instrumented cone-tipped probe into the ground while simultaneously recording the resistance at the cone tip (q_c) and along the friction sleeve (f_s) at approximately 5-centimeter intervals. Based on the tip resistance and tip to sleeve ratio (R_f) , the CPT classified the soil behavior type and estimated engineering properties of the soil, such as equivalent Standard Penetration Test (SPT) blow count, internal friction angle within sand layers, and undrained shear strength in silts and clays. A pressure transducer behind the tip of the CPT cone measured pore water pressure (u_2) . Graphical logs of the CPT data is included as part of this appendix.

Field tests included an evaluation of the unconfined compressive strength of the soil samples using a pocket penetrometer device. The results of these tests are presented on the individual boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.


Attached boring and CPT logs and related information depict subsurface conditions at the locations indicated and on the date designated on the logs. Subsurface conditions at other locations may differ from conditions occurring at these boring and CPT locations. The passage of time may result in altered subsurface conditions due to environmental changes. In addition, any stratification lines on the logs represent the approximate boundary between soil types and the transition may be gradual.





BORING NUMBER EB-1 PAGE 1 OF 2

		E		CORN	IERS	TONE				<u> </u>			\ <i>r</i>				PAGE	1 OF	2
				EART	'H GF	ROUF)	PRO	JE		ME <u>S</u>	unshine	<u>vista Re</u> 2	sidentia	al Deve	lopme	nt		-
								PRU) 12			920-1-2	2 Oblone P	arkway	Wate	onvillo	CA		_
	DATE ST		D 1	2/21/16	DATE COMP	PLETED 12/21	1/16	GR			EVATIO	N 30 F	T +/-	BOI	RING F)EPTH	, <u>07</u> 44 8	3 ft.	-
		G COM		CTOR Explorati	on Geoservices	s lnc	1/10		пті		36 9108	75°	<u> </u>			-12 [,]	1 7734	.61°	_
	DRILLING	G MET		Mobile B-53 8	inch Hollow-St	em Auger		GR				EVELS:		Lone				01	_
	LOGGED	BY	DL			on , ago		V	AT	TIME	OF DRI	LLING	30 ft.						
	NOTES	_						Ţ	АТ	END (OF DRIL	LING 3	30 ft.						
ł				This log is a part of a repo	rt by Cornerstone Earth (Group, and should not be	e used as	÷		~			%	(1)	UND	RAINED	SHEAR	STRENG	TH,
	ELEVATION (ft)	DEPTH (ft)	SYMBOL	a stand-arole occurrent. exploration at the time of c and may change at this lo simplification of actual cor gradual.	This description applies of initialing. Subsurface condi- cation with time. The des ditions encountered. Tra	ing to the rotation of the tions may differ at other cription presented is a insitions between soil typ	locations bes may be	Value (uncorrected blows per foot		SAMPLES PE AND NUMBEF	RY UNIT WEIGHT PCF	NATURAL	ASTICITY INDEX,	ERCENT PASSING No. 200 SIEVE		ND PENI RVANE CONFIN	ksf ETROME ED COM LIDATED	ETER IPRESSIO I-UNDRAIN	N NED
	30.0-	0-			DESCRIP	ΓΙΟΝ		ź		Ę		ΟW	PL/	E	TR 1.	iaxial 0 2.	0 3.0	0 4.0	
	29.0 - - -	-		Clayey Sand medium dens coarse sand, Fat Clay (CH stiff to very s mottles, som	with Gravel (se, moist, gra fine to coarse [Fill] tiff, moist, dar e fine sand, h	SC) [Fill] y brown, fine e gravel k brown with igh plasticity	to /- l brown	14	X	MC-1		25				0			
-	-	-						21		MC-2B	97	21					C		
ESIDENTIAL.GP	25.0-	5-		Fat Clay (CH very stiff, mo high plasticity) ist, dark brow /	n, some fine	 sand,	21	X	MC-3	94	28						0	
SHINE VISTA RI		-						26	X	MC-4	95	21					0		
S\928-1-2 SUNS	20.5 _	- 10		Lean Clay wi very stiff, mo sand, some s	th Sand (CL) ist, gray with silt, low plastic	brown mottles city	s, fine	25		MC-5B	103	23						0	
VG/GINT FILE	17.5 _	-		Silty Sand (S medium dens	M) se, moist, bro	wn, fine to me		27		MC-6B	98	9							
7/17 09:56 - P:\DRAFTI		- 15								ST									
ONE 0812.GDT - 2/	-	- - 20-		Poorly Grade medium dens medium sand	e d Sand with se to dense, r d	Silt (SP-SM) noist, brown,	fine to	28	X	SPT-8		8							
ROUP2 - CORNERS	-	-						33		SPT									
ONE EARTH G		25-						62	X	MC-10B	90	4							
ERST(4.07			с	ontinued Nex	t Page													
ORNE -			1						-						1			I	
ŭ																			



CORNERSTONE EARTH GROUP2 - CORNERSTONE 0812.GDT - 2/7/17 09:56 - P./DRAFTING/GINT FILES/928-1-2 SUNSHINE VISTA RESIDENTIAL

BORING NUMBER EB-2

PAGE 1 OF 2





BORING NUMBER EB-3

PAGE 1 OF 2





BORING NUMBER EB-4 PAGE 1 OF 2

			EARIN GROUP	PR			JMBER	<u>928-1-</u>	2 Oblana [Dorkwow	. Moto	onville			
DATE ST		- 1		PR				N <u>511 (</u>	<u>Jnione F</u> T ±/		, vvats PINC I		e, CA	5 ft	
								09 F	+/-				1 <u>41.</u>	<u>5 IL.</u>	
			CTOR Exploration Geoservices, Inc.	_ LA			30.9102			LONG		<u>-12</u>	1.772	05	
DRILLING			Nobile B-53, 8 Inch Hollow-Stem Auger	_ GR	00			EVELS:							
LOGGED	BA	DL			- AI			LLING	Not Enc	ountere	d				
NOTES _				<u>+</u>	- A1	END	of Dril		Not Enco	ountered	1				
VATION (ft)	EPTH (ft)	SYMBOL	This log is a part of a report by Cornerstone Earth Group, and should not be used a stand-alone document. This description applies only to the location of the exploration at the time of drilling. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locatio and may change at this location with time. The description presented is a simplification of actual conditions encountered. Transitions between soil types ma gradual.	e (uncorrected) each ws per foot		AMPLES AND NUMBER	JNIT WEIGHT PCF	ATURAL JRE CONTENT	CITY INDEX, %	ENT PASSING 200 SIEVE		RAINED) SHEAF ksf NETROM	L STREN	IGTH,
ELE				Valu		YPE,	J Y I	UISTI	ASTI	RC No.		CONSC	DLIDATE	D-UNDR	AINED
69.0-	0.		DESCRIPTION	Ż		-		<u>ĭ</u>		L	1	.0 2	2.0 3	.0 4	1.0
00.0			Clayey Sand with Gravel (SC) [Fill]												
68.0-			Coarse sand, fine to coarse gravel	34		MC-1B	91	30	55						>4.5
-			fine sand, high plasticity Liquid Limit = 80, Plastic Limit = 25	41		мс									>4.5
- 04.5	5-		Silty Sand (SM) medium dense, moist, brown, fine sand	25		MC-3B	87	12							
62.5			Silt with Sand (ML) very stiff, moist, brown, fine sand, low plasticity	22		SPT-4		20		79				0	
60.8	10		Lean Clay with Sand (CL) medium stiff to stiff, moist, brown, fine sand some silt, moderate plasticity	, 8		SPT-5		34			0				
- 57.5				13		SPT						0			
_			very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity	30		MC-7B	83	37						0	
- 54.0-	15 [.]		Silty Sand (SM)	35		MC-8B	85	37							
- 52 3			medium dense, moist, brown, fine sand												
	-		Lean Clay (CL) very stiff, moist, brown, some fine sand, some silt, low plasticity												
- 48 0	20 ·					MC-9B	87	34							
-			Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity												
-	25			32		MC-10B	83	41						0	
43.0-			Continued Next Pass												



BORING NUMBER EB-4A

PAGE 1 OF 1



BORING NUMBER EB-5 PAGE 1 OF 2

DATE S DRILLIN DRILLIN LOGGEI NOTES	TARTE IG COM IG MET D BY _	CORNE EARTH 2/28/16 C CTOR Exploration (Mobile B-53, 8 inc) This log is a part of a report by G a stand-alone document. This d exploration at the time of driling and may change at this location simplification of actual conditions gradual.	ERSTONE GROUPLETED 12/28/10 Geoservices, Inc. In Hollow-Stem Auger	PF Pf G G G G G G G G G M- V A S A S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S			ME SI JMBER DCATIOI EVATIO 36.9096 TER LE OF DRIL DF DRIL	UNSHINE 928-1-2 N 511 (N 48 F 5° EVELS: LLING L TRAILING NUTURE UNITERIAL LING L	Vista Re 2 Dhlone P T +/- Not Enco Not Enco	BOI LONG UNITELEC PARKING LONG SOUNTELEC UNITELEC DUNTELEC UNITELEC	Al Deve , Wats RING E SITUDE d UNDF O HA A TO UNDF UNT T	Iopme onville DEPTH E12 RAINED ND PENI RVANE CONFIN CONFIN CONFIN	AGE ont , CA , CA , CA , 54.5 , 1.77188 SHEAR S ksf ETROMET ED COMFLIDATED-0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ft. ft. 3° STRENG FER PRESSIG	
48.0	- 0- 	Clayey Sand wift medium dense, coarse sand, fin Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist,	h Gravel (SC) [Fill] moist, gray brown, fine to e to coarse gravel dark brown, some fine sat			MC-1B	97	25				0 2.			<u>,</u>
45.0 ·	5-	high plasticity Fat Clay (CH) stiff to very stiff, mottles, some fill	moist, gray with brown	/ [_]	4	MC-2B	79	39				0			
8-1-2 SUNSHINE VISIA RESIDENTIAL 10	 - 10- 	Lean Clay with stiff, moist, brow plasticity	Sand (CL)	26 N 26	5 5	MC-3B MC-4B	82 89	39 29				0	0	,	
36.0 36.0	 - 15-	Lean Clay (CL) very stiff, moist, some fine sand,	gray with brown mottles, low to moderate plasticity	 , 27	7	MC-5B	89	33					0		
80.5 - 30.5		Silt (ML) — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	brown, fine sand, some th layers, low plasticity	 nin 29		MC-6B	92	29		96			C		
28.0	- 20- 	Lean Clay with S very stiff, moist, sand, some silt,	Sand (CL) gray and brown mottled, f low plasticity	 ine ²⁰		SPT							0		
	 - 25- 	Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, some fine sand,	gray with brown mottles, high plasticity	30		MC-8B	87	32					0		
		Cont	inued Next Page												

_									BO	RINC	S NI	JME	BER PAGE	EB	-5 F 2
	E			PRO	JJE		ME S	unshine	Vista Re	esidentia	al Deve	elopme	ent		
			EARTH GROUP	PRO	JE			928-1-	2 Oblona I	Darkway	Wate	onville			
			This log is a part of a report by Cornerstone Earth Group, and should not be used as a stand-along document. This description applies only to the location of the					<u> </u>	8			RAINED	SHEAR	STREN	GTH,
ELEVATION (ft)	DEPTH (ft)	SYMBOL	a scalar-arone document. This description applies only do the document of the exploration at the time of drifting. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locations and may change at this location with time. The description presented is a simplification of actual conditions encountered. Transitions between soil types may be gradual.	/alue (uncorrected blows per foot			RY UNIT WEIGHT PCF	NATURAL ISTURE CONTEN	STICITY INDEX,	RCENT PASSING No. 200 SIEVE		AND PEN DRVANE NCONFIN	ksf IETROM NED CON DLIDATEI	ETER //PRESS/ D-UNDR/	ON
21.0-			DESCRIPTION	ź		≽	ä	Ŵ	PLA	8	TF 1	RIAXIAL .0 2	.0 3	.0 4.	0
_			very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity												
-	30-		Some thin interbedded silt layers	51		MC-9B	92	29							
16.5 _ _	-		Silt with Sand (ML) very stiff, moist, gray and brown mottled, fine sand, low plasticity												
-	35-	-		59		MC-10B	95	26					0		
- 11.0 - -	-		Silty Sand (SM) dense, moist, brown, fine sand	59	X	MC-11B	98	20		47					
- - 5.0- -	40- - - - - - -		Fat Clay (CH) hard, moist, gray with brown mottles, trace fine sand, high plasticity	67		MC-12C	89	32							>4.5
- 1.0- -	 		Silt with Sand (ML) hard, moist, gray and brown mottled, fine sand, low plasticity			MC-13B	94	29							>4.5
-2.0-	50-		Poorly Graded Sand with Silt (SP-SM) dense, moist, brown, fine to medium sand, some coarse sand	74		MC-14B	103	16							
-4.5 _ -5.8 _			Lean Clay with Sand (CL) very stiff, moist, gray brown, fine sand, low	41 - <u>50</u> 6"		SPT MC								0	
 - - -	55 -	-	Very dense, moist, brown, fine sand Bottom of Boring at 54.5 feet.												

CORNERSTONE EARTH GROUP2 - CORNERSTONE 0812.GDT - 2/7/17 09:56 - PADRAFTING/GINT FILES/928-1-2 SUNSHINE VISTA RESIDENTIAL.GPJ

BORING NUMBER EB-6 PAGE 1 OF 2

DATE STARTED 1 DRILLING CONTRAC DRILLING METHOD LOGGED BY DL NOTES (1) HLd ag (1) HLd ag (1) HLd ag (1) HLd ag (1) HLd ag (1) HLd ag (1) HLd ag	CORRNERSTONE Second S	PRC PRC GRC LAT GRC V V Piows bec toot	DJEC DJEC DJEC DUNE TTUE DUNE AT E		ME SI MBER CATION EVATIO 66.90955 TER LE OF DRIL	UNSHING 928-1-2 928-1-2 N 511 (N 67 F 2° EVELS: LLING L ING N ING ING ING ING ING ING ING IN	Vista Re 2 Dhlone F T +/- Not Encc	Parkway Parkway BOI LONG Duntered Duntered Duntered Duntered	CONSTITUTION	shear shear	t. 34° STRENG ETER IPRESSI 0-UNDRA 0 4.	F 2
	Clayey Sand with Gravel (SC) [Fill] medium dense, moist, gray brown, fine to medium sand, fine to coarse gravel Fat Clay (CH) hard, moist, dark brown, some fine sand, high plasticity Liquid Limit = 61, Plastic Limit = 20 Silt (ML) very stiff, moist, brown, fine sand, low plasticity Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity Silt (ML) very stiff, moist, brown, fine sand, low plasticity Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, brown, fine sand, low plasticity Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity Continued Next Page	31 29 14 12 15 33 24 26 27 32		AC-18 AC-28 AC-38 SPT AC-58 AC-68 SPT-7 AC-68 SPT-7 AC-88 AC-88 MC	119 115 97 81 93 87 87 82	8 20 21 36 31 27 33 39	41	92			0	>4.5



BORING NUMBER EB-7 PAGE 1 OF 1

-	DATE ST DRILLING DRILLING LOGGED NOTES		CORREGESTORE 1/22/16 DATE COMPLETED 1/22/16 CTOR Exploration Geoservices, Inc. Mobile B-53, 8 inch Hollow-Stem Auger This log is a part of a report by Cornerstone Earth Group, and should not be used as a stand-alone document. This description applies only to the location of the exploration with time. The description presented is a simplification of actual conditions encountered. Transitions between soil types may be gradual.	PRC PRC GRC LAT GRC V pows bet toot			ME SI MBER CATIO EVATIO 36.9103 TER LE OF DRIL DF DRIL	UNSHINE 928-1-2 N 511 (N 56 F 5° EVELS: LLING 1 TRUNCTOR NUSION UNITION LLING 1 LLING 1 L	Vista Re 2 Dhlone P T +/- Not Enco	BCKCENT PASSING LONC LONC UNITERCE UNIT	d UND d UND d d d d und d und d und d d und d d d d	CONFIN CONVILLE CONVILLE CONFIN CONFI	nt , CA 25 ft 1.7726 SHEAR 	3° 3° STREN :TER !PRESS -UNDR 0 4	IGTH,
	- 53.0		Clayey Sand with Gravel (SC) [Fill] medium dense, moist, dark gray, fine to coarse sand, fine to coarse subangular gravel	49	X	MC-1B	142	8							
IAL.GPJ	- 51.0	5-	Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity Lean Clay with Sand (CL) stiff moist brown fine sand some silt low	23	X	MC-2 MC-3B	97	32 24				0	>		
FILES/928-1-2 SUNSHINE VISTA RESIDENT	- 48.5 - - - -	 - 10- 	Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity	22		MC-4B	90	31					0		
- 2/7/17 09:56 - P:\DRAFTING\GINT	-	15-		31	X	MC-5B	96	28					0)	
ERSTONE 0812.GDT	-	20-		32	X	MC-6B	82	40						0	
JERSTONE EARTH GROUP2 - CORN	34.0- - 31.8 ⁻ 31.0- -	25-	Silty Sand (SM) dense, moist, brown, fine sand Lean Clay with Sand (CL) hard, moist, brown, fine sand, moderate plasticity Bottom of Boring at 25.0 feet.	52	X	MC-7B	94	29							>4.5
CORNERS'															

BORING NUMBER EB-8 PAGE 1 OF 2

000000000000000000000000000000000000	DATE ST DRILLING DRILLING LOGGED NOTES	G CON G MET		CORNERSTONE 1/22/16 DATE COMPLETED 1/1/22/16 CTOR Exploration Geoservices, Inc. Mobile B-53, 8 inch Hollow-Stem Auger	PRC PRC GRC LAT GRC <u>V</u>	DJECT N DJECT L DUND EI ITUDE _ DUND W AT TIME AT END	IAME <u>S</u> IUMBER OCATIO LEVATIO 36.9099 ATER LI E OF DRI OF DRI	Sunshine 928-1-2 N 511 (N 69 F 8° EVELS: LLING LLING	Vista Re 2 Dhlone F T +/- Not Encc Not Encc	Parkway Parkway BOI LONG ountered	d UNDF	onville, DEPTH -121	nt CA 35 ft 1.77329)°	
0 Clayey Sand with Gravel (SC) [Fill] medium dense, moist, gray brown, fine to coarse sand, fine to coarse gravel very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity 19 wc-rs 85 34 68.0 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 63.0 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 63.0 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 66.5 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 66.5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 66.5 5	ELEVATION	DEPTH (ft	SYMBOL	simplification of actual conditions encountered. Transitions between soil types may be gradual.	N-Value (uncorr blows per fc	SAMPLES TYPE AND NUR	DRY UNIT WE PCF	NATURAL MOISTURE CON	PLASTICITY INE	PERCENT PAS No. 200 SIE		RVANE CONFINE CONSOL IAXIAL 0 2.0	ED COMF LIDATED- 0 3.0	PRESS UNDR	ION AINED .0
63.0 5 Sitty Sand (SM) medium dense, moist, brown, fine sand 51 Mc.38 101 16 60.5	69.0- 68.0- - - -	- 0- 		Clayey Sand with Gravel (SC) [Fill] medium dense, moist, gray brown, fine to coarse sand, fine to coarse gravel Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity	19 26	MC-1E	3 85	34					0		-
60.5 Image: Site (ML) medium stiff, moist, brown, some fine sand, some clay, low plasticity 15 Sert.4 34 90 Image: Sert.4 34 34 90 Image: Sert.4 34 36 Image: Sert.4 Image: Sert.4		5-		Silty Sand (SM) medium dense, moist, brown, fine sand	51	МС-зе	3 101	16						(þ
56.5 Fat Clay (CH) Very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity 53 51.5 Lean Clay with Sand (CL) very stiff, moist, brown, fine sand, some silt, low plasticity 41 47.0 Fat Clay (CH) 20 Very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, some silt, low plasticity 47.0 Fat Clay (CH) 220 Very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity 220 Kees 47.0 Continued Next Page	60.5 - -	10-		Silt (ML) medium stiff, moist, brown, some fine sand, some clay, low plasticity	15 14	SPT-4	5	34		90	0	>			
51.5 Lean Clay with Sand (CL) very stiff, moist, brown, fine sand, some silt, low plasticity 41 MC-78 92 32 47.0 Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity 28 MC-88 73 43 43.0 Continued Next Page Continued Next Page 1 MC-78 92 32		 - 15-		Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity	53	MC-6E	3 84	37						0	
47.0 Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity 43.0- Continued Next Page	- 51.5 - - -			Lean Clay with Sand (CL) very stiff, moist, brown, fine sand, some silt, low plasticity	41	MC-7E	3 92	32					¢		
43.0- Continued Next Page	47.0-			Fat Clay (CH) very stiff, moist, gray with brown mottles, some fine sand, high plasticity	28	MC-8E	3 73	43					D		
	43.0-			Continued Next Page											



Earm	Project Sunsł	nine Vista Residential Deve	lopmentOperator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(362).cpt
INC	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS	
	Hole Number	CPT-01	Date and Time	11/12/2016 10:29:29 AM	Maximum Depth	21.98 ft
	EST CW Donth Du	ring Toot	15 00 ft		· –	



Eann	Project Sunsl	nine Vista Residential Deve	lopmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(364).cpt
ING INC.	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS	
	Hole Number	CPT-02	Date and Time	11/12/2016 12:13:17 PM	Maximum Depth	21.33 ft
	EST GW Donth Du	ing Tost	15 20 ft		• –	



ann	Project Sunshine V	ista Residential Deve	elopmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(367).cpt
NC.	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS	
	Hole Number	CPT-03	Date and Time	11/12/2016 2:51:19 PM	Maximum Depth	49.05 ft
	EST GW Depth During To	est	27 00 ft			



Ц	Project Suns	shine Vista Residential Deve	lopmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(370).cpt
	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS	
	Hole Number	CPT-04	Date and Time	11/13/2016 8:08:10 AM	Maximum Depth	50.52 ft
	EST GW Denth Di	uring Test	4 60 ft			



Project	Sunshine Vista Residential Develo	pmen Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(365).cpt
Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS	
Hole Number	CPT-05	Date and Time	11/12/2016 1:15:20 PM	Maximum Depth	51.67 ft
EST GW Dept	h During Test	27.70 ft			



U.	Project	Sunshine Vista Residential Develo	opmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(368).cpt	
	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS		
	Hole Number	CPT-06	Date and Time	11/12/2016 3:40:00 PM	Maximum Depth	28.21 ft	
	EST GW Don	th During Test	4 00 ft		· –		



ann	Project Sun	shine Vista Residential Deve	lopmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(371).cpt	
INC.	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS		
	Hole Number	CPT-07	Date and Time	11/13/2016 9:13:42 AM	Maximum Depth	40.85 ft	
	EST GW Donth D	uring Test	/ 20 ft		· _		



Eann	Project Sunshi	ne Vista Residential Deve	lopmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(373).cpt	
ING INC.	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS		
	Hole Number	CPT-08	Date and Time	11/13/2016 11:50:25 AM	Maximum Depth	38.22 ft	
	EST CW Danth Duri	na Taat	4 00 4		· –		



Eann	Project Sunshin	e Vista Residential Deve	elopmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(366).cpt	
G INC.	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS		
	Hole Number	CPT-09	Date and Time	11/12/2016 2:14:56 PM	Maximum Depth	39.21 ft	
	EST GW Donth During Test		/ 00 ft		· _		



<u>II</u>	Project Sunshin	e Vista Residential Deve	lopmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(372).cpt
1.00	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS	
	Hole Number	CPT-10	Date and Time	11/13/2016 10:23:50 AM	Maximum Depth	52.00 ft
	EST GW Depth During Test		4 00 ft			



	Project Sunshin	e Vista Residential Deve	lopmen [:] Operator	KK-RB	Filename	SDF(369).cpt	
INCL	Job Number	928-1-2	Cone Number	DDG1333	GPS		
	Hole Number	CPT-11	Date and Time	11/12/2016 4:10:46 PM	Maximum Depth	50.52 ft	
	EST GW Depth During	n Tost	8 70 ft				



APPENDIX B: LABORATORY TEST PROGRAM

The laboratory testing program was performed to evaluate the physical and mechanical properties of the soils retrieved from the site to aid in verifying soil classification.

Moisture Content: The natural water content was determined (ASTM D2216) on 92 samples of the materials recovered from the borings. These water contents are recorded on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Dry Densities: In place dry density determinations (ASTM D2937) were performed on 78 samples to measure the unit weight of the subsurface soils. Results of these tests are shown on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Washed Sieve Analyses: The percent soil fraction passing the No. 200 sieve (ASTM D1140) was determined on 8 samples of the subsurface soils to aid in the classification of these soils. Results of these tests are shown on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Plasticity Index: Two Plasticity Index determinations (ASTM D4318) were performed on samples of the subsurface soils to measure the range of water contents over which this material exhibits plasticity. The Plasticity Index was used to classify the soil in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System and to evaluate the soil expansion potential. Results of these tests are shown on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Consolidated-Undrained Triaxial Compression with Pore Pressure Measurements: The undrained shear strength was determined on three remolded and three relatively undisturbed sample of soil material by undrained triaxial shear strength testing with pore pressure measurements (ASTM D4767). The results of these tests are included as part of this appendix.

Consolidation: One consolidation test (ASTM D2435) was performed on a relatively undisturbed sample of the subsurface clayey soils to assist in evaluating the compressibility property of this soil. Results of the consolidation test are presented graphically in this appendix.

Compaction: One compaction test (ASTM D 1557-00 Method B) was performed on a composite sample of the subsurface soils to measure the relative maximum dry density and optimum moisture content. Results of the compaction test is included as part of this appendix.







	DPER			Cons	Solidation	n Test	
Job No.: Client: Project: Soil Type:	640-1069 Cornerstone 928-1-2 Olive Brown	Earth Group		Boring: Sample: Depth, ft.: Strain-Lo	EB-2 5 10(Tip-3") g-P Curve	Run By: Reduced: Checked: Date:	MD PJ PJ/DC 1/11/2017
Strain.%	0.0 2.0 4.0 6.0 8.0 10.0 12.0 14.0 16.0 18.0 20.0					1000	10000
Assumed Gs	27	Initial	Final	Effect	ive Stress, psf		
Moist Dry Dens Void I % Satu	ure %: sity, pcf: Ratio: ıration:	27.3 93.6 0.801 91.9	26.0 99.0 0.702 100.0				




APPENDIX D: PREVIOUS GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION DATA



KEV TO LOGS

					NL I	101		3					
		UNI	FIED	SOII	L CI	LASSI	FICA	TION	SYS	STEM			
PI	RIMAR	RY DIVISION	١S			GRO SYM	DUP BOL			SECO	NDAR	Y DIVISION	IS
			CLEA	NGRA	VFIS	G	W	Well g	raded g	ravels,	gravel-s	and mixtures,	little or no fines
	GR More	RAVELS than half of	(Less t	than 5%	fines)	G	Р	Poor	ly grade	ed grave	els, grav fi	vel-sand mixtur	res, little or no
COARSE	is lar	ger than the	C	GRAVEI		G	М	Silty	gravels	, gravel	-sand-si	ilt mixtures, no	on-plastic fines
GRAINED SOILS	No	o. 4 sieve	WI	TH FIN	ES	G	С	Clay	ey grav	els, gra	vel-sand	d-clay mixtures	s, plastic fines
More than half of the material is	S		CLE	AN SAN	NDS	S	W	W	ell grad	ed sand	s, grave	elly sands, little	e or no fines
larger than the No. 200 sieve	More	than half of	(Less t	than 5%	fines)	S	Р	Poo	orly gra	ded san	ds, grav	elly sands, littl	e or no fines
	the co is sma	aller than the		SAND		S	М	S	Silty sar	nds, san	d-silt m	ixtures, non-pl	astic fines
	ES	S	С		Clayey	sands, s	and-cla	y mixtures, pla	astic fines				
	ML Inorganic silts and very fine sands, silty o or clayey silts with slight pla									ands, silty or c th slight plasti	layey fine sands city		
FINE GRAINED		SILTS AN Liquid limit	D CL. less th	AYS an 50		С	L	Inorga	nic clay s	ys of lov andy cla	v to me ays, silt <u>y</u>	dium plasticity y clays, lean cl	, gravelly clays, ays
SOILS						0	L	Org	ganic si	lts and o	organic	silty clays of le	ow plasticity
More than half of the material is						М	Η	Inorga	nic silts	s, micac silt	eous or ty soils,	diatomacaceo elastic silts	us fine sandy or
smaller than the No. 200 sieve	1	SILTS AN Liquid limit g	D CL	AYS than 50		C	Н		Inorg	anic cla	ys of hi	gh plasticity, f	at clays
						0	Н	Orga	nic clay	ys of me	dium to	high plasticit	y, organic silts
HIG	HLY C	ORGANIC SC	DILS			F	P t		Р	eat and	other hi	ighly organic s	oils
			(GRAIN		SIZE		LIMIT	S				
			SA	ND				GRA	VEL				
SILT AND CLA	AY -	FINE	MED	DIUM	COA	RSE	FI	NE	COA	ARSE	C	OBBLES	BOULDERS
	No. 2	.00 No.	40	No. 1 US	0 STANE	No DARD	4 SIEVE	3/4 i SIZE	n.	3 in	l.	12	in.
REI ATIVE	DEN	ISITY			C	ONSIS	TENC	'V			MO	ISTURE CO	NDITION
SAND AND GRA	VEL	BLOWS/FT*		SI	LT AN	ID CLA	Y	BLOW	/S/FT*		C	D	RY
VERY LOOSE		0 - 4			VERY	SOFT		0 -	- 2		L A	M	DIST
VERTICOSE0411A1LOOSE4 - 10SOFT2 - 4YSATURATE									RATED				
MEDIUM DENS	E	10 - 30			FI	RM		4 -	- 8		S	D	RY
DENSE		30 - 50			ST	IFF		8 -	16		A	D	AMP
VERY DENSE		OVER 50			VERY	STIFF		16	- 32		N D	v	VET
					HA	RD		OVE	R 32		D	SATU	RATED
* Number of blows of 14	40 pound	hammer falling	30 inche	es to drive	e a 2 inc	ch O.D. (1 3/8 in	ch I.D.) s	split spo	on (AST	M D-158	36).	
		BUTANO	GEOT	ECHNI	CAL	ENGIN	IEERII	NG, IN	C.				FIGURE
													B-3

				LOG OF EXI	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Proje	ect No	.:	16-	135-SC	Boring:		B1							
Proje	ect:		511	Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
			Ŧ	20, 2017	Elevation:		<i>.</i>			1				
Date	: ved Bv	•	Jun AP	e 20, 2016	Method of Drillin	ıg:	6 inc	n solid	stem t	ruck n	iounteo	auge	er	
(pa		2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	ot		(pcf)	nt (%)	ıdex	(ze	Atte Lii	rberg nits
Depth (ft.	Soil Type	Undisturbe	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Description		Blows / Fc	N_{60}	Dry Density	Moisture Conte	Expansion Ir	Swell (psi	Particle Si	L.L.	P.I.
	SM			Grev silty SAND with gravel (FILL)										
	CH	È		Dark brown FAT CLAY, stiff, slightly mo	ist (FILL).	29	11	93.8	27.8		2,300			
						19	15		24.7					
- 5 - 	CL			Brown-tan mottled LEAN CLAY with san moist.	d , stiff,	38 12	14 9	93.1	26.7 34.1	35		✓	42	20
10 				Very stiff.		17 22	9 18		38.8 39.6					
-15- 						44 18	21 14	86.9	34.3 34.2					
-20-		\setminus				40	20		40.0					
				Drilling terminated at a depth of 21 1/2 fea No groundwater was encountered during d	et. rilling.									
				BUTANO GEOTECHNI	CAL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	C.						FIG B	URE -4

				LOG OF EX	XPLORATORY	BOR	NG							
Proj	ect No	.:	16-	135-SC	Boring:		B2							
Proj	ect:		511	l Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
					Elevation:									
Date	e:		Jur	ue 20, 2016	Method of Drill	ing:	6 incl	h solid	stem t	ruck n	nounted	1 auge	er	
Log	ged By	:	AP											
t.)	Je	bed		2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	oot		(pcf)	ent (%)	Index	mp. (psf)	ize	Other	Tests
Depth (f	Soil Ty _l	Undistur	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Description	er	Blows / F	N ₆₀	Dry Density	Moisture Cont	Expansion]	Unconfined Co	Particle S		
				Description										
	SM (FILL)	\square		Gray silty SAND with gravel (FILL), gr black FAT CLAY layer.	ading into a 6"	24	9		26.1					
 - 5-	CL		l	Brown-orange mottled LEAN CLAY, ve slightly moist.	ery stiff,	22	18		28.9					
		\square				39	14	97.3	20.3					
	SM			Brown-orange silty SAND, medium den	se, damp.	19	15		25.9					
- 10- - 10- 	CL			Brown-orange LEAN CLAY with sand,	very stiff, moist.	36	18	84.5	36.9					
 -15-	•													
		\square				64	30		21.8					
				Drilling terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 No groundwater encountered during dril	feet. ling.									
-20-					C									
	1													
-25-]													
-	1													
	1													
-30-	1													
	-													
-	1													
	1													
-35-	-													
<u></u>	1	<u> </u>		BUTANO GEOTECHN	ICAL ENGINEER	ING. IN	<u> </u>						FIG	URE
						, _, _,							B	-5

			LOG OF EXH	LORATORY	BORI	NG							
Project No.:	:	16-	135-SC	Boring:		B3							
Project:		511	Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
Date:		Jun	e 20, 2016	Method of Drillin	ıg:	6 incl	h solid	stem t	ruck m	ounted	l auge	r	
Logged By:		AP			-	1				1	-		
t.) De	bed		2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	oot		' (pcf)	tent (%)	Index	mp. (psf)	ize	Other 7	Tests
Depth (f Soil Ty	Undisturl	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Static Water		Blows / F	N_{60}	ory Density	isture Con	Axpansion	onfined Co	Particle S	ell (psf)	
			Description				Ι	Mc	I	Unc		Sw	
CH (FILL			6" Gray silty SAND over: Black FAT CLAY with sand, stiff, slightly Increasing sand.	moist (FILL).	38 21	19 17	102.5	20.9 17.4					
- 5 - CH		,	Tan FAT CLAY, very stiff, moist.		40 11	15 8		34.4			~		
- 10- CH			Increase in fine-grained sand.		34	17	84.4	36.8				1,800	
-15- SM	$\overline{\ }$		Tan silty SAND, medium dense, damp.		51	19		24.4					
-20-			Boring terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 feet No groundwater encountered during drillin	g.									
			BUTANO GEOTECHNIC	CAL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	C.				-	-	FIGU B-	JRE 6

				LOG OF EX	XPLORATOR	Y BOR	ING							
Proj Proj	ect No	.:	16- 511	135-SC Ohlone Parkway	Boring: Location: Elevation:		B4							
Date Log	e: ged By	:	Jun AP	e 20, 2016	Method of Dr	illing:	6 inc	h solid	stem t	ruck n	nounted	l auge	er	
h (ft.)	Type	turbed	ılk	$\sum_{i=1}^{2^{"}} \frac{2^{"} \operatorname{Ring}}{\operatorname{Sample}} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{2.5^{"}} \frac{2.5^{"} \operatorname{Ring}}{\operatorname{Sample}}$	Bulk Sample	: / Foot	60	sity (pcf)	Content (%)	on Index	Comp. (psf)	le Size	Other	· Tests
Dept	Soil	Undis	B	$\prod_{\text{Spoon Sample}} \text{Faile} \qquad \qquad$		Blows	2	Dry Der	Moisture (Expansi	Unconfined	Partic		
 	SM (FILL) EH (FILI			Gray silty SAND with gravel, medium of damp (FILL). Black FAT CLAY with sand, gravel (FI	lense, slightly LL).	28 17	10 13	93.3	27.8 23.2					
- 5- 	СН			Brown-orange mottled FAT CLAY with very stiff, moist.	ı sand,	53 25	25 21	91.2	12.0 15.0					
-10- 	-					35	17	85.1	36.0		4,700			
 -15-				Hard.		79	36	94.2	21.0					
- 20- - 20- 				Drilling terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 No groundwater encountered during dri	feet. Iling.									
				BUTANO GEOTECHN	NICAL ENGINEE	ERING, II	NC.						FIG B	URE -7

				LOG OF E	XPLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Proje	ct No.	.:	16-	135-SC	Boring:		B5							
Proje	ct:		511	l Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
Date			Iun	ne 20, 2016	Elevation: Method of Drill	ing	6 incl	h solid	stem t	ruck m	ounter	1 911 04	۶r	
Logge	ed By	:	AP	le 20, 2010	Method of Dim	ing.	0 me	ii sonu	stern t	ruek n	lountee	i uugi	21	
:)	е	bed		2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	oot		(pcf)	ent (%)	ndex	mp. (psf)	ize	Other 7	Tests
Depth (f	Soil Typ	Undisturb	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Static Wa Spoon Sample Static Wa	ıter	Blows / F	N_{60}	Dry Density	Moisture Cont	Expansion I	Unconfined Co	Particle S	Swell (psf)	
	CU			Description	1						_			
	CH FILL)	\setminus		stiff, moist (FILL).	th trace gravel,	41	15	98.2	19.6					
	СН]	Orange-brown mottled FAT CLAY wit	h sand,	16	13		35.0					
				still, moist.		41 21	20 17	78.2	44.3 37.6				3,500	
-10- 		\setminus				50/6"		97.3	25.2					
15														
-20-	СН			Hard.		46	42					~		
 -25- 														
-30-						1								
 	SM			Tan silty SAND, very dense, damp.		72	65		15.5					
-35-				BUTANO GEOTECH	NICAL ENGINEER	ING, IN	С.						FIGU	IRE

				LC	G OF EXP	LORATORY	BORI	NG							
Project Project	No.	:	16- 511	135-SC Ohlone Parkway		Boring: Location: Elevation:		B5 co	ontinue	d.					
Date: Logged	l By:		Jun AP	e 20, 2016		Method of Drillir	ıg:	6 incl	n solid	stem t	ruck m	ounted	l auge	er	
(ft.)	ype	rbed	κ	2" Ring Sample Samp	Ring le	Bulk Sample	Foot		ty (pcf)	ntent (%)	ı Index	omp. (psf)	Size	Other	Tests
Depth	Soil T	Undistu	Bull	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample	Static Water Table		Blows /	N_{60}	Dry Densi	Moisture Co	Expansior	Unconfined C	Particle		
				Des	cription										
 -40- sp 	P-SM			Tan poorly-graded SAND, v	ery dense, dam	p.	80	73		8.6			~		
				Drilling terminated at a depti No groundwater encountered	h of 41 1/2 feet I during drilling										
				BUTANO C	JEOTECHNIC	AL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	С.						FIG B-	URE 8b

	LOG OF EX	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Project No.: 16-135-SC Project: 511 Ohlone Parkv	vay	Boring: Location: Elevation:		B6							
Date: June 20, 2016 Logged By: AP		Method of Drillin	ng:	6 incl	h solid	stem t	ruck m	ounted	l auge	er	
Ci 2" Ring Sample	2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	oot		(pcf)	tent (%)	Index	mp. (psf)	ize	Other	[.] Tests
Depth (f Soil Tyr Bulk Bulk	erzaghi Split poon Sample Description		Blows / F	N_{60}	Dry Density	Moisture Cont	Expansion]	Unconfined Co	Particle S		
	Description										
CH Dark brown-b	lack FAT CLAY, stiff, mois	st.	44 19	21 15	102.7	22.0 23.1	103				
CL Tan-olive browstiff, moist.	wn-orange mottled LEAN C	ELAY,	31 23	16 19	92.6	28.8 29.0					
-10- Increase in sar	nd.		50/6"			15.8					
SP Poorly-graded	SAND, medium dense, dar	np.	42	38		7.3					
Coarser sand.			38	34		8.1					
 -25- 		¥									
Hole collapse, u	nable to obtain sample.										
Drilling termin Groundwater of	nated at a depth of 31 1/2 fe encountered at 25 1/2 feet.	et.									
	BUTANO GEOTECHNI	CAL ENGINEERI	NG, IN	С.						FIG B	URE -9

					I	LOG OF EX	PLORATOR	Y BOR	ING							
Proj	ect No	.:	16-	135-SC			Boring:		B7							
Proj	ect:		511	Ohlone Parkway			Location:									
							Elevation:									
Date	:		Jun	e 20, 2016			Method of Dri	lling:	6 inc	h solid	stem t	ruck n	ounted	l auge	er	
Log	ged By	:	AP													
(1)	pe		2" Ring Sample	$\sum_{i=1}^{2} S_{i}$	5" Ring umple	Bulk Sample	ot		(pcf)	ent (%)	ndex	np. (psf)	ze	Atte Lir	rberg nits
pth (ft	il Typ	listurb	Bulk	Terzagh	ni Split		r	ws / Fc	N_{60}	ensity	e Conte	Ision In	ed Con	icle Si		
De	SC	Unc		Spoon S	Sample	T able		Blo		Dry D	Moisture	Expar	nconfin	Part	L.L.	P.I.
]	Description					-		n			
	CH		1	1 foot of gray silty	SAND	(FILL).		21	16	105.0	10.2					
	CH Olive brown-tan FAT CLAY with sand, grav						noist.	31	16 26	105.9	19.3 23.6					
 -5-			Į													
								49	23	82.7	37.2				84	57
			ł					27	25		55.4					
 -10-			ļ													
		\geq						42	20		29.5					
-15-			ļ													
		\backslash		Increase in sand.				60	28		19.6			\checkmark		
					_											
				Drilling terminated	d at a de	epth of 16 1/2 fe rod during drill	et.									
20				no groundwater er	licounte	ieu uuring urin	ing.									
-25-																
-30-																
┣ -																
-35-				l												
	1		<u> </u>	BI	UTANO	O GEOTECHN	ICAL ENGINEE	RING, II	NC.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	FIG	URE
															B-	-10

				LOG OF EXI	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Proj	ect No	.:	16-	-135-SC	Boring:		B8							
Proj	ect:		511	l Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
			_		Elevation:					_		_		
Date	: rod Bu		Jur	ne 20, 2016	Method of Drillin	ng:	6 incl	h solid	stem t	ruck n	nounted	l auge	er	
Logg	дец Бу		Ar								G			
(ft.)	ype	rbed	3	2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	Foot		ty (pcf)	ntent (%)	Index	omp. (pst	Size	Other	Tests
Depth	Soil T	Undistu	Bull	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Static Water Table		Blows /	N_{60}	Dry Densi	Ioisture Co	Expansion	iconfined C	Particle		
				Description					2		Ur			
{	SC (FILI		4	Gray-black clayey SAND with gravel (FIL	L).	25	13		23.5					
	СН	Ē		Olive-brown FAT CLAY with trace grave	l, stiff, moist.	16	13		36.8					
- 5- 				Very stiff.		40 26	20 22	92.7	27.2 27.6		4,000			
 -10-	с с													
	SC			Brown-orange mottled clayey SAND, very damp.	v dense,	70	32		14.7					
-15-	r.		1											
				Drilling terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 fee No groundwater encountered during drillin	et. ng.		26		19.6					
		-	-	BUTANO GEOTECHNI	CAL ENGINEERII	NG, IN	C.		<u> </u>	<u>.</u>	<u>.</u>		FIG B-	URE 11

LOG OF EX	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Project No.: 16-135-SC	Boring:		B9							
Project: 511 Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
Dete: 1000 27, 2016	Elevation:		C in al	h				1		
Logged By: AP	Method of Driffi	ig:	o me	n sona	stem t	ruck II	iountec	i auge		
$\sum_{i=1}^{2^{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{2^{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{2^{$	Bulk Sample	ot		(pcf)	nt (%)	idex	ıp. (psf)	ze	Other 7	ſests
(J) J) <		Blows / Fo	N_{60}	Dry Density (Moisture Conte	Expansion Ir	Unconfined Con	Particle Si	Swell (psf)	
Description										
- CH - (FILL) - (FIL	debris	19 18	10 14		20.2 26.8					
CH Black FAT CLAY, stiff, moist.		22 17	12 14	100.5	23.3 24.1	41			1,200	
CH Olive-brown/tan FAT CLAY with sand.		24	14	93.8	28.5		8,600			
-15- - CL Gray-orange mottled sandy LEAN CLAY	, stiff, moist.	30 24	18 25	94.5	24.6 29.5		3,300			
Drilling terminated at a depth of 18 feet. No groundwater encountered during drilli	ng.									
BUTANO GEOTECHNI	CAL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	C.						FIGU B-1	RE 2

				LOG OF EXI	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Proje	ect No.	.:	16-	135-SC	Boring:		B10							
Proje	ect:		511	Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
					Elevation:									
Date	:		Jun	e 27, 2016	Method of Drillin	ng:	6 incl	h solid	stem t	ruck m	ounted	l auge	er	
Logg	ged By	:	AP							1		1	1	
ît.)	pe	bed		2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	Toot		/ (pcf)	tent (%)	Index	mp. (psf)	Size	Other	[.] Tests
Depth (Soil Ty	Undistur	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample \sum_{Table} Static Water		Blows / J	N_{60}	Dry Densit	oisture Cor	Expansion	onfined Co	Particle 3	-Value	
				Description				Г	Me		Unc		R	
	M (EILI	<u>`</u>		Grav silty SAND with gravel (EILL)										
	CH	\setminus		Black FAT CLAY with gravel, glass frage	nents (FILL).	23	11		21.6					
	(FILL]			16	12		21.5					
						ł								
- 5 -	СН	\setminus		Black sandy FAT CLAY with trace gravel		20	11	95 3	20.3					
	011	T			•	20	18	20.0	20.6					
			\boxtimes											
10		\setminus				31	17	111.7	17.7					
			Х											
-15-		\setminus		Brown FAT CLAY stiff moist		27	16	104 7	22.6					
						27	10	101.7	22.0					
		\setminus		Olive-brown FAT CLAY, very stiff, moist		30	25		27.4					
					-									
	SM			Brown-orange mottled silty SAND, dense.	damp.	34			9.9					
					1									
				Drilling terminated at a depth of 26 1/2 fee	et.									
				No groundwater encountered during drillin	ng.									
-35-														
				BUTANO GEOTECHNI	CAL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	C.						FIG	URE
													B-	-13

				LOG OF EXI	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Proj	ect No	.:	16-	135-SC	Boring:		B11							
Proj	ect:		511	l Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
					Elevation:									
Date	:		Jun	ne 27, 2016	Method of Drillin	ng:	6 incl	h solid	stem t	ruck n	nounted	l auge	er	
Log	ged By	': 	AP											
(ft.)	/pe	rbed		2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	Foot		y (pcf)	ntent (%)	Index	omp. (psf	Size	Other	[.] Tests
Depth	Soil T	Undistu	Bull	$ \begin{array}{c c} \hline Terzaghi Split \\ Spoon Sample \\ \hline Table \end{array} $ Static Water Table		Blows /	N_{60}	Dry Densi	oisture Co	Expansion	confined C	Particle	-Value	
				Description					W		Unc		R	
	СН		ļ	6 inches of gray silty SAND (FILL) over:										
	(FILL)	\square		Black FAT CLAY, stiff, moist.		20	11	95.7	24.2		6,600			
			А			11	8		26.5					
- 5 -	СН	_	ļ	Olive brown-orange mottled FAT CLAY	with sand,									
		\square		trace gravel, stiff, moist.		24	13	95.2	25.2					
						12	10		22.6			V		
-10-														
		\vdash				15	9		35.1					
-15-			1	2 inch gravel layer at 15 1/2 feet.		30	18		37.8					
						50	10		57.0					
				Drilling terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 fe	et.									
				No groundwater encountered during drillin	ng.									
-25-														
-30-														
-35-														
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	BUTANO GEOTECHNI	CAL ENGINEERI	NG. IN	С.		<u> </u>	<u>I</u>			FIG	URE
													B-	14

				LOG OF EXE	PLORATORY	BORI	ING							
Proj	ect No	.:	16-	135-SC	Boring:		B12							
Proj	ect:		511	Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
			Ŧ		Elevation:									
Date	e: oed By		Jun	e 27, 2016	Method of Drillin	ng:	6 inc.	h solid	stem t	ruck n	ounted	1 auge	er	
105	Bearby			$2^{"}$ Ring $2.5^{"}$ Ring	Bulk			f)	(%)	×	(psf)		Other	Tests
(ft.)	ype	rbed		Sample Sample		Foot		ty (pc	ntent	Inde	omp.	Size		1
epth (oil T	idistu	Bull	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Table		/ SMC	\mathbf{N}_{60}	Densit	re Co	unsion	ned C	rticle	ue	
D	S	Ur				Ble		Dry I	loistu	Expa	confii	Pa	R-Val	
				Description					М		Un		ł	
	СН		ļ	6 inches gray silty SAND with gravel (FIL	L) over:									
	(FILL)	\vdash		Black FAT CLAY, stiff, slightly moist.	oravel	21 13	15 9	95.0	25.4					
	(FILL)			stiff, moist (FILL).	graver,	15			51.9					
- 5-	CI	$\overline{\ }$		Orange-brown mottled I FAN CLAY with	, cand	34	17	101.1	167			 ✓ 		
		Γ		stiff, moist.	i sund,	12	10	101.1	27.3					
			P							0				
-10-			ļ											
				Trace organics, firm, moist.		10	8		35.3					
]													
-15- 				Verv stiff.		27	29		18.1					
			Í											
	ļ					ł								
-20-			ļ											
	СН			Olive-green-brown FAT CLAY, stiff, mois	st.	12	11		31.2					
	1			Drilling terminated at a depth of 21 1/2 fee No groundwater an countered during drilling	et.									
					ıg.									
[_														
-30-	•													
	Ì													
 -35-														
				BUTANO GEOTECHNIC	CAL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	C.					_	FIG	URE
													B-	-13

				LOG OF EXH	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Projec	ct No.	:	16-	135-SC	Boring:		B13							
Projec	et:		511	Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
_			-		Elevation:					_		_		
Date:	d By		Jun	e 27, 2016	Method of Drillin	ng:	6 incl	h solid	stem t	ruck m	ountec	l auge	er	
Logge	u by	•	Ar								(J			
(ft.)	ype	urbed	k	2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	Foot	_	(ty (pcf)	ontent (%)	n Index	Comp. (ps	Size	Other	Tests
Depth	Soil T	Undist	Bul	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Static Water Table		Blows /	${ m N}_6$	Dry Dens	loisture Co	Expansio	confined (Particle	R-Value	
				Description					N		Un		Γ	
(I	SM FILL)			Black-brown silty SAND with gravel, loos slightly damp (FILL).	e,	23	8		9.7					
 - <u>- (</u>	CH FILL)		 	Black FAT CLAY with trace gravel, sand,	stiff (FILL).	18	14		23.1					
	SC	$\left \right $		Brown clayey SAND, loose, damp. Very loose.		25 4	9 3		15.2 22.8					
 - 10			ŀ			-								
	СН	$\left \right\rangle$		Olive-brown FAT CLAY, stiff, moist.		23 14	13 13	82.2	40.6 36.4					
-15-														
				Very stiff.		18	18		33.7					
 - 20-				Drilling terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 fee No groundwater encountered during drillin	et. ng.									
 -25-														
 -35-														
				BUTANO GEOTECHNIO	CAL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	<u>с</u> .		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	FIG	URE
													D-	10

LOG OF EX	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Project No.: 16-135-SC	Boring:		B14							
Project: 511 Ohlone Parkway	Location:									
Date: June 27, 2016	Method of Drillin	ıg:	6 incl	ı solid	stem t	ruck m	ounted	l auge	er	
Logged By: AP								1		
$\widehat{\Xi} = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}}_{a} = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}}$	Bulk Sample	Foot		y (pcf)	itent (%)	Index	omp. (psf)	Size	Other	[.] Tests
$\begin{array}{c c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ $		Blows /	$\rm N_{60}$	Dry Densit	Aoisture Coi	Expansion	confined C	Particle	R-Value	
Description					Z		Ŋ			
- SC Brown-black clayey SAND with gravel, lo - (FILL) slightly damp (FILL).	oose,	14	5		15.2					
(FILL)	moist (FILL).	. 14	10		26.5					
- CL Tan sandy LEAN CLAY, firm, moist.		12 8	7 6		25.2 32.4					
CH Olive-brown FAT CLAY, stiff, moist.		21	12		32.8					
		33	20	96.9	27.1					
Drilling terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 fer Drilling terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 fer No groundwater encountered during drilling Drilling terminated at a depth of 16 1/2 fer No groundwater encountered during drilling	et. ng.									
 -25- 										
BUTANO GEOTECHNI	CAL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	C.		<u> </u>		ı	<u> </u>	FIG B-	URE 17

					L	.OG OF EX	EXPLORA	TORY	BORI	NG							
Projec Projec Date:	et No. et:	:	16- 511 Jun	135-SC Ohlone Parkway e 29, 2016			Boring Locatic Elevati Methoo	: on: on: 1 of Drillin	ıg:	T1 12 inc	ch back	thoe b	ucket				
Logge	ed By	:	AP	2" Ring	$\sum_{n=1}^{2.5}$	" Ring		lk			(f)	(%)	X	(psf)		Other	Tests
Depth (ft.)	Soil Type	Undisturbed	Bulk	Sample	hi Split Sample	mple ↓ Static Wate Table Description	er San	трие	Blows / Foot	${ m N_{60}}$	Dry Density (pc	Moisture Content	Expansion Inde	Unconfined Comp.	Particle Size	R-Value	
F F - 5- 	FILL			Very loose rubble: blocks, gravel, soil	large co	oncrete blocks	, asphalt										
F F - 10 	FILL			Tires, soil (FILL). ▲													
)	lack-tar	n FAT CLAY (n	ative).										
				B	UTANO	GEOTECHN	ICAL ENG	GINEERIN	IG, IN	C.						FIG B-	URE 18

				LC	OG OF EXP	LORATORY	BORI	ING							
Proje Proje Date:	ect No. ect:		16- 511 Jun	135-SC Ohlone Parkway e 29, 2016		Boring: Location: Elevation: Method of Drillin	ng:	T2 12 in	ch back	choe b	ucket				
Logg	ed By	:	AP								1		1	1	
(ft.)	ype	rbed	2	2" Ring Sample 2.5" I Samp	Ring ble	Bulk Sample	Foot		ty (pcf)	ntent (%)	Index	omp. (psf)	Size	Other	Tests
Depth	Soil T	Undistu	Bull	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample	Example Static Water Table		Blows /	${ m N}_{60}$	Dry Densi	Moisture Co	Expansion	Unconfined C	Particle	R-Value	
				De	scription										
	FILL			Very loose rubble: concrete, plastic, soil (FILL).	wood, metal ri	ms,									
- 5- 	^			•											
-10^{-1}			H	Black-tar	n FAT CLAY (na	ative).									
				BUTANO C	GEOTECHNIC	AL ENGINEERI	NG, IN	С.		•	•	•	•	FIG B-	URE 19

				LOG	OF EXPLORATOR	Y BOR	ING							
Proj Proj	ect No. ect:	.:	16- 511	135-SC Ohlone Parkway	Boring: Location: Elevation:		Т3							
Date Log	e: ged By	:	Au AP	gust 10, 2016	Method of Dri	lling:	12 in	ch bacl	khoe b	ucket				
ft.)	pe	bed			Bulk Sample	Foot		y (pcf)	itent (%)	Index	omp. (psf)	Size	Other	Tests
Depth (Soil Ty	Undistur	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Descri	Static Water Table otion	Blows /]	N_{60}	Dry Densit	Moisture Cor	Expansion	Unconfined Co	Particle	R-Value	
	FILL			Soil, vegetation, rubber hoses, a concrete rubble (debris).	netal fenders,									
				1										
 - 10- 			СН	Black-tan F	AT CLAY (native).									
-15- -														
-25- - 30- 														
				BUTANO GE	TECHNICAL ENGINEE	RING, IN	C.						FIG B-	URE 20

Project No.: 16-135-SC Boring: T4 Project: 511 Ohlone Parkway Location: Elevation: Date: August 10, 2016 Method of Drilling: 12 inch backhoe bucket Logged By: AP (1) $\frac{1}{10}$ \frac	
Date: August 10, 2016 Method of Drilling: 12 inch backhoe bucket Logged By: AP (1) 0 2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample Bluk Sample 100 J (s) 110 J (s) 12 minor 0 1 10 J 1 10 J 10 J </td <td></td>	
(1) 100 1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ther Tests
FILL Soil, vegetation, metal debris, wood planks, gravel (debris). FILL Brown clayey SAND, loose, some gravel.	R-Value
FILL Brown clayey SAND, loose, some gravel.	
CH CH Black-tan FAT CLAY (native). Black-tan FAT CLAY (native).	
BUTANO GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC.	FIGURE B-21

				LOG OF	EXPLORATORY	BOR	NG							
Proje Proje Date Logg	ect No. ect: : ged By	:	16- 511 Au; AP	135-SC l Ohlone Parkway gust 10, 2016	Boring: Location: Elevation: Method of Drilli	ing:	T5 12 in	ch back	choe b	ucket				
h (ft.)	Type	turbed	ılk	2" Ring Sample Sample	Bulk Sample	: / Foot	60	sity (pcf)	Content (%)	on Index	Comp. (psf)	le Size	Other	Tests
Dept	Soil	Undis	Bı	$\prod_{\text{Spoon Sample}} \text{Ierzaghi Split} \qquad \qquad$	Water	Blows	Z	Dry Den	Moisture C	Expansi	Unconfined	Partic	R-Value	
	FILL			Loose soil, vegetation, gravel, tires, n concrete rubble, fabric, rope, rubber i (debris).	netal debris, inner tubes									
-15 -15 -20 -20 -20 -25 -30 -30 -30 -35			CH I	Olive-brown	FAT CLAY (native).									
				BUTANO GEOTEC	CHNICAL ENGINEER	ING, IN	C.						FIG B-	URE 22

			_		LOG OF EXE	PLORATORY	BORI	NG							
Projec Projec	et No. et:	:	16- 511	135-SC Ohlone Parkway		Boring: Location: Elevation:		T6 Belov	w T2, o	bserva	ation o	f conta	ct		
Date: Logge	d By	:	Au AP	gust 10, 2016		Method of Drillin	ng:	12 in	ch back	thoe b	ucket				
ft.)	'pe	rbed		2" Ring Sample	2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	Foot		y (pcf)	itent (%)	Index	omp. (psf)	Size	Other	Tests
Depth (Soil T ₃	Undistu	Bulk	Terzaghi Spli Spoon Sampl	t Static Water Table		Blows /	N_{60}	Dry Densit	Moisture Cor	Expansion	Unconfined C	Particle	R-Value	
F - 5-	FILL			Loose soil, vegetation, concrete rubble, fabric, (debris).	gravel, tires, metal rope, rubber inner	debris, tubes									
			CH		Black-brown FAT	CLAY (native).									
				BUTA	NO GEOTECHNIC	CAL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	C.						FIG B-	URE 23

				LOG OF	EXP	LORATORY	BORI	ING							
Proj	ect No	.:	16-	135-SC		Boring:		T7							
Proj	ect:		511	l Ohlone Parkway		Location:		Belov	w T5, o	bserva	ation o	f conta	ct		
Date	:		Au	gust 10, 2016		Method of Drillin	ıg:	12 in	ch back	choe b	ucket				
Log	ged By	:	AP	1				1		1	1	1	1		
ft.)	be	bed		2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample		Bulk Sample	Goot		y (pcf)	itent (%)	Index	omp. (psf)	Size	Other	· Tests
Depth (Soil Ty	Undistur	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Σ Static Table Description	Water		Blows / I	N ₆₀	Dry Density	Moisture Con	Expansion	Unconfined Co	Particle 3	R-Value	
 - 5 - 10- 	FILL			Loose soil, vegetation, gravel, tires, r concrete rubble, fabric, rope, rubber (debris).	metal d inner t	lebris, ubes									
 -15-		СН		Black-brown	FAT CI	LAY (native).									
20- 20- 25- 				Debris from trench.											
				BUTANO GEOTEC	CHNIC	AL ENGINEERIN	NG, IN	C.						FIG B-	URE 24

				L	OG OF EXP	LORATORY I	BORI	NG							
Proj Proj Date	ect No. ect: e:	.:	16- 511 Ац	135-SC Ohlone Parkway gust 10, 2016		Boring: Location: Elevation: Method of Drillin	g:	T8 12 ine	ch back	choe b	ucket				
ť.)	ed Dy	bed .		2" Ring Sample Sar	" Ring nple	Bulk Sample	oot		/ (pcf)	tent (%)	Index	mp. (psf)	ize	Other	Tests
Depth (f	Soil Ty _l	Undisturl	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample	Static Water Table		Blows / F	N ₆₀	Dry Density	Moisture Con	Expansion	Unconfined Co	Particle S	R-Value	
	FILL			Loose soil, vegetation, grav	vel, concrete rub	ble (FILL).									
	1			^											
-5-			CH		Black-brown F	AT CLAY (native).									
				BUTANO	GEOTECHNIC	CAL ENGINEERIN	IG, IN	С.		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I	FIG B-	URE 25

LOG OF EXPLORATORY BORING																
Proj Proj	ect No	.:	16-135-SC			Boring:	Т9									
rioj			511 Onione Faikway			Elevation:										
Date: Logged By:		August 10, 2016 AP			Method of Drillir	ng:	12 inch backhoe bucket									
Depth (ft.)	Soil Type	bed		2" Ring Sample	$\sum_{a}^{2.5}$	5" Ring mple	Bulk Sample	Blows / Foot		/ (pcf)	tent (%)	Index	mp. (psf)	bize	Other	Tests
		Undistur	Bulk	Terzagh Spoon S	ghi Split Sample	∑ Static Water Table			N_{60}	Dry Density	Ioisture Con	Expansion 1	confined Co	Particle S	R-Value	
					I	Description					N		'n			
	СН			≤ 6" loose sand, g stiff black FAT Cl	ravel, de LAY (na	ebris (FILL) over utive).										
	BUTANO GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC.											FIG	URE 26			
											-5					

LOG OF EXPLORATORY BORING														
Project No.: Project:		.:	16-135-SC 511 Ohlone Parkway		Boring: Location: Elevation:		T10							
Date: Logged By:		:	Au AP	gust 10, 2016	Method of Drilling:		12 inch backhoe bucket							
ft.)	be	bed		2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample	Bulk Sample	oot		y (pcf)	tent (%)	Index	omp. (psf)	Size	Other	Tests
Depth (1	Soil Ty	Undistur	Bulk	Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Description		Blows / H	N_{60}	Dry Density	Moisture Con	Expansion	Unconfined Co	Particle S	R-Value	
	FILL			Loose soil, vegetation, gravel, concrete ru asphalt rubble, rubber innertubes, corruga (debris).	ibble, ited pipe									
- 5 -	FILL			Loose silty SAND with gravel.										
				Trenching terminated at a depth of approx 8 feet.										
-30- -35- 				Debris from trench. BUTANO GEOTECHNI	ICAL ENGINEERII	NG, IN	С.						FIG B-	URE 27

LOG OF EXPLORATORY BORING																										
Projec	ct No.	:	16-135-SC			Boring: T11																				
Projec	Project:		511 Ohlone Parkway		Location: Elevation:																					
Date: Logged By:		:	August 10, 2016 AP		Method of Drilling:		12 inch backhoe bucket																			
t.)	Soil Type	bed	Bulk	Bulk	Bulk										2" Ring Sample 2.5" Ring Sample		Bulk Sample	oot		(pcf)	ent (%)	ndex	mp. (psf)	ize	Other	Tests
Depth (f		Undisturb				Terzaghi Split Spoon Sample Spoor Sample	Static Water Table		Blows / H	N_{60}	Dry Density	Moisture Cont	Expansion I	Unconfined Cor	Particle S.	R-Value										
	CL/ CH			≤ 6" loose sand, gravel, debris (l brown sandy LEAN CLAY with black FAT CLAY (native).	FILL) over organics (r	native) over																				
-5-																										
BUTANO GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC.											FIG B-	URE 28														


























MILLER PACIFIC Engineering group

APPENDIX B: SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES RESULTS



Slope Stability Analysis

We analyzed various cross sections throughout the planned project site as shown on Figures 1 through 7 of this section. Two of the five sections analyzed, the MSE Wall Section and Section B, consisted of placing significant portions of fill on the existing grades. The remaining sections either involved cutting soil away from the slopes or adding minor amounts of fill. Therefore, we performed slope stability analyses on the MSE Sections and Section B utilizing the slope stability software SLIDE developed by Rocscience. Section B also includes a 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) above the five foot terraced retaining walls. Therefore, 2 stability analyses were performed on this section, a global analysis and an analysis focused on the 2:1 slope.

Slope stability analyses results indicate a factor of safety against soil movement. Under static conditions a factor of Safety above 1.5 is considered appropriate. Under seismic conditions, a factor of safety less than 1.0 indicates some movement may be observed during a strong seismic event. We utilized the procedures outlined by Bray and Travasarou, 2007 to determine the amount of deformation. The results of our slope stability and slope deformation analyses are presented in the following pages and summarized below:

	Static F.S.	<u>Seismic F.S.</u>	Seismic Deformation ¹
Section B (Global)	2.00	0.75	~4 – 8-in
Section B (2:1)	3.37	1.30	0.0-in (F.S. > 1.0)
Section MSE Wall	1.75	0.66	~6 – 12-in

Notes:

1. Predicted deformations are distributed throughout the landslide mass.



















SECTION B

Simplified Procedure for Estimating Earthquake Induced Deviatoric Slope Displacements

by Jonathan D. Bray and Thaleia Travasarou Journal of Geotechnical and Geonvironmental Engineering, ASCE, V. 133(4), pp. 381-392, April 2007

SEE NOTES BELOW FOR GUIDANCE IN THE USE OF SPREADSHEET

Input Parameters				
Yield Coefficient (ky)	0.260		Based on pseudostatic analysis	
Initial Fundamental Period (Ts)	I Fundamental Period (Ts) 0.10 se			
Degraded Period (1.5Ts)	0.15	seconds		
Moment Magnitude (Mw)	8.0			
Spectral Acceleration (Sa(1.5Ts))	1.5	g	Input the Spectral Acceleration at the	
		-	base of the sliding mass assuming	
Additional Input Parameters			there is no material above it.	
Probability of Exceedance #1 (P1)	84	%		
Probability of Exceedance #2 (P2)	50	%		
Probability of Exceedance #3 (P3)	16	%		
Displacement Threshold (d_threshold)	2.54	cm		
Intermediate Calculated Parameters		1		
Non-Zero Seismic Displacement Est (D)	30.55	cm	eq. (5) or (6)	
Standard Deviation of Non-Zero Seismic D	0.66			
		r		
Results				
Probability of Negligible Displ. (P(D=0))	0.00		eq. (3)	
D1	15.8	cm	calc. using eq. (7)	
D2	30.5	cm	calc. using eq. (7)	
D3	58.9	cm	calc. using eq. (7)	
P(D>d_threshold)	1.00		eq. (7)	
Notes				

1. Values highlighted in blue are input parameters, and results are presented in the table with the yellow heading.

2. Probability of Exceedance is the desired probability of exceeding a particular displacement value.

3. Displacements D1, D2, and D3 correspond to P1, P2, and P3, respectively.

(e.g., the probability of exceeding displacement D1 is P1)

4. The 16%, 50%, and 84% percentile displacement values at selected ky values are shown to the right.

5. Calculated seismic displacements are due to deviatoric deformation only (add in volumetrically induced movement).

6. ky may range between 0.01 and 0.5, Ts between 0 and 2 s, Sa between 0.002 and 2.7 g, M between 4.5 and 8

7. Rigid slope is assumed for Ts < 0.05 s, i.e. Ts = 0.0. If Ts is just less than 0.05 s, set Ts = 0.050 s

8. When a value for D is not calculated, D is < 1cm

9. ky should be estimated with a slope stability program; the simplified equations shown below provide approximate values.

10. Examples of how Ts is estimated are shown below.

11. Vs = weighted avg. shear wave velocity for the sliding mass, e.g., for 2 layers, Vs = [(h1)(Vs1) + (h2)(Vs2)]/(h1 + h2)

Simplified Procedure for Estimating Earthquake Induced Deviatoric Slope Displacements by Jonathan D. Bray and Thaleia Travasarou Journal of Geotechnical and Geonvironmental Engineering, Vol 133, No. 4, pp. 381-392, April 2007

MSE WALL SECTION

Simplified Procedure for Estimating Earthquake Induced Deviatoric Slope Displacements

by Jonathan D. Bray and Thaleia Travasarou Journal of Geotechnical and Geonvironmental Engineering, ASCE, V. 133(4), pp. 381-392, April 2007

SEE NOTES BELOW FOR GUIDANCE IN THE USE OF SPREADSHEET

Input Parameters			
Yield Coefficient (ky)	0.260		Based on pseudostatic analysis
Initial Fundamental Period (Ts)	seconds	1D: Ts=4H/Vs 2D: Ts=2.6H/Vs	
Degraded Period (1.5Ts)	0.11	seconds	
Moment Magnitude (Mw)	8.0		
Spectral Acceleration (Sa(1.5Ts))	1.25	g	Input the Spectral Acceleration at the
			base of the sliding mass assuming
Additional Input Parameters			there is no material above it.
Probability of Exceedance #1 (P1)	84	%	
Probability of Exceedance #2 (P2)	50	%	
Probability of Exceedance #3 (P3)	16	%	
Displacement Threshold (d_threshold)	2.54	cm	
Intermediate Calculated Parameters		1	
Non-Zero Seismic Displacement Est (D)	19.98	cm	eq. (5) or (6)
Standard Deviation of Non-Zero Seismic D	0.66		
Results			
Probability of Negligible Displ. (P(D=0))	0.00		eq. (3)
D1	10.4	cm	calc. using eq. (7)
D2	20.0	cm	calc. using eq. (7)
D3	38.5	cm	calc. using eq. (7)
P(D>d_threshold)	1.00		eq. (7)
Notes			

1. Values highlighted in blue are input parameters, and results are presented in the table with the yellow heading.

2. Probability of Exceedance is the desired probability of exceeding a particular displacement value.

3. Displacements D1, D2, and D3 correspond to P1, P2, and P3, respectively.

(e.g., the probability of exceeding displacement D1 is P1)

4. The 16%, 50%, and 84% percentile displacement values at selected ky values are shown to the right.

5. Calculated seismic displacements are due to deviatoric deformation only (add in volumetrically induced movement).

6. ky may range between 0.01 and 0.5, Ts between 0 and 2 s, Sa between 0.002 and 2.7 g, M between 4.5 and 8

7. Rigid slope is assumed for Ts < 0.05 s, i.e. Ts = 0.0. If Ts is just less than 0.05 s, set Ts = 0.050 s

8. When a value for D is not calculated, D is < 1cm

9. ky should be estimated with a slope stability program; the simplified equations shown below provide approximate values.

10. Examples of how Ts is estimated are shown below.

11. Vs = weighted avg. shear wave velocity for the sliding mass, e.g., for 2 layers, Vs = [(h1)(Vs1) + (h2)(Vs2)]/(h1 + h2)

Simplified Procedure for Estimating Earthquake Induced Deviatoric Slope Displacements by Jonathan D. Bray and Thaleia Travasarou *Journal of Geotechnical and Geonvironmental Engineering, Vol 133, No. 4, pp. 381-392, April 2007*



APPENDIX C: RISK TARGETED MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE (MCE_R) GROUND MOTION HAZARD ANALYSIS

Due to the presence of sandy soil layers beneath the building site that are prone to liquefaction, we judge the site should be classified as "Site Class F" per the 2019 California Building Code. However, per section 20.3.1 of the ASCE 7-16, an equivalent linear site-specific response analysis (i.e., SHAKE, DeepSoil, etc.) is not required if the proposed structure has a fundamental period of less than 0.5 seconds. We anticipate the proposed structures will have fundamental periods less than 0.5-seconds; therefore, based on the harmonic mean of the blow counts we recommend classifying the site as a "Site Class D".

The ASCE 7-16 mapped spectral acceleration parameters at a period of 0.2-second, S_s , and 1.0-second, S_1 , at the project site are 2.47 g and 0.94 g, respectively. Per ASCE 7-16 Table 11.4-1 a Site-Specific Ground Motion shall be developed per Section 11.4.8 for S_s values greater than 1.0 g for Site Class E sites and all cases for Site Class F sites. Additionally, a Site-Specific Ground Motion Hazard Analysis shall be performed per ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.8 if the S₁ value is greater than 0.2 g for Site Class D, greater than 1.0 g for Site Class E, and all cases for Site Class F. Therefore, per ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.8, we performed a Site-Specific Ground Motion Hazard Analysis per ASCE 7-16 Section 21.2, as described in the sections below.

Probabilistic (MCE_R) Ground Motions: Method 1

A probabilistic acceleration response spectrum, corresponding to a 2% chance of exceedance in 50-years (2,475 return period) was generated utilizing the United States Geologic Survey (USGS) online Unified Hazard Tool (https://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/interactive/, accessed 2019) for a Site Class D soil profile ($V_{S30} = 270$ m/s) an the Dynamic: Conterminous U.S. 2014 (v4.2.0) model. The accelerations given were modified by the risk coefficients C_{RS} and C_{R1}, 0.93 and 0.90, respectively. The accelerations were further converted to the probabilistic spectral response acceleration in the maximum horizontal response utilizing the procedures outlined by in ASCE 7-16. These modifications to the probabilistic spectra correspond to a response with a risk targeted level of 1% probability of collapse within a 50-year period. The resulting probabilistic MCE_R values and spectra are presented on Figures C-1 and C-2, respectively.

Deterministic (MCE_R) Ground Motions

A deterministic acceleration response spectrum was generated utilizing the NGA attenuation models outlined by Abrahamson, Silva & Kamai (2014); Boore, Stewart, Seyhan & Atkinson (2014); Campbell & Borzognia (2014); and Chiou & Youngs (2014) NGA2 West models for a Site Class D ($V_{S30} = 270$ m/s). The geometric average of the 84th percentile spectral accelerations from the aforementioned attenuation relationships were modified for the probabilistic spectral response acceleration in the maximum horizontal direction, utilizing the procedures outlined in ASCE 7-16. The resulting deterministic MCE_R values and spectra are shown on Figures C-1 and C-2, respectively. The deterministic MCE_R spectra shall not be less than the Lower Limit Deterministic MCE_R Response Spectrum, as described in ASCE 7-16 Figure 21.2-1 which is tabulated and plotted on Figures C-1 and C-2, respectively.

MILLER PACIFIC Engineering group

Site Specific MCE_R

The site specific MCE_R spectral response acceleration at any period shall be taken as the lesser of the response accelerations from the probabilistic ground motions and the deterministic ground motions and is presented on Figure C-3. Additionally, per ASCE 7-16 Section 21.3, the design spectral response acceleration at any period is equal to $2/3^{rds}$ the MCE_R Response Spectrum, as shown on Figure C-3.

Per ASCE 7-16 Section 21.4, the MCE_R spectral response acceleration parameters shall be taken from the Site-Specific Spectrum defined as follows and are presented on Figure C-3:

- S_{DS} The S_{DS} parameter shall be taken as 90% of the maximum spectral acceleration, S_a, obtained from the site-specific spectrum, at any period between 0.2 and 5.0seconds. However, the values obtained shall not be less than 80% of the values determined in accordance with ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.5.
- S_{D1} The S_{D1} parameter shall be taken as the maximum value of the product, TS_a, for periods between 1.0 and 2.0-seconds for Site Class C and B sites; and periods between 1.0 and 5.0-seconds for Site Class D, E & F sites. However, the values obtained shall not be less than 80% of the values determined in accordance with ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.5.
- S_{MS} The S_{MS} parameter is equal to 1.5 times the S_{DS} value, but not less than 80% of the values determined in accordance with ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.4.
- S_{M1} The S_{M1} parameter is equal to 1.5 times the S_{D1} value, but not less than 80% of the values determined in accordance with ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.4.

ASCE 7-16 SITE SPECIFIC RISK-TARGETED MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE (MCE_R)

Project Name: Hillcrest Residential Development Project Numb: 1680.023

General Seismic Parameters ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4		Mir	Minimum Design Spectra Parameters ASCE 7-16 Section 21.3				ICE Screening up #1) 21.2.3	Min. Determi ASCE 7-16 (Su	Min. Deterministic MCE ASCE 7-16 (Sup #1) 21.2.2		
Site Class:	D	Site Class:	D	S _{MS} (g):	2.47	Fa:	1.00	Fa:	1.00		
S _S (g):	2.47	S _S (g):	2.47	S _{M1} (g):	2.35	1.2 x Fa (g):	1.20	1.5 x Fa (g):	1.50		
S ₁ (g):	0.94	S ₁ (g):	0.94	S _{DS} (g):	1.65	Max PSHA (g):	2.79	Max DSHA (g):	2.10		
F _a :	1.20	F _a :	1.00	S _{D1} (g):	1.57	DSHA Rqd.:	YES	Min MCE Rqd.:	NO		
F _v :	N/A	F _v :	2.50	T ₀ (sec):	0.19						
T _L (sec):	12.0			T _S (sec):	0.95						
C _{RS} :	0.93										
C _{R1} :	0.90										

Probabilistic MCE ASCE 7-16 Section 21.2.1 - Method 1						Determir NGA West2 201	Scaled Determ ASCE 7-16 (Su	Scaled Deterministic MCE ASCE 7-16 (Sup #1) 21.2.2			
		Sa _{RotD100}						Sa _{RotD100}			
Period (sec)	Sa _{RotD50} (g)	Sa _{RotD50}	Sa _{RotD100} (g)	C _R	Sa (g)	Period (sec	c) Sa _{RotD50} (g)	Sa _{RotD50}	Sa _{RotD100} (g)	Period (sec)	Sa (g)
0.01	1.04	1.10	1.15	0.931	1.07	0.01	0.73	1.10	0.81	0.01	0.58
0.10	1.76	1.10	1.94	0.931	1.81	0.02	0.74	1.10	0.81	0.02	0.58
0.20	2.28	1.10	2.51	0.931	2.33	0.03	0.75	1.10	0.82	0.03	0.59
0.30	2.57	1.13	2.89	0.928	2.68	0.05	0.82	1.10	0.90	0.05	0.64
0.50	2.58	1.18	3.03	0.921	2.79	0.08	0.97	1.10	1.06	0.08	0.76
0.75	2.19	1.24	2.71	0.912	2.47	0.10	1.12	1.10	1.23	0.10	0.88
1.00	1.87	1.30	2.43	0.903	2.19	0.15	1.35	1.10	1.48	0.15	1.06
2.00	1.10	1.35	1.48	0.903	1.34	0.20	1.51	1.10	1.67	0.20	1.19
3.00	0.75	1.40	1.05	0.903	0.95	0.25	1.66	1.11	1.85	0.25	1.32
4.00	0.54	1.45	0.79	0.903	0.71	0.30	1.77	1.13	1.99	0.30	1.42
5.00	0.42	1.50	0.63	0.903	0.57	0.40	1.83	1.15	2.10	0.40	1.50
						0.50	1.78	1.18	2.09	0.50	1.49
						0.75	1.49	1.24	1.85	0.75	1.32
						1.00	1.26	1.30	1.64	1.00	1.17
						1.50	0.88	1.33	1.17	1.50	0.83
						2.00	0.65	1.35	0.88	2.00	0.63
						3.00	0.41	1.40	0.57	3.00	0.41
						4.00	0.27	1.45	0.38	4.00	0.27
						5.00	0.18	1.50	0.27	5.00	0.20
						7.50	0.08	1.50	0.12	7.50	0.09
						10.00	0.04	1.50	0.07	10.00	0.05

Site Specifi ASCE 7-16 Se	ic MCE _R ction 21.2.3	Site-Specific Desi ASCE 7-16 Se	gn Spectrum ction 21.3		80% General Res ASCE 7-16 S	1% General Response Spectrum ASCE 7-16 Section 21.3					
Period (sec)	Sa (g)	Period (sec)	Sa (g)	Peric	d (sec) Sa	(g) 80% S	ia (g)				
0.01	0.81	0.01	0.54	C	.01 0.1	71 0.5	57				
0.02	0.81	0.02	0.54	C	.04 0.8	37 0.6	9				
0.03	0.82	0.03	0.55	C	.07 1.0	02 0.8	2				
0.05	0.90	0.05	0.60	C	.10 1.	18 0.9	14				
0.08	1.06	0.08	0.71	C	.13 1.:	34 1.0	17				
0.10	1.23	0.10	0.82	C	.16 1.4	19 1.1	9				
0.15	1.48	0.15	0.99	T _O = 0	.19 1.	65 1.3	2				
0.20	1.67	0.20	1.11	T _S = 0	.95 1.0	65 1.3	2				
0.25	1.85	0.25	1.23	1	.26 1.:	24 0.9	19				
0.30	1.99	0.30	1.33	1	.57 1.0	3.0 0.0	0				
0.40	2.10	0.40	1.40	1	.89 0.8	33 0.6	57				
0.50	2.09	0.50	1.39	2	.20 0.1	71 0.5	57				
0.75	1.85	0.75	1.23	2	.51 0.0	63 0.5	i0				
1.00	1.64	1.00	1.09	2	.82 0.4	56 0.4	4				
1.50	1.17	1.50	0.78	3	.13 0.:	50 0.4	0				
2.00	0.88	2.00	0.58	3	.44 0.4	46 0.3	6				
3.00	0.57	3.00	0.38	3	.75 0.4	42 0.3	3				
4.00	0.38	4.00	0.26	4	.07 0.:	39 0.3	:1				
5.00	0.27	5.00	0.18	4	.38 0.:	36 0.2	9				
7.50	0.12	7.50	0.08	4	.69 0.:	33 0.2	.7				
10.00	0.07	10.00	0.04	5	.00 0.:	31 0.2	5				
MPEG			504 Redw	ood Blvd.							
		ACIFIC	Suite 220 Novato, CA 94947		ASCE 7-16 MCEr CALCULATIONS						
					Hillcrest Residential Subdivision						╗
	INTERIN	u ukuur	T 415/38	32-3444	Watsonville California					()_1	
	ATION @ 2019 ALL	RIGHTS RESERVED	F 415/38	2-3450							
FILE: 1680.023 AppB.dwg	ALL		www.mille	rpac.com	Project No.	2914.001	Date:	1/08/21		FIGURE	

Latitude: 36.9105 Longitude: -121.7719



