Geotechnical Engineering Investigation

Proposed Industrial Warehouse Development
5006 and 5010 Mission Boulevard
Montclair, California

Don Julian Investment LLC
138 N. Glendora Avenue
Glendora, California 91741

Attn: Mr. Cary Niu

Project Number 22409-21
March 31, 2021

NorCal Engineering

NorCal Engineering
Soils and Geotechnical Consultants
10641 Humbolt Street Los Alamitos, CA 90720
(562) 799-9469 Fax (562) 799-9459

March 31, 2021 Project Number 22409-21

Don Julian Investment LLC
138 N. Glendora Avenue
Glendora, California 91741

Attn: Mr. Cary Niu

RE: **Geotechnical Engineering Investigation** - Proposed Industrial Warehouse Development - Located at 5006 and 5010 Mission Boulevard, in the City of Montclair, California

Dear Mr. Niu:

Pursuant to your request, this firm has performed a Geotechnical Engineering Investigation for the above referenced project in accordance with your approval of our proposal dated February 26, 2021. The purpose of this investigation is to evaluate the geotechnical conditions of the subject site and to provide recommendations for the proposed industrial warehouse development.

The scope of work included the following: 1) site reconnaissance; 2) subsurface geotechnical exploration and sampling; 3) laboratory testing; 4) soil infiltration testing; 5) engineering analysis of field and laboratory data; 5) preparation of a geotechnical engineering report. It is the opinion of this firm that the proposed development is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint provided that the recommendations presented in this report are followed in the design and construction of the project.

1.0 Project Description

It is proposed to construct an industrial warehouse development consisting of 125,000 square feet building on the 5.12-acre property. The proposed concrete tilt-up building will be supported by a conventional slab-on-grade foundation system with perimeter-spread footings and isolated interior footings. Other improvements will include asphalt and concrete pavement areas, hardscape and landscaping. It is assumed that the proposed grading for the development will include cut and fill procedures on the order of a few feet to achieve finished grade elevations. Final building plans shall be reviewed by this firm prior to submittal for city approval to determine the need for any additional study and revised recommendations pertinent to the proposed development, if necessary.

2.0 Site Description

The subject property is located within the 5000 block and north side of Mission Boulevard, in the City of Montclair. The generally rectangular-shaped parcel is elongated in an east to west direction with topography of the relatively level property descending slightly from a north to south direction on the order of a few feet. The western half of the site is an undeveloped parcel covered with a moderate growth of natural grasses and weeds. The eastern half of the property is occupied by an abandoned building with surrounding asphalt pavement.

3.0 Site Exploration

The investigation consisted of the placement of seven (7) subsurface exploratory borings by a truck mounted hollow stem auger to depths ranging between 7 and 20 feet below current ground elevations. The borings were placed at accessible locations throughout the property. The explorations were visually classified and logged by a field engineer with locations of the subsurface explorations shown on the attached plan.

The exploratory borings revealed the existing earth materials to consist of fill and natural soil. Detailed descriptions of the subsurface conditions are listed on the boring logs in Appendix A. It should be noted that the transition from one soil type to another as shown on the boring logs is approximate and may in fact be a gradual transition. The soils encountered are described as follows:

Fill: A fill soil classifying as a brown, fine to coarse grained, silty SAND with was encountered across the site to depths ranging from 1 to 3.5 feet below ground surface. These soils were noted to be loose to medium dense and moist.

Natural: A natural undisturbed soil classifying as a brown, fine to coarse grained, silty SAND with occasional gravel and cobble was encountered beneath the upper fill soils. These native soils were observed to be medium dense and damp to moist. Deeper soils were classified as a sandy SILT to gravelly sand which were noted to be firm to stiff/ dense and moist.

The overall engineering characteristics of the earth material were relatively uniform with each excavation. Groundwater was not encountered to the depth of our borings and slight caving occurred in the deeper cohesionless soils.

4.0 Laboratory Tests

Relatively undisturbed samples of the subsurface soils were obtained to perform laboratory testing and analysis for direct shear, consolidation tests, and to determine in-place moisture/densities. These relatively undisturbed ring samples were obtained by driving a thin-walled steel sampler lined with one-inch long brass rings with an inside diameter of 2.42 inches into the undisturbed soils. Bulk bag samples were obtained in the upper soils for expansion index tests and maximum density tests. All test results are included in Appendix B, unless otherwise noted.

4.1 **Field Moisture Content** (ASTM: D 2216) and the dry density of the ring samples were determined in the laboratory. This data is listed on the logs of explorations.

4.2 **Maximum Density tests** (ASTM: D 1557) were performed on typical samples of the upper soils. Results of these tests are shown on Table I.

4.3 **Expansion Index tests** (ASTM: D 4829) were performed on remolded samples of the upper soils to determine expansive characteristics. Results of these tests are provided on Table II.

4.4 **Corrosion tests** consisting of sulfate, pH, resistivity and chloride analysis to determine potential corrosive effects of soils on concrete and underground utilities. Test results are provided on Table III.

4.5 **R-Value test** per California Test Method 301 was performed on a representative sample, which may be anticipated to be near subgrade to determine pavement design. Results are provided within the pavement design section of the report.

4.6 **Direct Shear tests** (ASTM: D 3080) were performed on undisturbed and/or remolded samples of the subsurface soils. The test is performed under saturated conditions at loads of 1,000 lbs./sq.ft., 2,000 lbs./sq.ft., and 3,000 lbs./sq.ft. with results shown on Plate A.

4.7 **Consolidation tests** (ASTM: D 2435) were performed on undisturbed samples to determine the differential and total settlement which may be anticipated based upon the proposed loads. Water was added to the samples at a surcharge of one KSF and the settlement curves are plotted on Plates B and C.

5.0 Seismicity Evaluation

The proposed development lies outside of any Alquist Priolo Special Studies Zone and the potential for damage due to direct fault rupture is considered unlikely. The nearest fault is located about 4 kilometers from the site and is capable of producing a Magnitude 7.0 earthquake. Ground shaking originating from earthquakes along other active faults in the region is expected to induce lower horizontal accelerations due to smaller anticipated earthquakes and/or greater distances to other faults.

The seismic design parameters are provided on the following page and are based on the 2019 California Building Code (CBC) Standard ASCE/SEI 7-16. The data was obtained from the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) website, https://asce7hazardtool.online/. The ASCE 7 Hazards Report is attached in Appendix C.

Seismic Design Acceleration Parameters

Latitude	34.056
Longitude	-117.696
Site Class	D
Risk Category	III
Mapped Spectral Response Acceleration	S_S = 1.608 S_1 = 0.600
Adjusted Maximum Acceleration	S_{MS} = 1.608
Design Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters	S_{DS} = 1.072
Peak Ground Acceleration	PGA_M = 0.721

6.0 Liquefaction Evaluation

The site is expected to experience ground shaking and earthquake activity that is typical of the Southern California area. It is during severe shaking that loose, granular soils below the groundwater table can liquefy. Based on review of the *County of San Bernardino County Land Use Plan – General Plan – Geologic Hazard Overlays (2009)*, the site lies outside a zone of "Suspected Liquefaction Susceptibility". Based on review of local groundwater maps, the depth of groundwater is in excess of 350 feet (Carson & Matti 1982). Thus, the design of the proposed construction in conformance with the latest Building Code provisions for earthquake design is expected to provide mitigation of ground shaking hazards that are typical to Southern California.

7.0 Infiltration Characteristics

Infiltration tests within the site were performed to provide preliminary infiltration rates for the purpose of planning and design of an on-site water disposal system. A truck mounted Simco 2800 Drill Rig equipped with a hollow stem auger was used to excavate the exploratory borings to a depth of 15 feet below existing ground surface. The borings consisted of six-inch diameter test holes. A three-inch diameter perforated PVC casing with solid end cap was installed in the borings and then surrounded with gravel materials to prevent caving.

The infiltration holes were carefully filled with clean water and refilled after two initial readings. Based upon the initial rates of infiltration at each location, test measurements were measured at selected maximum intervals thereafter. Measurements were obtained by using an electronic tape measure with 1/16-inch divisions and timed with a stopwatch. The field infiltration rate was computed using a reduction factor – R_f based on the field measurements with our calculations given in Appendix D. Based upon the results of our testing, the soils encountered in the planned on-site drainage disposal system area exhibit the following infiltration rates.

Boring/Test No.	Depth	Soil Classification	Field Infiltration Rate	Design Rate
T-1/TH-1	15'	Sandy SILT	~11.2'/Day 5.6 in/hr	2.8 in/hr
T-2/TH-2	15'	Sandy SILT	5.2 in/hr	2.6 in/hr

5.6'/day

The correction factors CF_t, CF_v and CF_s are given below based on soils at 15 feet from our field tests.

a) $CF_t = R_f = 27.75$ to 31.88 for our two infiltration test holes.

b) $CF_v = 1.0$ based on uniform soils encountered in two borings for infiltration tests.

c) $CF_s = 2.0$ for long-term siltation, plugging and maintenance. The subsurface soils are likely to have some plugging and regular maintenance of storm water discharge devices is required.

Based on the results of our field testing, the subsurface soils encountered in the proposed on-site drainage disposal system shall utilize the design infiltration rates based on the safety factor required by the county standard. All systems must meet the latest city and/or county specifications and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) requirements. A review of the groundwater maps of the Upper Santa Ana River Basin (Carson and Matti, 1982) reveals a groundwater depth in excess of 350 feet.

MZ 1 of Chino Basin

It is recommended that foundations shall be setback a minimum distance of 10 feet from the drainage disposal system and the bottom of footing shall be a minimum of 10 feet from the expected zone of saturation. The boundary of the zone of saturation may be assumed to project downward from the top of the permeable portion of the disposal system at an inclination of 1 to 1 or flatter, as determined by the geotechnical engineer.

8.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

Based upon our evaluations, the proposed development is acceptable from a geotechnical engineering standpoint. By following the recommendations and guidelines set forth in our report, the structures will be safe from excessive settlements under the anticipated design loadings and conditions. The proposed development shall meet all requirements of the City Building Ordinance and will not impose any adverse effect on existing adjacent structures.

The following recommendations are based upon soil conditions encountered in our field investigation; these near-surface soil conditions could vary across the site. Variations in the soil conditions may not become evident until the commencement of grading operations for the proposed development and revised recommendations from the geotechnical engineer may be necessary based upon the conditions encountered. It is recommended that site inspections be performed by a representative of this firm during all grading and construction of the development to verify the findings and recommendations documented in this report. Any unusual conditions which may be encountered in the course of the project development may require the need for additional study and revised recommendations.

8.1 Site Grading Recommendations

Any vegetation and/or demolition debris shall be removed and hauled from proposed grading areas prior to the start of grading operations. Existing vegetation shall not be mixed or disced into the soils. Any removed soils may be reutilized as compacted fill once any deleterious material or oversized materials (in excess of eight inches) is removed. Grading operations shall be performed in accordance with the attached *Specifications for Placement of Compacted Fill.*

8.1.1 Removal and Recompaction Recommendations

All disturbed soils and/or fill (about 1 to 3.5 feet below ground surface) shall be removed to competent native material, the exposed surface scarified to a depth of 12 inches, brought to within 2% of optimum moisture content and compacted to a minimum of 90% of the laboratory standard (ASTM: D-1557) prior to placement of any additional compacted fill soils, foundations, slabs-on-grade and pavement. Grading shall extend a minimum of five horizontal feet outside the edges of foundations or equidistant to the depth of fill placed, whichever is greater.

It is possible that isolated areas of undiscovered fill not described in this report are present on site; if found, these areas should be treated as discussed earlier. A diligent search shall also be conducted during grading operations in an effort to uncover any underground structures, irrigation or utility lines. If encountered, these structures and lines shall be either removed or properly abandoned prior to the proposed construction.

Any imported fill material should be preferably soil similar to the upper soils encountered at the subject site. All soils shall be approved by this firm prior to importing at the site and will be subjected to additional laboratory testing to assure concurrence with the recommendations stated in this report.

If placement of slabs-on-grade and pavement is not completed immediately upon completion of grading operations, additional testing and grading of the areas may be necessary prior to continuation of construction operations. Likewise, if adverse weather conditions occur which may damage the subgrade soils, additional assessment by the soils engineer as to the suitability of the supporting soils may be needed.

Care should be taken to provide or maintain adequate lateral support for all adjacent improvements and structures at all times during the grading operations and construction phase. Adequate drainage away from the structures, pavement and slopes should be provided at all times.

8.1.2 Fill Blanket Recommendations

Due to the potential for differential settlement of foundations placed on compacted fill and native materials, it is recommended that all foundations including floor slab areas be underlain by a uniform compacted fill blanket at least two feet in thickness. This fill blanket shall extend a minimum of five horizontal feet outside the edges of foundations or equidistant to the depth of fill placed, whichever is greater.

8.2 Shrinkage and Subsidence

Results of our in-place density tests reveal that the soil shrinkage will be on the order of 10 to 15% due to excavation and recompaction, based upon the assumption that the fill is compacted to 92% of the maximum dry density per ASTM standards. Subsidence should be 0.2 feet die to earthwork operations. The volume change does not include any allowance for vegetation or organic stripping, removal of subsurface improvements, or topographic approximations. Although these values are only approximate, they represent our best estimate of lost yardage, which will likely occur during grading. If more accurate shrinkage and subsidence factors are needed, it is recommended that field testing the actual equipment and grading techniques should be conducted.

8.3 Temporary Excavations

Temporary unsurcharged excavations in the existing site materials may be made at vertical inclinations up to 4 feet in height unless cohesionless soils are encountered. In areas where soils with little or no binder are encountered, where adverse geological conditions are exposed, or where excavations are adjacent to existing structures, shoring or flatter excavations may be required. The temporary cut slope gradients given above do not preclude local raveling and sloughing. All excavations shall be made in accordance with the requirements of the soils engineer, CAL-OSHA and other public agencies having jurisdiction. Care should be taken to provide or maintain adequate lateral support for all adjacent improvements and structures at all times during the grading operations and construction phase.

8.4 Foundation Design

All foundations may be designed utilizing the following allowable bearing capacities for an embedded depth of 18 inches into approved engineered fill with the corresponding widths:

Allowable Bearing Capacity (psf)		
Width (feet)	Continuous Foundation	Isolated Foundation
1.5	2000	2500
2.0	2075	2575
4.0	2375	2875
6.0	2500	3000

The bearing value may be increased by 500 psf for each additional foot of depth in excess of the 18-inch minimum depth, up to a maximum of 4,000 psf. A one-third increase may be used when considering short-term loading and seismic forces. Any foundations located along property line may utilize an allowable bearing capacity of 1,500 psf and embedded into competent native soils. A modulus of subgrade reaction (k) of 200 pci may be used for design of slabs placed on engineered fill soils supporting sustained concentrated loads. A representative of this firm shall inspect all foundation excavations prior to pouring concrete.

8.5 Settlement Analysis

Resultant pressure curves for the consolidation tests are shown on Plates B and C. Computations utilizing these curves and the recommended allowable soil bearing capacities reveal that the foundations will experience settlements on the order of ¾ inch and differential settlements of less than ¼ inch.

8.6 Lateral Resistance

The following values may be utilized in resisting lateral loads imposed on the structure. Requirements of the California Building Code should be adhered to when the coefficient of friction and passive pressures are combined.

Coefficient of Friction - 0.40
Equivalent Passive Fluid Pressure = 250 lbs./cu.ft.
Maximum Passive Pressure = 2,500 lbs./cu.ft.

The passive pressure recommendations are valid only for approved compacted fill soils or competent native materials.

8.7 Retaining Wall Design Parameters

Active earth pressures against retaining walls will be equal to the pressures developed by the following fluid densities. These values are for **granular backfill material** placed behind the walls at various ground slopes above the walls.

Surface Slope of Retained Materials (Horizontal to Vertical	Equivalent Fluid Density (lb./cu.ft.)
Level	30
5 to 1	35
4 to 1	38
3 to 1	40
2 to 1	45

Any applicable short-term construction surcharges and seismic forces should be added to the above lateral pressure values. An equivalent fluid pressure of 45 pcf may be utilized for the restrained wall condition with a level grade behind the wall.

The seismic-induced lateral soil pressure for walls greater than 6 feet may be computed using a triangular pressure distribution with the maximum value at the top of the wall. The maximum lateral pressure of (20 pcf) H where H is the height of the retained soils above the wall footing should be used in final design of retaining walls. Sliding resistance values and passive fluid pressure values may be increased by 1/3 during short-term wind and seismic loading conditions.

All walls shall be waterproofed as needed and protected from hydrostatic pressure by a reliable permanent subdrain system. The granular backfill to be utilized immediately adjacent to retaining walls shall consist of an approved select granular soil with a sand equivalency greater than 30. This backfill zone of free draining material shall consist of a wedge beginning a minimum of one horizontal foot from the base of the wall extending upward at an inclination of no less than ¾ to 1 (horizontal to vertical).

8.8 **Slab Design**

All concrete slabs shall be a minimum of six inches in thickness in the proposed warehouse areas and four inches in office and hardscape and placed on approved subgrade soils. Additional reinforcement requirements and an increase in thickness of the slabs-on-grade may be necessary based upon soils expansion potential and proposed loading conditions in the structures and should be evaluated further by the project engineers and/or architect.

A vapor retarder (10-mil minimum thickness) should be utilized in areas which would be sensitive to the infiltration of moisture. This retarder shall meet requirements of ASTM E 96, *Water Vapor Transmission of Materials* and ASTM E 1745, *Standard Specification for Water Vapor Retarders used in Contact with Soil or Granular Fill Under Concrete Slabs.* The vapor retarder shall be installed in accordance with procedures stated in ASTM E 1643, *Standard practice for Installation of Water Vapor Retarders used in Contact with Earth or Granular Fill Under Concrete Slabs.*

The moisture retarder may be placed directly upon compacted subgrade soils conditioned to near optimum moisture levels, although one to two inches of sand beneath the membrane is desirable. The subgrade upon which the retarder is placed shall be smooth and free of rocks, gravel or other protrusions which may damage the retarder. Use of sand above the retarder is under the purview of the structural engineer; if sand is used over the retarder, it should be placed in a dry condition.

8.9 **Pavement Section Design**

The table below provides a preliminary pavement design based upon an R-Value of 50 for the subgrade soils for the proposed pavement areas. Final pavement design may need to be based on R-Value testing of the subgrade soils near the conclusion of site grading to assure that these soils are consistent with those assumed in this preliminary design. The recommendations are based upon estimated traffic loads. *Client should submit any other anticipated traffic loadings to the geotechnical engineer, if necessary, so that pavement sections may be reviewed to determine adequacy to support the proposed loadings.*

Type of Traffic	Traffic Index	Asphalt (in.)	Base Material (in.)
Automobile Parking Stalls	4.0	3.0	3.0
Light Vehicle Circulation Areas	5.5	3.5	4.5
Heavy Truck Access Areas	7.0	4.0	8.0

Any concrete slab-on-grade in pavement areas shall be a minimum of six inches in thickness and may be placed on approved subgrade soils. All pavement areas shall have positive drainage toward an approved outlet from the site. Drain lines behind curbs and/or adjacent to landscape areas should be considered by client and the appropriate design engineers to prevent water from infiltrating beneath pavement. If such infiltration occurs, damage to pavement, curbs and flow lines, especially on sites with expansive soils, may occur during the life of the project.

Any approved base material shall consist of a Class II aggregate or equivalent and should be compacted to a minimum of 95% relative compaction. All pavement materials shall conform to the requirements set forth by the City of Montclair. The base material; and asphaltic concrete should be tested prior to delivery to the site and during placement to determine conformance with the project specifications. A pavement engineer shall designate the specific asphalt mix design to meet the required project specifications.

8.10 Utility Trench and Excavation Backfill

Trenches from installation of utility lines and other excavations may be backfilled with on-site soils or approved imported soils compacted to a minimum of 90% relative compaction. All utility lines shall be properly bedded with clean sand having a sand equivalency rating of 30 or more. This bedding material shall be thoroughly water jetted around the pipe structure prior to placement of compacted backfill soils.

8.11 Corrosion Design Criteria

Representative samples of the surficial soils, typical of the subgrade soils expected to be encountered within foundation excavations and underground utilities were tested for corrosion potential. The minimum resistivity value obtained for the samples tested is representative of an environment that may be severely corrosive to metals. The soil pH value was considered mildly alkaline and may not have a significant effect on soil corrosivity. Consideration should be given to corrosion protection systems for buried metal such as protective coatings, wrappings or the use of PVC where permitted by local building codes.

According to Table 4.3.1 of ACI 318 Building Code and Commentary, these contents revealed negligible sulfate concentrations. Therefore, a Type II cement according to latest CBC specifications may be utilized for building foundations at this time. It is recommended that additional sulfate tests be performed at the completion of site grading to assure that the as graded conditions are consistent with the recommendations stated in this design. Corrosion test results may be found on the attached Table IV.

8.12 Expansive Soil

If expansive soils are encountered, special attention should be given to the project design and maintenance. The attached *Expansive Soil Guidelines* should be reviewed by the engineers, architects, owner, maintenance personnel and other interested parties and considered during the design of the project and future property maintenance.

9.0 Closure

The recommendations and conclusions contained in this report are based upon the soil conditions uncovered in our test excavations. No warranty of the soil condition between our excavations is implied. NorCal Engineering should be notified for possible further recommendations if unexpected to unfavorable conditions are encountered during construction phase. It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure that all information within this report is submitted to the Architect and appropriate Engineers for the project.

A preconstruction conference should be held between the developer, general contractor, grading contractor, city inspector, architect, and soil engineer to clarify any questions relating to the grading operations and subsequent construction. Our representative should be present during the grading operations and construction phase to certify that such recommendations are complied within the field.

This geotechnical investigation has been conducted in a manner consistent with the level of care and skill exercised by members of our profession currently practicing under similar conditions in the Southern California area. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
NORCAL ENGINEERING

Keith D Tucker

KEITH D. TUCKER
No. 841
Exp. 12/31/2022

Keith D. Tucker
Project Engineer
R.G.E. 841

Scott D. Spensiero
Project Manager

SPECIFICATIONS FOR PLACEMENT OF COMPACTED FILL

Excavation

Any existing low-density soils and/or saturated soils shall be removed to competent natural soil under the inspection of the Geotechnical Engineering Firm. After the exposed surface has been cleansed of debris and/or vegetation, it shall be scarified until it is uniform in consistency, brought to the proper moisture content and compacted to a minimum of 90% relative compaction (in accordance with ASTM: D 1557).

In any area where a transition between fill and native soil or between bedrock and soil are encountered, additional excavation beneath foundations and slabs will be necessary in order to provide uniform support and avoid differential settlement of the structure.

Material for Fill

The on-site soils or approved import soils may be utilized for the compacted fill provided they are free of any deleterious materials and shall not contain any rocks, brick, asphaltic concrete, concrete or other hard materials greater than eight inches in maximum dimensions. Any import soil must be approved by the Geotechnical Engineering firm a minimum of 72 hours prior to importation of site.

Placement of Compacted Fill Soils

The approved fill soils shall be placed in layers not excess of six inches in thickness. Each lift shall be uniform in thickness and thoroughly blended. The fill soils shall be brought to within 2% of the optimum moisture content, unless otherwise specified by the Soils Engineering firm. Each lift shall be compacted to a minimum of 90% relative compaction (in accordance with ASTM: D 1557) and approved prior to the placement of the next layer of soil. Compaction tests shall be obtained at the discretion of the Geotechnical Engineering firm but to a minimum of one test for every 500 cubic yards placed and/or for every 2 feet of compacted fill placed.

The minimum relative compaction shall be obtained in accordance with accepted methods in the construction industry. The final grade of the structural areas shall be in a dense and smooth condition prior to placement of slabs-on-grade or pavement areas. No fill soils shall be placed, spread or compacted during unfavorable weather conditions. When the grading is interrupted by heavy rains, compaction operations shall not be resumed until approved by the Geotechnical Engineering firm.

Grading Observations

The controlling governmental agencies should be notified prior to commencement of any grading operations. This firm recommends that the grading operations be conducted under the observation of a Soils Engineering firm as deemed necessary. A 24-hour notice must be provided to this firm prior to the time of our initial inspection.

Observation shall include the clearing and grubbing operations to assure that all unsuitable materials have been properly removed; approve the exposed subgrade in areas to receive fill and in areas where excavation has resulted in the desired finished grade and designate areas of overexcavation; and perform field compaction tests to determine relative compaction achieved during fill placement. In addition, all foundation excavations shall be observed by the Geotechnical Engineering firm to confirm that appropriate bearing materials are present at the design grades and recommend any modifications to construct footings.

EXPANSIVE SOIL GUIDELINES

The following expansive soil guidelines are provided for your project. The intent of these guidelines is to inform you, the client, of the importance of proper design and maintenance of projects supported on expansive soils. ***You, as the owner or other interested party, should be warned that you have a duty to provide the information contained in the soil report including these guidelines to your design engineers, architects, landscapers and other design parties in order to enable them to provide a design that takes into consideration expansive soils.***

In addition, you should provide the soil report with these guidelines to any property manager, lessee, property purchaser or other interested party that will have or assume the responsibility of maintaining the development in the future.

Expansive soils are fine-grained silts and clays which are subject to swelling and contracting. The amount of this swelling and contracting is subject to the amount of fine-grained clay materials present in the soils and the amount of moisture either introduced or extracted from the soils. Expansive soils are divided into five categories ranging from “very low” to “very high”. Expansion indices are assigned to each classification and are included in the laboratory testing section of this report. *If the expansion index of the soils on your site, as stated in this report, is 21 or higher, you have expansive soils.* The classifications of expansive soils are as follows:

Classification of Expansive Soil*

Expansion Index	Potential Expansion
0-20	Very Low
21-50	Low
51-90	Medium
91-130	High
Above 130	Very High

*From Table 18A-I-B of California Building Code (1988)

When expansive soils are compacted during site grading operations, care is taken to place the materials at or slightly above optimum moisture levels and perform proper compaction operations. Any subsequent excessive wetting and/or drying of expansive soils will cause the soil materials to expand and/or contract. These actions are likely to cause distress of foundations, structures, slabs-on-grade, sidewalks and pavement over the life of the structure. ***It is therefore imperative that even after construction of improvements, the moisture contents are maintained at relatively constant levels, allowing neither excessive wetting or drying of soils.***

Evidence of excessive wetting of expansive soils may be seen in concrete slabs, both interior and exterior. Slabs may lift at construction joints producing a trip hazard or may crack from the pressure of soil expansion. Wet clays in foundation areas may result in lifting of the structure causing difficulty in the opening and closing of doors and windows, as well as cracking in exterior and interior wall surfaces. In extreme wetting of soils to depth, settlement of the structure may eventually result. Excessive wetting of soils in landscape areas adjacent to concrete or asphaltic pavement areas may also result in expansion of soils beneath pavement and resultant distress to the pavement surface.

Excessive drying of expansive soils is initially evidenced by cracking in the surface of the soils due to contraction. Settlement of structures and on-grade slabs may also eventually result along with problems in the operation of doors and windows.

Projects located in areas of expansive clay soils will be subject to more movement and "hairline" cracking of walls and slabs than similar projects situated on non-expansive sandy soils. There are, however, measures that developers and property owners may take to reduce the amount of movement over the life the development. The following guidelines are provided to assist you in both design and maintenance of projects on expansive soils:

- Drainage away from structures and pavement is essential to prevent excessive wetting of expansive soils. Grades should be designed to the latest building code and maintained to allow flow of irrigation and rain water to approved drainage devices or to the street. Any "ponding" of water adjacent to buildings, slabs and pavement after rains is evidence of poor drainage; the installation of drainage devices or regrading of the area may be required to assure proper drainage. Installation of rain gutters is also recommended to control the introduction of moisture next to buildings. Gutters should discharge into a drainage device or onto pavement which drains to roadways.

- Irrigation should be strictly controlled around building foundations, slabs and pavement and may need to be adjusted depending upon season. This control is essential to maintain a relatively uniform moisture content in the expansive soils and to prevent swelling and contracting. Over-watering adjacent to improvements may result in damage to those improvements. NorCal Engineering makes no specific recommendations regarding landscape irrigation schedules.

- Planting schemes for landscaping around structures and pavement should be analyzed carefully. Plants (including sod) requiring high amounts of water may result in excessive wetting of soils. Trees and large shrubs may actually extract moisture from the expansive soils, thus causing contraction of the fine-grained soils.

- Thickened edges on exterior slabs will assist in keeping excessive moisture from entering directly beneath the concrete. A six-inch thick or greater deepened edge on slabs may be considered. Underlying interior and exterior slabs with 6 to 12 inches or more of non-expansive soils and providing presaturation of the underlying clayey soils as recommended in the soil report will improve the overall performance of on-grade slabs.

- Increase the amount of steel reinforcing in concrete slabs, foundations and other structures to resist the forces of expansive soils. The precise amount of reinforcing should be determined by the appropriate design engineers and/or architects.

- Recommendations of the soil report should always be followed in the development of the project. Any recommendations regarding presaturation of the upper subgrade soils in slab areas should be performed in the field and verified by the Soil Engineer.



NORTH

1 INCH = 100 FEET

NorCal Engineering
SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

PROJECT 22409-21
DATE MARCH 2021

SITE PLAN

List of Appendices
(in order of appearance)

Appendix A
Log of Explorations

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

NOTE: DUAL SYMBOLS ARE USED TO INDICATE BORDERLINE SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

KEY:

■	Indicates 2.5-inch Inside Diameter. Ring Sample.
☒	Indicates 2-inch OD Split Spoon Sample (SPT).
⧅	Indicates Shelby Tube Sample.
◫	Indicates No Recovery.
◧	Indicates SPT with 140# Hammer 30 in. Drop.
✉	Indicates Bulk Sample.
◩	Indicates Small Bag Sample.
◨	Indicates Non-Standard
⧗	Indicates Core Run.

COMPONENT PROPORTIONS

DESCRIPTIVE TERMS	RANGE OF PROPORTION
Trace	1 - 5%
Few	5 - 10%
Little	10 - 20%
Some	20 - 35%
And	35 - 50%

COMPONENT DEFINITIONS

COMPONENT	SIZE RANGE
Boulders	Larger than 12 in
Cobbles	3 in to 12 in
Gravel	3 in to No 4 (4.5mm)
Coarse gravel	3 in to 3/4 in
Fine gravel	3/4 in to No 4 (4.5mm)
Sand	No. 4 (4.5mm) to No. 200 (0.074mm)
Coarse sand	No. 4 (4.5 mm) to No. 10 (2.0 mm)
Medium sand	No. 10 (2.0 mm) to No. 40 (0.42 mm)
Fine sand	No. 40 (0.42 mm) to No. 200 (0.074 mm)
Silt and Clay	Smaller than No. 200 (0.074 mm)

MOISTURE CONTENT

DRY	Absence of moisture, dusty, dry to the touch.
DAMP	Some perceptible moisture; below optimum
MOIST	No visible water; near optimum moisture content
WET	Visible free water, usually soil is below water table.

RELATIVE DENSITY OR CONSISTENCY VERSUS SPT N -VALUE

COHESIONLESS SOILS		COHESIVE SOILS		
Density	N (blows/ft)	Consistency	N (blows/ft)	Approximate Undrained Shear Strength (psf)
Very Loose	0 to 4	Very Soft	0 to 2	< 250
Loose	4 to 10	Soft	2 to 4	250 - 500
Medium Dense	10 to 30	Medium Stiff	4 to 8	500 - 1000
Dense	30 to 50	Stiff	8 to 15	1000 - 2000
Very Dense	over 50	Very Stiff	15 to 30	2000 - 4000
		Hard	over 30	> 4000

Don Julian Investments
22409-21

Log of Boring B-1

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission Blvd., Montclair

Date of Drilling: 3/19/2021

Groundwater Depth: None Encountered

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs

Drop: 30"

Surface Elevation: Not Measured

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Samples		Laboratory		
			Type	Blow Counts	Moisture	Dry Density	Fines Content %
0		Asphalt Pavement / Base Material FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, moist NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND					
5		Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble					
10		Sandy SILT Brown, firm, moist					
15		Boring completed at depth of 15'					
20							
25							
30							
35							

Don Julian Investments
22409-21

Log of Boring B-2

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission Blvd., Montclair

Date of Drilling: 3/19/2021 | **Groundwater Depth: None Encountered**

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs | **Drop: 30"**

Surface Elevation: Not Measured



Depth (feet)	Material Description	Samples		Laboratory		
		Type	Blow Counts	Moisture	Dry Density	Fines Content %
0	Asphalt Pavement / Base Material					
	FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, moist					
5	NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble					
10	Sandy SILT Brown, firm, moist					
15	Boring completed at depth of 15'					
20						
25						
30						
35						

NorCal Engineering

Don Julian Investments
22409-21

Log of Boring B-3

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission Blvd., Montclair

Date of Drilling: 3/19/2021 | **Groundwater Depth: None Encountered**

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs | **Drop: 30"**

Surface Elevation: Not Measured



Material Description	Samples: Type	Samples: Blow Counts	Laboratory: Moisture	Laboratory: Dry Density	Laboratory: Fines Content %
Asphalt Pavement / Base Material					
FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, moist	▽				
NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble	■	6/8	3.1	112.8	
Sandy SILT Brown, firm, moist	■ ■	5/6 9/12	10.0 12.4	106.5 105.2	
SAND (fine to coarse grained) Light brown, dense, moist; slightly silty	■	9/13	13.2	98.9	

Boring completed at depth of 21'

NorCal Engineering

Don Julian Investments
22409-21

Log of Boring B-4

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission Blvd., Montclair

Date of Drilling: 3/19/2021 **Groundwater Depth:** None Encountered

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs **Drop:** 30"

Surface Elevation: Not Measured



Depth (feet)	Material Description	Samples: Type	Samples: Blow Counts	Laboratory: Moisture	Laboratory: Dry Density	Laboratory: Fines Content %
0	Asphalt Pavement / Base Material					
	FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, moist					
5	NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble	■	3/4	5.5	108.2	
	SAND (fine to coarse) Light brown to brown, medium dense, moist; slightly silty with occasional gravel and cobble	■	7/9	2.6	113.3	
10	Sandy SILT Brown, firm, moist					
	Boring completed at depth of 10'					
15						
20						
25						
30						
35						

Don Julian Investments
22409-21

Log of Boring B-5

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission Blvd., Montclair

Date of Drilling: 3/19/2021 **Groundwater Depth: None Encountered**

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs **Drop: 30"**

Surface Elevation: Not Measured



Depth (feet)	Material Description	Samples: Type	Samples: Blow Counts	Laboratory: Moisture	Laboratory: Dry Density	Laboratory: Fines Content %
0	Asphalt Pavement / Base Material					
	FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, moist	■	3/3	7.4	104.9	
5	NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble	■	5/5	5.8	110.9	
	Sandy SILT Brown, firm, moist					
10	Boring completed at depth of 10'	■	5/7	13.1	99.1	
15						
20						
25						
30						
35						

Don Julian Investments
22409-21

Log of Boring B-6

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission Blvd., Montclair

Date of Drilling: 3/19/2021

Groundwater Depth: None Encountered

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs

Drop: 30"

Surface Elevation: Not Measured



Depth (feet)	Lith-ology	Material Description	Samples: Type	Samples: Blow Counts	Laboratory: Moisture	Laboratory: Dry Density	Laboratory: Fines Content %
0		Asphalt Pavement / Base Material					
		FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, moist					
5		NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble	■		6.2	109.0	
		Gravelly (fine to coarse grained) SAND Light brown, dense, damp; slightly silty with cobbles	■		2.3	124.3	
		Boring completed at depth of 7'					
10							
15							
20							
25							
30							
35							

NorCal Engineering

Don Julian Investments
22409-21

Log of Boring B-7

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission Blvd., Montclair

Date of Drilling: 3/19/2021 **Groundwater Depth:** None Encountered

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs **Drop:** 30"

Surface Elevation: Not Measured

GWT not encountered

Depth (feet)	Material Description	Samples: Type	Samples: Blow Counts	Laboratory: Moisture	Laboratory: Dry Density	Laboratory: Fines Content %
0	FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, loose, moist					
	NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble					
5		■	8/13	3.6	110.1	
	Sandy SILT Brown, firm, moist					
10		■	6/8	10.2	104.4	
15	Boring completed at depth of 15'	■	7/10	11.2	105.1	
20						
25						
30						
35						

SuperLog CivilTech Software, USA www.civiltech.com File: C:\Superlog4\PROJECT\22409-21.log Date: 3/29/2021

NorCal Engineering

Appendix B
Laboratory Tests

TABLE I
MAXIMUM DENSITY TESTS

Sample	Classification	Optimum Moisture (%)	Maximum Dry Density (lbs/cu.ft)
TB3 @ 2'	Silty SAND	9.0	126.0

TABLE II
EXPANSION TESTS

Sample	Classification	Expansion Index
B-3 @ 2'	Silty SAND	0

TABLE III
CORROSION TESTS

Sample	pH	Electrical Resistivity	Sulfate (%)	Chloride (ppm)
B-3 @ 2'	7.1	4,350	0.003	238

% by weight
ppm – mg/kg

Sample No. B4@3'

Sample Type: Undisturbed-Saturated

Soil Description: Silty F-C Grained Sand

		1	2	3
Normal Stress	(psf)	1000	2000	3000
Peak Stress	(psf)	600	1260	1944
Displacement	(in.)	0.150	0.225	0.175
Residual Stress	(psf)	588	1260	1908
Displacement	(in.)	0.250	0.250	0.250
Initial Dry Density	(pcf)	108.2	108.2	108.2
Initial Water Content	(%)	5.5	5.5	5.5
Strain Rate	(in./min.)	0.020	0.020	0.020





	Ø (Deg)	C (psf)
Peak Stress	31	70
Residual Stress	31	80

NorCal Engineering

SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

Don Julian Investments

PROJECT NUMBER: 22409-21 DATE: 3/31/2021

DIRECT SHEAR TEST

ASTM D3080

Plate A

Sample No. B1 | Depth 5' | Date 3/31/2021

Vertical Pressure (kips/sq.ft.)	Sample Height (inches)	Consolidation (percent)	Saturated
0.125	**1.0000**	**0.0**	
0.25	**0.9961**	**0.4**	
0.5	**0.9928**	**0.7**	
1	**0.9880**	**1.2**	
1	**0.9857**	**1.4**	S
2	**0.9797**	**2.0**	
4	**0.9737**	**2.6**	
8	**0.9663**	**3.4**	
0.25	**0.9733**	**2.7**	

Date Tested: 3/29/2021
Sample: B3
Depth: 5'



F-C Grained Sand w/ Some Silt
Dry Density: 112.8 pcf
Initial Water Content: 3.1 %
Saturated Water Content: 16.3 %
Saturated @ 1 kip/sq.ft.

NorCal Engineering

SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

Don Julian Investments

PROJECT NUMBER: 22409-21 DATE: 3/31/2021

CONSOLIDATION TEST

ASTM D2435

Plate B

Vertical Pressure (kips/sq.ft.)	Sample Height (inches)	Consolidation (percent)
0.125	1.0000	0.0
0.25	0.9944	0.6
0.5	0.9904	1.0
1	0.9847	1.5
1	0.9850	1.5
2	0.9782	2.2
4	0.9623	3.8
8	0.9379	6.2
0.25	0.9548	4.5

Saturated

Sample No. B3

Depth 10'

Date 3/31/2021

Date Tested: 3/29/2021
Sample: B3
Depth: 10'



Sandy Silt
Dry Density: 106.5 pcf
Initial Water Content: 10.0 %
Saturated Water Content: 18.1 %
Saturated @ 1 kip/sq.ft.

NorCal Engineering

SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

Don Julian Investments

PROJECT NUMBER: 22409-21 DATE: 3/31/2021

CONSOLIDATION TEST

ASTM D2435

Plate C

Appendix C
Seismic Hazard Report

ASCE 7 Hazards Report

Address:
5006 Mission Blvd
Ontario, California
91762

Standard: ASCE/SEI 7-16
Risk Category: II
Soil Class: D - Stiff Soil

Elevation: 927.96 ft (NAVD 88)
Latitude: 34.056069
Longitude: -117.695896



AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS

Seismic

Site Soil Class: D - Stiff Soil

Results:

S_S :	1.608	S_{D1} :	N/A
S_1 :	0.6	T_L :	8
F_a :	1	PGA :	0.655
F_v :	N/A	PGA_M :	0.721
S_{MS} :	1.608	F_{PGA} :	1.1
S_{M1} :	N/A	I_e :	1
S_{DS} :	1.072	C_v :	1.422

Ground motion hazard analysis may be required. See ASCE/SEI 7-16 Section 11.4.8.

Data Accessed: Fri Mar 26 2021

Date Source: USGS Seismic Design Maps

The ASCE 7 Hazard Tool is provided for your convenience, for informational purposes only, and is provided "as is" and without warranties of any kind. The location data included herein has been obtained from information developed, produced, and maintained by third party providers; or has been extrapolated from maps incorporated in the ASCE 7 standard. While ASCE has made every effort to use data obtained from reliable sources or methodologies, ASCE does not make any representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness, reliability, currency, or quality of any data provided herein. Any third-party links provided by this Tool should not be construed as an endorsement, affiliation, relationship, or sponsorship of such third-party content by or from ASCE.

ASCE does not intend, nor should anyone interpret, the results provided by this Tool to replace the sound judgment of a competent professional, having knowledge and experience in the appropriate field(s) of practice, nor to substitute for the standard of care required of such professionals in interpreting and applying the contents of this Tool or the ASCE 7 standard.

In using this Tool, you expressly assume all risks associated with your use. Under no circumstances shall ASCE or its officers, directors, employees, members, affiliates, or agents be liable to you or any other person for any direct, indirect, special, incidental, or consequential damages arising from or related to your use of, or reliance on, the Tool or any information obtained therein. To the fullest extent permitted by law, you agree to release and hold harmless ASCE from any and all liability of any nature arising out of or resulting from any use of data provided by the ASCE 7 Hazard Tool.

Appendix D
Soil Infiltration Data

PERCOLATION TEST DATA

Client: Don Julian Investment	**Tested By:** J.O.
Project No.: 22409-21	**Date Tested:** 3/19/2021
Test Hole: 1	**Caving:**
Depth of Test Hole: 15’	**Notes:**
Diameter of Test Hole: 8”	**Strata Peculiarities:**
Date Excavated: 3/19/2021	

Sandy Soil Criteria Test

TIME	TRIAL NO.	T1	H1	H2	D
8:44	1	30	0.0	97.0	97.0
9:14					
9:14	2	30	0.0	95.0	95.0
9:44					

____Soil Criteria

TIME	T1	TE	H1	H2	D
9:44	10	10	0.0	41.0	41.0
9:54					
9:54	10	20	0.0	47.0	47.0
10:04					
10:04	10	30	0.0	47.0	47.0
10:14					
10:14	10	40	0.0	48.0	48.0
10:24					
10:24	10	50	0.0	46.0	46.0
10:34					
10:34	10	60	0.0	47.0	47.0
10:44					
10:44	10	70	0.0	47.0	47.0
10:54					
10:54	10	80	0.0	47.0	47.0
11:04					
11:04	10	90	47.0	74.0	27.0
11:14					
11:14	10	100	74.0	99.0	25.0
11:24					

T1 – Time Interval (min)
TE – Total Elapsed Time (min)
H1 – Initial Water Level
H2 – Final Water Level (in)
D – Change in H_2O Level (in)

NORCAL
ENGINEERING
SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

PERCOLATION TEST DATA

Client: Don Julian Investment	**Tested By:** J.C.
Project No.: 22409-21	**Date Tested:** 3/19/2021
Test Hole: 2	**Caving:**
Depth of Test Hole: 15’	**Notes:**
Diameter of Test Hole: 8”	**Strata Peculiarities:**
Date Excavated: 3/19/2021	

Sandy Soil Criteria Test

TIME	TRIAL NO.	T1	H1	H2	D
9:51	1		0.0	96.0	96.0
10:21					
10:21	2		0.0	92.0	92.0
10:51					

____Soil Criteria

TIME	T1	TE	H1	H2	D
10:51	10	10	0.0	24.0	24.0
11:01					
11:01	10	20	0.0	30.0	30.0
11:11					
11:11	10	30	0.0	29.0	29.0
11:21					
11:21	10	40	0.0	30.0	30.0
11:31					
11:31	10	50	0.0	29.0	29.0
11:41					
11:41	10	60	0.0	28.0	28.0
11:51					
11:51	10	70	0.0	28.0	28.0
12:01					
12:01	10	80	0.0	29.0	29.0
12:11					
12:11	10	90	29.0	61.0	32.0
12:21					
12:21	10	100	61.0	84.0	23.0
12:31					

T1 – Time Interval (min)
TE – Total Elapsed Time (min)
H1 – Initial Water Level
H2 – Final Water Level (in)
D – Change in H_2O Level (in)

SOIL INFILTRATION RATE CALCS ⇒ Auger Boring

Location:	TH-1	TH-2
• Depth =	15.0'	15.0'
• Hole Dia. =	8"	8"
• Drop = Δd	52"	55"
• Time = Δt Interval	20 min	20 min.
• Preadjusted Perc. Rate	156 in/hr	165 in/hr
• Initial Water Depth = d_1	133"	151"
• Reduction Factor = R_f	27.75	31.88
• INFILTRATION RATE	5.6 in/hr	5.2 in/hr

$$\text{Infiltration Rate} = \frac{\text{Preadjusted Perc. Rate}}{\text{Reduction Factor}}$$

$$\text{Reduction Factor} = R_f = \left[\frac{2 \cdot d_1 - \Delta d}{\text{Dia.}}\right] + 1$$

NorCal Engineering
SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

DATE

NorCal Engineering
Soils and Geotechnical Consultants
10641 Humbolt Street Los Alamitos, CA 90720
(562) 799-9469 Fax (562) 799-9459

October 12, 2021 Project Number 22409-21

Don Julian Investment LLC
138 N. Glendora Avenue
Glendora, California 91741

Attn.: Mr. Cary Niu

RE: **Updated Soils Infiltration Study** - Proposed Industrial Warehouse Development - Located at 5006 and 5010 Mission Boulevard, in the City of Montclair, California

Dear Mr. Niu:

Pursuant to your request, this firm has performed an Updated Soil Infiltration Study for the above referenced project in accordance with your approval of our proposal dated September 17, 2021. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the feasibility of an on-site water disposal system for the proposed industrial warehouse development. The scope of work included the following: 1) site reconnaissance; 2) subsurface geotechnical exploration; 3) soil infiltration testing; 4) engineering analysis of field and laboratory data; and 5) preparation of a report.

Project Description

The 5.12-acre subject property is situated in an industrial/commercial area located within the 5000 block and north side of Mission Boulevard in the City of Montclair. The generally rectangular-shaped parcel is elongated in an east to west direction with topography of the relatively level descending slightly from north to south direction on the order of a few feet.

Project Description

It is proposed to construct an industrial warehouse development consisting of 125,000 square feet building as shown on the attached Site Plan. The proposed concrete tilt-up building will be supported by a conventional slab-on-grade foundation system with perimeter-spread footings and isolated interior footings. Other improvements will include asphalt and concrete pavement areas, hardscape and landscaping. It is assumed that the proposed grading for the development will include cut and fill procedures on the order of a few feet to achieve finished grade elevations.

An on-site storm water disposal system and been proposed toward the front portion of the property along the east and west sides of the proposed warehouse building. The bottom of the system has been proposed at approximately 15 to 20 feet in depth. Infiltration tests were performed to provide preliminary infiltration rates for the purpose of planning and design of a storm water disposal system. Final building plans shall be reviewed by this firm prior to submittal for city/county approval to determine the need for any additional study and revised recommendations pertinent to the proposed development, if necessary.

Field Exploration and Testing

The field exploration consisted of two (2) exploratory borings by a truck mounted hollow stem auger to depths of 35 and 50 feet below ground surface (bgs) to determine the subsurface soil conditions. The site was found to be underlain by fill and alluvial deposits consisting of a brown, fine to coarse grained, silty SAND to a sandy SILT. These soils were noted to be medium dense/firm and damp to moist. No caving occurred and no groundwater was encountered to the depths of our borings. The location of the exploratory borings are shown on the attached Site Plan. Detailed description of the subsurface soils is shown on the attached logs in Appendix A.

Laboratory analysis to determine the percent by weight of soil finer than the No. 200 sieve (ASTM: 1140) was provided on selected soil samples. These results are shown on the attached boring logs.

Groundwater Information

Exploratory Borings B-1 and B-2 were drilled to a depth of 35 and 50 feet below ground surface to determine the presence of groundwater within the proposed infiltration area. No groundwater was encountered to the depth of our borings. A review of groundwater maps of the Upper Santa Ana River Basin (Carson and Matti, 1982) reveals groundwater depths in excess of 350 feet at the project site. Nearby County of Los Angeles groundwater monitoring well located approximately 0.5 miles to the northeast from the subject site noted a groundwater depth at 359 feet below ground surface in July 2017.

Results of Field Infiltration Tests

Infiltration tests within the site were performed to provide preliminary infiltration rates for the purpose of planning and design of an on-site water disposal system field testing per City of Montclair – Site Evaluation and Testing Protocols for Storm Water Infiltration Best Management Practices and the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program. Two exploratory trenches (T-1 and T-2) were excavated by a track mounted excavator to depths of 15 and 20 feet within the proposed infiltration area for the placement of four (4) infiltration test holes. The infiltration tests consisted of the double ring infiltration test per ASTM Method D 3385.

The infiltration holes were carefully filled with clean water and refilled after each reading. Based upon the initial rates of infiltration at each location, test measurements were measured at selected maximum intervals thereafter. Measurements were obtained by using an electronic tape measure with 1/16-inch divisions and timed with a stopwatch.

The field infiltration rate was computed using a reduction factor – R_f based on the field measurements with our calculations given in Appendix D. Based upon the results of our testing, the soils encountered in the planned on-site drainage disposal system area exhibit the following infiltration rates.

Boring/Test No.	Depth	Soil Classification	Field Infiltration Rate
T-1/TH-1	15'	Sandy SILT	3.2 in/hr
T-1/TH-2	15'	Sandy SILT	4.9 in/hr
T-2/TH-3	20'	Sandy SILT	5.0 in/hr
T-2/TH-4	20'	Sandy SILT	3.0 in/hr

The correction factors CF_t, CF_v and CF_s are given below based on soils at 15 and 20 feet from our field tests.

a) CF_t = Rf =1.0 for our four infiltration test holes.

b) CF_v = 1.0 based on uniform soils encountered in four borings for infiltration tests.

c) CF_s = 2.0 for long-term siltation, plugging and maintenance. The subsurface soils are likely to have some plugging and regular maintenance of storm water discharge devices is required.

Based on the results of our field testing, the subsurface soils encountered in the proposed on-site drainage disposal system consisted predominately of sandy silts and shall utilize the design infiltration rates based on the safety factor required by the county standard. All systems must meet the latest city and/or county specifications and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) requirements.

It is recommended that foundations shall be setback a minimum distance of 10 feet from the drainage disposal system and the bottom of footing shall be a minimum of 10 feet from the expected zone of saturation. The boundary of the zone of saturation may be assumed to project downward from the top of the permeable portion of the disposal system at an inclination of 1 to 1 or flatter, as determined by the geotechnical engineer.

Closure

The recommendations and conclusions contained in this report are based upon the soil conditions uncovered in our test excavation. No warranty of the soil condition between our excavations is implied. NorCal Engineering should be notified for possible further recommendations if unexpected to unfavorable conditions are encountered during construction phase.

This firm should have the opportunity to review the final plans to verify that all our recommendations are incorporated. This report and all conclusions are subject to the review of the controlling authorities for the project. Our representative should be present during the grading operations and construction phase to certify that such recommendations are complied within the field.

This geotechnical investigation has been conducted in a manner consistent with the level of care and skill exercised by members of our profession currently practicing under similar conditions in the Southern California area. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
NORCAL ENGINEERING

Keith D Tucker

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
KEITH D. TUCKER
No. 841
Exp. 12/31/2022
GEOTECHNICAL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Keith D. Tucker
Project Engineer
R.G.E. 841

Scott D. Spensiero
Project Manager

References

1. City of Montclair – Site Evaluation and Testing Protocols for Storm Water Infiltration Best Management Practices.

2. San Bernardino County – Appendix VII - Infiltration Rate Evaluation Protocol and Factor of Safety Recommendations dated May 19, 2011.

3. California Department of Water Resources, Internet Website, http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/index.cfm.

4. U.S. Geological Survey – J.C Matti and S.E. Carson – Contour Map Showing Minimum Depth to Groundwater, Upper Santa Ana River Valley, California 1973-1979, 1983.



NORTH

1 INCH = 100 FEET

NorCal Engineering
SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

PROJECT: 20409-21
DATE: OCTOBER 2021

SITE PLAN

List of Appendices

(in order of appearance)

Appendix A
Log of Excavations

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

NOTE: DUAL SYMBOLS ARE USED TO INDICATE BORDERLINE SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

KEY:

- ■ Indicates 2.5-inch Inside Diameter. Ring Sample.
- ☒ Indicates 2-inch OD Split Spoon Sample (SPT).
- ⧅ Indicates Shelby Tube Sample.
- ◫ Indicates No Recovery.
- ◧ Indicates SPT with 140# Hammer 30 in. Drop.
- 🖂 Indicates Bulk Sample.
- ◩ Indicates Small Bag Sample.
- ◨ Indicates Non-Standard
- ⊠ Indicates Core Run.

COMPONENT PROPORTIONS

DESCRIPTIVE TERMS	RANGE OF PROPORTION
Trace	1 - 5%
Few	5 - 10%
Little	10 - 20%
Some	20 - 35%
And	35 - 50%

COMPONENT DEFINITIONS

COMPONENT	SIZE RANGE
Boulders	Larger than 12 in
Cobbles	3 in to 12 in
Gravel	3 in to No 4 (4.5mm)
Coarse gravel	3 in to 3/4 in
Fine gravel	3/4 in to No 4 (4.5mm)
Sand	No. 4 (4.5mm) to No. 200 (0.074mm)
Coarse sand	No. 4 (4.5 mm) to No. 10 (2.0 mm)
Medium sand	No. 10 (2.0 mm) to No. 40 (0.42 mm)
Fine sand	No. 40 (0.42 mm) to No. 200 (0.074 mm)
Silt and Clay	Smaller than No. 200 (0.074 mm)

MOISTURE CONTENT

DRY	Absence of moisture, dusty, dry to the touch.
DAMP	Some perceptible moisture; below optimum
MOIST	No visible water; near optimum moisture content
WET	Visible free water, usually soil is below water table.

RELATIVE DENSITY OR CONSISTENCY VERSUS SPT N -VALUE

COHESIONLESS SOILS		COHESIVE SOILS		
Density	N (blows/ft)	Consistency	N (blows/ft)	Approximate Undrained Shear Strength (psf)
Very Loose	0 to 4	Very Soft	0 to 2	< 250
Loose	4 to 10	Soft	2 to 4	250 - 500
Medium Dense	10 to 30	Medium Stiff	4 to 8	500 - 1000
Dense	30 to 50	Stiff	8 to 15	1000 - 2000
Very Dense	over 50	Very Stiff	15 to 30	2000 - 4000
		Hard	over 30	> 4000

Don Julian Investment, LLC
22409-21

Log of Boring B-1

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission, Montclair

Date of Drilling: 10/6/2021

Groundwater Depth: None Encountered

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs

Drop: 30"

Surface Elevation: Not Measured

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology		Material Description	Samples		Laboratory		
				Type	Blow Counts	Moisture	Dry Density	Fines Content %
0		GWT not encountered	FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, loose, damp					
			NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble					
5				■	4/5			42
10			Sandy SILT Brown to grey brown, firm, moist; with occasional gravel					
15				■	5/8			53
20								
25				■	5/7			50
			Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Light brown, dense to very dense, moist; with gravel and occasional cobble					
30								
35								

Don Julian Investment, LLC
22409-21

Log of Boring B-2

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission, Montclair

Date of Drilling: 10/6/2021 | **Groundwater Depth:** None Encountered

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs | **Drop:** 30"

Surface Elevation: Not Measured

Depth (feet)	Lithology		Material Description	Samples: Type	Samples: Blow Counts	Laboratory: Moisture	Laboratory: Dry Density	Laboratory: Fines Content %
0		GWT not encountered	Asphalt Pavement					
			FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, moist					
5			NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble					
10			Sandy SILT Brown to grey brown, firm, moist; with occasional gravel	■	4/5			60
15								
20				■	6/7			57
25			Silty (fine to medium grained) SAND Light brown to brown, dense, moist; with gravel and occasional cobble					
30				■	9/13			37
35								

SuperLog CivilTech Software, USA www.civiltech.com File: C:\Superlog4\PROJECT\2240921-2.log Date: 10/12/2021

Don Julian Investment, LLC
22409-21

Log of Boring B-2

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission, Montclair

Date of Drilling: 10/6/2021 **Groundwater Depth: None Encountered**

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs **Drop: 30"**

Surface Elevation: Not Measured

Depth (feet)	Lith- ology	Material Description	Samples: Type	Samples: Blow Counts	Laboratory: Moisture	Laboratory: Dry Density	Laboratory: Fines Content %
35	▨	Silty (fine to medium grained) SAND Light brown to brown, dense, moist; with gravel and occasional cobble					
40	▥	Sandy SILT Brown, firm, moist; with occasional gravel	■	8/11			55
45	▨	Silty (fine to medium grained) SAND Grey-brown, dense, moist; with occasional gravel and some cobble					
50	▨		■	15/17			33
		Boring completed at depth of 51.5'					
55							
60							
65							
70							

Don Julian Investment, LLC
22409-21

Log of Trench T-1

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission, Montclair

Date of Drilling: 10/6/2021 **Groundwater Depth:** None Encountered

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs **Drop:** 30"

Surface Elevation: Not Measured



Depth (feet)	Lith-ology		Material Description	Samples		Laboratory		
				Type	Blow Counts	Moisture	Dry Density	Fines Content %
0		GWT not encountered	FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, loose, damp					
			NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble					
			Sandy SILT Brown to grey brown, firm, moist; with occasional gravel					
15			Trench completed at depth of 15'					51

Depth scale: 0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35

NorCal Engineering

Don Julian Investment, LLC
22409-21

Log of Trench T-2

Boring Location: 5006 & 5010 Mission, Montclair

Date of Drilling: 10/6/2021 | **Groundwater Depth: None Encountered**

Drilling Method: Simco 2800HS

Hammer Weight: 140 lbs | **Drop: 30"**

Surface Elevation: Not Measured

Depth (feet)	Lith-ology		Material Description	Samples: Type	Samples: Blow Counts	Laboratory: Moisture	Laboratory: Dry Density	Laboratory: Fines Content %
0		GWT not encountered	Asphalt Pavement					
			FILL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, loose, damp					
5			NATURAL Silty (fine to coarse grained) SAND Brown, medium dense, damp to moist; with occasional gravel and cobble					
10			Sandy SILT Brown to grey brown, firm, moist; with occasional gravel					
15								
20			Boring completed at depth of 20'	☒				54
25								
30								
35								

Appendix B
Field Infiltration Data

NORCAL
ENGINEERING
SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

Project: Don Julian Investments, LLC
Project No.: 22409-21
Date: 10/6/2021
Test No. TH-1
Depth: 15'
Tested By: J.S. Jr.

TIME (hr/min)	CHANGE TIME (min)	CUMULATIVE TIME (min)	INNER RING READING (cm)	INNER RING CHANGE	INNER RING FLOW (cc)	OUTER RING READING (cm)	OUTER RING CHANGE	OUTER RING FLOW (cc)	INNER RING INF RATE (cm/hr)	OUTER RING INF RATE (cm/hr)	INNER RING INF RATE (ft/hr)
9:20			38.0			99.5					
9:30	10	10	39.6	1.6		101.4	1.9				
9:30			39.6			101.4					
9:40	10	20	41.0	1.4		102.5	1.1				
9:40			41.0			102.5					
9:50	10	30	42.4	1.4		104.0	1.5				
9:50			42.0			104.0					
10:00	10	40	43.5	1.5		105.7	1.7				
10:00			35.5			99.1					
10:10	10	50	37.3	1.8		100.5	1.4				
10:10			37.3			100.5					
10:20	10	60	38.9	1.6		102.0	1.5				
10:20			37.0			99.0					
10:30	10	70	38.2	1.2		100.4	1.4		7.2	8.4	
10:30			38.2			100.4					
10:40	10	80	39.4	1.2		101.7	1.3		7.2	7.8	
10:40			39.4			101.7					
10:50	10	90	40.6	1.8		103.0	1.3		10.8	7.8	
10:50			40.6			103.0					
11:00	10	100	42.0	1.4		104.4	1.4		8.4	8.4	
11:00			37.1			100.4					
11:10	10	110	38.3	1.2		101.7	1.3		7.2	7.8	
11:10			38.3			101.7					
11:20	10	120	39.4	1.1		103.0	1.3		6.6	7.8	

Average = 7.9 / 8.0 cm/hr

Project: Don Julian Investments, LLC
Project No.: 22409-21
Date: 10/6/2021
Test No. TH-2
Depth: 15'
Tested By: J.S. Jr.

TIME (hr/min)	CHANGE TIME (min)	CUMULATIVE TIME (min)	INNER RING READING (cm)	INNER RING CHANGE	INNER RING FLOW (cc)	OUTER RING READING (cm)	OUTER RING CHANGE	OUTER RING FLOW (cc)	INNER RING INF RATE (cm/hr)	OUTER RING INF RATE (cm/hr)	INNER RING INF RATE (ft/hr)
9:20			74.0			46.5					
9:30	10	10	76.5	2.5		49.2	2.7				
9:30			69.5			42.0					
9:40	10	20	72.0	2.5		44.9	2.9				
9:40			72.0			44.9					
9:50	10	30	74.2	2.2		47.0	2.1				
9:50			69.0			41.8					
10:00	10	40	71.2	2.2		44.0	2.2				
10:00			71.2			44.0					
10:10	10	50	73.3	2.1		46.3	2.3				
10:10			69.5			42.7					
10:20	10	60	71.5	2.0		44.7	2.0		12.0	12.0	
10:20			71.5			44.7					
10:30	10	70	73.8	2.3		46.7	2.0		13.8	12.0	
10:30			69.0			42.0					
10:40	10	80	71.3	2.3		44.3	2.3		13.8	13.8	
10:40			71.3			44.3					
10:50	10	90	73.0	1.7		46.2	1.9		10.2	11.4	
10:50			73.0			46.2					
11:00	10	100	75.0	2.0		48.2	2.0		12.0	12.0	
11:00			69.3			41.9					
11:10	10	110	71.2	1.9		43.8	1.9		11.4	11.4	
11:10			71.2			43.8					
11:20	10	120	73.2	2.0		45.9	2.1		12.0	12.6	

Average = 12.2 / 12.2 cm/hr

Project: Don Julian Investments, LLC
Project No.: 22409-21
Date: 10/6/2021
Test No. TH-3
Depth: 20’
Tested By: J.S. Jr.

TIME (hr/min)	CHANGE TIME (min)	CUMULATIVE TIME (min)	INNER RING READING (cm)	INNER RING CHANGE	INNER RING FLOW (cc)	OUTER RING READING (cm)	OUTER RING CHANGE	OUTER RING FLOW (cc)	INNER RING INF RATE (cm/hr)	OUTER RING INF RATE (cm/hr)	INNER RING INF RATE (ft/hr)
11:43			36.7			68.5					
11:53	10	10	38.0	1.3		73.0	4.5				
11:53			38.0			73.0					
12:03	10	20	40.0	2.0		76.0	3.0				
12:03			37.5			70.0					
12:13	10	30	39.7	2.2		73.5	3.5				
12:13			39.7			73.5					
12:23	10	40	41.5	1.8		76.3	2.8				
12:23			41.5			76.3					
12:33	10	50	43.5	2.0		79.5	3.2				
12:33			36.5			68.0					
12:43	10	60	38.4	1.9		71.5	3.5		11.4	21.0	
12:43			38.4			71.4					
12:53	10	70	40.5	2.1		74.6	3.2		12.6	19.2	
12:53			40.5			74.6					
1:03	10	80	42.4	1.9		77.9	3.3		11.4	19.8	
1:03			38.0			70.5					
1:13	10	90	40.0	2.0		73.7	3.2		12.0	19.2	
1:13			40.0			73.7					
1:23	10	100	42.5	2.5		76.0	2.3		15.0	13.8	
1:23			37.0			69.2					
1:33	10	110	39.0	2.0		72.3	3.1		12.0	18.6	
1:33			39.0			72.3					
1:43	10	120	41.2	2.2		75.3	3.0		13.2	18.0	

Average = 12.5 / 18.5 cm/hr

NORCAL
ENGINEERING
SOILS AND GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

Project: Don Julian Investments, LLC
Project No.: 22409-21
Date: 10/6/2021
Test No. TH-4
Depth: 20’
Tested By: J.S. Jr.

TIME (hr/min)	CHANGE TIME (min)	CUMULATIVE TIME (min)	INNER RING READING (cm)	INNER RING CHANGE	INNER RING FLOW (cc)	OUTER RING READING (cm)	OUTER RING CHANGE	OUTER RING FLOW (cc)	INNER RING INF RATE (cm/hr)	OUTER RING INF RATE (cm/hr)	INNER RING INF RATE (ft/hr)
11:43			100.5			39.2					
11:53	10	10	103.2	2.7		41.3	2.1				
11:53			97.0			33.0					
12:03	10	20	98.5	1.5		35.0	2.0				
12:03			100.0			38.5					
12:13	10	30	101.2	1.2		40.3	1.8				
12:13			101.2			40.3					
12:23	10	40	102.5	1.3		42.1	1.8				
12:23			102.5			42.1					
12:33	10	50	104.0	1.5		44.0	1.9				
12:33			99.0			38.8					
12:43	10	60	100.0	1.0		40.5	1.7		6.0	10.2	
12:43			100.0			40.5					
12:53	10	70	101.5	1.5		42.0	1.5		9.0	9.0	
12:53			101.5			42.0					
1:03	10	80	102.8	1.3		43.4	1.4		7.8	8.4	
1:03			100.5			38.0					
1:13	10	90	101.7	1.2		39.8	1.8		7.2	10.8	
1:13			101.7			39.8					
1:23	10	100	103.2	1.5		41.5	1.7		9.0	10.2	
1:23			103.2			41.5					
1:33	10	110	104.3	1.1		43.5	2.0		6.6	12.0	
1:33			100.3			38.2					
1:43	10	120	101.6	1.3		39.8	1.6		7.8	9.6	

Average = 7.6 / 10.0 cm/hr