GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS M.S.A. 6160015454 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

PREPARED FOR

SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

> JANUARY 29, 2014 REVISED FEBRUARY 24, 2014 PROJECT NO. G1115-52-54



GEOTECHNICAL ENVIRONMENTAL MATERIALS



MATERIAL

Project No. G1115-52-54 January 29, 2014 Revised February 24, 2014

San Diego Gas and Electric Company Civil/Structural Engineering 8316 Century Park Court San Diego, California 92123

Attention: Mr. Tyler Lonsdale

Subject: GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS M.S.A. 6160015454 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Dear Mr. Lonsdale:

In accordance with your authorization of our revised Proposal No. LG-13297 dated October 31, 2013, we herein submit the results of our geotechnical investigation for the subject power poles. The accompanying report presents the results of our study and conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the geotechnical aspects of the proposed transmission line. The site is considered suitable for development provided the recommendations of this report are followed.

Should you have questions regarding this report, or if we may be of further service, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

GEOCON INCORPORATED



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE AND SCOPE
PROJECT AND SITE DESCRIPTION1
FIELD INVESTIG ATION
LABORATORY TESTING RESULTS
GEOLOGIC SETTING
GEOLOGIC AND SITE SOIL CONDITIONS96.1Undocumented Fill (Qudf)106.2Topsoil (Unmapped)106.3Colluvium (Qcol)106.4Alluvium (Qal)116.5Landslide Deposits (Qls)116.6Terrace Deposits (Qt)116.7Otay Formation (To)116.8Fanglomerate Deposits (Tof)116.9Mission Valley Formation (Tmv)126.10Santiago Peak Volcanics (Kmzu)126.11Groundwater12
RECOMMENDED FOUNDATION DESIGN PARAMETERS
CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS
ITATIONS AND UNIFORMITY OF CONDITIONS
PS AND ILLUSTRATIONS Figure 1, Vicinity Map Figures 2 – 13, Site Plan Figure 14, Flood Hazards Map PENDIX A FIELD INVESTIGATION Figures A-1 – A-21, Logs of Borings

APPENDIX B

LABORATORY TESTING Table B-I, Summary of Laboratory Direct Shear Test Results Table B-II, Summary of Laboratory Water-Soluble Sulfate Test Results Table B-III, Summary of Laboratory Water-Soluble Chloride Ion Content Test Results Table B-IV, Summary of Laboratory Potential of Hydrogen (pH) and Resistivity Test Results Figure B-1, Gradation Curves

APPENDIX C

SEISMIC REFRACTION SURVEY

GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This report presents the results of a geotechnical investigation performed for the proposed replacement of existing wood poles with new steel poles along approximately 8 miles of TL 649 transmission line in San Diego County, California. The purpose of the geotechnical investigation was to evaluate the surface and subsurface soil conditions and general site geology in the vicinity of each pole location, and to provide geotechnical design parameters required for foundation design of the proposed poles.

The scope of this geotechnical investigation included a review of readily available published and unpublished geologic literature and performing a field investigation, laboratory testing, engineering analyses, and the preparation of this report. Our geotechnical field investigation included drilling twenty-one (21) small-diameter exploratory borings to a maximum depth of approximately 41 feet. A geophysical survey consisted of eleven (11) seismic refraction lines was also conducted in the area where boring is not feasible due to environmental, overhead, and/or subsurface restraints.

The boring logs, and other details of the field investigation, are presented in Appendix A. We tested selected soil samples obtained during the field investigation to evaluate pertinent physical properties for engineering analyses and to assist in providing recommendations for foundation design criteria. Details of the laboratory test results are presented in Appendix B. Seismic refraction survey results are presented in Appendix C.

The recommendations presented in this report are based on an analysis of the data collected during site investigation, the results of laboratory tests performed on soil samples collected during the site investigation, and our experience with similar soil and geologic conditions.

2. PROJECT AND SITE DESCRIPTION

The project alignment is located along the SDG&E easement on the south side of the Otay River, east of I-805, in San Diego County, California. Specifically, the TL649 alignment extends approximately 5 miles eastward from its western terminus in the Ocean View Hills neighborhood to approximately 1³/₄ miles east of SR-125, then the alignment extends southward approximately 2 miles in the Otay Mesa area, (see *Vicinity Map*, Figure 1).

We understand that steel poles will be installed to replace the existing wooden poles along the TL649 alignment as a part of the transmission line improvements. The engineered steel poles required geotechnical explorations to provide engineering parameters for the design and construction of the

new structures. Topographically, the alignment consists of ridges and canyons that are accessed from various public roads and gated entrances along the SDG&E and local utility easements. Table 2 below lists the proposed new poles and their approximate coordinates.

Item	Structure No.	Latitude	Longitude	Work Being Done
1	Z188716	32.58748611	-117.020811	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
2	Z188717	32.58746667	-117.018200	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
3	Z188721	32.58744167	-117.014083	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
4	Z183072	32.58607778	-117.012178	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
5	Z188723	32.58600556	-117.009308	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
6	Z188724	32.58599167	-117.007742	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
7	Z183266	32.58523333	-117.005503	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
8	Z183265	32.58509722	-117.003808	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
9	Z188726	32.58499722	-117.002344	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
10	Z188727	32.58523333	-117.001289	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
11	P81121	32.58528611	-117.000622	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
12	Z81118	32.585525	-116.998222	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
13	P81117	32.58561667	-116.997253	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
14	Z81116	32.58566389	-116.996783	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
15	P81113	32.5852	-116.994383	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
16	Z81112	32.58511111	-116.993944	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
17	Z81107	32.58521667	-116.990606	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
18	Z81104	32.58497222	-116.988764	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
19	Z81097	32.58588056	-116.982850	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
20	Z81975	32.58666111	-116.975725	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
21	Z81973	32.58679722	-116.974178	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
22	Z81081	32.58722778	-116.969417	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
23	Z118863	32.58779444	-116.966711	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
24	P204534	32.58817222	-116.964944	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
25	Z81074	32.58830556	-116.964325	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
26	Z81072	32.58930556	-116.963383	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
27	Z81069	32.59044444	-116.962297	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
28	Z81066	32.59105556	-116.959650	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
29	Z81055	32.59328889	-116.950117	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
30	Z81049	32.59557778	-116.946094	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
31	Z731392	32.59654444	-116.945064	New steel FDN (TYP) pole

TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES

Item	Structure No.	Latitude	Longitude	Work Being Done
32	Z81044	32.59813889	-116.943394	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
33	Z31723	32.59831667	-116.939369	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
34	Z31729	32.59421667	-116.939364	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
35	Z31744	32.58210278	-116.939342	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
36	Z31768	32.58211111	-116.940781	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
37	Z34102	32.582125	-116.943925	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
38	Z31745	32.58213056	-116.945111	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
39	Z31746	32.58150556	-116.945106	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
40	Z31749	32.57916944	-116.945103	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
41	Z31750	32.57849444	-116.944947	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
42	Z31753	32.57649722	-116.944942	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
43	Z31754	32.57567778	-116.944936	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
44	Z31757	32.57325278	-116.944922	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
45	Z31758	32.57243611	-116.944917	New steel FDN (TYP) pole

TABLE 2 (Concluded) SUMMARY OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES

We understand that the proposed monopole foundations at each location will consist of a drilled, castin-place reinforced concrete pier that will vary in diameter and depth depending on the prevailing soil conditions and loading, but are generally on the order of 4 to 10 feet in diameter and depths of up to 40 feet.

The site description and proposed improvements are based on a site reconnaissance, the available topographic maps and plans, and discussions with you. If improvement plans differ from those described herein, Geocon Incorporated should be contacted for review of the plans and possible revisions to this report, especially with regard to changes in final grades of the top of the pole foundations.

3. FIELD INVESTIGATION

We performed our field investigation between November 11, 2013 and December 3, 2013, that consisted of drilling 21 small-diameter borings (B-2 through B-11, B-13 through B-23) to a maximum depth of approximately 41 feet. In addition, we conducted a geophysical survey including 11 seismic refraction survey lines (SL-1 through SL-11) at the locations where environmental, overhead, or subsurface constraints precluded exploratory borings. The locations of the proposed poles together with the approximate locations of the field exploration are shown on Figures 2 through 13, *Site Plans*.

Table 3 summarizes the proposed structures, approximate elevations, and associated subsurface explorations.

ID No.	Structure No.	Approximate Elevation (MSL)	Exploration No.
1	Z188716	219	SL-6
2	Z188717	228	B-2
3	Z188721	208	B-3
4	Z183072	221	B-3
5	Z188723	189	B-4
6	Z188724	199	B-4
7	Z183266	249	B-5
8	Z183265	250	B-5
9	Z188726	240	B-6
10	Z188727	223	B-6
11	P81121	212	B-7
12	Z81118	209	B-7
13	P81117	205	B-7
14	Z81116	201	B-8 & SL-7
15	P81113	212	B-8
16	Z81112	215	B-8
17	Z81107	201	B-9
18	Z81104	204	B-9
19	Z81097	211	SL-8
20	Z81975	194	B-10
21	Z81973	197	B-10
22	Z81081	224	B-11
23	Z118863	216	SL-9
24	P204534	228	B-13
25	Z81074	231	B-13
26	Z81072	221	B-14
27	Z81069	221	B-14
28	Z81066	234	B-15
29	Z81055	277	B-16
30	Z81049	285	B-17
31	Z731392	274	B-17
32	Z81044	267	B-18 & SL-10

TABLE 3 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES AND ASSOCIATED EXPLORATIONS

ID No.	Structure No.	Approximate Elevation (MSL)	Exploration No.
33	Z31723	264	B-19
34	Z31729	514	B-20 & SL-5
35	Z31744	554	SL-4
36	Z31768	474	SL-3
37	Z34102	440	SL-2
38	Z31745	531	B-22
39	Z31746	546	B-22
40	Z31749	592	SL-1
41	Z31750	603	SL-1
42	Z31753	583	B-23
43	Z31754	567	B-23 & SL-11
44	Z31757	577	B-21
45	Z31758	598	B-21

TABLE 3 (Concluded) SUMMARY OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES AND ASSOCIATED EXPLORATIONS

B = Hollow Stem Auger Boring.

SL = Seismic Refraction Line.

We advanced the borings near the proposed new steel poles to a maximum depth of 41 feet below grade using an all-terrain truck-mounted drill rig equipped with 6-inch-diameter, hollow-stem augers. We obtained relatively undisturbed samples at various depths by driving a 3-inch O.D. split-tube sampler (California Sampler) into the soil mass with a 140-pound hammer falling 30 inches. The sampler was equipped with 1-inch-high by 2³/₈-inch-diameter brass sampler rings to facilitate removal and laboratory testing of the soil recovered. We also performed Standard Penetration Tests (SPTs) at selected depths in accordance with ASTM D 1586. We collected disturbed samples from the SPT sampler and drill cuttings.

We visually examined soil conditions encountered in the borings, classified, and logged in general conformance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedure D 2488). The logs of the exploratory borings are presented on Figures A-1 through A-21 in Appendix A.

Seismic refraction survey is a commonly used geophysical technique to estimate the depth-tobedrock, competence of bedrock, or depth to other seismic velocity boundaries. Typical field procedures consist of a series of geophones placed along the line at a set distance or "geophone interval." A serious of shots will be generated by hitting a sledgehammer to a strike plate to record the refraction waves returned to the surface. Thus, a profile or cross section showing the depth to bedrock together with the seismic velocities of overburden and bedrock can be calculated. In addition, the drillability of bedrock can be estimated based on empirical relationship with the seismic velocities. The typical on-site equipment for seismic refraction survey consists of geophones, sledgehammer, strike plate, and seismographs. The results of seismic refraction survey near the proposed new steel poles are included in Appendix C of this report.

4. LABORATORY TESTING RESULTS

We performed laboratory tests on a selected sample in accordance with generally accepted test methods of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) or other suggested procedures. Selected samples were tested for their *in situ* moisture and dry density, direct shear strength, water-soluble sulfate, water-soluble chloride ion content, pH and resistivity. Additionally, we performed a grain size distribution analysis on two soil sample for potential local scour evaluation at the proposed Poles Z81973 and Z31723. The gradation curves are presented on Figure B-1. The results of the laboratory tests are presented below on Tables 4.1 through 4.5, and in Appendix B. The in-place dry density and moisture content of the samples tested are presented on the boring logs in Appendix A.

Sample	Depth of Sample Sample, feet		Dry	Moistur ('	re Content %)	Unit Peak [Ultimate*]	Angle of Peak [Ultimate*]
No.	(Geologic Unit)	Structure	Density (pcf)	Initial	Final	Cohesion (psf)	Shear Resistance (degrees)
B2-4	7.5 (Qls)	Z118717	102.1	17.9	23.5	625 [390]	29 [29]
B2-8	20 (To)	Z118717	115.4	15.3	18.6	600 [430]	31 [31]
B2-10	30 (To)	Z118717	104.3	22.8	25.1	980 [0]	38 [33]
B3-3	5 (Qudf)	Z118721	96.4	18.3	27.6	770 [715]	28 [26]
B3-5	10 (To)	Z118721	110.0	17.0	20.4	525 [470]	29 [28]
B3-7	15 (To)	Z118721	112.6	15.2	22.2	0 [0]	39 [38]
B4-4	10 (Qal)	Z118724	108.0	17.2	25.6	920 [700]	27 [27]
B4-8	20 (Qal)	Z118724	109.5	18.8	24.5	880 [640]	26 [26]
B4-12	40 (To)	Z118724	98.1	23.6	29.2	420 [340]	30 [29]
B5-2	5 (Qcol)	Z183266	98.1	18.1	25.3	350 [360]	29 [29]
B5-4	10 (To)	Z183266	113.3	7.8	16.0	700 [220]	33 [33]
B6-3	7.5 (Qcol)	Z188726	102.5	22.9	24.6	1500 [690]	25 [25]
B6-5	15 (To)	Z188726	109.5	11.1	18.9	920 [480]	22 [22]
B6-7	25 (To)	Z188726	104.6	15.5	23.1	550 [400]	22 [22]
B7-5	20 (To)	P81121	112.6	10.1	18.9	280 [250]	34 [34]

TABLE 4.1 SUMMARY OF LABORATORY DIRECT SHEAR TEST RESULTS ASTM D 3080

Sample	Depth of Sample, feet	Dry		Moistur ('	Moisture Content (%)		Angle of Peak [Ultimate*]
No.	(Geologic Unit)	Structure	Density (pcf)	Initial	Final	Cohesion (psf)	Shear Resistance (degrees)
B8-3	7.5 (Qal)	P81113	101.0	23.1	28.5	750 [720]	19 [17]
B8-5	12.5 (Qt)	P81113	111.8	14.5	21.6	140 [140]	31 [31]
B8-9	25 (To)	P81113	113.9	11.5	17.1	1400 [1100]	15 [15]
B9-2	5 (Qal)	Z81104	109.6	15.9	20.1	385 [75]	32 [32]
B13-1	5 (Qal)	Z81074	107.6	14.5	20.8	710 [650]	27 [27]
B13-5	15 (To)	Z81074	98.0	23.6	30.3	390 [400]	23 [23]
B13-7	25 (To)	Z81074	106.9	19.4	24.2	750 [500]	27 [27]
B14-3	15 (To)	Z18069	104.8	21.2	27.1	330 [125]	28 [28]
B14-8	30 (To)	Z18069	111.9	15.6	17.3	225 [430]	33 [27]
B15-3	7.5 (Qt)	Z81066	112.0	14.7	18.4	860 [840]	33 [33]
B15-5	15 (To)	Z81066	109.5	14.2	19.5	680 [490]	29 [28]
B17-3	15 (To)	Z81049	113.8	14.6	17.4	940 [660]	30 [30]
B17-5	25 (To)	Z81049	117.0	13.6	15.3	1150 [325]	30 [30]
B18-2	5 (Qt)	Z81044	117.1	11.1	15.7	860 [470]	31 [31]
B19-3	10 (To)	Z31723	115.9	9.2	18.8	240 [240]	35 [31]
B19-5	20 (To)	Z31723	118.8	10.5	18.3	580 [600]	27 [24]
B19-7	30 (To)	Z31723	119.7	13.6	21.1	690 [500]	26 [25]
B21-1	5 (To)	Z31758	100.9	18.2	26.0	640 [440]	29 [28]
B21-4	15 (To)	Z31758	98.8	15.5	24.2	630 [500]	33 [32]
B21-8	35 (To)	Z31758	103.7	21.7	24.0	780 [430]	30 [30]
B22-6	25 (To)	Z31745	89.4	31.4	39.4	1200 [500]	27 [27]
B22-8	40 (To)	Z31745	79.8	38.5	44.7	940 [730]	29 [26]
B23-3	10 (To)	Z31754	101.3	18.4	20.4	930 [660]	29 [25]
B23-5	18.5 (To)	Z31754	100.8	13.3	21.7	475 [460]	35 [33]

TABLE 4.1 (Concluded)SUMMARY OF LABORATORY DIRECT SHEAR TEST RESULTSASTM D 3080

* Ultimate values measured at end-of-test at a horizontal deflection of 0.2 inches.

TABLE 4.2 SUMMARY OF LABORATORY WATER-SOLUBLE SULFATE TEST RESULTS CALIFORNIA TEST NO. 417

Sample No.	Water-Soluble Sulfate (%)	Water-Soluble Sulfate (ppm)	Sulfate Severity
B3-1	0.002	18	Not Applicable (S0)
B5-1	0.001	8	Not Applicable (S0)
B9-1	0.0005	5	Not Applicable (S0)
B19-1	0.0003	3	Not Applicable (S0)
B23-1	0.0004	4	Not Applicable (S0)

TABLE 4.3 SUMMARY OF LABORATORY WATER-SOLUBLE CHLORIDE ION CONTENT TEST RESULTS CALIFORNIA TEST NO. 422

Sample No.	Chloride Ion Content (%)	Chloride Ion Content (ppm)
B3-1	0.011	109
B5-1	0.018	178
B9-1	0.025	248
B19-1	0.006	55
B23-1	0.033	331

TABLE 4.4 SUMMARY OF LABORATORY POTENTIAL OF HYDROGEN (PH) AND RESISTIVITY TEST RESULTS CALIFORNIA TEST NO. 643

Sample No.	рН	Minimum Resistivity (ohm-centimeters)
B3-1	7.8	570
B5-1	8.1	830
B9-1	7.6	620
B19-1	7.0	5200
B23-1	7.8	570

Sample No.	Sample Depth (ft)	% Gravel	el % Sand % Fines		USCS Classification
B10-2	14	21.3	52.1	26.6	SC
B19-1	0	53.7	35.0	11.3	GP

TABLE 4.5 SUMMARY OF LABORATORY GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION TEST RESULTS ASTM D422

5. GEOLOGIC SETTING

The site is located in the coastal plain of the Peninsular Ranges province of southern California. The Peninsular Ranges is a geologic and geomorphic province that extends from the Imperial Valley to the Pacific Ocean and from the Transverse Ranges to the north and into Baja California to the south. The coastal plain of San Diego County is underlain by a thick sequence of relatively undisturbed and non-conformable sedimentary rocks that range in age from Upper Cretaceous through the Pleistocene with intermittent deposition. Geomorphically, the coastal plain is characterized by a stair-stepped series of marine terraces, which are younger to the west and have been dissected by west flowing rivers that drain the Peninsular Ranges to the east. The coastal plain is a relatively stable block that is dissected by relatively few faults consisting of the potentially active La Nacion Fault Zone and the active Rose Canyon Fault Zone. The Peninsular Ranges are also dissected by the Elsinore Fault Zone that is associated with and sub-parallel to the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is the plate boundary between the Pacific and North American Plates.

The alignment is located on the eastern portion of the coastal plain. Marine sedimentary units make up the geologic units encountered on the alignment and consist of a Pleistocene age Terrace Deposits and the Tertiary age Otay Formation. The Terrace Deposits are shallow marine and non-marine sandstone units with layers containing cobble up to 18 inches in diameter. This unit is located on the central portion of the alignment on the southern flanks of the Otay River Valley. The Otay Formation typically consists of three lithostratagraphic members composed of a basal conglomerate member, a middle gritstone member and an upper sandstone/siltstone/claystone member with a maximum reported regional thickness of roughly 400 feet. In addition, bentonitic claystone layers are common within the upper member typically deposited as highly consolidated volcanic ash deposits.

6. GEOLOGIC AND SITE SOIL CONDITIONS

The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Study Zone as established by the State Geologist. Analysis using the computer program *EQFAULT* (Version 3.00) indicates that Rose Canyon Fault Zone, located approximately 10 miles west of the site, is the dominant source of

potential ground motion at the site. Earthquakes on the Rose Canyon Fault having a maximum magnitude of 7.2 are considered representative of the potential for seismic ground shaking at the site.

The regional geology is referenced to California Geologic Survey, *Geologic Map of the San Diego* 30' x 60' *Quadrangle, California*, prepared by Kennedy, M. P. and S. S. Tan, 2005, and *Geologic Map of the Otay Mesa* 7.5' *Quadrangle, San Diego County, Californa*, CGS and USGS, 2002.

The project site and vicinity are generally underlain by five surficial soil types and five geologic formations. The surficial unit consists of undocumented fill, topsoil, colluvium, alluvium, and landslide deposits. The formational materials consist of Terrace Deposits, Otay Formation, Fanglomerate Deposits, Mission Valley Formation, and Santiago Peak Volcanoes. The boring and seismic lines are shown next to each pole on Figures 2 through 13. The soil and geologic unit encountered or expected at each pole location are depicted in Appendix A. In addition, metavolcanic rock with varying degrees of weathering was also interpreted underlain the surficial soils along seismic refraction survey lines. The surficial soil types and geologic units are described below in order of increasing age.

6.1 Undocumented Fill (Qudf)

We encountered undocumented fill in 14 of the 21 borings to a maximum depth of 5 feet which was likely placed during the construction of access roads and/or installation of ground utilities. The undocumented fill consists primarily of loose to dense, dry to moist, silty sand, clayey sand, and sandy gravel and varies in consistancy to a firm to medium stiff, sandy clay with cobbles and gravel. We recommend the foundation of the proposed poles extends into the geologic units below the undocumented fill.

6.2 Topsoil (Unmapped)

We encountered topsoil in 3 of the 21 borings to a maximum depth of approximately 3 feet. The topsoil consists primarily of loose, sandy gravel and stiff sandy clay. The top few inches of this material typically has a high organic content due to vegetative growth. We recommend the foundation of the poles extend below topsoil into underlying geologic units.

6.3 Colluvium (Qcol)

We encountered colluvium below the undocumented fill in Borings B-5 and B-6 to a maximum depth of 10 feet. The composition of colluvium at these locations were firm to stiff sandy clay. We recommend the foundation of the poles extend below topsoil into underlying geologic units.

6.4 Alluvium (Qal)

We encountered alluvium in 7 of the 21 borings to a maximum depth of approximately 30 feet. The alluvium generally consists of medium dense to dense clayey sand, silty sand, clayey gravel, and sandy gravel and varies to stiff to hard sandy clay with gravel. The alluvium is considered suitable for support of the proposed steel pole foundations and can generally be excavated with moderate effort. The potential for liquefaction is considered low due to the presence of relatively dense soil and lack of near-surface permanent groundwater.

6.5 Landslide Deposits (QIs)

We encountered Quaternary-age Landslide Deposits, as mapped by Kennedy and Tan (2005), underlying undocumented fill in Boring B-2 (Z188717) to a maximum depth of approximately 20 feet. The Landslide Deposits encountered in B-2 generally consists of medium dense, silty sand with a trace of gravel. We recommend the foundation of the poles extend through the Landslide Deposits into underlying geologic unit.

6.6 Terrace Deposits (Qt)

Pleistocene-age Terrace Deposits unconformably overlie the Otay Formation in the vicinity of the Otay River basin. We encountered Terrace Deposits in 9 of the 21 boring drilled. This formation encountered in our borings generally consisted of medium dense to very dense clayey sand, clayey gravel, sandy gravel and stiff to hard sandy clay. The granular portions of the Terrace Deposits typically exhibit adequate shear strength and "low" expansive potential.

6.7 Otay Formation (To)

The Tertiary-age Otay Formation is the predominant geologic unit along the majority of the project alignment. As encountered in 16 of our 21 borings, the Otay Formation generally consisted of medium dense to very dense, silty sandstone, clayey sandstone and stiff to hard, sandy claystone, sandy siltstone with varying degree of cementation. Although the Otay Formation is exposed above the Fanglomerate Deposits, the stratigraphic relationship between the two formations can actually be described as "interfingering".

6.8 Fanglomerate Deposits (Tof)

The Fanglomerate facies of the Otay Formation was encountered at shallow depth in Boring B-20. This unit typically consists of very dense, moderately to slightly cemented, clayey sandstone containing up to 30 to 50 percent sub-angular gravels, cobbles and boulders up to approximately 2 feet in dimension. Fanglomerate Deposits are expected along SL-2, SL-3, and SL-5. Excavations depths in excess of 10 to 15 feet in the Fanglomerate Deposits may be very difficult and require

specialized heavy-duty equipment. Both Otay Formation and the Fanglomerate facies possess relatively high shear strength parameters.

6.9 Mission Valley Formation (Tmv)

Based on a review of the geologic map by Kennedy and Tan, 2005, we expect that the mid Tertiary– age Mission Valley Formation to be encountered along portion of the alignment at SL-6. The material typically consists of interbedded sandstone, claystone and siltstone with various degree of cementation. The Mission Valley Formations in this area exhibits adequate shear strength.

6.10 Santiago Peak Volcanics (Kmzu)

We did not encounter Santiago Peak Volcanoes at the surface or in the borings, however, several seismic lines indicate the presence of hard rock bellow the sedimentary formations. The depth varies, ranging from 35 to 60 feet at some proposed pole locations. Santiago Peak Volcanics typically consist of mildly metamorphosed volcanic and meta-sedimentary rock of the Cretaceous/Jurassic-age. These materials are generally moderately strong to strong, intensely to slightly weathered, and moderately to slightly jointed. Moderately to slightly weathered and slightly jointed metavolcanic rock will likely be very difficult to excavate or be nonrippable. Excavations within this unit will likely result in the generation of oversized material, however we do not expect the new pole foundations to encounter metavolcanic rock during construction.

6.11 Groundwater

Regional groundwater level is expected to be in excess of 100 feet below site grade. We did not encounter groundwater during our field investigation within the borings or adjacent areas and do not expect groundwater to significantly impact proposed construction. However, we encountered slight seepage in Borings B-10 and B-14 at approximately depths of 18 and 30 feet, respectively. Groundwater or perched groundwater could be encountered during construction following heavy rainfall, runoff, and/or irrigation.

7. RECOMMENDED FOUNDATION DESIGN PARAMETERS

A generalized subsurface soil profile has been developed for the area surrounding each pole foundation based on the data obtained from our exploration. Soil layers have been categorized by depth below the existing grade and assigned soil parameters that may be utilized with the *MFAD* computer program used by SDG&E for pier foundation design.

Tables 7.1 through 7.45 summarize the average total unit weight, cohesive strength, angle of internal friction, and deformation modulus assigned to the soil layers beneath the proposed pole sites. The

parameters presented herein are based on current and past experience and/or testing of similar materials. We have assumed that the existing grade will not be changed significantly. If the finalized improvements are different from those currently proposed, Geocon Incorporated should be contacted for further evaluation.

 TABLE 7.1

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z188716)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 12	Mission Valley Formation – upper	250	30	121	15	129	3.0	1.0
12 to 35	Mission Valley Formation – lower	420	35	127	10	135	4.0	1.0
35+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-6.

 TABLE 7.2

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z188717)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
2 to 20	Landslide Deposits	300	29	123	17	129	1.5	1.0
20 to 38+	Otay Formation - Claystone	600	31	128	16	132	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-2.

 TABLE 7.3

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z188721)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 5½	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
5½ to 20	Otay Formation – Sandstone	300	33	123	17	129	3.0	1.0
20 to 25	Otay Formation - Claystone	500	31	127	15	132	3.0	1.0
25 to 27+	Otay Formation – Sandstone	300	37	132	15	135	6.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-3.

 TABLE 7.4

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z183072)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 5½	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
5½ to 20	Otay Formation – Sandstone	300	33	123	17	129	3.0	1.0
20 to 25	Otay Formation - Claystone	500	31	127	15	132	3.0	1.0
25 to 27+	Otay Formation – Sandstone	300	37	132	15	135	6.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-3.

 TABLE 7.5

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z188723)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 3	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
3 to 30	Alluvium	400	27	129	17	132	1.5	1.0
30 to 40	Otay Formation - Claystone	500	31	127	18	130	3.0	1.0
40 to 41+	Otay Formation – Sandstone	300	33	123	23	126	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-4.

 TABLE 7.6

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z188724)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 3	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
3 to 30	Alluvium	400	27	129	17	132	1.5	1.0
30 to 40	Otay Formation - Claystone	500	31	127	18	130	3.0	1.0
40 to 41+	Otay Formation – Sandstone	300	33	123	23	126	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-4.

 TABLE 7.7

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z183266)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 3	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
3 to 7½	Colluvium	300	29	118	18	125	1.5	1.0
7½ to 19+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	33	130	15	134	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-5.

 TABLE 7.8

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z183265)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 3	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
3 to 7½	Colluvium	300	29	118	18	125	1.5	1.0
7½ to 19+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	33	130	15	134	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-5.

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle \$ (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 5	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
5 to 10	Colluvium	600	25	124	22	127	1.5	1.0
10 to 15	Otay Formation – Claystone	480	22	122	11	132	2.8	1.0
15 to 36+	Otay Formation – Sandstone/Siltstone	400	22	122	15	130	3.2	1.0

 TABLE 7.9

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z188726)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-6.

 TABLE 7.10

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z188727)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 5	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
5 to 10	Colluvium	600	25	124	22	127	1.5	1.0
10 to 15	Otay Formation – Claystone	480	22	122	11	132	2.8	1.0
15 to 36+	Otay Formation – Sandstone/Siltstone	400	22	122	15	130	3.2	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-6.

 TABLE 7.11

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (P81121)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 20	Alluvium	250	32	121	15	129	1.8	1.0
20 to 25+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	250	34	124	10	133	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-7.

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 20	Alluvium	250	32	121	15	129	1.8	1.0
20 to 25+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	250	34	124	10	133	3.0	1.0

 TABLE 7.12

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81118)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-7.

 TABLE 7.13

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (P81117)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 20	Alluvium	250	32	121	15	129	1.8	1.0
20 to 25+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	250	34	124	10	133	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-7.

REC	RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (281116)											
Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor				
0 to 5½	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0				
5½ to 9	Alluvium	600	19	124	23	126	1.5	1.0				
9 to 181⁄2	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	140	31	129	15	133	2.0	1.0				
18½ to 30	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	33	128	12	134	3.0	1.0				
30 to 35	Otay Formation - Claystone	500	31	116	10	129	3.0	1.0				
35 to 38	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	37	121	10	132	4.0	1.0				
381/2+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9				

 TABLE 7.14

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81116)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-8 and at SL-7.

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 5½	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
5½ to 9	Alluvium	600	19	124	23	126	1.5	1.0
9 to 18½	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	140	31	129	15	133	2.0	1.0
18½ to 30	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	33	128	12	134	3.0	1.0
30 to 35	Otay Formation - Claystone	500	31	116	10	129	3.0	1.0
35 to 38	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	37	121	10	132	4.0	1.0
381/2+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

 TABLE 7.15

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (P81113)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-8.

 TABLE 7.16

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81112)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 5½	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
5½ to 9	Alluvium	600	19	124	23	126	1.5	1.0
9 to 181⁄2	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	140	31	129	15	133	2.0	1.0
18½ to 30	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	33	128	12	134	3.0	1.0
30 to 35	Otay Formation - Claystone	500	31	116	10	129	3.0	1.0
35 to 38	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	37	121	10	132	4.0	1.0
381/2+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-8.

 TABLE 7.17

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81107)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 3½	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
3½ to 8½	Alluvium	350	32	128	16	132	2.0	1.0
8½ to 15	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	140	31	129	15	133	2.0	1.0
15 to 17+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	33	126	10	134	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-9.

 TABLE 7.18

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81104)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 3½	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
3½ to 8½	Alluvium	350	32	128	16	132	2.0	1.0
8½ to 15	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	140	31	129	15	133	2.0	1.0
15 to 17+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	33	126	10	134	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-9.

TABLE 7.19RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81097)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 10	Alluvium	300	32	128	16	132	2.0	1.0
10 to 20	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	140	31	129	15	133	2.5	1.0
20 to 45	Otay Formation	300	33	126	10	134	3.0	1.0
45+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-8.

TABLE 7.20 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81975)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 12	Alluvium	300	32	128	16	132	2.0	1.0
12 to 18	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	140	31	129	15	133	2.5	1.0
18 to 31 ¹ / ₂ +	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	33	126	10	134	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-10.

TABLE 7.21 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81973) Total Total Unit Friction Saturated Moist Moisture Deformation Strength Soil/Rock Cohesion Depth (feet) Angle **b** Unit Content Unit Modulus E_p Reduction Туре с Weight **y** (%) Weight y (ksi) Factor (degrees) (psf) (pcf) (pcf)

128

129

126

16

15

10

132

133

134

300 Sandstone

300

140

32

31

33

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-10.

TABLE 7.22 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81081)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
2 to 191⁄2	Terrace Deposits – Clayey/Sandy Gravel	140	31	129	15	133	2.5	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-11.

0 to 12

12 to 18

18 to 31¹/₂+

Alluvium

Terrace Deposits -

Sandy Gravel Otay Formation - 1.0

1.0

1.0

2.0

2.5

3.0

 TABLE 7.23

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z118863)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 8	Alluvium	300	32	128	16	132	2.0	1.0
8 to 20	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	300	33	128	12	134	3.0	1.0
20 to 38	Otay Formation - Sandstone	500	31	116	10	129	3.0	1.0
38 to 50+	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	300	37	121	10	132	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-9.

 TABLE 7.24

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (P204534)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 8	Alluvium	250	27	123	15	130	1.5	1.0
8 to 30½	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	400	27	125	20	128	2.0	1.0
30½ to 35	Otay Formation - Sandstone	200	37	126	18	130	3.0	1.0
35+	Otay Formation – Claystone	600	33	129	18	132	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-13.

 TABLE 7.25

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81074)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 8	Alluvium	250	27	123	15	130	1.5	1.0
8 to 30 ¹ /2	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	400	27	125	20	128	2.0	1.0
30½ to 35	Otay Formation - Sandstone	200	37	126	18	130	3.0	1.0
35 to 35½+	Otay Formation – Claystone	600	33	129	18	132	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-13.

 TABLE 7.26

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81072)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 1	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
1 to 10	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	100	36	115	15	125	3.0	1.0
10 to 14	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	330	28	124	15	128	2.8	1.0
14 to 30 ¹ / ₂ +	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Sandstone	430	27	127	22	128	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-14.

 TABLE 7.27

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81069)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 1	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
1 to 10	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	100	36	115	15	125	3.0	1.0
10 to 14	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	330	28	124	15	128	2.8	1.0
14 to 30 ¹ / ₂ +	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Sandstone	430	27	127	22	128	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-14.

 TABLE 7.28

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81066)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
2 to 131/2	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	600	33	128	15	133	2.2	1.0
13 to 20+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	450	30	125	14	131	3.6	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-15.

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 4	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
4 to 18+	Terrace Deposits – Sandy/Clayey Gravel	150	36	129	15	133	4.0	1.0

 TABLE 7.29

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81055)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in current Boring B-16.

 TABLE 7.30

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81049)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
2 to 12	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Clay	600	30	128	15	132	1.6	1.0
12 to 29+	Otay Formation – Sandstone/Claystone	320	30	131	14	138	3.5	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-17.

TABLE 7.31 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z731392)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
2 to 12	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Clay	600	30	128	15	132	1.6	1.0
12 to 29+	Otay Formation – Sandstone/Claystone	320	30	131	14	138	3.5	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-17.

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 1	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
1 to 5	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	150	36	124	11	133	3.0	1.0
5 to 15	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	450	31	128	11	135	3.5	1.0
15 to 45	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	450	30	132	10	138	4.0	1.0
45+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

 TABLE 7.32

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81044)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-18 and at SL-10.

 TABLE 7.33

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31723)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 7½	Alluvium	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
7½ to 30	Otay Formation - Sandstone	240	32	128	10	136	4.0	1.0
30 to 36	Otay Formation – Siltstone	500	26	136	14	138	4.0	1.0
36 to 40½+	Otay Formation - Sandstone	300	37	136	14	138	6.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-19.

TABLE 7.34
RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31729)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 3	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
3 to 60	Fanglomerate Deposits	300	36	127	10	135	4.0	1.0
60+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-20 and at SL-5.

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
2 to 20+	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	450	30	132	10	138	4.0	1.0

 TABLE 7.35

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31744)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-4.

TABLE 7.36 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31768)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 15	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
15 to 20	Colluvium	300	30	120	15	129	2.0	1.0
20 to 45	Fanglomerate Deposits	300	36	127	10	135	4.0	1.0
45+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-3.

TABLE 7.37 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z34102)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 20	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	450	30	132	10	138	2.2	1.0
20 to 60+	Fanglomerate Deposits	300	36	127	10	135	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-2.

							``	
Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 11/2	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
1½ to 5	Otay Formation - Sandstone	200	30	127	15	132	2.0	1.0
5 to 13	Otay Formation – Sandy Gravel	250	36	132	10	138	3.5	1.0
13 to 41+	Otay Formation – Siltstone	700	29	125	25	125	3.0	1.0

 TABLE 7.38

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31745)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-22.

 TABLE 7.39

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31746)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 1½	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
1½ to 5	Otay Formation - Sandstone	200	30	127	15	132	2.0	1.0
5 to 13	Otay Formation – Sandy Gravel	250	36	132	10	138	3.5	1.0
13 to 41+	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	700	29	125	25	125	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-22.

 TABLE 7.40

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31749)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
2 to 35	Otay Formation - Sandstone	200	30	127	15	132	2.0	1.0
35 to 50	Fanglomerate Deposits	300	36	127	10	135	4.0	1.0
50+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-1.

TABLE 7.41 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31750)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
2 to 35	Otay Formation - Sandstone	200	30	127	15	132	2.0	1.0
35 to 50	Fanglomerate Deposits	300	36	127	10	135	4.0	1.0
50+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-1.

TABLE 7.42 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31753)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle φ (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
2 to 10	Otay Formation – Sandstone	300	32	121	15	129	3.0	1.0
10 to 15	Otay Formation – Siltstone	500	29	120	18	126	3.5	1.0
15 to 19½+	Otay Formation – Sandstone	400	36	115	13	126	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-23.

REC	OMMENDED SO	IL PARA	METERS	FOR PIE	R FOUND	ATION DE	SIGN (Z31754	4)
Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight y	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Streng Reduct Facto

TABLE 7.43

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle \$ (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
2 to 10	Otay Formation – Sandstone	300	32	121	15	129	3.0	1.0
10 to 15	Otay Formation – Siltstone	500	29	120	18	126	3.5	1.0
15 to 19½+	Otay Formation – Sandstone	400	36	115	13	126	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-23 and SL-11.

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 5	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
5 to 41+	Otay Formation- Sandstone/Siltstone	400	30	120	17	127	3.0	1.0

 TABLE 7.44

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31757)

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-21.

 TABLE 7.45

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31758)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 5	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
5 to 41+	Otay Formation- Sandstone/Siltstone	400	30	120	17	127	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-21.

We understand initially from SDG&E that the proposed poles Z81975 and Z31723 may be subject to potential scour due to the proximity to Otay River channel. Gradation analyses using representative soil samples from Borings B-10 and B-19 were performed to facilitate local scour evaluation if necessary. However, a further review of the current FEMA online flood hazards map along the TL 649 alignment indicates that no pole is located within "High Risk Area – Floodway", and only pole (Z81975) is located within the "High Risk Area" as depicted on Figure 10, *FEMA Hazards Map*.

In general, local scour is a function of the depth of water, diameter of drilled pier, gradation of surficial soil, and the velocity of flow. A hydrologic and/or hydraulic report for the project is not available at this point. Based on Figure 10, the location of Z81975 is not located within the potential active flow channel in case of a flood event. However, this location could be submerged due to potential backflow entering the locally depression pocket. The depth of backflow water would likely be limited and the velocity of the backflow, if any is expected to be relatively slow. Therefore the potential for local scour at this pole is likely low.

For the purpose of a conservative foundation design, a worst scenario assuming an active flow velocity at this pole may be considered. Using the formula by Laursen (1962), the estimated local

scour depths are summarized in Table 7.46 based on a pier diameter of 6 feet and the approximate median diameter of the surficial soil of between 0.46 mm and 2.2 mm.

Assumed Pier Diameter, feet	Assumed Flow Depth, feet	Estimated Local Scour Depth, feet
6	4	5.5
6	6	6.5
6	8	8.0
6	10	8.5

TABLE 7.46SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED LOCAL SCOUR AT Z81975

Note: Worst scenario with active flow velocity assumed.

8. CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

We expect very dense to hard formational materials with varying amounts of gravel, cobbles, and boulders will be encountered during some pole installations at the site. The contactor should have auger, core barrels, and excavating tools suitable for penetrating dense layers, concretions, and cemented zones on-site during the pole construction.

Slight seepage was encountered in Borings B-10 and B-14 at approximately depths of 18 and 30 feet, respectively. Ground water or perched groundwater could be encountered during construction following heavy rainfall, runoff, and/or irrigation. Sloughing or reveling could occur where relatively clean sands are encountered below the groundwater level. Casing and/or wet methods may be necessary for the installation of pole foundation below groundwater, if any.

The drilling equipment should allow maneuverability on difficult and sloped terrain, penetration and support of weak and unconsolidated soils, and/or rotary percussive drilling in obstructions including cobbles and hard formational materials.

LIMITATIONS AND UNIFORMITY OF CONDITIONS

- 1. The firm that performed the geotechnical investigation for the project should be retained to provide testing and observation services during construction to provide continuity of geotechnical interpretation and to check that the recommendations presented for geotechnical aspects of site development are incorporated during site grading, construction of improvements, and excavation of foundations. If another geotechnical firm is selected to perform the testing and observation services during construction operations, that firm should prepare a letter indicating their intent to assume the responsibilities of project geotechnical engineer of record. A copy of the letter should be provided to the regulatory agency for their records. In addition, that firm should provide revised recommendations concerning the geotechnical aspects of the proposed development, or a written acknowledgement of their concurrence with the recommendations presented in our report. They should also perform additional analyses deemed necessary to assume the role of Geotechnical Engineer of Record.
- 2. The recommendations of this report pertain only to the site investigated and are based upon the assumption that the soil conditions do not deviate from those disclosed in the investigation. If any variations or undesirable conditions are encountered during construction, or if the proposed construction will differ from that anticipated herein, Geocon Incorporated should be notified so that supplemental recommendations can be given. The evaluation or identification of the potential presence of hazardous or corrosive materials was not part of the scope of services provided by Geocon Incorporated.
- 3. This report is issued with the understanding that it is the responsibility of the owner or his representative to ensure that the information and recommendations contained herein are brought to the attention of the architect and engineer for the project and incorporated into the plans, and the necessary steps are taken to see that the contractor and subcontractors carry out such recommendations in the field.
- 4. The findings of this report are valid as of the present date. However, changes in the conditions of a property can occur with the passage of time, whether they be due to natural processes or the works of man on this or adjacent properties. In addition, changes in applicable or appropriate standards may occur, whether they result from legislation or the broadening of knowledge. Accordingly, the findings of this report may be invalidated wholly or partially by changes outside our control. Therefore, this report is subject to review and should not be relied upon after a period of three years.



N NO SCALE

THE GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION MADE AVAILABLE FOR DISPLAY WAS PROVIDED BY GOOGLE EARTH, THE BEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION INVALID AVAILABLE FOR DISPLAT WAS PROVIDED BY GODGLE BARTINE SUBJECT TO A LICENSING AGREEMENT. THE INFORMATION IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY; IT IS NOT INTENDED FOR CLIENT'S USE OR RELIANCE AND SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED BY CLIENT. CLIENT SHALL INDEMNIFY, DEFEND AND HOLD HARMLESS GEOCON FROM ANY LIABILITY INCURRED AS A RESULT OF SUCH USE OR RELIANCE BY CLIENT.





	VICINITY MAP	
	SDG&E TL649	
WOOD T	O STEEL IMPROVEMENTS	
SAN DIEG	o county, california	
DATE 01 - 29 - 2014	PROJECT NO. G1115 - 52 - 54	FIG. 1

ME / AML

DSK/GTYPD

REVISED DATE 02 - 24 - 2014

Vicinity Map



SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA


Y \PROJECTS\G1115-52-54 (SDG&E TL 649)\SHEETS\G1115-52-54 Map.dwg

















Y \PROJECTS\G1115-52-54 (SDG&E TL 649)\SHEETS\G1115-52-54 Map.dwg



THE GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION MADE AVAILABLE FOR DISPLAY WAS PROVIDED BY GOOGLE EARTH, SUBJECT TO A LICENSING AGREEMENT. THE INFORMATION IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY; IT IS NOT INTENDED FOR CLIENT'S USE OR RELIANCE AND SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED BY CLIENT. CLIENT SHALL INDEMNIFY, DEFEND AND HOLD HARMLESS GEOCON FROM ANY LIABILITY INCURRED AS A RESULT OF SUCH USE OR RELIANCE BY CLIENT.

SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA





SCALE 1"=250'

GEOCON LEGEND

- Z31758 APPROX. LOCATION OF PROPOSED STEEL POLE
- B-23 APPROX. LOCATION OF EXPLORATORY BORING



Y:\PROJECTS\G1115-52-54 (SDG&E TL 649)\SHEETS\G1115-52-54 Map.dwg



THE GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION MADE AVAILABLE FOR DISPLAY WAS PROVIDED BY GOOGLE EARTH, SUBJECT TO A LICENSING AGREEMENT. THE INFORMATION IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY; IT IS NOT INTENDED FOR CLIENT'S USE OR RELIANCE AND SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED BY CLIENT. CLIENT SHALL INDEMNIFY, DEFEND AND HOLD HARMLESS GEOCON FROM ANY LIABILITY INCURRED AS A RESULT OF SUCH USE OR RELIANCE BY CLIENT.

 FIGURE
 13

 SITE PLAN
 DATE
 01 - 29 - 2014

 REVISED DATE
 02 - 24 - 2014

Y \PROJECTS\G1115-52-54 (SDG&E TL 649)\SHEETS\G1115-52-54 Map.dwg



SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS





APPENDIX A

FIELD INVESTIGATION

We performed the current field investigation, including 21 borings (B-2 through B-11 and B-13 through B-23), on November 11, 2013 through December 3, 2013. We also performed a geophysical survey including 11 seismic refraction survey lines (SL-1 through SL-11) at the locations where environmental, overhead, and subsurface restrictions precluded drilling during our field investigation. The locations of the exploratory borings and seismic refraction lines are shown on *Site Plans*, Figures 2 through 13. Boring logs and an explanation of the geologic units encountered are presented in figures following the text in this appendix.

We obtained samples using a Modified California Sampler and/or Standard Penetration Test (SPT). The type of sample is noted on the exploratory boring logs, Figures A-1 through A-21. The laboratory tests are presented in Appendix B.

The details of the fieldwork and the results of the seismic refraction survey are presented in Appendix C.

	1	1	1	1		1					
		75	TER		BORING B 2	CE ().	ΥTI	RE (%)			
DEPTH IN EEET	SAMPLE NO.	НОГОС	NDWA	SOIL CLASS	ELEV. (MSL.) 240' DATE COMPLETED 11-11-2013	ETRAT SISTAN	DENS P.C.F.)	DISTUF UTENT			
		E	GROU	(USCS)	EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	PENE RES (BLC	DRY (MC CON			
- 0 -	B2-1			CL	TOPSOIL						
			-		Stiff, damp, brown, Sandy CLAY	-					
- 2 -	B2-2			SM	LANDSLIDE DEBRIS (Qls) Medium dense, moist, light grayish brown, Silty, fine- to medium-grained SAND; trace carbonates	_ 32					
	B2-3		-		-Becomes dry, loose, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained	9					
- 8 -	. B2-4			<u>-</u>	Medium dense, moist, light yellowish brown, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained SAND; some carbonates; trace clasts of cemented gravel	 21		17.9			
- 10 -	B2-5				-Becomes loose	7 7					
- 12 - 	B2-6					13	104.9	16.8			
- 14 -			-		-Becomes fine- to coarse-grained	-					
 - 16 - 	B2-7		 - -	 SM	Medium dense, moist, reddish brown, Silty, fine to medium SAND	18 - -					
- 18 - 						_					
- 20 - 	B2-8			CL	OTAY FORMATION (To) Very stiff, moist, olive brown, Sandy CLAYSTONE	48	115.4	15.3			
- 22 -						_					
- 24 -						_					
- 26 - - 26 -	B2-9			CH	Very stiff, moist, pinkish gray, Silty CLAYSTONE; ("Bentonite"), waxy texture common parting surfaces	24					
- 28 - 						_					
Figure	• A-1,						G111	5-52-54.GPJ			
Log o	f Boring	g B 2	2, F	Page 1	of 2						

... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE ... CHUNK SAMPLE ▼ ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE NOTE: THE LOG OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS SHOWN HEREON APPLIES ONLY AT THE SPECIFIC BORING OR TRENCH LOCATION AND AT THE DATE INDICATED. IT IS NOT WARRANTED TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS AT OTHER LOCATIONS AND TIMES.

SAMPLE SYMBOLS



		1	1			1				
DEPTH		ЭGҮ	ATER	SOIL	BORING B 2	ATION NNCE /FT.)	NSITY Ξ.)	JRE IT (%)		
IN FEET	NO.	НОГ	NDV	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 240' DATE COMPLETED 11-11-2013	IETR/ SIST/ OWS	Y DEN (P.C.I	OISTI		
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	RE (BI	DR	≥O		
			\vdash		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION					
- 30 -	B2-10			СН	-Hard to thickly bedded, internal parting surface	65	104.3	22.8		
 - 32 -						_				
						_				
- 34 -						-				
	B2-11				-Becomes hard, poorly indurated, reddish brown, Sandy CLAYSTONE with	67				
- 30 - 					bentonne texture	_				
- 38 -			1		BORING REFUSAL AT 38 FEET					
					Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 7.5 ft ³ grout slurry					
Figure	• A-1,	1	1			1	G111	5-52-54.GPJ		
Log o	f Borin	gB2	2, F	Page 2	of 2					
SAMP	PLE SYME	BOLS		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S.	SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED)				
1				🕅 DISTL	IRBED OR BAG SAMPLE 🛛 🔪 WATER	ABLE OR SE	EPAGE			



			-					
DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ГІТНОГОСУ	ROUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 3 ELEV. (MSL.) 207' DATE COMPLETED 11-11-2013	ENETRATION RESISTANCE (BLOWS/FT.)	DRY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)
			GF		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE]	
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
	B3-1			CL	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf) Firm damp brown Sandy CLAY			
					Thin, wanp, orown, bandy CLAYT			
	B3-2	$\langle / / \rangle$				7		
		[/]						
4	ļ ſ							
6	B3-3		<u>.</u>	SM	ΟΤΑΥ FORMATION (Το)	29	96.4	18.3
_ 0 _] [•	5111	Medium dense, moist, yellowish brown, Silty, fine- to medium-grained			
	B3-4		°		SANDSIONE; abundant carbonates, weakly cemented	31		
	55-4		•					
	[• •					
- 10 -	B3-5		•		-Becomes fine- to coarse-grained SAND	45	110.0	17.0
			•					
- 12 -								
	B3-6		•	SM	Medium dense, moist, grayish brown, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained SANDSTONE; moderately cemented	- 27		
- 14 -	╎┍					-		
	B3-7		•			32	112.6	15.2
- 16 -			• •		-Uniform, thickly bedded	-		
			• •			-		
- 18 -			•			-		
			•			-		
- 20 -	B3-8			$-\frac{1}{CL}$	Very stiff, moist, light brown, Sandy CLAYSTONE; few fine gravel within	$-\frac{1}{22}$		
	200				matrix, trace BENTONITE CLAYSTONE	⊢		
- 22 -	[-		
						-		
- 24 -						-		
	B2 0		- -	SMEC	Very dense moist light brown Silty to Clayery fine grained CANDSTONE:	50/2"		
- 26 -			•	SIVI-SC	well cemented, difficult drilling	- 30/3		
			°		DODING DEDUCAL AT 27 FEFT			
					Groundwater not encountered			
					Backfilled with 5.3 ft ³ grout slurry			
<u> </u>								
Figure	A-2, f Boring		2 6	h and	of 1		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
	i Bolilių	y D C	, г	aye I				
SAMF	PLE SYMB	OLS		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)	

M. ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE
 M. ... CHUNK SAMPLE
 Y.... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE



-		-	_					
DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ГІТНОГОСУ	ROUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 4 ELEV. (MSL.) 199' DATE COMPLETED 11-11-2013 EQUIPMENT MARI 5 W/ 6-inch HSA	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (BLOWS/FT.)	DRY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)
			U			_		
0					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
0	B4-1		:	SC	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf)			
- 2 -					Loose, ury, grayish brown, Clayey SAND	_		
	1		1	SC				
- 4 -	1			50	Medium dense, moist, dark brown, Clayey SAND	-		
	B4-2					27		
- 6 -					-Trace carbonates	-		
						-		
- 8 -	B4-3				-Uniform	_ 15		
			1		Children	-		
- 10 -							100.0	15.0
L _	B4-4				-Uniform	23	108.0	17.2
- 12 -			;					
12	B4-5		1		-Massive	16		
- 14 -						-		
	B4-6	-4-		CL	Stiff, moist, brown, Sandy CLAY	27	114.7	16.2
- 16 -			1			-		
			1			-		
- 18 -	B4-7		1		-Poor recovery	_ 19		
			1		Tool Reovery	-		
- 20 -			1				100 5	10.0
L _	B4-8]		-Becomes fat CLAY	33	109.5	18.8
- 22 -								
22								
						Γ		
- 24 -						-		
	B4-9	$\left \right $			-Uniform, very stiff	19		
- 26 -						-		
						-		
- 28 -						-		
			1			-		
		[]]						
Figure	e A-3,				-6.0		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
	T Boring	<u>дв</u> 4	₽, P	age 1	01 2			
SAME		210		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)	
SAMPLE SYMBOLS								



			_					
DEPTH		GY	ATER	SOIL	BORING B 4	TION VCE FT.)	SITY (RE [(%)
IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	гного	UNDW/	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 199' DATE COMPLETED 11-11-2013	IETRA SISTAN OWS/I	Y DEN (P.C.F	OISTU
			GROI	()	EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BL	DR	≥O
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 30 - - 32 -	B4-10			CL	OTAY FORMATION (To) Stiff, moist, whitish gray, Sandy CLAYSTONE; highly weathered, trace carbonates	22 	108.3	17.8
 - 34 -						_		
 - 36 - 	B4-11				-Becomes very stiff	21 		
- 38 - 						_		
- 40 -	B4-12		1	SM -	Medium dense, moist, light brown, Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE; weakly	23	98.1	23.6
					BORING TERMINATED AT 41 FEET Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 8.0 ft ³ grout slurry			
Figure Log o	e A-3, f Borin	gB4	I, F	Page 2	of 2		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
SAMPLE SYMBOLS Image: Sampling unsuccessful Image: Sampling unsuccessful Image: Sampling unsuccessful Image: Sampling unsuccessful Image: Sample under the sample of the sa								

1	1		_						
DEPTH		ЭСУ	ATER	SOIL	BORING B 5	ATION NCE /FT.)	VSITY ⊑.)	JRE IT (%)	
IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	THOL	NDN	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 249' DATE COMPLETED 11-13-2013	JETR/ SISTA -OWS	Y DEN (P.C.I	OISTI	
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BL (BL	DR	© ⊻	
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION				
- 0 -	B5-1			SM	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf)				
- 2 -					Loose, dry, gray brown, Snty, fine- to medium-gramed, trace graver	_			
- 4 -				CL	COLLUVIUM (Qcol) Stiff, moist, brown, Sandy CLAY; few carbonates	_			
	B5-2					- 18	98.1	18.1	
- 6 -									
- 8 -	B5-3			SM	OTAY FORMATION (To)	_ 32			
					Dense, moist, whitish gray, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained SANDSTONE; ("GRITSTONE"), moderately cemented	_			
- 10 -	B5-4)))		-Some fine gravel, moderately cemented	- 53	113.3	7.8	
						-			
- 12 -			, , ,						
- 14 -						_			
	B5-5				-Becomes very dense, predominantly fine- to medium-grained	- 68		15.0	
- 16 -						-			
						-			
- 18 - 	B5-6		, ,		-Difficult drilling, progress slow, few, coarse subrounded gravel -Becomes well cemented, practical	54			
					-Refusal with hollow stem auger				
					BORING REFUSAL AT 19 FEET Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 3.7 ft ³ grout slurry				
Figure	Δ_ <u>Δ</u>						G111	5-52-54.GP.J	
Log of Boring B 5, Page 1 of 1									
SAME				SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)		
SAIVIP	SAMPLE SYMBOLS				RBED OR BAG SAMPLE WATER	TABLE OR SE	EPAGE		

-								
DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ГІТНОГОЄУ	GROUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 6 ELEV. (MSL.) 240' DATE COMPLETED 11-13-2013 EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (BLOWS/FT.)	DRY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)
			┢					
- 0 -			_	SM	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
		말라		SIVI	Medium dense, damp, light grayish brown, Silty, fine SAND; trace rootlets	_		
2 -								
2	B6-1							
F -	1 🛛					-		
- 4 -			-			-		
				CI		- 7		
- 6 -	B6-2				Firm, moist, brown, Sandy CLAY	_ /		
Ű					,,,,			
						-	100.5	
- 8 -	B6-3				-Becomes stiff	- 26	102.5	22.9
	-		1			-		
- 10 -		Inta	1					
L _	B6-4			CL	OTAY FORMATION (To) Very stiff moist light gravish brown Sandy CLAYSTONE	18		
					very still, moist, light grayish brown, Sandy CL2 (15101)			
- 12 -	1					-		
	-					-		
- 14 -	-					L		
10	B6-5			$-\frac{1}{80}$	Medium dense maist light grav. Clavey fine- to medium-grained	${24}$		
- 16 -	1 Г				SANDSTONE; weakly cemented, trace fine gravel	- 27	107.5	11.1
						-		
- 18 -	-					-		
F -						L		
_ 20 _								
20	B6-6					19		
	1					-		
- 22 -	1					-		
						-		
- 24 -								
			Ĺ_					
	B6-7			SC	Medium dense, moist, grayish brown, Clayey, fine-grained SANDSTONE;	16	104.6	15.5
- 26 -	1 [weakly cemented	-		
	1					-		
- 28 -	-					-		
L -			×					
Figure	e A-5,						G111	5-52-54.GPJ
Log o	f Boring	gВб	6, F	Page 1	of 2			
SAMPLE SYMBOLS							SIURBED)	
1				W DISIL	JINDED UN DAG SAMPLE 🔊 UNUNK SAMPLE 💆 WATER	I ABLE UK SE	EPAGE	

1		1	-	1				
DEPTH IN	SAMPLE	огосу	DWATER	SOIL CLASS	BORING B 6	RATION STANCE VS/FT.)	DENSITY C.F.)	STURE ENT (%)
FEET	NO.	LITH	NNO	(USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 240 DATE COMPLETED 11-13-2013	ENET RESIS	RY [(Р.	
			GR		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE			0
_ 30 _					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
	B6-8		-	ML	Stiff, moist, gray, Sandy SILTSTONE	25		
- 32 -			, ,	<u>-</u>	Medium dense, moist, reddish brown, Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE;			
					weakly cemented, friable	-		
- 34 -			> >		-Dimont drining	-		
	B6-9		, ,	SM -	Dense, moist, reddish, brown, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained SANDSTONE;		106.5	5.3
- 36 -		مْ الْمَ أَمْ	<u>}</u> – –		\neg moderately cemented			
					Groundwater not encountered			
					Backfilled with 7.1 ft ³ grout slurry			
Figure	e A-5,						G111	5-52-54.GPJ
Log o	fBoring	g B 6	6, F	Page 2	of 2			
SAMPLE SYMBOLS								
	SAMPLE SYMBOLS		ULS 🕅 DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE 🛛 CHUNK SAMPLE 🔍 WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE					

(m)			_						
DEPTH		βGY	ATER	SOIL	BORING B 7	TION NCE FT.)	SITY (:	IRE Г (%)	
IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	DIOH	MDNL	CLASS	ELEV. (MSL.) 212' DATE COMPLETED 11-13-2013	ETRA SISTAI OWS/	Y DEN (P.C.F	OISTU NTEN ⁻	
			GRO	(0000)	EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BL	DR	Ŭ Ū C	
			\vdash		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION				
- 0 -		0.000			BASE				
 - 2 -	B7-1			GC	ALLUVIUM (Qal) Dense, moist, dark reddish brown, Clayey GRAVEL with sand, sampling not practical to approx 6 feet	-			
- 4 -						-			
- 6 -	1	00				-			
 - 8 -	B7-2			SM-CL	Dense to hard, moist, brown to grayish brown, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained SAND to Sandy CLAY with gravel	 35			
- 10 -					-Gravel lense encountered to about 13 beet	_			
- 12 -	B7-3					-			
- 14 -						-			
- 16 -					-No recovery, sampling unsuccessful	46			
- 18 -	B7-4					16			
					-Medium dense to very stiff	_			
- 20 -	B7-5	ار ا و مر ۰۰ ۰ ۰ ۰	-	SC	OTAV FORMATION (To)	23	112.6	10.1	
 - 22 -				50	Medium dense, moist, grayish brown, Clayey, fine- to coarse-grained SANDSTONE; ("GRITSTONE"); few coarse subrounded gravel, moderately cemented	_	112.0	10.1	
 - 24 -						-			
┣ -		_ <u> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</u>			-Difficult drilling from 23 feet	<u>├</u>			
					BORING REFUSAL AT 25 FEET Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 4.9 ft ³ grout slurry				
Figure A-6. G1115-52-54.GPJ									
Log o	f Boring	gB7	' , F	Page 1	of 1				
CANF				SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)		
SAMPLE SYMBOLS									

SAMPLE SYMBOLS

		1	1			1					
		<u>≻</u>	TER		BORING B 8	CE ()	Ł	(%)			
DEPTH IN	SAMPLE	OLOG	-NDWA	SOIL CLASS	ELEV. (MSL.) 212' DATE COMPLETED 11-14-2013	TRATI STAN(WS/F	DENSI C.F.)	ISTUR TENT (
FEET		Ē	ROU	(USCS)		PENE RESI (BLC	DRY (F	CON			
			U								
- 0 -			,		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION						
		0000		80	BASE						
- 2 -	D9 1				Medium dense, moist, brown, Clayey SAND; trace gravel	-					
	D0-1					-					
- 4 -						-					
	B8-2					- 11					
- 6 -				CL	ALLUVIUM (Qal) Stiff, moist, light yellowish brown, Sandy CLAY; trace fine gravel, highly	-					
					weathered	-	101.0	22.1			
- 8 -	B8-3					_ 24	101.0	23.1			
				SC	TERRACE DEPOSITS (Qt)						
_ 10 _	B8-4				medium to coarse subangular gravel within matrix	18					
- 12 -	▎										
	B8-5				-Becomes light grayish brown	_ 22	111.8	14.5			
- 14 -						_					
	D8.6				Bacomac brown uniform consistency	- 18					
- 16 -	D0-0				-Becomes brown, uniform consistency	-					
	[-					
- 18 -	B8-7				-Basal coarse gravel along contact	_ 31					
				SM	OTAY FORMATION (To)	-					
- 20 -	B8-8				coarse-grained SANDSTONE; ("GRITSTONE"), weakly cemented, friable,	20					
			> >		fine gravel within matrix	-					
- 22 -			, ,								
_ 24 _			ò								
						L					
- 26 -	B8-9			SM	Medium dense, moist, reddish brown to grayish brown, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained SANDSTONE; ("GRITSTONE"), moderately cemented	39	113.9	11.5			
- 28 -			, ,			-					
			, ,			-					
Figure							G111	5-52-54 GP I			
Log o	Log of Boring B 8, Page 1 of 2										
					LING UNSUCCESSFUL	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)				

Same and the second sec ... CHUNK SAMPLE ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE NOTE: THE LOG OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS SHOWN HEREON APPLIES ONLY AT THE SPECIFIC BORING OR TRENCH LOCATION AND AT THE DATE INDICATED. IT IS NOT WARRANTED TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS AT OTHER LOCATIONS AND TIMES.



	1	1		1				
DEPTH	SAMPLE	-0GY	WATER	SOIL	BORING B 8	ATION ANCE S/FT.)	ENSITY F.)	TURE NT (%)
FEET	NO.	THOI	UND	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 212' DATE COMPLETED 11-14-2013	NETR	кү DE (P.C	AOIS ⁻
			GRC		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	RE RE	Ъ	2 O O
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 30 -	B8-10			CH-CL	-Basal gravel along formational contact	40		
					Hard, moist, brown, Silty CLAYSTONE; ("BENTONITE")			
					-Grades to Sandy CLAYSTONE	_		
- 34 -						-		
	B8-11			<u></u>	-Difficult drilling, slow progress			10.2
- 36 -	D0-11			5 11	SANDSTONE; friable, low cohesive strength		100.8	10.2
	B8-12				-Very dense	- 50/6"		
- 38 -					- Becomes very difficult drilling	_		
					-Poor recovery at 38.5 feet, possible rock encountered			
					Groundwater not encountered			
					Backfilled with 7.6 ft' grout slutry			
Figure	Δ_7						G111	5-52-54 GP I
Logo	f Boring	gB8	8, F	Page 2	of 2		0.11	
SAMF	SAMPLE SYMBOLS							
1				🕅 DISTL	JRBED OR BAG SAMPLE ■ CHUNK SAMPLE ■ WATER	TABLE OR SE	EPAGE	

DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ГІТНОГОЄУ	GROUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 9 ELEV. (MSL.) 205' DATE COMPLETED 11-14-2013 EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (BLOWS/FT.)	DRY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	
			┢						
- 0 -		0.0.00			BASE				
- 2 - - 2 -	B9-1			CL	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf) Stiff, damp, dark brown, Sandy CLAY				
- 4 - 	B9-2				CL	ALLUVIUM (Qal) Stiff, moist, dark brown, Sandy CLAY; few gravel	_ 24	109.6	15.9
- 8 -	B9-3	60.00		GP	-Hard TERRACE DEPOSITS (Qt)	_ 37			
- 10 - - 12 -	В9-4				Dense, moist, reddish brown, Sandy GRAVEL; ("CONGLOMERATE"), difficult drilling; sampling not practical	_			
 - 14 - 	B0.5			SM	-Basal gravel along contact				
- 16 - 	Б9-J		> > > >	5101	OTAY FORMATION (To) Dense, moist, grayish white, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained SANDSTONE; ("GRITSTONE"), some interformational fine to coarse gravel lense BORING REFUSAL AT 17 FEET	_			
					Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 7.5 ft ³ grout slurry				
Figure A-8, G1115-52-54.GPJ C1115-52-54.GPJ									
SAMF	SAMPLE SYMBOLS SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) Image: Sample definition of the sa								

DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ГІТНОГОĞY	GROUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 10 ELEV. (MSL.) 197' DATE COMPLETED 11-14-2013 EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (BLOWS/FT.)	DRY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)			
_ 0 _					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION						
		000	, ,	GP	BASE						
		000	4	_	ALLUVIUM (Qal) Dense. drv. gravish brown. Sandy GRAVEL						
		000									
		0000	i								
- 4 -		0000				-					
		000	ž 1.		-Sampling not practical	-					
- 6 -		000				-					
		000	4			-					
- 8 -	B10-1	777		$-\overline{sc}$	Medium dense, damp, brown, Clayey, fine- to coarse-grained SAND; some	22					
	▏				coarse gravel	-					
- 10 -					-Sampling not practical	-					
						-					
- 12 -		0.00	į	GP	TERRACE DEPOSITS (Qt)						
		000			Dense, damp, reddish brown, Sandy GRAVEL; ("CONGLOMERATE")	-					
- 14 -	B10-2				-Massive gravereobole lense to about 18 feet	-					
		0 - 0			-Difficult drilling, Clavey SAND with gravel	-					
- 16 -		0000				-					
		000				-					
- 18 -			4⊻.	SM	-Slight seepage along contact						
					OTAY FORMATION (To)	-					
- 20 -	B10-3				("GRITSTONE"), moderately cemented	84/11"					
						-					
- 22 -						-					
						-					
- 24 -					-difficult drilling slow progress	$\left - \right $					
	B10-4				-No recovery dense	- 34					
- 26 -	510-4				no recovery, dense	-					
- 28 -						-					
						-					
)								
Figure	Figure A-9, G1115-52-54.GPJ										

Log of Boring B 10, Page 1 of 2

SAMPLE SYMBOLS	SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL	STANDARD PENETRATION TEST	DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED)
	🕅 DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE	CHUNK SAMPLE	WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

DEPTH	SAMPLE	OGY	NATER	SOIL	BORING B 10	ATION ANCE S/FT.)	NSITY .F.)	'URE NT (%)
IN FEET	NO.	THOL	UND/	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 197' DATE COMPLETED 11-14-2013	NETR SIST, LOWS	tY DE (P.C.	10IST
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	RE (BE	DR	20
20			F		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 30 -	B10-5			SM	-No recovery, very dense	84/11"		
					BORING REFUSAL AT 31.5 FEET Slight seepage encountered at 18 feet Backfilled with 6.2 ft ^a grout slurry			
Figure	• <mark>A-9</mark> , f Boring		0	Daug 2	of 2		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
		JDI	υ,					
SAMPLE SYMBOLS				LING UNSUCCESSFUL ■ STANDARD PENETRATION TEST ■ DRIVE S IRBED OR BAG SAMPLE ■ WATER	DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED			

DEPTH		GY	ATER	801	BORING B 11	TION NCE FT.)	SITY (RE - (%)	
IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	тного	UNDW/	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 224' DATE COMPLETED 11-18-2013	JETRA SISTAN -OWS/I	Y DEN (P.C.F	IOISTU INTENI	
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	PEN RE (BI	DR	Co⊻	
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION				
- 0 -		070	-	80	BASE				
- 2 -	B11-1			sc	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf) Moist, brown, Clayey SAND				
				GC-GP	TERRACE DEPOSITS (Qt) Dense, moist, grayish brown, Clayey to Sandy GRAVEL	-			
- 4 -		0000				-			
	B11-2		2			- 43			
- 6 -	DILZ	0-10				-			
	[000				-			
- 8 -		900			Crades to vallowich brown Sandy CDAVEL	-			
- -		6 1 0	Å		-Grades to yenowish brown, Sandy GKAVEL	-			
- 10 -		07070				- 50/5"			
L -	BII-3	of g	2		-No recovery, sampling unsuccessful on possible gravel lense	_ 50/5"			
- 12 -						_			
L _			∢ フ						
- 14 -		0/0%	4		-Difficult drilling	_			
L			Å						
- 16 -	B11-4 B11-5	0 - 0			-Clasts of metavolcanic rock within sampler tip	50/3"			
			2						
- 18 -					-Excavates to a Sandy CLAY with some gravel				
	B11-6	% ~ 0 % ~ 0	2			_ 44			
		0 K 0	+		-Sampling unsuccessful, chased with standard pen				
					BORING REFUSAL AT 19.5 FEET				
					Groundwater not encountered				
Figure	∋ A -1,						G111	5-52-54.GPJ	
Log o	f Boring	g B 1	1,	Page 1	of 1				
		01.0		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)		
SAMF	SAMPLE SYMBOLS				IRBED OR BAG SAMPLE I CHUNK SAMPLE I WATER	TABLE OR SE	EPAGE		

(1	1	_									
DEPTH		ЭGY	ATER	SOIL	BORING B 13	FT.)	SITY (∶	JRE T (%)				
IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	HOLG	MDN	CLASS	ELEV. (MSL.) 232' DATE COMPLETED 11-15-2013	ETRA SISTA OWS/	r den (P.C.F	DISTL NTEN				
			GROI	(0000)	EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BL	DR	Ž Ö Ž				
			\square		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION							
- 0 -		0.0		CI	BASE							
- 2 -			-	CL	ALLUVIUM (Qal) Brown, damp, Sandy CLAY; some gravel	_						
- 4 -						_						
- 6 -	B13-1			CL	Stiff, moist, brown to yellowish brown, Sandy CLAY; few angular gravel; trace carbonates	26	107.6	14.5				
- 8 -					- Highly weathered near formational contact							
	B13-2			ML	OTAY FORMATION (To)	-						
- 10 - 	B13-3				very suiff, moist, light onve brown, sandy SIL1S1ONE	26						
- 12 -						-						
 - 14 -	B13-4			CL	Hard, moist, reddish brown to olive brown, Silty CLAYSTONE	_ 30 _						
 - 16 -	B13-5				-Becomes pinkish red, stiff	25 	98.0	23.6				
						-						
- 18 - 						-						
- 20 - 	B13-6			CL	Very stiff, moist, pinkish red, Silty CLAYSTONE; ("BENTONITE"), trace manganese oxide staining	$-\frac{-28}{28}$						
- 22 - 						- -						
- 24 -						-						
- 26 -	B13-7			SM-ML	Becomes interbedded Medium dense, moist, light brown, Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE to very stiff, Sandy SILTSTONE	46	106.9	19.4				
- 28 -						-						
Log of Boring B 13, Page 1 of 2												
SAMF	SAMPLE SYMBOLS											

		<u>≻</u>	ER		BORING B 13	Ζщγ	≿	
DEPTH	SAMPLE	00	WAT	SOIL		ATIC ANC S/FT	ENSI'	NT (°
IN FEET	NO.	THOI	UND	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 232' DATE COMPLETED 11-15-2013	NETR SIST LOW:	tΥ DE (P.C	10IS1 NTE
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BEP	DR	2 O ≤
			\vdash		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 30 -	B13-8		, 			57		
				SIVI	cemented	-		
- 32 -			, ,			-		
						-		
- 34 -						-		
	B13-9			CL	Hard, moist, gayish brown, Sandy CLAYSTONE	50/5"	109.5	18.7
					BORING TERMINATED AT 35.5 FEET			
					Backfilled with 7.0 ft ³ grout slurry			
								
Log of	e A-11, f Borino	a B 1	3.	Page 2	? of 2		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
			- 7					
SAMPLE SYMBOLS			INS GROUCESSFUL IN STAINDARD PENETRATION TEST IN DRIVES	SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) R TABLE OR SEEPAGE				

SAMPLE SYMBOLS

			Яï		BORING B 14	ZWA	~	(;			
	SAMPLE	LOGY	WATE	SOIL		RATIO SATIO S/FT.)	ENSIT (.F.)	TURE NT (%			
FEET	NO.	ITHO	IND	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 221' DATE COMPLETED 11-15-2013	NETF	ЗҮ DE (P.C	NOIS'			
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	L RE	Ď	20			
0					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION						
		9/0/		SC	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf) Damp brown Clayey SAND: few gravel						
- 2 -				SC	TERRACE DEPOSITS (Qt)						
	B14-1				Grayish brown, dry, Clayey, fine- to coarse-grained SAND; some gravel	_					
- 4 -						-					
					-Sampling unsuccessful	50/3"					
- 6 -		0.000		$-\frac{1}{GP}$	Very dense, dry, reddish brown, Sandy GRAVEL; difficult drilling, sampling						
		000	Ż		not practical at 7.5 feet, gravel lense from approx. 5-9 feet	-					
- 8 -		000	- 			-					
_ 10 _		000									
	B14-2			SC	Medium dense, moist, light grayish brown to pale yellowish brown, Clayey SAND; trace subrounded to subangular gravel; possible highly weathered	22					
- 12 -	│				otay formation	_					
						_ 42					
- 14 -			-	ML	-Sampling unsuccessful						
	B14-3		-		OTAY FORMATION (To) Stiff moist olive gray, Sandy SILTSTONE	- 38	104.8	21.2			
- 16 -			-			-					
	B14-4		-			90/10"					
_ 18 _				SM-ML	Very dense to hard, moist, olive to grayish brown, Silty SANDSTONE to Sandy SILTSTONE						
- 20 -			>								
	B14-5		>		-Grades to Sandy SILTSTONE	72/10"	100.4	22.5			
- 22 -	B14-6		> >			-					
			> >			-					
- 24 -						-					
	B14-7		,+ ,	- SM	Very dense, moist, light grayish brown, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained	80/11"					
- 26 -	[ò		SANDSTONE; ("GKITSTONE")						
- 28 -			Ì								
			> >			-					
Eigung											
Figure A-12, G1115-52-54.GPJ Log of Boring B 14. Page 1 of 2											

		7	TER		BORING B 14	NUU LUON	È	۲E (%)	
DEPTH IN	SAMPLE		MA	SOIL		ZATI TAN	ENS C.F.)	TUR	
FEET	NO.	HH H	NNC	(USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 221' DATE COMPLETED 11-15-2013	NET!	{Y D (Р.(AOIS	
			GRC		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	RE (BE	Ð	200	
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION				
- 30 -	B14-8				Slight seepage	50/6"	111.9	15.6	
	B14-X				-Slight seepage BORING REFUSAL AT 30.5 FEET Slight seepage encountered at 30 feet Backfilled with 6.0 ft ³ grout slurry				
L			1				0111		
Loa o	a-12, f Borind	3 B 1	4.	Page 2	e of 2		G111	5-52-54.GPJ	
		,	- 7				071105		
SAMPLE SYMBOLS			I SAMP						
				WA DISIL	INDED ON DAG SAIVIFLE IN WATER	INDLE UK SE	LEAGE		



DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ГІТНОГОЄУ	ROUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 15 ELEV. (MSL.) 227' DATE COMPLETED 11-15-2013 EQUIDMENT MAPL 5 w/ 6 inch HSA	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (BLOWS/FT.)	DRY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)		
			Ū							
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION					
- 0 -			2	SC	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf)					
	B15-1				Dry, brown, Clayey, fine- to medium-grained SAND; few gravel	-				
- 2 -				SC	TERRACE DEPOSITS (Qt) Medium dense, dry, reddish brown, Clayey SAND; trace lense of gravel	_				
- 4 -			1			-				
	B15-2				-Gravel lense encountered	22				
- 6 -						-				
			1							
- 8 -	B15-3			SC	Medium dense, moist, olive brown, Clayey SAND; some gravel	_ 37	112.0	14.7		
						-				
- 10 -	-				-No recovery, sampling unsuccessful, gravel in sampler shoe	- 21				
					-Erroneous blowcount	-				
- 12 -						L				
	B15-4			CL	Hard, moist, reddish brown, Sandy CLAY; some gravel	_ 77				
- 14 -	│			SC	OTAY FORMATION (To) Medium dense, moist alive brown Clavey, fine, to medium grained	-				
	B15-5		*		SANDSTONE; some gravel	- 36	109.5	14.2		
- 16 -		(``,`,`,`,`,` (``,`,`,`,`				-				
					-Grades to fine SAND with some gravel	-				
- 18 -						-				
						-				
- 20 -		<u> </u>			-Gravel lense encountered at about 20 feet, sampling not practical					
					BORING REFUSAL AT 20 FEET					
					Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 3.9 ft ³ grout slurry					
Figure A-13, G1115-52-54.GPJ										
SAME				SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)			
SAMPLE SYMBOLS				🕅 DISTL	IRBED OR BAG SAMPLE 🛛 CHUNK SAMPLE 🗶 WATER	TABLE OR SE	EPAGE			

(
DEPTH	SAMDLE	OGY	NATER	SOIL	BORING B 16	ATION ANCE S/FT.)	NSITY F.)	URE VT (%)		
IN FEET	NO.	THOL	ND	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 277' DATE COMPLETED 11-18-2013	NETR SIST, LOWS	(P.C.	10IST NTEI		
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BE (BE	DR	C≤C		
			\vdash		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION					
		0000	2	GP	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf) Brown dry Sandy GRAVEL: few cobble clasts					
- 2 -		0000	7			_				
		0000	4			_				
- 4 -		0 0	4 2	GP	TERRACE DEPOSITS (Ot)					
	B16-1	000	2		Dense, moist, reddish to yellowish brown. Sandy GRAVEL; pulverized clasts	-70/11"				
- 6 -			4		of cobble, difficult excavation to about 10 feet; unsuccessful sampling	_				
		000	~			-				
- 8 -		0000	Ż			-				
		0000	2			-				
- 10 -	B16-2		7		-Possible "CONGLOMERATE" with Clayey SAND matrix	50/2"				
- 12 -		0000	2							
		0000	2			_				
- 14 -		0000	2		-Excavates to a Clayey SAND with pulverized gravel	-				
	B16-3	070	4 1	$-\overline{GC}$	¬Increased drill chatter/	$-\frac{-63}{-63}$				
- 16 -					Very dense, moist, reddish brown, Clayey GRAVEL; some sand laminations of cohesive clayey sand	-				
		00%				-				
- 18 -			1		BORING REFUSAL AT 18 FEET					
					Backfilled with 3.5 ft ³ grout slurry					
Figure	e A-14,	~ D 4	6	Dogo 4	of 4		G111	5-52-54.GPJ		
LOGO	I POLINÓ	у В 1	ю,	rage 1						
SAMF	SAMPLE SYMBOLS			SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED)						
1				LXJ DIOTC						



DEPTH		GΥ	ATER	201	BORING B 17	TION VCE	SITY (RE - (%)		
IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	OTOH-	MDN	CLASS	ELEV. (MSL.) 285' DATE COMPLETED 11-18-2013	ETRA SISTAN OWS/I	Y DEN (P.C.F	OISTU		
			GROL	(0000)	EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	RE: (BL	DR	CO		
			┢		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION					
- 0 -		° d ° l		GC	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf)					
			,		Reddish brown, Clayey GRAVEL	-				
- 2 - 				CL	TERRACE DEPOSITS (Qt) Stiff, moist, reddish brown, Sandy CLAY; few gravel; pp = 3.5 tst					
- 4 -						_				
-	D17.1					- 21				
- 6 -	B1/-1					- 21				
						-				
- 8 -						-				
						-				
- 10 - 	B17-2				-Becomes mottled grayish brown to yellowish brown, trace fine gravel with little fine- to coarse-grained SAND; trace mica	28				
- 12 -	╎┍		1	CI						
				CL	Stiff, moist, brown, Sandy CLAYSTONE; PP = 4.5 tsf	-				
- 14 -						_				
	P17.2					-				
- 16 -	Б1/-5			\overline{SC}	Dense, moist, olive brown to grayish brown, Clayey SANDSTONE; weakly	-33	113.8	14.6		
					cemented	-				
- 18 -	B17-4			CL -	Hard, moist, grayish, mottle pinkish red, Silty CLAYSTONE; $pp = 4.5$ tsf	$-\frac{36}{36}$				
	1 🖡					-				
- 20 -						-				
						-				
- 22 -						-				
						-				
- 24 -						-				
	B17-5		,	SC	Dense, moist, reddish brown, Clayey SANDSTONE; clasts of subangular	46	117.0	13.6		
- 20 -] [giavei					
- 28 -					-Becomes very dark	-				
			<u> </u>		BORING REFUSAL AT 29 FEET					
E I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I										
Log of Boring B 17, Page 1 of 2										
			-	SAMP			STURBED			
SAMPLE SYMBOLS										

DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ІТНОГОСУ	JUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 17 ELEV. (MSL.) 285' DATE COMPLETED 11-18-2013	NETRATION ESISTANCE !LOWS/FT.)	RY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE DNTENT (%)	
			GRC		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	RE BE	DF	- U	
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION				
					Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 5.7 ft ³ grout slurry				
Figure	A-15,		_				G111	5-52-54.GPJ	
	r Boring	ј В 1	1,	Page 2					
SAMP	SAMPLE SYMBOLS			SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S JRBED OR BAG SAMPLE CHUNK SAMPLE WATER	SSFUL I STANDARD PENETRATION TEST I DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTU SAMPLE I CHUNK SAMPLE V WATER TABLE OR SEEPA			
DEPTH SAMPLE		госу	ATER	0.011	BORING B 18	rion VCE =T.)	ытү (RE - (%)	
-----------------	---------------	--------------------------------	-----------	------------------	---	--------------------------	------------------	-------------	
IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	иного		CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 267' DATE COMPLETED 11-18-2013	JETRA SISTAN OWS/F	Y DEN (P.C.F.	OISTU	
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BL	DR	COM	
			\square		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION				
- 0 -		0.000	į	GP	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf)				
	B18-1	$0 \land 0$ $0 \circ 0$		GP	Reddish brown, Sandy GRAVEL TEPPACE DEPOSITS (Ot)				
- 2 -					Dense, dry, reddish brown, Sandy GRAVEL	-			
		000				-			
- 4 -		0000				-			
	B18-2		1 –	$-\overline{sc}$	Very dense, moist, dark reddish brown, Clayey SAND; some gravel	75/11"		11.1	
- 6 -						-			
			,			-			
- 8 -			2			-			
						-			
- 10 -	B18-3	$\left(- \frac{1}{r} \right)$		$-\frac{1}{8C}$	Dense, moist, dark reddish brown, Clavey SAND; some gravel	$-\frac{38}{38}$			
				50		-			
- 12 -	[-			
			;			-			
- 14 -			1		Difficult drilling	-			
			1		- Sampler bouncing, no recovery				
					BORING REFUSAL AT 15 FEET				
					Backfilled with 2.9 ft ³ grout slurry				
Figure	A-16 ,		~		-64		G111	5-52-54.GPJ	
Logo	T Boring	д В 1	δ,	Page 1	OT 1				
SAME	PLE SYMB	OLS		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)		
	01110			🕅 DISTL	IRBED OR BAG SAMPLE 🛛 🛄 WATER	TABLE OR SE	EPAGE		

	1	1						
DEPTH		GY	ATER	001	BORING B 19	IION ICE	ытҮ)	RE ' (%)
IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	тного		CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 264' DATE COMPLETED 11-19-2013	NETRA1 SISTAN LOWS/F	Y DENS (P.C.F.	10ISTUI
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BE	DR	≥0 0
			┢		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
_ 0 _	B19-1	0 - 0	2	GP	ALLUVIUM (Qal) Medium dense, reddish brown, Sandy GRAVEL			
- 2 -					Weddun donso, readish brown, bundy Grarv EE	-		
			4			-		
- 4 -			2					
- 6 -		000			-Uniform, sampling not practical in upper 7 feet	_		
			2			_		
- 8 -	B19-2			SM-SC	OTAY FORMATION (To) Dense moist reddish to gravish brown Silty to Clayey fine SAND	_ 51		
	┤					-		
- 10 -	B19-3		,	SM	Very dense, moist, light grayish to yellowish brown, Silty, fine- to	74/10"	115.9	9.2
- 12 -			>		matrix			
			, , ,			_		
- 14 -			> >			-		
	B19-4		,	SC -	Very dense, moist, gray to olive brown, Clayey, fine- to medium-grained	81/11"		
- 16 -] [SANDSTONE; moderately cemented			
- 18 -						_		
			» >			-		
- 20 -	B19-5		*		-Uniform	- 50/4"	118.8	10.5
						-		
- 22 -								
- 24 -						-		
	B19-6				-Massive	-		
- 26 -						-		
- 28 -			*					
<u> </u>								
Figure	e A-17, f Boring	a B 1	9.	Page 1	of 2		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
							ĺ	
SAMPLE SYMBOLS SAMPLE SYMBOLS Image: Sample instruction of the sample instructing						EPAGE		

		1	-			1		
DEPTH IN SAMPLE		огосу	VATER	SOIL	BORING B 19	ATION ANCE (/FT.)	чSITY F.)	URE JT (%)
IN FEET	NO.	THOL	UNDV	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 264' DATE COMPLETED 11-19-2013	LOWS	Y DEI (P.C.	IOIST NTEN
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BER	DR	≥o C
			┢		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 30 -	B19-7			ML	Hard, moist, olive to grayish brown, Sandy SILTSTONE	50/6"	119.7	13.6
 - 32 -			-			_		
			-			-		
- 34 -						-		
	B19-8	-	-			50/5"		
- 36 - 			, , , ,	SM	Dense, moist, grayish brown, Silty, fine- to coarse-grained SANDSTONE; ("GRITSTONE")	 -		
- 38 -			ò			-		
	B19-9		, 	$-\overline{SM}$	Very dense, moist, light grayish brown, Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE;	74		
- 40 -			<u>,</u>		faint laminations of "GRITSTONE"	-		
					Groundwater not encountered			
					Backfilled with 7.9 ft ³ grout slurry			
<u> </u>								
Figure	e A-17, f Boring	g B 1	9,	Page 2	? of 2		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
			•	SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)	
SAMF	SAMPLE SYMBOLS SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) SAMPLE SYMBOLS DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE CHUNK SAMPLE WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE							



		1	1	
	BORING B 20	TION LCE	SITY (RE - (%)
IN SAMPLE O O CLASS FEET NO. H O (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 514' DATE COMPLETED 11-19-2013	JETRA SISTAN OWS/F	Y DENS (P.C.F.	OISTUI
GRO L	EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	REP (BI	DR	CS
	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 0 B20-1 ₿°∂ ຣ°∂ GP	TOPSOIL			
	Reddish brown, Sandy GRAVEL; trace clay	-		
		-		
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	OTAY FANGLOMERATE DEPOSITS(Tof) Very dense, damp, grayish brown, Sandy GRAVEL; clasts of cobble, estimated ("FANGLOMERATE")	_		
	BORING REFUSAL AT 5 FEET Groundwater not encountered			
	Groundwater not encountered			
				E E0 E4 OD :
Log of Boring B 20. Page	1 of 1		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
	PLING UNSUCCESSFUL I STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)	



		Ye	TER		BORING B 21	ION CE T.)	IТY	RE (%)
DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	THOLOG	NDWA	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 598' DATE COMPLETED 11-19-2013	IETRAT SISTAN OWS/F	Y DENS (P.C.F.)	OISTUF
			GROI	(0000)	EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	PEN RE:	DR	202
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 0 -				CL	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf)			
	1		1		Damp, dark brown, Sandy CLAY; with cobble and debris	-		
- 2 -	1					_		
- 4 -						_		
6	B21-1			SM	OTAY FORMATION (To) Dense moist gravish brown Silty fine to coarse grained SANDSTONE	72	100.9	18.2
	B21-2				Dense, morst, grayish brown, binty, fine- to coarse-granted by (1005) for the			
- 8 -								
- 10 -						L		
	B21-3			ML	Very stiff, moist, light gray, SILTSTONE; little to no sand	27		
- 12 -	. ∎					_		
L _						_		
- 14 -						_		
	D21.4		 		Used excit light even Sandy SUITSTONE	75/10"		15.5
- 16 -	B21-4			MIL	Hard, moist, light gray, sandy SIL1STONE	- /3/10	98.8	15.5
						-		
- 18 -						-		
						-		
- 20 -	B21-5				-Grades to fine-grained SANDSTONE	_ 7.5/8"		
	{ [SM	Very dense, moist, light grayish brown, Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE	-		
- 22 -								
						-		
- 24 -								
	B21-6			ML	Hard, moist, olive brown, Sandy SILTSTONE; pp = 4.5 tsf	50/6"	104.6	19.5
- 26 -	1							
F	1							
- 28 -	1							
	1							
Figure	e A-19,						G111	5-52-54.GPJ
Log o	fBoring	g B 2	1,	Page 1	of 2			
SAME	PLE SYMB	IOLS		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)	
				🕅 DISTL	IRBED OR BAG SAMPLE 🛛 🛄 CHUNK SAMPLE 🕎 WATER	TABLE OR SE	EPAGE	



	-							
DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ГІТНОГОGY	BROUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 21 ELEV. (MSL.) <u>598'</u> DATE COMPLETED <u>11-19-2013</u> EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (BLOWS/FT.)	DRY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)
			Ľ					
- 30 -					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
50	B21-7			ML	-Massive	71/12"		
						-		
- 34 - 			-		-Grades to Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE	_		
- 36 -	B21-8			$-\overline{SM}$	Very dense, moist, gray, Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE; friable		103.7	21.7
00								
- 38 -								
						-		
- 40 -	B21-9			ML	Hard, moist, dark gray, Sandy SILTSTONE	8/10"		
					Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 8.0 ft ³ grout slurry			
Figure	A-19,	n R 2	1	Page 2	of 2		G111	5-52-54.GPJ
	i Bonné	y D Z	١,	raye 2				
SAMP	PLE SYMB	OLS		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED) EPAGE	

-			_					
DEPTH		OGY	VATER	SOIL	BORING B 22	ATION ANCE S/FT.)	VSITY F.)	URE JT (%)
IN FEET	NO.	THOL	UNDV	CLASS (USCS)	ELEV. (MSL.) 530' DATE COMPLETED 11-20-2013	LOWS	Y DEI (P.C.	IOIST NTEN
			GRO		EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BE BE	DR	≥O
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 0 -	B22-1			SC	TOPSOIL Moist brown Sandy CLAY			
- 2 -				SM	OTAY FORMATION (To)			
					Medium dense, dry, light, gray, Silty SANDSTONE; some gravel	_		
- 4 -						-		
	B22-2			GP	Very dense, moist, gray, Sandy GRAVEL	80/12"		
- 6 -						-		
		000				-		
- 8 -		000						
- 10 -		000			-Difficult drilling	_		
	B22-3	000			-Sampling not practical	-		
- 12 -		000			-Excavates to a Sandy GRAVEL	-		
		STITIT.		ML –	Hard, moist, gray, Sandy SILTSTONE			
- 14 -						-		
	B22-4					62		
						_		
- 18 -					Graval lansas anountarad	_		
					-Oraver lenses encountered	-		
- 20 -					-CAL sampler bouncing, sampling unsuccessful	-		
	B22-5				-Gravel in slough within sampler	- 37		
- 22 -					-Poor recovery	-		
- 24 -								
	D22 (-Grades to hard, damp, brown, Silty CLAYSTONE	_		
- 26 -	B22-6			ML	Stiff, moist, brown, Sandy SILTSTONE		89.4	31.4
						-		
- 28 -						-		
						-		
Figure	e A-20,						G111	5-52-54.GPJ
Log o	t Boring	g B 2	2,	Page 1	ot 2			
SAMF	PLE SYMB	OLS		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S	AMPLE (UNDIS	STURBED)	
1				01010 مم		OILOLI		

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								i
			Я	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 22	Zu C	≻	(%
DEPTH	SAMPLE	00	NAT			ATIC ANC S/FT.	NSIT (. F.)	URE NT (%
IN FEET	NO.	HOL	ND		ELEV. (MSL.) 530' DATE COMPLETED 11-20-2013	IETR SIST OW:	Y DE (P.C	0IST NTEI
			GROI	· · · ·	EQUIPMENT MARL 5 w/ 6-inch HSA BY: M. ERTWINE	(BL BL	DR	≥o
			\vdash					
- 30 -	B22-7			ML	Hard, moist, dark gravish brown, Sandy SILTSTONE	66		
						-		
- 32 -						-		
						-		
- 34 -						-		
						-		
- 36 -						-		
						-		
- 38 -						-		
						-		
- 40 -	B22-8			ML -	Hard, moist, gray, Sandy SILTSTONE; trace lamination of slightly Bentonite	85/10"	79.8	38.5
			-		CLAYSTONE			
					Groundwater not encountered			
					Backfilled with 8.0 ft ³ grout slurry			
Figure	A-20,						G111	5-52-54.GPJ
Log of	fBoring	g B 2	2 , I	Page 2	2 of 2			
				SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL STANDARD PENETRATION TEST DRIVE S.	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)	
SAIVIP	LE STIMB	UL3		🕅 DISTU	IRBED OR BAG SAMPLE I CHUNK SAMPLE I WATER	TABLE OR SE	EPAGE	



	-							
DEPTH IN FEET	SAMPLE NO.	ГІТНОГОСУ	ROUNDWATER	SOIL CLASS (USCS)	BORING B 23 ELEV. (MSL.) 567' DATE COMPLETED 11-20-2013 EQUIDMENT MAPL 5 w/ 6 inch HSA BV: M EPTIMINE	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (BLOWS/FT.)	DRY DENSITY (P.C.F.)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)
			G			-		
					MATERIAL DESCRIPTION			
- 0 -		신문의		SM	UNDOCUMENTED FILL (Qudf)			
	B23-1				Light grayish brown, Silty SAND; few gravel			
- 2 -			; > >	SM	OTAY FORMATION (To)	<u>+</u>		
			, ,		Dense, moist, gray, Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE	-		
- 4 -						-		
	B23-2		, ,			45		
- 6 -	1227 2		, ,			-		
						-		
- 8 -			, ,					
L _			> >					
- 10 -	l L		, , 					
10	B23-3			ML	Hard, moist, dark gray, Sandy SILTSTONE	43	101.3	18.4
10			-					
- 12 -			-					
- 14 -			-					
	B23-4		; ,	$-\overline{SM}$	Very dense, moist, light gray, Silty, fine-grained SANDSTONE	88/10"		
- 16 -	▏					-		
						-		
- 18 -			>			-		
	B23-5		> >		-Uniform	_ 85/9"	100.8	13.3
					BORING TERMINATED AT 19.5 FEET			
					Groundwater not encountered Backfilled with 3.8 ft ³ grout slurry			
Figure	Δ_21	1	1			1	G111	5-52-54 GP.1
Loa	f Boring	a B 2	3.	Page 1	of 1		0.11	
3 •			-,		- 			
SAMF	PLE SYMB	OLS		SAMP	LING UNSUCCESSFUL	AMPLE (UNDI	STURBED)	
1				DISIL DISIL	INDED ON DAG SAMPLE IN CHUNK SAMPLE IN WATER	I ABLE UR SE	EPAGE	



APPENDIX B

LABORATORY TESTING

We performed laboratory tests in accordance with the generally accepted test methods of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) or other suggested procedures. We selected ring samples for laboratory testing for dry density moisture content and shear strength. The results of our laboratory tests are presented in tabular forms hereinafter and on Figure B-1. The results of in-place density and moisture content tests are depicted on the boring logs in Appendix A. The plots of direct shear test results are also included within this Appendix B.

Sample No.	Dry Density (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Unit Peak [Ultimate*] Cohesion (psf)	Angle of Peak [Ultimate*] Shear Resistance (degrees)
B2-4	102.1	17.9	625 [390]	29 [29]
B2-8	115.4	15.3	600 [430]	31 [31]
B2-10	104.3	22.8	980 [0]	38 [33]
B3-3	96.4	18.3	770 [715]	28 [26]
B3-5	110.0	17.0	525 [470]	29 [28]
B3-7	112.6	15.2	0 [0]	39 [38]
B4-4	108.0	17.2	920 [700]	27 [27]
B4-8	109.5	18.8	880 [640]	26 [26]
B4-12	98.1	23.6	420 [340]	30 [29]
B5-2	98.1	18.1	350 [360]	29 [29]
B5-4	113.3	7.8	700 [220]	33 [33]
B6-3	102.5	22.9	1500 [690]	25 [25]
B6-5	109.5	11.1	920 [480]	22 [22]
B6-7	104.6	15.5	550 [400]	22 [22]
B7-5	112.6	10.1	280 [250]	34 [34]
B8-3	101.0	23.1	750 [720]	19 [17]
B8-5	111.8	14.5	140 [140]	31 [31]
B8-9	113.9	11.5	1400 [1100]	15 [15]
B9-2	109.6	15.9	385 [75]	32 [32]
B13-1	107.6	14.5	710 [650]	27 [27]
B13-5	98.0	23.6	390 [400]	23 [23]
B13-7	106.9	19.4	750 [500]	27 [27]
B14-3	104.8	21.2	330 [125]	28 [28]

TABLE B-I
SUMMARY OF LABORATORY DIRECT SHEAR TEST RESULTS
ASTM D 3080

Sample No.	Dry Density (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Unit Peak [Ultimate*] Cohesion (psf)	Angle of Peak [Ultimate*] Shear Resistance (degrees)
B14-8	111.9	15.6	225 [430]	33 [27]
B15-3	112.0	14.7	860 [840]	33 [33]
B15-5	109.5	14.2	680 [490]	29 [28]
B17-3	113.8	14.6	940 [660]	30 [30]
B17-5	117.0	13.6	1150 [325]	30 [30]
B18-2	117.1	11.1	860 [470]	31 [31]
B19-3	115.9	9.2	240 [240]	35 [31]
B19-5	118.8	10.5	580 [600]	27 [24]
B19-7	119.7	13.6	690 [500]	26 [25]
B21-1	100.9	18.2	640 [440]	29 [28]
B21-4	98.8	15.5	630 [500]	33 [32]
B21-8	103.7	21.7	780 [430]	30 [30]
B22-6	89.4	31.4	1200 [500]	27 [27]
B22-8	79.8	38.5	940 [730]	29 [26]
B23-3	101.3	18.4	930 [660]	29 [25]
B23-5	100.8	13.3	475 [460]	35 [33]

TABLE B-I (Concluded) SUMMARY OF LABORATORY DIRECT SHEAR TEST RESULTS ASTM D 3080

TABLE B-II SUMMARY OF LABORATORY WATER-SOLUBLE SULFATE TEST RESULTS CALIFORNIA TEST NO. 417

Sample No.	Water-Soluble Sulfate (%)	Water-Soluble Sulfate (ppm)	Sulfate Severity
B3-1	0.002	18	Not Applicable (S0)
B5-1	0.001	8	Not Applicable (S0)
B9-1	0.0005	5	Not Applicable (S0)
B19-1	0.0003	3	Not Applicable (S0)
B23-1	0.0004	4	Not Applicable (S0)

TABLE B-III SUMMARY OF LABORATORY WATER-SOLUBLE CHLORIDE ION CONTENT TEST RESULTS CALIFORNIA TEST NO. 422

Sample No.	Chloride Ion Content (%)	Chloride Ion Content (ppm)	
B3-1	0.011	109	
B5-1	0.018	178	
B9-1	0.025	248	
B19-1	0.006	55	
B23-1	0.033	331	

TABLE B-IV SUMMARY OF LABORATORY POTENTIAL OF HYDROGEN (PH) AND RESISTIVITY TEST RESULTS CALIFORNIA TEST NO. 643

Sample No.	рН	Minimum Resistivity (ohm-centimeters)
B3-1	7.8	570
B5-1	8.1	830
B9-1	7.6	620
B19-1	7.0	5200
B23-1	7.8	570

TABLE B-V SUMMARY OF LABORATORY GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION TEST RESULTS ASTM D422

Sample No.	Sample Depth (ft)	% Gravel	% Sand	% Fines	USCS Classification
B10-2	14	21.3	52.1	26.6	SC
B19-1	0	53.7	35.0	11.3	GP



G1115-52-54.GPJ

Figure B-1

ORPORATED **SDG&E TL 649**

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B2-4 Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: PJ





Description: SM-Light yellowish brown, Silty, fine to coarse SAND



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-32-54 Sample No.: B2-8 Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: PJ

Description: CL-Olive brown, Sandy CLAY



SDG&E

Date: Tuesday, November 26, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

By: PJ

G1115-32-54 Sample No.: B2-10 Description: CH-Gray, Silty CLAY **Remarks:**



OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

Natural or Remold: Natural

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B3-3 Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2013

By: PJ

Description: SM-Yellowish brown, Silty, fine to medium SAND

Remarks:



* Degree of saturation calculated with a specific gravity of 2.65

0.0050

0.0050

Rate (in/min) 0.0050

OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

Natural or Remold: Natural

G1115-52-54

Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2013

By: PJ

Sample No.: B3-5 Na Description: SM-Yellowish brown, Silty, fine to coarse SAND

Remarks:



OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-32-54 Sample No.: B3-7 Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: JD

Description: SM-Light gravish brown, Silty, fine to coarse SAND

Remarks:



SDG@E

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-32-54

Date: Thursday, November 21, 2013 Natural or Remold: Natural

By: TG

Sample No.: B4-4 Description: SC-Dark brown, Clayey SAND **Remarks:**



GEOCON INCORPORATED

OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT



Horizontal Deformation, (in)

* Degree of saturation calculated with a specific gravity of 2.65

Rate (in/min) 0.0012

1000

1143

Max

0.06

3000

2672

Max

0.17

0.0010

5000

3001

Max

0.13

0.0011

Normal Stress (psf)

Failure Stress (psf)

Failure Deffinition

Displacement (in)

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B4-12 Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: JD

Description: SM-Light brown, Silty, fine SAND Remarks:



GEOCON

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

Natural or Remold: Natural

SDG&E -TL 649

Date: Friday, November 22, 2013

By: TG

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B5-2 Description: CL-Brown, Sandy CLAY



* Degree of saturation calculated with a specific gravity of 2.65

Rate (in/min) 0.0010

872

Max

0.30

2143

Max

0.29

0.0010

3129

Max

0.16

0.0011

Failure Stress (psf)

Failure Deffinition

Displacement (in)

Horizontal Deformation, (in)

ORPORATED **SDG&E TL 649**

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Friday, November 22, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: PJ

Sample No.: B5-4@10'

Description: SM-Whitish gray, Silty, fine to coarse SAND



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

Date: Friday, November 22, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: TG

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B6-3 Description: CL-Brown, Sandy CLAY Remarks:



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Friday, November 22, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: PJ

Sample No.: B6-5@15' Description: SC-Light gray brown clayey(f-m) sand.



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B6-7 Date: Friday, November 22, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: PJ

Description: SC-Light gray brown clayey(f-m)sand. Remarks:



OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Friday, November 22, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: PJ

Sample No.: B7-5@20

Description: SC-Grayish brown, Clayey, fine to coarse SAND

Remarks:



SDG&E TL-649

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: TG

Sample No.: B8-3 Description: CL-Yellowish brown, Sandy CLAY



G1115-52-54



GEOCON INCORPORATED SDG&E TL 649

OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

Natural or Remold: Natural

G1115-52-54

Date: Saturday, November 23, 2013

By: PJ

Sample No.: B8-5@12 1/2

Description: SC-Brown to dark reddish browm, Clayey SAND

Remarks:





DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

Natural or Remold: Natural

G1115-52-54

Date: Friday, November 22, 2013

By: PJ

Sample No.: B8-9 @ 25'

Description: Light yellowish brown, Silty, f-c SAND Remarks:



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Friday, December 13, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: TG

Sample No.: B9-2 Description: CL - Brown, Sandy CLAY Remarks:



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B13-1 Description: CL-Brown (f-c) sandy clay.

Remarks:



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B13-5 Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Description: CL-Pinkish red, Silty CLAY Remarks:



SDG&E TL 649

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B13-7 Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Description: SM-ML-Light brown, Silty, fine SAND to Sandy SILT




GEOCON INCORPORATED SDG&E TL 649

S DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B14-3
Description: ML-Olive gray, Sandy SILT



OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B14-8 Date: Sunday, December 03, 2017

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Description: SM-Light grayish brown, Silty, fine to coarse SAND





DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B15-3 Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Description: SC-Olive brown, Clayey SAND Remarks:



OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B15-5 Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Description: SC-Olive brown, Clayey, fine to medium SAND

Remarks:



GEOCON INCORPORATED SDG&E TL 649

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Monday, December 09, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B17-3
Description: Olive brown, Clayey SAND



OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Monday, December 09, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B17-5 Description: SC-Dark brown clayey(f-m)sand w/silt. Remarks:



OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Thursday, December 12, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B18-2@5

Description: SC-Yellowish brown clayey(f-m)sand w/silt.



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Wednesday, December 04, 2013

By: NJ

Sample No.: B19-3@10'

Natural or Remold: Natural

Description: SM-Light yellowish to gravish brown, Silty, fine to coarse SAND

Remarks:



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Wednesday, December 04, 2013

By: NJ

Sample No.: B19-5@20'

Natural or Remold: Natural

Description: SC-Light brown clayey(f-m)sand w/silt. Remarks:



OIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Wednesday, December 04, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B19-7@30'

Description: Olive to grayish brown, Sandy SILT





* Degree of saturation calculated with a specific gravity of 2.65

0.0050

Rate (in/min) 0.0050 0.0050

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No · B21@ Date: Wednesday, December 04, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B21@1

Description: SM-Brown silty(f-m)sand w/clay.



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B21-4 Date: Friday, December 06, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Description: ML-Olive brown(f-m)sandy silt. Remarks:



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54

Date: Friday, December 06, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B21-8 Description: SM-Gray, Silty fine SAND Remarks:



GEOCON INCORPORATED

SDG&E TL 649 G1115-52-54

Date: Friday, December 06, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

By: NJ

Sample No.: B22-6

Description: ML-Olive brown clayey silt w/fine sand. Remarks:



GEOCON INCORPORATED

SDG&E TL 649 G1115-52-54

Date: Friday, December 06, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

____ By: <u>NJ</u>

Sample No.: B-22-8

Description: ML-Grey brown fine sandy silt w/little clay. Remarks:



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

SDG&E TL 649 G1115-52-54

Date: Thursday, December 12, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Sample No.: B23-3



Description: ML-Olive gray(f-m)sandy silt.



DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

G1115-52-54 Sample No.: B23-5 Date: Thursday, December 12, 2013

Natural or Remold: Natural

By: NJ

Description: SM-Light gray, Silty, fine SAND Remarks:





SEISMIC REFRACTION SURVEY SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

PREPARED FOR:

Geocon. Inc. 6960 Flanders Drive San Diego, CA 92121

PREPARED BY:

Southwest Geophysics, Inc. 8057 Raytheon Road, Suite 9 San Diego, CA 92111

> December 23, 2013 Project No. 113448



December 23, 2013 Project No. 113448

Mr. Mike Ertwine Geocon, Inc. 6960 Flanders Drive San Diego, CA 92121

Subject: Seismic Refraction Survey SDG&E TL649 Wood to Steel Improvements San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Ertwine:

In accordance with your authorization, we have performed a seismic refraction survey pertaining to the subject project located in San Diego County, California. Specifically, our survey consisted of performing 11 seismic refraction traverses at the project site. The purpose of our study was to develop subsurface velocity profiles of the areas surveyed, and to assess the apparent rippability of the subsurface materials. This data report presents our survey methodology, equipment used, analysis, and results.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service on this project. Should you have any questions related to this report, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Sincerely, **SOUTHWEST GEOPHYSICS, INC.**

Aaron T. Puente Senior Staff Geologist/Geophysicist

ATP/HV/hv Distribution: (1) Addressee (electronic)

Ham Van de Vingt

Hans van de Vrugt, C.E.G., P.Gp. Principal Geologist/Geophysicist



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.INTRODUCTION12.SCOPE OF SERVICES13.SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION14.SURVEY METHODOLOGY25.ANALYSIS AND RESULTS36.LIMITATIONS47.SELECTED REFERENCES5

Table

Table 1 -	– Rippability	Classification	3

Figures

Figure 1 –	Site Location Map
Figure 2a –	Line Location Map (SL-1 through SL-4)
Figure 2b –	Line Location Map (SL-5)
Figure 2c –	Line Location Map (SL-6)
Figure 2d –	Line Location Map (SL-7)
Figure 2e –	Line Location Map (SL-8)
Figure 2f –	Line Location Map (SL-9)
Figure 2g –	Line Location Map (SL-10)
Figure 2h –	Line Location Map (SL-11)
Figure 3a –	Site Photographs (SL-1 through SL-6)
Figure 3b –	Site Photographs (SL-7 through SL-11)
Figure 4a –	Seismic Profile, SL-1
Figure 4b –	Seismic Profile, SL-2
Figure 4c –	Seismic Profile, SL-3
Figure 4d –	Seismic Profile, SL-4
Figure 4e –	Seismic Profile, SL-5
Figure 4f –	Seismic Profile, SL-6
Figure 4g –	Seismic Profile, SL-7
Figure 4h –	Seismic Profile, SL-8
Figure 4i –	Seismic Profile, SL-9
Figure 4j –	Seismic Profile, SL-10
Figure 4k –	Seismic Profile, SL-11

Page

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with your authorization, we have performed a seismic refraction survey pertaining to the subject project located in San Diego County, California (Figure 1). Specifically, our survey consisted of performing 11 seismic refraction traverses at the project site. The purpose of our study was to develop subsurface velocity profiles of the areas surveyed, and to assess the apparent rippability of the subsurface materials. This data report presents our survey methodology, equipment used, analysis, and results.

2. SCOPE OF SERVICES

Our scope of services included:

- Performance of 11 seismic refraction lines (SL-1 through SL-11) at the project site.
- Compilation and analysis of the data collected.
- Preparation of this data report presenting our results and conclusions.

3. SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located east of the I-805 Freeway and north of Otay Mesa Road in San Diego County, California (Figure 1). The seismic traverse locations SL-1 through SL-11 are located next to the existing power poles Z31750, Z34102, Z31768, Z31744, Z31729, Z188716, Z81116, Z81097, Z118863, Z81044, and Z31755 respectively. The seismic lines roughly trend parallel to the power lines. The topography varies significantly across the project area and includes steep slopes, drainages and mesas. Vegetation in the project area generally consists of annual grass, brush, and scattered small trees. Outcrops of granitic and conglomerate rock were observed in several locations within the project area. Figures 2a through 2h, 3a and 3b depict the general site conditions in the area of the seismic lines.

Based on our discussions with you, it is our understanding new power poles will be installed within the project area. Information derived from our study as well as the exploratory excavations conducted by your office will be used in the foundation design for the proposed power poles.

4. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

A seismic P-wave (compression wave) refraction survey was conducted at the site to evaluate the characteristics of the subsurface materials and to develop subsurface velocity profiles of the areas surveyed. The seismic refraction method uses first-arrival times of refracted seismic waves to estimate the thicknesses and seismic velocities of subsurface layers. Seismic P-waves generated at the surface, using a hammer and plate, are refracted at boundaries separating materials of contrasting velocities. These refracted seismic waves are then detected by a series of surface vertical component geophones and recorded with a 24-channel Geometrics StrataView seismograph. The travel times of the seismic P-waves are used in conjunction with the shot-to-geophone distances to obtain thickness and velocity information on the subsurface materials.

Seismic lines SL-1 through SL-11 were oriented generally in-line with existing power lines (Figures 2a through 2h). The general line locations were selected by your office as well as the desired exploration depths. The seismic lines were 200 feet long and shot points (signal generation locations) were conducted at the ends, midpoint, and intermediate points along the lines. In general, the effective depth of evaluation for a seismic refraction traverse is approximately one-third to one-fifth the length of the traverse.

The refraction method requires that subsurface velocities increase with depth. A layer having a velocity lower than that of the layer above will not generally be detectable by the seismic refraction method and, therefore, could lead to errors in the depth calculations of subsequent layers. In addition, lateral variations in velocity, such as those caused by core stones or intrusions can also result in the misinterpretation of the subsurface conditions.

The rippability values presented in Table 1 are based on our experience with similar materials and assumes that a Caterpillar D-9 dozer ripping with a single shank is used. We emphasize that the cutoffs in this classification scheme are approximate and that rock characteristics, such as fracture spacing and orientation, play a significant role in determining rock rippability. These characteristics may also vary with location and depth. For trenching operations, the rippability values should be scaled downward. For example, velocities as low as 3,500 feet/second may indicate difficult ripping during trenching operations. In addition, the presence of boulders, which can be troublesome in a narrow trench, should be anticipated.

Table 1 – Rippability Classification				
Seismic P-wave Velocity	Rippability			
0 to 2,000 feet/second	Easy			
2,000 to 4,000 feet/second	Moderate			
4,000 to 5,500 feet/second	Difficult, Possible Blasting			
5,500 to 7,000 feet/second	Very Difficult, Probable Blasting			
Greater than 7,000 feet/second	Blasting Generally Required			

It should be noted that the rippability cutoffs presented in Table 1 are slightly more conservative than those published in the Caterpillar Performance Handbook (Caterpillar, 2011). Accordingly, the above classification scheme should be used with discretion, and contractors should not be relieved of making their own independent evaluation of the rippability of the on-site materials prior to submitting their bids.

5. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

As previously indicated, 11 seismic traverses were conducted as part of our study. The collected data were processed using SIPwin (Rimrock Geophysics, 2003), a seismic interpretation program, and analyzed using SeisOpt Pro (Optim, 2008) which uses first arrival picks and elevation data to produce subsurface velocity models. SeisOpt Pro uses a nonlinear optimization technique called adaptive simulated annealing. The resulting velocity model provides a tomography image of the estimated geologic conditions. Both vertical and lateral velocity information is contained in the tomography model. Changes in layer velocity are revealed as gradients rather than discrete contacts, which typically are more representative of actual conditions.

The results from our analysis are presented in the tomography models included on Figures 4a through 4k. As depicted, the models reveal distinct low velocity materials in the near-surface and generally higher velocity materials at depth. The low velocity materials are likely topsoil, colluvium, and/or alluvium) with the higher velocity materials likely representing Otay Formation and possibly weathered granitic rock depending on the location and depth. In addition, it is our un-

derstanding that Terrace Deposits and Landslide Debris also underlie portions of the project site. These materials are likely represented by low to intermediate velocity layers or zones in the models. Also evident in the models are substantial lateral variations in velocity which may be related to buried boulders, cemented zones, and/or differential weathering of the subsurface materials.

6. LIMITATIONS

The field evaluation and geophysical analyses presented in this report have been conducted in general accordance with current practice and the standard of care exercised by consultants performing similar tasks in the project area. No warranty, express or implied, is made regarding the conclusions, recommendations, and opinions presented in this report. There is no evaluation detailed enough to reveal every subsurface condition. Variations may exist and conditions not observed or described in this report may be present. Uncertainties relative to subsurface conditions can be reduced through additional subsurface exploration. Additional subsurface surveying will be performed upon request.

This document is intended to be used only in its entirety. No portion of the document, by itself, is designed to completely represent any aspect of the project described herein. Southwest Geophysics, Inc. should be contacted if the reader requires additional information or has questions regarding the content, interpretations presented, or completeness of this document. This report is intended exclusively for use by the client. Any use or reuse of the findings, conclusions, and/or recommendations of this report by parties other than the client is undertaken at said parties' sole risk.

7. SELECTED REFERENCES

Mooney, H.M., 1976, Handbook of Engineering Geophysics, dated February.

Optim, Inc., 2008, SeisOpt Pro, V-5.0.

Rimrock Geophysics, 2003, Seismic Refraction Interpretation Program (SIPwin), V-2.76.

Telford, W.M., Geldart, L.P., Sheriff, R.E., and Keys, D.A., 1976, Applied Geophysics, Cambridge University Press.












































GEOTECHNICAL E ENVIRONMENTAL MATERIALS



Project No. G1115-52-54 October 28, 2014

CORPORATED

San Diego Gas and Electric Company Civil/Structural Engineering 8316 Century Park Court San Diego, California 92123

Attention: Mr. Tyler Lonsdale

Subject: SUPPLEMENTAL GEOTECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS M.S.A. 6160015454 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Dear Mr. Lonsdale:

In accordance with your request, this letter presents our supplemental geotechnical recommendations for steel pole foundations. Geocon Incorporated previously performed geotechnical investigation for the subject project and presented our findings and recommendations in the report titled: *Geotechnical Investigation, SDG&E TL649 Wood to Steel Improvements, M.S.A. 6160015454, San Diego, California*, dated January 29, 2014 (Revised February 24, 2014, Project No. G1115-52-54).

Table 1 below lists the proposed eight poles and their approximate coordinates. We understand that micropile foundations are considered for the first seven poles (Items 19, 21, 34 through 38), and a drilled, cast-in-place reinforced concrete pier is considered for the eighth pole (Item New).

Item	Structure No.	Latitude	Longitude	Work Being Done
19	Z81097	32.58588056	-116.982850	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
21	Z81973	32.58679722	-116.974178	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
34	Z31729	32.59421667	-116.939364	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
35	Z31744	32.58210278	-116.939342	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
36	Z31768	32.58211111	-116.940781	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
37	Z34102	32.582125	-116.943925	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
38	Z31745	32.58213056	-116.945111	New steel FDN (TYP) pole
New	Z731391	32.59823825	-116.94130145	New steel FDN (TYP) pole

TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES

FIELD EXPLORATION

The exploration locations we performed for the entire TL649 wood to steel alignment consisted of drilling 21 small-diameter borings and 11 seismic refraction survey lines. The exploration locations with respect to the proposed poles, borings logs, seismic refraction survey line results, laboratory test results, and the recommendations were included in the above referenced report.

For the purposes of this supplemental letter, the Table 2 below summarizes the eight proposed structures, approximate elevations, and associated subsurface explorations.

ID No.	Structure No.	Approximate Elevation (MSL)	Reference Exploration
19	Z81097	211	SL-8
21	Z81973	197	B-10
34	Z31729	514	B-20 & SL-5
35	Z31744	554	SL-4
36	Z31768	474	SL-3
37	Z34102	440	SL-2
38	Z31745	531	B-22
New	Z731391	287.5	B-18 & SL-10

TABLE 2SUMMARY OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES AND ASSOCIATED EXPLORATIONS

B = Hollow Stem Auger Boring.

SL = Seismic Refraction Line.

RECOMMENDED FOUNDATION DESIGN PARAMETERS

A generalized subsurface soil profile has been developed for the area surrounding each pole foundation based on the data obtained from our exploration. Soil layers have been categorized by depth below the existing grade and assigned soil parameters that may be utilized with the *MFAD* computer program used by SDG&E for pier and/or micropile foundation design.

Tables 3 through 10 summarize the average total unit weight, cohesive strength, angle of internal friction, and deformation modulus assigned to the soil layers beneath the proposed pole sites. The parameters presented herein are based on current and past experience and/or testing of similar materials. We have assumed that the existing grade will not be changed significantly. If the finalized improvements are different from those currently proposed, Geocon Incorporated should be contacted for further evaluation.

TABLE 3 **RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z81097)**

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 10	Alluvium	300	32	128	16	132	2.0	1.0
10 to 20	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	140	31	129	15	133	2.5	1.0
20 to 45	Otay Formation	300	33	126	10	134	3.0	1.0
45+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-8.

300

140

300

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-10.

Alluvium

Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel

Otay Formation -

Sandstone

REC	OMMENDED SO	IL PARA	METERS	FOR PIE	r found	ATION DE	SIGN (Z8197	3)
Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (ncf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor

128

129

126

16

15

10

132

133

134

2.0

2.5

3.0

1.0

1.0

1.0

TABLE 4

32

31

33

TABLE 5 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31729)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 3	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
3 to 60	Fanglomerate Deposits	300	36	127	10	135	4.0	1.0
60+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-20 and at SL-5.

0 to 12

12 to 18

18 to 31¹/₂+

TABLE 6RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31744)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 2	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
2 to 20+	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	450	30	132	10	138	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-4.

TABLE 7 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31768)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 15	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	1.0
15 to 20	Colluvium	300	30	120	15	129	2.0	1.0
20 to 45	Fanglomerate Deposits	300	36	127	10	135	4.0	1.0
45+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-3.

TABLE 8 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z34102)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle φ (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 20	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	450	30	132	10	138	2.2	1.0
20 to 60+	Fanglomerate Deposits	300	36	127	10	135	4.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at SL-2.

TABLE 9
RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z31745)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 11/2	Topsoil	200	30	115	15	125	1.5	1.0
1½ to 5	Otay Formation - Sandstone	200	30	127	15	132	2.0	1.0
5 to 13	Otay Formation – Sandy Gravel	250	36	132	10	138	3.5	1.0
13 to 41+	Otay Formation – Siltstone	700	29	125	25	125	3.0	1.0

Note: Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-22.

TABLE 10
RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z731391)

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 1	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	0.3
1 to 5	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	150	36	124	11	133	3.0	0.4
5 to 17	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	450	31	128	11	135	3.5	0.5
17 to 45	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	450	30	132	10	138	4.0	1.0
45+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

Notes: (a) Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-18 and at SL-10.

(b) Strength reduction within upper 17 feet due to adjacent slope with significant erosion.

We understand that micropile foundations are considered for the seven poles including Z81097, Z81973, Z31729, Z31744, Z31768, Z34102, and Z31745. Based on our adjacent explorations, some locations are underlain by up to 20 feet of surficial soils and or deposits over more competent formational materials. We would recommend that all micropiles be extended at least 10 feet into the competent formational materials from a geotechnical engineering standpoint. Thus, the recommended minimum embedment of micropile for each structure is listed below:

- Z81097 minimum embedment of 30 feet.
- Z81973 minimum embedment of 28 feet.
- Z31729 minimum embedment of 13 feet.
- Z31744 minimum embedment of 12 feet.
- Z31768 minimum embedment of 30 feet.
- Z34102 minimum embedment of 30 feet.
- Z31745 minimum embedment of 15 feet.

Note the minimum embedment from a geotechnical engineering standpoint is not recommended in lieu of the other structural requirements, and we understand that the micropiles will be designed by a micropile specialty contractor and/or structural engineer based on the specific design requirements and our recommended soil parameters.

We understand from SDG&E that the proposed pole Z731391 may be subject to potential scour due to the proximity to Otay River channel. In general, local scour is a function of the depth of water, diameter of drilled pier, gradation of surficial soil, and the velocity of flow. A hydrologic and/or hydraulic report for the project is not available at this point. However, our review of the current FEMA online flood hazards map indicates that this pole is not located within "High Risk Area – Floodway" nor "High Risk Area", but within "Moderately Risk Area" as depicted on Figure 1, *Flood Hazards Map*. Therefore the potential for local scour at this pole is considered low.

Pole Z731391 is located adjacent to a slope where rills and gullies due to erosion processes were observed. It is our opinion that the slope is not safe under the existing condition and should be repaired together with a proper drainage system so that runoff does not flow over the top of slope. The strength reduction due to adjacent slope with significant erosion has been incorporated into our recommended soil parameters.

CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

We expect very dense to hard formational materials with varying amounts of gravel, cobbles, and boulders will be encountered during some pole installations at the site. The contactor should have auger, core barrels, and excavating tools suitable for penetrating dense layers, concretions, and cemented zones on-site during the pole construction.

Regional groundwater level is expected to be in excess of 100 feet below site grade. Slight seepage was encountered in Boring B-10 at approximately depth of 18 feet. Ground water or perched groundwater could be encountered during construction following heavy rainfall, runoff, and/or irrigation. Sloughing or reveling could occur where relatively clean sands are encountered below the groundwater level. Casing and/or wet methods may be necessary for the installation of pole foundation below groundwater, if any.

The drilling equipment should allow maneuverability on difficult and sloped terrain, penetration and support of weak and unconsolidated soils, and/or rotary percussive drilling in obstructions including cobbles and hard formational materials.

Very dense to hard formational materials and metavolcanic rock are expected below the surficial undocumented fill, topsoil, colluvium, and terrace deposits at the site. The contractor should mobilize appropriate drilling equipment for the pier and/or micropile installation.

An experienced contractor specializing in pier and/or micropile construction and familiar with the regional geologic conditions should be selected for the project. The micropile specialty contractor is responsible for furnishing of all design, materials, products, accessories, tools, equipment, services, transportation, labor and supervision, and manufacturing techniques required for design, installation and testing of micropiles and pile top attachments for the project.

The micropile contractors should also be aware that due to the permeable nature of overburden soils and formation, grout overrun beyond the theoretical quantity of drilled hole should be expected.

The contractor should prepare and submit a full-length installation record for each micropile installed. Pile load tests including verification load tests and proof load tests, if required, should be performed in accordance with the standard procedures of *Micropile Design and Construction Guidelines* (FHWA, June 2000) or other guidelines. Grout testing should also be performed as a part of QA/AC procedures.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, or if we may be of further service, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Very truly yours,	SSIONAL GEOL	
GEOCON INCORPORATEI	MICHAELC. ERTWINE No. 9027	
Michael C. Ertwine PG 9027	OF THE OF CALIFORNIE	Yong Wang GE 2775 PROFESSION
YW:MCE:dmc		ALL ONG WAYS FEMAL
Enclosure: Figure 1, Floor	l Hazards Map	
(2) Addressee		FIE OF CALIFORNI



WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



GEOTECHNICAL . ENVIRONMENTAL . MATERIALS 6960 FLANDERS DRIVE - SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92121 - 2974

Y:\1_GEOTECH\G1000\G1115-52-54\2014-10-28\G1115-52-54 Flood Hazards Map.dwg

GEOTECHNICAL E ENVIRONMENTAL E MATERIALS



Project No. G1115-52-54 March 31, 2015

ORPORATED

San Diego Gas and Electric Company Civil/Structural Engineering 8316 Century Park Court San Diego, California 92123

Attention: Mr. Tyler Lonsdale

Subject: SUPPLEMENTAL GEOTECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS UPDATED LOCATION OF POLE Z731391 FOUNDATION SDG&E TL649 WOOD TO STEEL IMPROVEMENTS M.S.A. 6160015454 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Dear Mr. Lonsdale:

In accordance with your request, this letter presents our supplemental geotechnical recommendations for the updated location of subject steel pole foundation (Z731391). Geocon Incorporated previously performed geotechnical investigation for the subject project and presented our findings and recommendations in the report titled: *Geotechnical Investigation, SDG&E TL649 Wood to Steel Improvements, M.S.A.* 6160015454, San Diego, California, dated January 29, 2014 (Revised February 24, 2014, Project No. G1115-52-54). Additional recommendations were provided in a letter titles: *Supplemental Geotechnical recommendation, SDG&E TL 649 Wood to Steel Improvement, M.S.A.* 6160015454, San Diego, California, dated October 28, 2014 (Project No. G1115-52-54).

We understand the proposed location for the subject pole (Z731391) has been updated per Table 1 below.

TABLE 1 PROPOSED LOCATION FOR Z731391)

Item	Structure No. Latitude		Longitude	Work Being Done		
New	Z731391	32.5982231°	-116.9417452°	New steel FDN (TYP) pole		

A generalized subsurface soil profile has been developed for the area surrounding the pole foundation based on the data obtained from our exploration. Soil layers have been categorized by depth below the existing grade and assigned soil parameters that may be utilized with the *MFAD* computer program used by SDG&E for pier and/or micropile foundation design.

Table 2 summarizes the average total unit weight, cohesive strength, angle of internal friction, and deformation modulus assigned to the soil layers beneath the proposed pole site. The parameters presented herein are based on current and past experience and/or testing of similar materials. We have assumed that the existing grade will not be changed significantly. If the finalized improvements are different from those currently proposed, Geocon Incorporated should be contacted for further evaluation.

Depth (feet)	Soil/Rock Type	Unit Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle ø (degrees)	Total Moist Unit Weightγ (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Total Saturated Unit Weight γ (pcf)	Deformation Modulus E _p (ksi)	Strength Reduction Factor
0 to 1	Undocumented Fill	150	28	115	15	125	0.7	0.3
1 to 5	Terrace Deposits – Sandy Gravel	150	36	124	11	133	3.0	0.4
5 to 17	Terrace Deposits – Clayey Sand	450	31	128	11	135	3.5	0.5
17 to 45	Otay Formation – Siltstone/Claystone	450	30	132	10	138	4.0	1.0
45+	Metavolcanic Rock	3000	40	137	5	144	6.0	0.9

 TABLE 2

 RECOMMENDED SOIL PARAMETERS FOR PIER FOUNDATION DESIGN (Z731391)

Notes: (a) Based on the subsurface conditions encountered in Boring B-18 and at SL-10.

(b) Strength reduction within upper 17 feet due to adjacent slope with significant erosion.

We understand from SDG&E that the proposed location for pole Z731391 has been updated to stay outside the potential scour zone. Our review of the current FEMA online flood hazards map indicates that this pole is not located within "Moderately Risk Area" as depicted on Figure 1, *Flood Hazards Map*. Therefore the potential for local scour at this pole is considered low.

Pole Z731391 is located adjacent to a slope where rills and gullies due to erosion processes were observed. It is our opinion that the slope is not safe under the existing condition and should be repaired together with a proper drainage system so that runoff does not flow over the top of slope. The strength reduction due to adjacent slope with significant erosion has been incorporated into our recommended soil parameters.

Very dense to hard formational materials and metavolcanic rock are expected below the surficial undocumented fill, topsoil, colluvium, and terrace deposits at the site. The contactor should have auger, core barrels, and excavating tools suitable for penetrating dense layers, concretions, and cemented zones on-site during the pole construction.

Ground water or perched groundwater could be encountered during construction following heavy rainfall, runoff, and/or irrigation. Sloughing or reveling could occur where relatively clean sands are encountered below the groundwater level. Casing and/or wet methods may be necessary for the installation of pole foundation below groundwater, if any.

The drilling equipment should allow maneuverability on difficult and sloped terrain, penetration and support of weak and unconsolidated soils, and/or rotary percussive drilling in obstructions including cobbles and hard formational materials.

An experienced contractor specializing in pier and/or micropile construction and familiar with the regional geologic conditions should be selected for the project. The micropile specialty contractor is responsible for furnishing of all design, materials, products, accessories, tools, equipment, services, transportation, labor and supervision, and manufacturing techniques required for design, installation and testing of micropiles and pile top attachments for the project.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, or if we may be of further service, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

GEOCON INCORPORATED



(e-mail) SDG&E Attention: Ms. Risa Arai





© 2015 Google © 2015 INEGI

LINCAL STATE

Stay Dry

Y

Reference Layers

NFHL Data Available

N

(ô)

v

(@)

- FIRM Panel Boundary
- Flood Risk Areas



- 📃 High Risk Area
- Moderate Risk Area



- Low to Moderate Risk Area
- Undetermined Risk Area

©2010

FIGURE 1 - FLOOD HAZARDS MAP

2724 11 Eve alt

0