

Express Oil Change


Geotechnical Engineering Report

Gulfport, Mississippi

October 8, 2024 | Terracon Project No. EB245128

Prepared for:

Express Oil Change, LLC
1800 Southpark Drive
Birmingham, Alabama 35244



Nationwide
[Terracon.com](https://www.terracon.com)

- Facilities
- Environmental
- Geotechnical
- Materials



1919 Lakeland Drive, Suite A
Jackson, MS 39216
P (601) 956-4467
Terracon.com

October 8, 2024

Express Oil Change, LLC
1800 Southpark Drive
Birmingham, Alabama 35244

Attn: Ms. Ashley Bernatski
P: 205.943.5770
E: Ashley.bernatski@expressoil.com

Re: Geotechnical Engineering Report
Express Oil Change
East Pass Road
Gulfport, Mississippi
Terracon Project No. EB245128

Dear Ms. Ashley Bernatski:

We have completed the scope of Geotechnical Engineering services for the above referenced project in general accordance with Terracon Proposal No. PEB245128 dated August 6, 2024. This report presents the findings of the subsurface exploration and provides geotechnical recommendations concerning earthwork and the design and construction of foundations, floor slabs, and pavements for the proposed project.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you on this project. If you have any questions concerning this report or if we may be of further service, please contact us.

Sincerely,

Terracon

David Shin, E.I.
Staff Engineer

Ryan P. Steiner, P.E.
Office Manager

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 1

Project Description..... 1

Site Conditions 3

Geotechnical Characterization 3

Seismic Site Class..... 4

Geotechnical Overview 4

Earthwork 6

 Subgrade Preparation 6

 Fill Material Types 7

 Fill Placement and Compaction Requirements 8

 Utility Trench Backfill..... 8

 Grading and Drainage..... 9

 Earthwork Construction Considerations 9

 Construction Observation and Testing 10

Shallow Foundations 11

 Design Parameters – Compressive Loads 11

 Foundation Construction Considerations 12

Floor Slabs 13

 Floor Slab Design Parameters 13

 Floor Slab Construction Considerations 14

Lateral Earth Pressures 15

 Design Parameters..... 15

 Subsurface Drainage for Below-Grade Walls 16

Pavements 17

 General Pavement Comments 17

 Pavement Design Parameters 17

 Pavement Section Thicknesses 18

 Pavement Drainage..... 20

 Pavement Maintenance 20

General Comments 21

Figures

GeoModel


Attachments

Exploration and Testing Procedures

Site Location and Exploration Plans

Exploration and Laboratory Results

Supporting Information

Note: This report was originally delivered in a web-based format. **Blue Bold** text in the report indicates a referenced section heading. The PDF version also includes hyperlinks which direct the reader to that section and clicking on the  Terracon logo will bring you back to this page. For more interactive features, please view your project online at client.terracon.com.

Refer to each individual Attachment for a listing of contents.

Introduction

This report presents the results of our subsurface exploration and Geotechnical Engineering services performed for the proposed Express Oil Change to be located at East Pass Road in Gulfport, Mississippi. The purpose of these services was to provide information and geotechnical engineering recommendations relative to:

- Subsurface soil conditions
- Groundwater conditions
- Seismic site classification per IBC
- Site preparation and earthwork
- Dewatering considerations
- Foundation design and construction
- Floor slab design and construction
- Lateral earth pressure
- Pavement design and construction

The geotechnical engineering Scope of Services for this project included the advancement of soil borings, laboratory testing, engineering analysis, and preparation of this report.

Drawings showing the site and boring locations are shown on the [Site Location](#) and [Exploration Plan](#), respectively. The results of the laboratory testing performed on soil samples obtained from the site during our field exploration are included on the boring logs and/or as separate graphs in the [Exploration Results](#) section.

Project Description

Our initial understanding of the project was provided in our proposal and was discussed during project planning. A period of collaboration has transpired since the project was initiated, and our final understanding of the project conditions is as follows:

Item	Description
Information Provided	An email request for proposal was provided by Ashley Bernatski with Express Oil Change on August 2 nd , 2024. The request included a Parcel Map and conceptual plan drawings of the layout of the planned development and proposed boring locations and depths.
Project Description	The project includes the construction of a new Express Oil change with below-grade oil change pit and associated park/drive areas.

Item	Description
Proposed Structures	The structure associated with the project is an approximately 5,400 square foot single-story building with a below-grade oil change pit.
Building Construction	Not provided; we anticipate the building will be constructed using steel framing.
Finished Floor Elevation	Not provided; boring depths have assumed that finished floor is not more than 1 foot below existing grade.
Maximum Loads	<p>Anticipated structural loads were provided by the client in the request for proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Columns: 25 kips Walls: 2.5 kips per linear foot (klf) Slabs: 150 pounds per square foot (psf)
Grading/Slopes	A grading plan was not provided. In the absence of information provided by the design team, we have assumed minimal grading will be required, less than 1 foot of cut or fill.
Below-Grade Structures	Oil change "Pit" area under the center bay of the building.
Pavements	<p>A preferred pavement surfacing has not been identified to us as part of the preliminary information. Asphalt/Concrete surfacing is common in the area for projects of this nature and is the assumed preference.</p> <p>Unless information is provided prior to the report, the anticipated ACI traffic categories and daily truck traffic for rigid pavements will be assumed to consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automobile Parking: (Category A) Car parking areas and access lanes, 10 truck per day Drive Lanes/Entrances/Exits: (Category B) Entrance and truck service lanes, 50 trucks per day Dumpster Pad: (Category E) Garbage or fire truck lanes, 1 truck per day <p>Unless information is provided prior to the report, we assume that the traffic classification for flexible pavements will consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automobile Parking: (Class I) Parking stalls for autos and pickup trucks Drive Lanes/Entrances/Exits: (Class III) Delivery lanes with up to ten 3-axle trucks per day <p>The pavement design period is 20 years.</p>
Building Code	2018 IBC

Terracon should be notified if any of the above information is inconsistent with the planned construction, especially the grading limits, as modifications to our recommendations may be necessary.

Site Conditions

The following description of site conditions is derived from our site visit in association with the field exploration and our review of publicly available geologic and topographic maps.

Item	Description
Site Information	The project is located north of East Pass Road near Acadian Drive in Gulfport, Mississippi, approximately at 30.3999°N, 89.0222°W. ±0.95-acre parcel See Site Location
Existing Improvements	None, undeveloped parcel
Current Ground Cover	Grass and several large trees
Existing Topography	Based on our recent visit, the site appears to be relatively flat with elevations ranging from about 28 feet to 29 feet.

Geotechnical Characterization

We have developed a general characterization of the subsurface conditions based upon our review of the subsurface exploration, laboratory data, geologic setting and our understanding of the project. This characterization, termed GeoModel, forms the basis of our geotechnical calculations and evaluation of the site. Conditions observed at each exploration point are indicated on the individual logs. The individual logs can be found in the [Exploration Results](#) and the GeoModel can be found in the [Figures](#) attachment of this report.

As part of our analyses, we identified the following model layers within the subsurface profile. For a more detailed view of the model layer depths at each boring location, refer to the GeoModel.

Model Layer	Layer Name	General Description
1	Unstable Sands	Poorly-Graded Sands with Varying Amounts of Fines (SP/SP-SC/SP-SM) / Clayey Sand (SC) – very loose to loose
2	Stable Sands	Poorly-Graded Sands with Varying Amounts of Fines (SP/SP-SC/SP-SM) / Clayey Sand (SC) / Silty Sand (SM) – medium dense to very dense

As shown in the GeoModel, groundwater was observed in Borings B-01 and B-02 during our investigation at about 13 feet below existing grade. A piezometer was set in Boring B-01 via a bail out and recovery test method and upon rechecking after about a week, the groundwater was found at about 5 feet below existing grade.

Groundwater conditions may be different at the time of construction. Groundwater conditions may change because of seasonal variations in rainfall, runoff, and other conditions not apparent at the time of drilling. The possibility of groundwater level fluctuations should be considered when developing the design and construction plans for the project.

Seismic Site Class

The seismic design requirements for buildings and other structures are based on Seismic Design Category. Site Classification is required to determine the Seismic Design Category for a structure. The Site Classification is based on the upper 100 feet of the site profile defined by a weighted average value of either shear wave velocity, standard penetration resistance, or undrained shear strength in accordance with Section 20.4 of ASCE 7 and the International Building Code (IBC). Based on the soil properties observed at the site and as described on the exploration logs and results, our professional opinion is for that a **Seismic Site Classification of D** be considered for the project. Subsurface explorations at this site were extended to a maximum depth of 20 feet. The site properties below the boring depth to 100 feet were estimated based on our experience and knowledge of geologic conditions of the general area. Additional deeper borings or geophysical testing may be performed to confirm the conditions below the current boring depth.

Geotechnical Overview

As noted in [Geotechnical Overview](#), unstable sands (i.e., low blow count, N value of less than 7) were typically encountered throughout the site within the upper 2 feet with isolated zones being encountered as deep as 8 feet below existing grades. After stripping and grubbing but prior to placing fill, the exposed subgrade should be evaluated to confirm the presence and extent of unstable soils. It should be anticipated that unstable soils will

be present upon initial stripping and grubbing and mitigation of the soils will be required. Mitigation should consist of densification of the exposed subgrade using a heavy smooth drum vibratory compactor having a gross weight of not less than 22,000 pounds at the drum. The surface should be densified by making a minimum of 5 overlapping passes in a perpendicular direction to each other. Should the stability of the sands worsen during densification, the densification process should cease until the pore water pressure has dissipated. After the exposed subgrade has been densified, the entire area should be proof-rolled to observe for the presence of weak, yielding or pumping soils. Should mitigation of unstable soils be required, Terracon should be contacted to provide the appropriate recommendations.

Additionally, the subgrade soils could become unstable with typical earthwork and repeated construction traffic, especially after precipitation events. Effective drainage should be completed and maintained during construction to avoid potential subgrade issues. If possible, the grading should be performed during the warmer and drier times of the year. If grading is performed during the winter months, an increased risk for possible undercutting and replacement of unstable subgrade will persist. Additional site preparation recommendations, including subgrade improvement and fill placement, are provided in the **Earthwork** section.

It should be noted that groundwater was encountered as shallow as 5 feet below existing grades during our investigation and may prove difficult when excavating for the below-grade oil change pit. Groundwater seepage will need to be controlled during construction and the ground water level may need to be lowered prior to performing excavations. We recommend that the contractor retain the services of a dewatering expert to assist them in evaluating dewatering methods.

The **Shallow Foundations** section addresses support of the building bearing on native sands or engineered fill. The **Floor Slabs** section addresses slab-on-grade support of the building. Flexible and rigid pavement systems are feasible for this site. The **Pavements** section addresses the design of pavement systems.

Final grades will greatly affect the recommendations in this report. As assumed grading plan consisting of less than one (1) foot of cut or fill was used in the basis of our design and recommendations. This office should be notified upon completion of the site grading plans to revisit the recommendations contained herein.

The recommendations contained in this report are based upon the results of field and laboratory testing (presented in the **Exploration Results**), engineering analyses, and our current understanding of the proposed project. The **General Comments** section provides an understanding of the report limitations.

Earthwork

Earthwork is anticipated to include clearing and grubbing, excavations, and engineered fill placement. The following sections provide recommendations for use in the preparation of specifications for the work. Recommendations include critical quality criteria, as necessary, to render the site in the state considered in our geotechnical engineering evaluation for foundations, floor slabs, and pavements.

Subgrade Preparation

We recommend that the soils within the footprint of the proposed structures and pavements be mitigated as described in [Geotechnical Overview](#). Prior to placing fill, existing vegetation and root mat should be removed. Complete stripping of the topsoil should be performed in the proposed building and parking/driveway areas.

Stripped materials consisting of vegetation and organic materials should be wasted off site or used to vegetate landscaped areas or exposed slopes after completion of grading operations. Stripping depths between our boring locations and across the site could vary considerably as such we recommend actual stripping depths be evaluated by a representative of Terracon during construction to aid in preventing removal of excess material.

Mature trees are located within or near the footprint of some of the proposed buildings, which will require removal at the onset of construction. Tree root systems can remove substantial moisture from surrounding soils. Where trees are removed, the full root ball and all associated dry and desiccated soils should be removed. The soil materials which contain less than 5 percent organics can be reused as engineered fill provided the material is moisture conditioned and properly compacted.

No root balls from the trees should be left in the ground after the site clearing process. The root ball should be excavated such that the roots remaining in the ground are smaller than ½-inch in diameter. The voids left behind by the removal of the root balls should be replaced with engineered fill as outlined in this report.

The subgrade should be proofrolled with an adequately loaded vehicle such as a fully-loaded tandem-axle dump truck. The proofrolling should be performed under the observation of the Geotechnical Engineer or representative. Areas excessively deflecting under the proofroll should be delineated and subsequently addressed by the Geotechnical Engineer. Mitigation might include processing to remove excess moisture, overexcavation and backfilling, chemical stabilization, or modification with geotextile reinforcement. Should mitigation of wet and pumping soils be required, our office should be notified so that appropriate mitigation can be prescribed by the project geotechnical engineer.

Fill Material Types

Reuse of On-Site Soil: Excavated on-site soil may be reused as fill. Material property requirements for on-site soil for use as Engineered Fill are noted in the table below:

Property	Engineered Fill
Composition	Free of deleterious material
Fines content	Less than 50% passing No. 200 sieve
Plasticity	$10 \leq \text{Plasticity Index (PI)} \leq 25$ Liquid Limit (LL) ≤ 45
GeoModel Layer Expected to be Suitable ¹	1, 2

1. Based on subsurface exploration. Actual material suitability should be determined in the field at time of construction.
2. High silt content soils are extremely sensitive to variations in moisture content and can lose strength rapidly with increases in moisture. It should be noted that the moisture content of the silt must be closely controlled in order to achieve the desired degree of compaction. The contractor should expect difficulties with controlling the soil's moisture content to near optimal levels in order to achieve adequate density of the compacted soil. Cement modification may be necessary for highly silty soils to maintain stability.

Imported Fill Materials: Imported fill materials should meet the following material property requirements. Regardless of its source, compacted fill should consist of approved materials that are free of organic matter and debris. Frozen material should not be used, and fill should not be placed on a frozen subgrade.

Soil Type ¹	USCS Classification	Acceptable Parameters
Low Plasticity Cohesive	CL	$10 \leq \text{Plasticity Index (PI)} \leq 25$ Liquid Limit (LL) ≤ 45
Granular ²	SW, SP, SM, SC	Less than 50% passing No. 200 sieve

Soil Type ¹	USCS Classification	Acceptable Parameters
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Engineered fill should consist of approved materials free of organic matter and debris. Frozen material should not be used, and fill should not be placed on a frozen subgrade. A sample of each material type should be submitted to the Geotechnical Engineer for evaluation prior to use on this site. High silt content soils are extremely sensitive to variations in moisture content and can lose strength rapidly with increases in moisture. It should be noted that the moisture content of the silt must be closely controlled in order to achieve the desired degree of compaction. The contractor should expect difficulties with controlling the soil's moisture content to near optimal levels in order to achieve adequate density of the compacted soil. Cement modification may be necessary for highly silty soils to maintain stability. 		

Fill Placement and Compaction Requirements

Engineered Fill should meet the following compaction requirements.

Item	Engineered Fill
Maximum Lift Thickness	9 inches or less in loose thickness when heavy, self-propelled compaction equipment is used 4 to 6 inches in loose thickness when hand-guided equipment (i.e., jumping jack or plate compactor) is used
Minimum Compaction Requirements ^{1,2}	98% of maximum dry density with stability present
Water Content Range ¹	Within -2% to +2% of optimum

- Maximum density and optimum water content as determined by the standard Proctor test (ASTM D 698).
- If the granular material is a coarse sand or gravel, or of a uniform size, or has a low fines content, compaction comparison to relative density may be more appropriate. In this case, granular materials should be compacted to at least 70% relative density (ASTM D 4253 and D 4254) at workable moisture content. Materials not amenable to density testing should be placed and compacted to a stable condition observed by the Geotechnical Engineer or representative.

Utility Trench Backfill

Any soft or unsuitable materials encountered at the bottom of utility trench excavations should be removed and replaced with Engineered Fill or bedding material in accordance with public works specifications for the utility to be supported. This recommendation is

particularly applicable to utility work requiring grade control and/or in areas where subsequent grade raising could cause settlement in the subgrade supporting the utility. Trench excavation should not be conducted below a downward 1:1 projection from existing foundations without engineering review of shoring requirements and geotechnical observation during construction.

On-site materials are considered suitable for backfill of utility and pipe trenches from 1 foot above the top of the pipe to the final ground surface, provided the material is free of organic matter and deleterious substances.

Trench backfill should be mechanically placed and compacted as discussed earlier in this report. Compaction of initial lifts should be accomplished with hand-operated tampers or other lightweight compactors. Where trenches are placed beneath slabs or footings, the backfill should satisfy the gradation and expansion index requirements of engineered fill discussed in this report. Flooding or jetting for placement and compaction of backfill is not recommended.

Grading and Drainage

All grades must provide effective drainage away from the building during and after construction and should be maintained throughout the life of the structure. Water retained next to the building can result in soil movements greater than those discussed in this report. Greater movements can result in unacceptable differential floor slab and/or foundation movements, cracked slabs and walls, and roof leaks. The roof should have gutters/drains with downspouts that discharge onto splash blocks at a distance of at least 10 feet from the building.

Exposed ground should be sloped and maintained at a minimum 5% away from the building for at least 10 feet beyond the perimeter of the building. Locally, flatter grades may be necessary to transition ADA access requirements for flatwork. After building construction and landscaping have been completed, final grades should be verified to document effective drainage has been achieved. Grades around the structure should also be periodically inspected and adjusted, as necessary, as part of the structure's maintenance program. Where paving or flatwork abuts the structure, a maintenance program should be established to effectively seal and maintain joints and prevent surface water infiltration.

Earthwork Construction Considerations

The near-surface soils are sensitive to increases in moisture content and have a tendency to lose strength and stability as the moisture content increases or as a result of construction traffic. We suggest earthwork construction take place during generally dryer months of the year. Wet season earthwork has an increased risk that may require

additional mitigation measures beyond that which would be expected during the drier summer and fall months.

Shallow excavations for the proposed structure are anticipated to be accomplished with conventional construction equipment. Upon completion of filling and grading, care should be taken to maintain the subgrade water content prior to construction of grade-supported improvements such as floor slabs and pavements. Construction traffic over the completed subgrades should be avoided. The site should also be graded to prevent ponding of surface water on the prepared subgrades or in excavations. Water collecting over or adjacent to construction areas should be removed. If the subgrade freezes, desiccates, saturates, or is disturbed, the affected material should be removed, or the materials should be scarified, moisture conditioned, and recompacted prior to floor slab construction.

The groundwater table could affect overexcavation efforts, especially for overexcavation and replacement of lower strength soils and deep excavation for pits. A temporary dewatering system consisting of sumps with pumps may be necessary to achieve the recommended depth of overexcavation depending on groundwater conditions at the time of construction.

As a minimum, excavations should be performed in accordance with OSHA 29 CFR, Part 1926, Subpart P, "Excavations" and its appendices, and in accordance with any applicable local and/or state regulations.

Construction site safety is the sole responsibility of the contractor who controls the means, methods, and sequencing of construction operations. Under no circumstances shall the information provided herein be interpreted to mean Terracon is assuming responsibility for construction site safety or the contractor's activities; such responsibility shall neither be implied nor inferred.

Excavations or other activities resulting in ground disturbance have the potential to affect adjoining properties and structures. Our scope of services does not include review of available final grading information or consider potential temporary grading performed by the contractor for potential effects such as ground movement beyond the project limits. A preconstruction/ precondition survey should be conducted to document nearby property/infrastructure prior to any site development activity. Excavation or ground disturbance activities adjacent or near property lines should be monitored or instrumented for potential ground movements that could negatively affect adjoining property and/or structures.

Construction Observation and Testing

The earthwork efforts should be observed by the Geotechnical Engineer (or others under their direction). Observation should include documentation of adequate removal of surficial materials (vegetation, topsoil, and pavements), evaluation and remediation of

existing fill materials, as well as proofrolling and mitigation of unsuitable areas delineated by the proofroll.

Each lift of compacted fill should be tested, evaluated, and reworked, as necessary, as recommended by the Geotechnical Engineer prior to placement of additional lifts. Each lift of fill should be tested for density and water content at a frequency of at least one test for every 5,000 square feet of compacted fill in the building areas and 10,000 square feet in pavement areas. Where not specified by local ordinance, one density and water content test should be performed for every 150 linear feet of compacted utility trench backfill and a minimum of one test performed for every 12 vertical inches of compacted backfill.

In areas of foundation excavations, the bearing subgrade should be evaluated by the Geotechnical Engineer. If unanticipated conditions are observed, the Geotechnical Engineer should prescribe mitigation options.

In addition to the documentation of the essential parameters necessary for construction, the continuation of the Geotechnical Engineer into the construction phase of the project provides the continuity to maintain the Geotechnical Engineer's evaluation of subsurface conditions, including assessing variations and associated design changes.

Shallow Foundations

If the site has been prepared in accordance with the requirements noted in [Earthwork](#), the following design parameters are applicable for shallow foundations.

Design Parameters – Compressive Loads

Item	Description
Maximum Net Allowable Bearing Pressure ^{1, 2}	1,600 psf
Required Bearing Stratum ³	GeoModel Layer 2 or Engineered Fill
Minimum Foundation Dimensions	Per IBC 1809.7
Ultimate Passive Resistance ⁴ (equivalent fluid pressures)	250 pcf
Sliding Resistance ⁵	130 psf allowable cohesion
Minimum Embedment below Finished Grade ⁶	18 inches
Estimated Total Settlement from Structural Loads ²	Less than about 1 inch


Item	Description
Estimated Differential Settlement^{2, 7}	About ½ of total settlement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The maximum net allowable bearing pressure is the pressure in excess of the minimum surrounding overburden pressure at the footing base elevation. Values assume that exterior grades are no steeper than 20% within 10 feet of structure. 2. Values provided are for maximum loads noted in Project Description. Additional geotechnical consultation will be necessary if higher loads are anticipated. 3. Unsuitable or soft soils should be overexcavated and replaced per the recommendations presented in Earthwork. 4. Use of passive earth pressures require the sides of the excavation for the spread footing foundation to be nearly vertical and the concrete placed neat against these vertical faces or that the footing forms be removed and compacted Engineered Fill be placed against the vertical footing face. Assumes no hydrostatic pressure. 5. Can be used to compute sliding resistance where foundations are placed on suitable soil/materials. Frictional resistance for granular materials is dependent on the bearing pressure which may vary due to load combinations. For fine-grained materials, lateral resistance using cohesion should not exceed ½ the dead load. 6. Embedment necessary to minimize the effects of frost and/or seasonal water content variations. For sloping ground, maintain depth below the lowest adjacent exterior grade within 5 horizontal feet of the structure. 7. Differential settlements are noted for equivalent-loaded foundations and bearing elevation as measured over a span of 50 feet. 	

Trees or other vegetation whose root systems can remove excessive moisture from the subgrade and foundation soils should not be planted next to critical structures. Trees and shrubbery should be kept away from the exterior edges of the foundation element a distance at least equal to 1.5 times their expected mature height.


Foundation Construction Considerations

As noted in **Earthwork**, the footing excavations should be evaluated under the observation of the Geotechnical Engineer. The base of all foundation excavations should be free of water and loose soil, prior to placing concrete. Concrete should be placed soon after excavating to reduce bearing soil disturbance. Care should be taken to prevent wetting or drying of the bearing materials during construction. Excessively wet or dry material or any loose/disturbed material in the bottom of the footing excavations should be removed/reconditioned before foundation concrete is placed.

If unsuitable bearing soils are observed at the base of the planned footing excavation, the excavation should be extended deeper to suitable soils, and the footings could bear directly on these soils at the lower level or on lean concrete backfill placed in the excavations. The lean concrete replacement zone is illustrated on the sketch below.



Overexcavation for Engineered Fill placement below footings should be conducted as shown below. The overexcavation should be backfilled up to the footing base elevation, with engineered fill placed, as recommended in the **Earthwork** section.



Floor Slabs

Design parameters for floor slabs assume the requirements for **Earthwork** have been followed. Specific attention should be given to positive drainage away from the structure and positive drainage of the aggregate base beneath the floor slab.

Floor Slab Design Parameters

Item	Description
Floor Slab Support¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subgrade per recommendations in Earthwork Minimum 6 inches of crushed aggregate compacted to at least 98% of ASTM D 698 ^{1, 2}

Item	Description
Estimated Modulus of Subgrade Reaction ²	100 pounds per square inch per inch (psi/in) for point loads

1. Floor slabs may be structurally independent of building footings or walls to reduce the possibility of floor slab cracking caused by differential movements between the slab and foundation.
2. Modulus of subgrade reaction is an estimated value based upon our experience with the subgrade condition, the requirements noted in [Earthwork](#), and the floor slab support as noted in this table. It is provided for point loads. For large area loads the modulus of subgrade reaction would be lower.
3. Aggregate base layer should consist of a free-draining material, less than 10% fines (i.e., clean sand or size 610 crushed stone).

The use of a vapor retarder should be considered beneath concrete slabs on grade covered with wood, tile, carpet, or other moisture sensitive or impervious coverings, when the project includes humidity-controlled areas, or when the slab will support equipment sensitive to moisture. When conditions warrant the use of a vapor retarder, the slab designer should refer to ACI 302 and/or ACI 360 for procedures and cautions regarding the use and placement of a vapor retarder.

Saw-cut contraction joints should be placed in the slab to help control the location and extent of cracking. For additional recommendations, refer to the ACI Design Manual. Joints or cracks should be sealed with a waterproof, non-extruding compressible compound specifically recommended for heavy duty concrete pavement and wet environments.

Where floor slabs are tied to perimeter walls or turn-down slabs to meet structural or other construction objectives, our experience indicates differential movement between the walls and slabs will likely be observed in adjacent slab expansion joints or floor slab cracks beyond the length of the structural dowels. The Structural Engineer should account for potential differential settlement through use of sufficient control joints, appropriate reinforcing or other means.

Mitigation measures, as noted in [Earthwork](#), are critical to the performance of floor slabs. In addition to the mitigation measures, the floor slab can be stiffened by adding steel reinforcement, grade beams, and/or post-tensioned elements.

Floor Slab Construction Considerations

Finished subgrade, within and for at least 10 feet beyond the floor slab, should be protected from traffic, rutting, or other disturbance and maintained in a relatively moist condition until floor slabs are constructed. If the subgrade should become damaged or desiccated prior to construction of floor slabs, the affected material should be removed,


and Engineered Fill should be added to replace the resulting excavation. Final conditioning of the finished subgrade should be performed immediately prior to placement of the floor slab support course.

The Geotechnical Engineer should observe the condition of the floor slab subgrades immediately prior to placement of the floor slab support course, reinforcing steel, and concrete. Attention should be paid to high traffic areas that were rutted and disturbed earlier, and to areas where backfilled trenches are located.

Lateral Earth Pressures

Design Parameters

Structures with unbalanced backfill levels on opposite sides should be designed for earth pressures at least equal to values indicated in the following table. Earth pressures will be influenced by structural design of the walls, conditions of wall restraint, methods of construction, and/or compaction and the strength of the materials being restrained. Two wall restraint conditions are shown in the diagram below. Active earth pressure is commonly used for design of free-standing cantilever retaining walls and assumes wall movement. The "at-rest" condition assumes no wall movement and is commonly used for basement walls, loading dock walls, or other walls restrained at the top. The recommended design lateral earth pressures do not include a factor of safety and do not provide for possible hydrostatic pressure on the walls (unless stated).



Lateral Earth Pressure Design Parameters

Earth Pressure Condition ¹	Coefficient for Backfill Type ²	Surcharge Pressure ³ p_1 (psf)	Equivalent Fluid Pressures (psf) ^{2,4}	
			Unsaturated ⁵	Submerged ⁵
Active (K_a)	Granular - 0.31	$(0.31)S$	$(40)H$	$(80)H$
At-Rest (K_o)	Granular - 0.47	$(0.47)S$	$(55)H$	$(90)H$

Lateral Earth Pressure Design Parameters

Earth Pressure Condition ¹	Coefficient for Backfill Type ²	Surcharge Pressure ³ p ₁ (psf)	Equivalent Fluid Pressures (psf) ^{2,4}	
			Unsaturated ⁵	Submerged ⁵

1. For active earth pressure, wall must rotate about base, with top lateral movements 0.002 H to 0.004 H, where H is wall height. For passive earth pressure, wall must move horizontally to mobilize resistance. Fat clay or other expansive soils should not be used as backfill behind the wall.
2. Uniform, horizontal backfill, compacted to at least 98% of the ASTM D 698 maximum dry density, with a maximum unit weight of 120 pcf.
3. Uniform surcharge, where S is surcharge pressure.
4. Loading from heavy compaction equipment is not included.
5. To achieve "Unsaturated" conditions, follow guidelines in **Subsurface Drainage for Below-Grade Walls** below. "Submerged" conditions are recommended when drainage behind walls is not incorporated into the design.

Backfill placed against structures should consist of granular soils or low plasticity cohesive soils. For the granular values to be valid, the granular backfill must extend out and up from the base of the wall at an angle of at least 45 degrees from vertical for the active case.


Footings, floor slabs or other loads bearing on backfill behind walls may have a significant influence on the lateral earth pressure. Placing footings within wall backfill and in the zone of active soil influence on the wall should be avoided unless structural analyses indicate the wall can safely withstand the increased pressure.

The lateral earth pressure recommendations given in this section are applicable to the design of rigid retaining walls subject to slight rotation, such as cantilever, or gravity type concrete walls. These recommendations are not applicable to the design of modular block - geogrid reinforced backfill walls (also termed MSE walls). Recommendations covering these types of wall systems are beyond the scope of services for this assignment. However, we would be pleased to develop a proposal for evaluation and design of such wall systems upon request.

Subsurface Drainage for Below-Grade Walls

A perforated rigid plastic drain line installed behind the base of walls and extends below adjacent grade is recommended to prevent hydrostatic loading on the walls. The invert of a drain line around a below-grade building area or exterior retaining wall should be placed near foundation bearing level. The drain line should be sloped to provide positive gravity drainage to daylight or to a sump pit and pump. The drain line should be surrounded by clean, free-draining granular material having less than 5% passing the No. 200 sieve, such

as No. 57 aggregate. The free-draining aggregate should be encapsulated in a filter fabric. The granular fill should extend to within 2 feet of final grade, where it should be capped with compacted cohesive fill to reduce infiltration of surface water into the drain system.



As an alternative to free-draining granular fill, a prefabricated drainage structure may be used. A prefabricated drainage structure is a plastic drainage core or mesh which is covered with filter fabric to prevent soil intrusion and is fastened to the wall prior to placing backfill.

Pavements

General Pavement Comments

Pavement designs are provided for the traffic conditions and pavement life conditions as noted in [Project Description](#) and in the following sections of this report. A critical aspect of pavement performance is site preparation. Pavement designs noted in this section must be applied to the site which has been prepared as recommended in the [Earthwork](#) section.

Pavement Design Parameters

An estimated California Bearing Ratio (CBR) of 3 was used for the subgrade for the asphaltic concrete (AC) pavement designs. An estimated modulus of subgrade reaction of 100 pci was used for the Portland cement concrete (PCC) pavement designs. The value was empirically derived based upon our experience with similar subgrade soils and our expectation of the quality of the subgrade as prescribed by the **Site Preparation** conditions as outlined in [Earthwork](#). A modulus of rupture of 550 psi was used in design for the concrete (based on correlations with a minimum 28-day compressive strength of 4,000 psi).

Pavement Section Thicknesses

The following table provides our opinion of minimum thickness for AC sections:

Asphaltic Concrete Design

Layer	Thickness (inches)	
	Automobile Parking (Class I) ¹	Drive Lanes/Entrances/Exits (Class III) ¹
AC ^{2, 3}	3	5
Aggregate Base	6	6

1. See [Project Description](#) for more specifics regarding traffic assumptions.
2. All materials should meet the current State of Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT) Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction (MSSRBC), 1990/2017 Edition or equivalent specifications.
 - Asphaltic Surface –MSSRBC (1990), MDOT SC-1, Type 8 material or MSSRBC (2017), Hot Mix Asphalt, ST, 9.5mm mixture
 - Asphaltic Base – MSSRBC (1990), MDOT BC-1, Type 6 material or MSSRBC (2017), Hot Mix Asphalt, ST, 19.0mm mixture
 - Aggregate base course should consist of a MDOT Size No. 610 Stone or crushed concrete material MSSRBC (2017). Aggregate base course should be compacted to 100 percent of its maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D-698, Standard Proctor Test.
3. A minimum 1.5-inch surface course should be used on AC pavements.

The following table provides our estimated minimum thickness of PCC pavements.

Portland Cement Concrete Design

Layer	Thickness (inches)		
	Automobile Parking (Category A) ¹	Drive Lanes/Entrances/Exits (Category B) ¹	Dumpster Pad (Category E) ¹
PCC ²	5	6	8
Aggregate Base	4	4	4

1. See [Project Description](#) for more specifics regarding traffic classifications.
2. All materials should meet the current State of Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT) *Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction* (MSSRBC), 1990/2017 Edition or equivalent specifications.

Portland Cement Concrete Design

Layer	Thickness (inches)		
	Automobile Parking (Category A) ¹	Drive Lanes/Entrances/Exits (Category B) ¹	Dumpster Pad (Category E) ¹

- Concrete Pavement – MSSRBC (2017), Section 501
- Aggregate base course should consist of a MDOT Size No. 610 Stone or crushed concrete material MSSRBC (2017). Aggregate base course should be compacted to 100 percent of its maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D-698, Standard Proctor Test.

Areas for parking of heavy vehicles, concentrated turn areas, and start/stop maneuvers could require thicker pavement sections. Edge restraints (i.e. concrete curbs or aggregate shoulders) should be planned along curves and areas of maneuvering vehicles.

Although not required for structural support, a minimum 4-inch thick base course layer is recommended to help reduce potential for slab curl, shrinkage cracking, and subgrade pumping through joints. Proper joint spacing will also be required to prevent excessive slab curling and shrinkage cracking. Joints should be sealed to prevent entry of foreign material and doweled where necessary for load transfer. PCC pavement details for joint spacing, joint reinforcement, and joint sealing should be prepared in accordance with ACI 330 and ACI 325.

Where practical, we recommend early-entry cutting of crack-control joints in PCC pavements. Cutting of the concrete in its “green” state typically reduces the potential for micro-cracking of the pavements prior to the crack control joints being formed, compared to cutting the joints after the concrete has fully set. Micro-cracking of pavements may lead to crack formation in locations other than the sawed joints, and/or reduction of fatigue life of the pavement.

Openings in pavements, such as decorative landscaped areas, are sources for water infiltration into surrounding pavement systems. Water can collect in the islands and migrate into the surrounding subgrade soils thereby degrading support of the pavement. Islands with raised concrete curbs, irrigated foliage, and low permeability near-surface soils are particular areas of concern. The civil design for the pavements with these conditions should include features to restrict or collect and discharge excess water from the islands. Examples of features are edge drains connected to the stormwater collection system, longitudinal subdrains, or other suitable outlets and impermeable barriers preventing lateral migration of water such as a cutoff wall installed to a depth below the pavement structure.

Pavement Drainage

Pavements should be sloped to provide rapid drainage of surface water. Water allowed to pond on or adjacent to the pavements could saturate the subgrade and contribute to premature pavement deterioration. In addition, the pavement subgrade should be graded to provide positive drainage within the granular base section. Appropriate sub-drainage or connection to a suitable daylight outlet should be provided to remove water from the granular subbase.

Pavement Maintenance

The pavement sections represent minimum recommended thicknesses and, as such, periodic upkeep should be anticipated. Preventive maintenance should be planned and provided for through an on-going pavement management program. Maintenance activities are intended to slow the rate of pavement deterioration and to preserve the pavement investment. Pavement care consists of both localized (e.g., crack and joint sealing and patching) and global maintenance (e.g., surface sealing). Additional engineering consultation is recommended to determine the type and extent of a cost-effective program. Even with periodic maintenance, some movements and related cracking may still occur, and repairs may be required.

Pavement performance is affected by its surroundings. In addition to providing preventive maintenance, the civil engineer should consider the following recommendations in the design and layout of pavements:

- Final grade adjacent to paved areas should slope down from the edges at a minimum 2%.
- Subgrade and pavement surfaces should have a minimum 2% slope to promote proper surface drainage.
- Install pavement drainage systems surrounding areas anticipated for frequent wetting.
- Install joint sealant and seal cracks immediately.
- Seal all landscaped areas in or adjacent to pavements to reduce moisture migration to subgrade soils.
- Place compacted, low permeability backfill against the exterior side of curb and gutter.
- Place curb, gutter and/or sidewalk directly on clay subgrade soils rather than on unbound granular base course materials.

General Comments

Our analysis and opinions are based upon our understanding of the project, the geotechnical conditions in the area, and the data obtained from our site exploration. Variations will occur between exploration point locations or due to the modifying effects of construction or weather. The nature and extent of such variations may not become evident until during or after construction. Terracon should be retained as the Geotechnical Engineer, where noted in this report, to provide observation and testing services during pertinent construction phases. If variations appear, we can provide further evaluation and supplemental recommendations. If variations are noted in the absence of our observation and testing services on-site, we should be immediately notified so that we can provide evaluation and supplemental recommendations.

Our Scope of Services does not include either specifically or by implication any environmental or biological (e.g., mold, fungi, bacteria) assessment of the site or identification or prevention of pollutants, hazardous materials or conditions. If the owner is concerned about the potential for such contamination or pollution, other studies should be undertaken.

Our services and any correspondence are intended for the sole benefit and exclusive use of our client for specific application to the project discussed and are accomplished in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practices with no third-party beneficiaries intended. Any third-party access to services or correspondence is solely for information purposes to support the services provided by Terracon to our client. Reliance upon the services and any work product is limited to our client and is not intended for third parties. Any use or reliance of the provided information by third parties is done solely at their own risk. No warranties, either express or implied, are intended or made.

Site characteristics as provided are for design purposes and not to estimate excavation cost. Any use of our report in that regard is done at the sole risk of the excavating cost estimator as there may be variations on the site that are not apparent in the data that could significantly affect excavation cost. Any parties charged with estimating excavation costs should seek their own site characterization for specific purposes to obtain the specific level of detail necessary for costing. Site safety and cost estimating including excavation support and dewatering requirements/design are the responsibility of others. Construction and site development have the potential to affect adjacent properties. Such impacts can include damages due to vibration, modification of groundwater/surface water flow during construction, foundation movement due to undermining or subsidence from excavation, as well as noise or air quality concerns. Evaluation of these items on nearby properties are commonly associated with contractor means and methods and are not addressed in this report. The owner and contractor should consider a preconstruction/precondition survey of surrounding development. If changes in the nature, design, or location of the project are planned, our conclusions and recommendations shall not be considered valid unless we review the changes and either verify or modify our conclusions in writing.

Geotechnical Engineering Report

Express Oil Change | Gulfport, Mississippi


October 8, 2024 | Terracon Project No. EB245128



Figures

Contents:

GeoModel



This is not a cross section. This is intended to display the Geotechnical Model only. See individual logs for more detailed conditions.

Model Layer	Layer Name	General Description	Legend	
1	Unstable Sands	Poorly-Graded Sands with Varying Amounts of Fines (SP / SP-SC / SP-SM) / Clayey Sand (SC) - very loose to medium dense	Topsoil	Poorly-graded Sand with Silt
2	Stable Sands	Poorly-Graded Sands with Varying Amounts of Fines (SP / SP-SC / SP-SM) / Clayey Sand (SC) / Silty Sand (SM) - medium dense to very dense	Silty Sand	Clayey Sand
			Poorly-graded Sand	Poorly-graded Sand with Clay

- ▽ First Water Observation
- ▽ Second Water Observation
- ▽ Third Water Observation

Groundwater levels are temporal. The levels shown are representative of the date and time of our exploration. Significant changes are possible over time.
Water levels shown are as measured during and/or after drilling. In some cases, boring advancement methods mask the presence/absence of groundwater. See individual logs for details.

NOTES:
Layering shown on this figure has been developed by the geotechnical engineer for purposes of modeling the subsurface conditions as required for the subsequent geotechnical engineering for this project.
Numbers adjacent to soil column indicate depth below ground surface.

Geotechnical Engineering Report

Express Oil Change | Gulfport, Mississippi

October 8, 2024 | Terracon Project No. EB245128



Attachments

Exploration and Testing Procedures

Field Exploration

Number of Borings	Approximate Boring Depth (feet)	Location
1 ¹	20	Building area
1	15	Building area
5	10	Parking/driveway area

1. A piezometer was installed in Boring B-01. A bail out and recovery test was performed to ensure that the piezometer was working properly.

Boring Layout and Elevations: Terracon personnel provided the boring layout using handheld GPS equipment (estimated horizontal accuracy of about ±10 feet) and referencing existing site features. If elevations and a more precise boring layout are desired, we recommend borings be surveyed.

Subsurface Exploration Procedures: We advanced the borings with a track-mounted, rotary drill rig using hollow stem auger techniques. Five (5) samples were obtained at depth intervals of approximately 2 feet in the upper 10 feet and at intervals of 5 feet thereafter within each boring to the terminal depth of the borehole. In the split-barrel sampling procedure, a standard 2-inch outer diameter split-barrel sampling spoon was driven into the ground by a 140-pound automatic hammer falling a distance of 30 inches. The number of blows required to advance the sampling spoon the last 12 inches of a normal 18-inch penetration is recorded as the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) resistance value. The SPT resistance values, also referred to as N-values, are indicated on the boring logs at the test depths. For safety purposes and in accordance with Mississippi State Regulations, all borings were backfilled with auger cuttings after their completion.

We also observed the boreholes while drilling and at the completion of drilling for the presence of groundwater. The groundwater levels are shown on the attached boring logs.

The sampling depths, penetration distances, and other sampling information was recorded on the field boring logs. The samples were placed in appropriate containers and taken to our soil laboratory for testing and classification by a Geotechnical Engineer. Our exploration team prepared field boring logs as part of the drilling operations. These field logs included visual classifications of the materials observed during drilling and our interpretation of the subsurface conditions between samples. Final boring logs were prepared from the field logs. The final boring logs represent the Geotechnical Engineer's interpretation of the field logs and include modifications based on observations and tests of the samples in our laboratory.

Laboratory Testing

The project engineer reviewed the field data and assigned laboratory tests. The laboratory testing program included the following types of tests:

- Moisture content
- 200 wash
- Organics content
- Rigid-wall permeability test

Based on the results of our field and laboratory programs, we described and classified the soil samples in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System.

Site Location and Exploration Plans

Contents:


Site Location Plan

Exploration Plan

Note: All attachments are one page unless noted above.

Site Location





Exploration and Laboratory Results

Contents:

Boring Logs (B-01 through B-07)
Fixed Wall Permeability Test

Note: All attachments are one page unless noted above.

Boring Log No. B-01

Model Layer	Graphic Log	Location: See Exploration Plan Latitude: 30.4001° Longitude: -89.0222° Depth (Ft.)	Depth (Ft.)	Water Level Observations	Sample Type	Field Test Results	Organic Content (%)	Water Content (%)	Percent Fines
1		0.2' TOPSOIL							
		POORLY GRADED SAND WITH SILT (SP-SM) , gray, loose				2-2-3 N=5		11.0	
2		2.0 SILTY SAND (SM) , black and brown, medium dense				4-6-8 N=14		10.2	13
		- loose below 4'							
		6.0 CLAYEY SAND (SC) , trace organics, black and brown, medium dense	5	▼		4-4-5 N=9		8.5	
						3-4-7 N=11		16.4	13
			10			2-9-12 N=21	4.6	25.5	
		13.0 POORLY GRADED SAND (SP) , gray, dense to very dense		▼					
			15			4-19-36 N=55		23.0	
			20			6-12-28 N=40		22.0	
		Boring Terminated at 20 Feet	20						

See [Exploration and Testing Procedures](#) for a description of field and laboratory procedures used and additional data (If any).
See [Supporting Information](#) for explanation of symbols and abbreviations.

Notes

Water Level Observations

- ▼ While drilling
- ▼ After 15 minutes
- ▼ After 1 week

Drill Rig
CME 45

Hammer Type
Automatic

Driller
Challenge

Logged by
R. James

Boring Started
09-09-2024

Boring Completed
09-09-2024

Advancement Method
Hollow-Stem Auger: 0'-20'

Abandonment Method
Boring backfilled with auger cuttings upon completion.

Boring Log No. B-02

Model Layer	Graphic Log	Location: See Exploration Plan Latitude: 30.4002° Longitude: -89.0224° Depth (Ft.)	Depth (Ft.)	Water Level Observations	Sample Type	Field Test Results	Organic Content (%)	Water Content (%)	Percent Fines
		0.2							
		TOPSOIL							
		POORLY GRADED SAND WITH CLAY (SP-SC) , brown, very loose to loose				WOH-1-2 N=3		5.1	
1						2-3-4 N=7		7.0	5
		6.0	5			2-2-3 N=5		10.8	
		POORLY GRADED SAND (SP) , dark gray, loose				2-4-5 N=9		15.8	
2			10			2-2-5 N=7		10.0	
		13.0							
		POORLY GRADED SAND (SP) , brown and dark gray, very dense							
		15.0	15			5-21-20 N=41		22.1	
		Boring Terminated at 15 Feet							

See [Exploration and Testing Procedures](#) for a description of field and laboratory procedures used and additional data (If any).
See [Supporting Information](#) for explanation of symbols and abbreviations.

Notes

Water Level Observations
▽ While drilling
▽ After 15 minutes

Drill Rig
CME 45
Hammer Type
Automatic
Driller
Challenge

Advancement Method
Hollow-Stem Auger: 0'-15'

Logged by
R. James
Boring Started
09-09-2024
Boring Completed
09-09-2024






Abandonment Method
Boring backfilled with auger cuttings upon completion.

Boring Log No. B-03

Model Layer	Graphic Log	Location: See Exploration Plan Latitude: 30.4004° Longitude: -89.0226° Depth (Ft.)	Depth (Ft.)	Water Level Observations	Sample Type	Field Test Results	Organic Content (%)	Water Content (%)	Percent Fines
2		0.0-0.2' TOPSOIL							
		POORLY GRADED SAND WITH CLAY (SP-SC) , dark gray, loose				2-3-5 N=8		4.9	
		2.0							
		CLAYEY SAND (SC) , dark gray, loose				2-2-3 N=5		12.5	24
		- medium dense below 6'	5			3-2-3 N=5		14.7	
						1-4-9 N=13		15.5	
						19-22-13 N=35		45.0	
		8.0							
		CLAYEY SAND (SC) , with organics, dark gray, dense							
		10.0	10						
		Boring Terminated at 10 Feet							

See Exploration and Testing Procedures for a description of field and laboratory procedures used and additional data (If any). See Supporting Information for explanation of symbols and abbreviations.	Water Level Observations Groundwater not encountered	Drill Rig CME 45 Hammer Type Automatic Driller Challenge
	Advancement Method Hollow-Stem Auger: 0'-10'	Logged by R. James Boring Started 09-09-2024
Notes	Abandonment Method Boring backfilled with auger cuttings upon completion.	Boring Completed 09-09-2024

Boring Log No. B-04

Model Layer	Graphic Log	Location: See Exploration Plan Latitude: 30.4003° Longitude: -89.0222° Depth (Ft.)	Depth (Ft.)	Water Level Observations	Sample Type	Field Test Results	Organic Content (%)	Water Content (%)	Percent Fines
1		0.2 TOPSOIL				2-2-3 N=5		5.9	
		POORLY GRADED SAND WITH CLAY (SP-SC) , dark gray, loose							
2		2.0 CLAYEY SAND (SC) , dark gray, loose to medium dense	5			4-4-6 N=10		7.7	13
						6-4-4 N=8		10.8	
						1-2-4 N=6		14.3	
		8.0 POORLY GRADED SAND WITH CLAY (SP-SC) , dark gray, medium dense							
		10.0	10			5-7-14 N=21		18.3	
		Boring Terminated at 10 Feet							

Notes	See Exploration and Testing Procedures for a description of field and laboratory procedures used and additional data (If any).	Water Level Observations Groundwater not encountered	Drill Rig CME 45 Hammer Type Automatic Driller Challenge
	See Supporting Information for explanation of symbols and abbreviations.		
		Advancement Method Hollow-Stem Auger: 0'-10'	
		Abandonment Method Boring backfilled with auger cuttings upon completion.	Logged by R. James Boring Started 09-09-2024 Boring Completed 09-09-2024

Boring Log No. B-05

Model Layer	Graphic Log	Location: See Exploration Plan Latitude: 30.4002° Longitude: -89.0225° Depth (Ft.)	Depth (Ft.)	Water Level Observations	Sample Type	Field Test Results	Organic Content (%)	Water Content (%)	Percent Fines
2		0.0-0.2 TOPSOIL							
		0.2-6.0 POORLY GRADED SAND WITH SILT (SP-SM) , brown, loose			X	2-2-3 N=5		7.2	
					X	2-3-4 N=7		8.9	5
		6.0-8.0 POORLY GRADED SAND (SP) , gray, very loose			X	2-2-5 N=7		7.2	
		8.0-10.0 POORLY GRADED SAND (SP) , gray, very dense			X	WOH N=0		18.5	
					X	9-16-23 N=39		20.3	
		Boring Terminated at 10 Feet	10						

Notes	See Exploration and Testing Procedures for a description of field and laboratory procedures used and additional data (If any). See Supporting Information for explanation of symbols and abbreviations.	Water Level Observations Groundwater not encountered	Drill Rig CME 45
			Hammer Type Automatic
			Driller Challenge
		Advancement Method Hollow-Stem Auger: 0'-10'	Logged by R. James
		Abandonment Method Boring backfilled with auger cuttings upon completion.	Boring Started 09-09-2024
			Boring Completed 09-09-2024

Boring Log No. B-06

Model Layer	Graphic Log	Location: See Exploration Plan Latitude: 30.3999° Longitude: -89.0226° Depth (Ft.)	Depth (Ft.)	Water Level Observations	Sample Type	Field Test Results	Organic Content (%)	Water Content (%)	Percent Fines
2		0.0-0.2	0.2						
		TOPSOIL							
		POORLY GRADED SAND WITH SILT (SP-SM) , brown and gray, loose				1-2-4 N=6		9.4	
		2.0							
		POORLY GRADED SAND WITH SILT (SP-SM) , brown and gray, medium dense				2-4-6 N=10		7.0	10
						9-6-7 N=13		9.4	
						3-7-9 N=16		11.7	
		10.0				6-10-14 N=24		19.5	
		Boring Terminated at 10 Feet		10					
<p>See Exploration and Testing Procedures for a description of field and laboratory procedures used and additional data (If any).</p> <p>See Supporting Information for explanation of symbols and abbreviations.</p> <p>Notes</p>			<p>Water Level Observations Groundwater not encountered</p>			<p>Drill Rig CME 45</p> <p>Hammer Type Automatic</p> <p>Driller Challenge</p>			
			<p>Advancement Method Hollow-Stem Auger: 0'-10'</p> <p>Abandonment Method Boring backfilled with auger cuttings upon completion.</p>			<p>Logged by R. James</p> <p>Boring Started 09-09-2024</p> <p>Boring Completed 09-09-2024</p>			

Boring Log No. B-07

Model Layer	Graphic Log	Location: See Exploration Plan Latitude: 30.4000° Longitude: -89.0223° Depth (Ft.)	Depth (Ft.)	Water Level Observations	Sample Type	Field Test Results	Organic Content (%)	Water Content (%)	Percent Fines
		0.2							
1		TOPSOIL POORLY GRADED SAND WITH SILT (SP-SM) , gray, loose				1-1-4 N=5		6.8	
		2.0							
		POORLY GRADED SAND WITH SILT (SP-SM) , gray, loose				3-4-5 N=9		7.1	8
2			5			9-4-5 N=9		7.6	
						3-4-5 N=9		9.3	
		- medium dense below 8'							
		10.0				4-4-6 N=10		7.4	
		Boring Terminated at 10 Feet	10						
<div>See Exploration and Testing Procedures for a description of field and laboratory procedures used and additional data (If any).</div> <div>See Supporting Information for explanation of symbols and abbreviations.</div>				Water Level Observations Groundwater not encountered		Drill Rig CME 45 Hammer Type Automatic Driller Challenge			
Notes				Advancement Method Hollow-Stem Auger: 0'-10'		Logged by R. James Boring Started 09-09-2024 Boring Completed 09-09-2024			
				Abandonment Method Boring backfilled with auger cuttings upon completion.					



Fixed-wall Permeability Determination

Project No.: EB245128
Project: Express Oil Change

Sample No : B-1 to B-7 0'-2' Composite
Description: Tan and Gray Sand

ASTM D4318 Atterberg Limits

Liquid Limit: N/A

Plastic Limit: N/A

Plasticity Index: N/A

ASTM D1140 Wash 200

Percent Fines (%): 12.9

SAMPLE PROPERTIES

Height (in.):	<u>2.947</u>	Area:	<u>6.49</u>	in. ²	Moisture Content		
Diameter (in.):	<u>2.874</u>	Volume:	<u>19.12</u>	in. ³			
Sample Wt. (g):	<u>878.72</u>	Vs:	<u>14.29</u>	in. ³	Wet Wt.:	<u>73.66</u>	<u>66.43</u> g
Ring Wt. (g):	<u>201.03</u>	Vv:	<u>4.83</u>	in. ³	Dry Wt.:	<u>68.74</u>	<u>56.67</u> g
Dry Density (pcf):	<u>125.9</u>	pcf			Moisture:	<u>7.2%</u>	<u>17.2%</u>
Gs:	<u>2.7</u>				Saturation:	<u>57.2%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

TEST PROPERTIES

Pressure (psi):	<u>5.00</u>	Gs(Permeant):	<u>1.000</u>
Pipet Dia. (cm.):	<u>0.800</u>		
Pipet Area (cm. ²):	<u>0.503</u>		

Date	Time	Reading (cm)	Temp. (deg. F)	Cum. Time Elapsed (hours)	Cum. Flow (cm ³)	K (cm/sec)	K(INCR) (cm/sec)	Gradient	PVR (%)
9/26/24	0:00:00	25.0	72	0.0					0.00
9/26/24	0:00:02	24.0	72	0.0	0.5	1.19E-04	1.19E-04	52	0.63
9/26/24	0:00:04	19.7	72	0.0	2.7	3.18E-04	5.17E-04	52	3.37
9/26/24	0:00:06	14.9	72	0.0	5.1	4.07E-04	5.85E-04	51	6.41
9/26/24	0:00:08	10.4	72	0.0	7.3	4.44E-04	5.55E-04	50	9.27
9/26/24	0:00:10	6.0	72	0.0	9.6	4.65E-04	5.50E-04	50	12.06
9/26/24	0:00:12	1.8	72	0.0	11.7	4.76E-04	5.31E-04	49	14.73

kavg (cm/s): 4.76E-04 cm/sec

Supporting Information

Contents:












General Notes

Unified Soil Classification System

Note: All attachments are one page unless noted above.

General Notes

DESCRIPTION OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

SAMPLING			WATER LEVEL		Water Initially Encountered	FIELD TESTS	(HP)	Hand Penetrometer	
					Water Level After a Specified Period of Time		(T)	Torvane	
					Water Level After a Specified Period of Time		(b/f)	Standard Penetration Test (blows per foot)	
				Water levels indicated on the soil boring logs are the levels measured in the borehole at the times indicated. Groundwater level variations will occur over time. In low permeability soils, accurate determination of groundwater levels is not possible with short term water level observations.			(PID) Detector	Photo-Ionization	
							(OVA)	Organic Vapor Analyzer	

DESCRIPTIVE SOIL CLASSIFICATION

Soil classification is based on the Unified Soil Classification System. Coarse Grained Soils have more than 50% of their dry weight retained on a #200 sieve; their principal descriptors are: boulders, cobbles, gravel or sand. Fine Grained Soils have less than 50% of their dry weight retained on a #200 sieve; they are principally described as clays if they are plastic, and silts if they are slightly plastic or non-plastic. Major constituents may be added as modifiers and minor constituents may be added according to the relative proportions based on grain size. In addition to gradation, coarse-grained soils are defined on the basis of their in-place relative density and fine-grained soils on the basis of their consistency.

LOCATION AND ELEVATION NOTES

Unless otherwise noted, Latitude and Longitude are approximately determined using a hand-held GPS device. The accuracy of such devices is variable. Surface elevation data annotated with +/- indicates that no actual topographical survey was conducted to confirm the surface elevation. Instead, the surface elevation was approximately determined from topographic maps of the area.

STRENGTH TERMS	RELATIVE DENSITY OF COARSE-GRAINED SOILS (More than 50% retained on No. 200 Sieve) Density determined by Standard Penetration Resistance. Includes gravels, sands and silts.			CONSISTENCY OF FINE-GRAINED SOILS (50% or more passing the No. 200 sieve). Consistency determined by laboratory shear strength testing, field visual-manual procedures or standard penetration resistance.			
	Descriptive Term (Density)	Standard Penetration or N-Value Blows/Ft.	Ring Sampler Blows/Ft.	Descriptive Term (Consistency)	Unconfined Compressive Strength, Qu, tsf	Standard Penetration or N-Value Blows/Ft.	Ring Sampler Blows/Ft.
	Very Loose	0 – 3	0 – 6	Very Soft	Less than 0.25	0 – 1	< 3
	Loose	4 – 9	7 – 18	Soft	0.25 to 0.50	2 – 4	3 – 4
	Medium Dense	10 – 29	19 – 58	Medium-Stiff	0.50 to 1.00	4 – 8	5 – 9
	Dense	30 – 50	59 – 98	Stiff	1.00 to 2.00	8 – 15	10 – 18
	Very Dense	> 50	≥ 99	Very Stiff	2.00 to 4.00	15 – 30	19 – 42
				Hard	> 4.00	> 30	> 42

RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF SAND AND GRAVEL

Descriptive Term(s) of other constituents	Percent of Dry Weight
Trace	< 15
With	15 – 29
Modifier	> 30

RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF FINES

Descriptive Term(s) of other constituents	Percent of Dry Weight
Trace	< 5
With	5 – 12
Modifier	> 12

GRAIN SIZE TERMINOLOGY

Major Component of Sample	Particle Size
Boulders	Over 12 in. (300mm)
Cobbles	12 in. to 3 in (300mm to 75mm)
Gravel	3 in. to #4 sieve (75mm to 4.75mm)
Sand	#4 to #200 sieve (4.75mm to 0.075mm)
Silt or Clay	Passing #200 sieve (0.075mm)

PLASTICITY DESCRIPTION

Term	Plasticity Index
Non-plastic	0
Low	1 – 10
Medium	11 – 30
High	> 30

Unified Soil Classification System

Criteria for Assigning Group Symbols and Group Names Using Laboratory Tests ^A				Soil Classification	
				Group Symbol	Group Name ^B
Coarse-Grained Soils: More than 50% retained on No. 200 sieve	Gravels: More than 50% of coarse fraction retained on No. 4 sieve	Clean Gravels: Less than 5% fines ^C	Cu≥4 and 1≤Cc≤3 ^E	GW	Well-graded gravel ^F
			Cu<4 and/or [Cc<1 or Cc>3.0] ^E	GP	Poorly graded gravel ^F
		Gravels with Fines: More than 12% fines ^C	Fines classify as ML or MH	GM	Silty gravel ^{F, G, H}
			Fines classify as CL or CH	GC	Clayey gravel ^{F, G, H}
	Sands: 50% or more of coarse fraction passes No. 4 sieve	Clean Sands: Less than 5% fines ^D	Cu≥6 and 1≤Cc≤3 ^E	SW	Well-graded sand ^I
			Cu<6 and/or [Cc<1 or Cc>3.0] ^E	SP	Poorly graded sand ^I
		Sands with Fines: More than 12% fines ^D	Fines classify as ML or MH	SM	Silty sand ^{G, H, I}
			Fines classify as CL or CH	SC	Clayey sand ^{G, H, I}
Fine-Grained Soils: 50% or more passes the No. 200 sieve	Silts and Clays: Liquid limit less than 50	Inorganic:	PI > 7 and plots above “A” line ^J	CL	Lean clay ^{K, L, M}
			PI < 4 or plots below “A” line ^J	ML	Silt ^{K, L, M}
	Silts and Clays: Liquid limit 50 or more	Organic:	$\frac{LL \text{ oven dried}}{LL \text{ not dried}} < 0.75$	OL	Organic clay ^{K, L, M, N}
					Organic silt ^{K, L, M, O}
		Inorganic:	PI plots on or above “A” line	CH	Fat clay ^{K, L, M}
			PI plots below “A” line	MH	Elastic silt ^{K, L, M}
		Organic:	$\frac{LL \text{ oven dried}}{LL \text{ not dried}} < 0.75$	OH	Organic clay ^{K, L, M, P}
					Organic silt ^{K, L, M, Q}
Highly organic soils:	Primarily organic matter, dark in color, and organic odor			PT	Peat

- ^A Based on the material passing the 3-inch (75-mm) sieve.

^B If field sample contained cobbles or boulders, or both, add "with cobbles or boulders, or both" to group name.

^C Gravels with 5 to 12% fines require dual symbols: GW-GM well-graded gravel with silt, GW-GC well-graded gravel with clay, GP-GM poorly graded gravel with silt, GP-GC poorly graded gravel with clay.

^D Sands with 5 to 12% fines require dual symbols: SW-SM well-graded sand with silt, SW-SC well-graded sand with clay, SP-SM poorly graded sand with silt, SP-SC poorly graded sand with clay.

^E $Cu = D_{60}/D_{10}$ $Cc = \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} \times D_{60}}$

^F If soil contains $\geq 15\%$ sand, add "with sand" to group name.

^G If fines classify as CL-ML, use dual symbol GC-GM, or SC-SM.
- ^H If fines are organic, add "with organic fines" to group name.

^I If soil contains $\geq 15\%$ gravel, add "with gravel" to group name.

^J If Atterberg limits plot in shaded area, soil is a CL-ML, silty clay.

^K If soil contains 15 to 29% plus No. 200, add "with sand" or "with gravel," whichever is predominant.

^L If soil contains $\geq 30\%$ plus No. 200 predominantly sand, add "sandy" to group name.

^M If soil contains $\geq 30\%$ plus No. 200, predominantly gravel, add "gravelly" to group name.

^N $PI \geq 4$ and plots on or above "A" line.

^O $PI < 4$ or plots below "A" line.

^P PI plots on or above "A" line.

^Q PI plots below "A" line.

