CONTACT INFORMATION

PREPARER INFORMATION

	AAG PROJECT NUMBER:	AAG21-092
	CONTACT:	CURTIS D. CUSHMAN
	ADDRESS:	8947 Buttonwood Lane NE Olympia, Washington 98516
	TELEPHONE:	(360) 491-5155
	Cell:	(360) 481-6677
	EMAIL ADDRESS:	CURTIS.CUSHMAN@COMCAST.NET
<u>CLIENT</u>	<u>r Information</u>	
	CLIENT:	Fuller Designs
	TELEPHONE:	(360) 880-4927
	BILLING ADDRESS:	1101 KRESKY VENUE Chehalis, Washington 98531
	SITE ADDRESS:	0 JACKSON ROAD CHEHALIS, WASHINGTON SECTION 03 TOWNSHIP 13N RANGE 02W PT LT 8 SE RD BLK 1 RICHARDT'S RPLT BLK 4-6 PARCUVIA ADD PRCL B BL-09-148 335384
	PARCEL:	010799001000
	GPS LOCATION:	46.641138 -122.926586 (DD)

ADDENDUM

Fuller Designs 645 SE Prospect Street Chehalis, WA 98532

> RE: JACKSON VILLAS LANDSLIDE HAZARD SITE VISIT 0 JACKSON ROAD CHEHALIS, WASHINGTON SECTION 03 TOWNSHIP 13N RANGE 02W PT LT 8 SE RD BLK 1 RICHARDT'S RPLT BLK 4-6 PARCUVIA ADD PRCL B BL-09-148 335384 PARCEL: 010799001000 SEPTEMBER 8, 2021

Dear Fuller Designs:

It has been indicated to All American Geotechnical, Inc (AAG) that certain questions have been brought up about the report of AAG dated August 14, 2021. This addendum is to extend and clarify those areas which may be considered needing amending by a competent professional.

The report of August 14, 2021 was to address the requirement that sub-surface information was to be done in order to get an idea of the extent of fill and the shallow soils and mass-wasting deposits underlying the area.

The overview approach to the geology is done in areas such as this to give the developer and engineer an idea of the deposits and derived soils prior to construction. The most recent report of AAG relied on 6 pits to give this overview. As it was clear from Pits 4, 5, and 6, the known presence of fill was verified in the northernmost part of the parcel, which fill extends down from Hosanna Lane. In Pits 4 and 6 fill was found, and in Pit 5 the fill was so massive it could not be penetrated with the excavator. Fine grained sediments were found at depth in Pits 4 and 6 and profiles of the subsurface are also included in the text for Pits 1 and 2 as well as Pit 4. These last three were considered the most important locations in this initial survey as the multiplex has been proposed to extend along the property line where these tests were taken. To that end, Pit 1 was sampled and tested by MTC. It was found to be ML on top of MH. These are silts.

To qualify out the rest of the northern area planned for residential development, Pit 6 was tested. Once through the fill, which may be as much as 6 feet in thickness, the deeper material was tested by MTC and this proved to be an Elastic silt (MH).

From page 4 of the report:

In pitting, we found there to be silts on top of elastic silts. There is possibly some clay content in the latter...A major difference in the two, despite some similarities, is that clays are chemically altered minerals with characteristics different from silts. Clays are plastic, and silts are elastic. The difference is that silts do not change volume when under pressure whereas clays plastically deform and swell when hydrated.

The soil class is D.

MTC labs are fully accredited and any questions as to techniques used and the validity of the tests should be addressed to them.

Bearing strength is above 2200 lbs/ft^2 as detailed on page 21 of the report.

It is not the purview of the engineering geologist to make specific recommendations as to type of materials to be used for geofabric. The findings here were exploratory and not for engineering although the soil profiles are certainly good for engineering purposes. Construction on fill is site-specific as the material is so varied and the degree of compaction is unknown even where the material is seen.

Similarly, at this level of investigation, site specific recommendations for construction are not to be expected and design elements such as the design of keying is the responsibility of the site engineer, or the Engineer of Record. Such elements may be included in the construction plans, but as these have not be finalized, there is little possibility of having such information on them at this time.

The concept of a geotechnical observer on site for certain phases of construction is not unique to this project and may be done at the request of the responsible jurisdiction agencies and/or the site manager.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SITE PREPARATION

All areas to be excavated should be cleared of deleterious matter including any debris, duff, and vegetation. Any soils material that is excavated may be stockpiled and later used for erosion control and/or landscaping. Surficial material unsuitable for these tasks should be removed from the project site. No foundation elements shall be constructed on "untested" fill material.

The material immediately on site may not be suitable for structural fill due to the silty nature of the material. Where placement of fill material is required, the exposed subgrade areas should be compacted to a firm and unyielding surface prior to placement of any fill. Over-excavation in any building area should be backfilled with structural fill, compacted to the density requirements described in the "Structural Fill" section of this report.

If structural fill is needed, we recommend that a member of our staff evaluate the exposed subgrade conditions

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRUCTURAL FILL

All fill material should be placed as structural fill. In general, the structural fill should be placed in horizontal lifts of 8 inches to allow adequate and uniform compaction of each lift. Fill should be compacted to at least 95 percent of MDD (maximum dry density) as determined in accordance with ASTM D-1557 to grade.

The final appropriate lift thickness will depend on the fill characteristics and compaction equipment used. We recommend that a field representative evaluate the appropriate lift thickness during construction.

Material placed for structural fill should be free of debris, organic matter, trash, and cobbles greater than 6 inches in diameter. The moisture content of the fill material should be adjusted for proper compaction.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUITABILITY OF ONSITE SOILS AS FILL

Onsite soils may be considered for use as structural fill only if industry standards are satisfied. Fill material requirements are found on page 9-26 to 9-30 of the WSDOT Standard Specifications 2010. In general, a native soil (sand, silt, and gravel) encountered on a site must have less than 10 percent fines (material passing the US No. 200 sieve) to be suitable for use as structural fill. To qualify, a soil must be tested in a geotechnical laboratory for gradation. On-site materials do not appear be acceptable as structural fill. Testing of specific samples would be required.

For your convenience the pitting results are repeated here.

PITTING

A total of six pits were dug and are described below. Please see site map after the text.

Pit 1

0-12" Brown sand. At 12" some concretion clots seen

12" – 6' Possibly ML as grain size is very fine. Grey layers are present and concretions with hematite mottling are present. Sample #1. The test results from MTC Labs indicates this is a sandy silt, with silt/clay (-200 sieve) fraction at 61.5% passing. Field tests indicate this is dominantly silt.

6' - 8' Picking up clay in grey material. There is silt/clay deposition to 8' T.D. Sample #2 is from this interval. This was classified as **MH** – *Elastic silt with sand*. While silt and sand dominate, there is a potential that there is a clay fraction of 38.8%. Plasticity index was 23.2%. Liquid limit was 55.8%. This sample has likely a large fraction of clay.

Pit 2

0-18" Dry dusty grey silty sand/sandy silt. First mottling seen at 18".

2' Material is clumping and excavating out in "plates." Composition appears silt-dominated.

2 ¹/₂' More mottling in greyer material – silt but minor clay present.

6' Heavily mottled – into richer clay layer w/manganese staining.

8' T.D. in material similar to same depth in Pit 1

Pit 3

0-5' Dry sandy silt

AAG21-092

5' Takes on a clayey aspect as part of grey material with mottling

7' T.D. "Plates" of clay/mottled material sheen of water on surface of "plate."

Pit 4

0 to 3' or 4' Silty sand with gravel. Dark brown. Likely fill.

5' Still the same but with small concretions. Looks like the native as seen in the top of Pits 1 to 3.

6' - 7' Manganese in deposits. No clay yet except in minor "blobs."

T.D. 8' Native silt/sand with clay. Abundant manganese stain.

Pit 5

Soil is mixed with concrete and brick

T.D. 2 ¹/₂' Heavy concrete chunks in soil. No further progress.

Pit 6

0-4' Apparent sand/silt dominant fill.

4' Brown fine-grained native material

6' - 8' Sample #3. (Mislabeled Pit 2 by MTC). This sample is again a MH – *Sandy elastic silt*. The silt/clay fraction was -67.7%. Clays were only found to be 9.7% with the Plastic Index of 12%. The liquid limit was. 34.9%. This is a silt.

Please see Conclusions and References in the original report.

Report Limitations and Guidelines for Use

We have prepared this report for the exclusive use of Fuller Designs and their authorized agents for the proposed building location in Lewis County, Washington. Within the limitations of scope, schedule and budget, our services have been executed in accordance with generally accepted practices in the field of geotechnical engineering in this area at the time this report was prepared. No warranty or other conditions, expressed or implied, should be understood.

READ THESE PROVISIONS CLOSELY

Some clients, design professionals, and contractors may not recognize that the geoscience practices (geotechnical engineering or geology) are far less exact than other engineering and natural science disciplines. This lack of understanding can create unrealistic expectations that could lead to

disappointments, claims and disputes. All American Geotechnical includes these explanatory "limitations" provisions in our reports to help reduce such risks.

The equipment, techniques and personnel used to perform an environmental study differ significantly from those used to perform a geotechnical or geologic study and vice versa. For that reason, geotechnical engineering or geologic reporting does not usually relate any environmental findings, conclusions or recommendations; e.g., about the likelihood of encountering underground storage tanks or regulated contaminants. Similarly, environmental reports are not used to address geotechnical or geologic concerns regarding a specific project.

REPORT LIMITATIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR USE

We have prepared this report for the exclusive use of Aaron Fuller and his authorized agents for the proposed building location in Lewis County, Washington. Within the limitations of scope, schedule and budget, our services have been executed in accordance with generally accepted practices in the field of geotechnical engineering in this area at the time this report was prepared. No warranty or other conditions, expressed or implied, should be understood.

READ THESE PROVISIONS CLOSELY

Some clients, design professionals, and contractors may not recognize that the geoscience practices (geotechnical engineering or geology) are far less exact than other engineering and natural science disciplines. This lack of understanding can create unrealistic expectations that could lead to disappointments, claims and disputes. All American Geotechnical includes these explanatory "limitations" provisions in our reports to help reduce such risks.

The equipment, techniques and personnel used to perform an environmental study differ significantly from those used to perform a geotechnical or geologic study and vice versa. For that reason, geotechnical engineering or geologic reporting does not usually relate any environmental findings, conclusions or recommendations; e.g., about the likelihood of encountering underground storage tanks or regulated contaminants. Similarly, environmental reports are not used to address geotechnical or geologic concerns regarding a specific project.



Respectfully Submitted, GEOTECHNICAL TESTING LABORATORY

Curtis D. Cushman, L.G., L.E.G. Senior Engineering Geologist

SAMPLING LOCATIONS

7-13-2021 program pit locations



Lewis County does not guarantee the accuracy of the information shown on this map and is not responsible for any use or misuse by others regarding this material. It is provided for general informational purposes only. This map does not meet legal, engineering, or survey standards. Please practice due diligence and consult with licensed experts before making decisions.

Clewis County GIS | 2019 Imagery C Pictometry & Lewis County

AAG21-092

8947 Buttonwood Lane NE, Olympia, WA 98516 Phone #: (360) 491-5155 Cell #: (360) 481-6677

LABORATORY RESULTS

SIEVE REPORT -- PIT 1 @ 6-FT BGS



Comments:

Reviewed by:

h Balget and to

Meghan Blodgett-Carrillo



SIEVE REPORT -- PIT 1 @ 8-FT BGS



Copyright Spears Engineering & Technical Services 55, 1996-98

Comments:

h Bladget and to

Reviewed by:

Meghan Blodgett-Carrillo



HYDROMETER REPORT -- PIT 1 @ 8-FT BGS

Project: O.C. All American Geotechnical - 2021 Date Received: 13-Jul-21						Unified Soils Classification System			
Project #: 21\$031			Sampled	Sampled By: Client		MH Elastic Silt with Sand			
Client : All American Geotechnical Inc.			Date Tes	ted: 16-Jul-21	Sample Color				
Source: Jackson Dit 1 @ 8 ft. sample #2			Tested	Tested By: C Kriss brown					
Source: Jackson Ph-1 (g 0 h, sample #2 Fester By. C. Kliss									
ASTM D422, HYDROMETER ANALYSIS						ASTM C136			
Assumed Sp Gr :	2.70					Sieve Ar	alysis		
Sample Weight:	50.10	grams				Grain Size D	istribution		
Hydroscopic Moist.:	7.75%				Sieve	Percent	Soils Particle		
Adj. Sample Wgt :	46.50	grams		ACCREDITED	Size	Passing	Diameter		
		-		Certificate #: 1366.01	3.0"	100%	75.000 mm		
Hydrometer					2.0"	100%	50.000 mm		
Reading	Corrected	Percent	Soils Particle		1.5"	100%	37.500 mm		
Minutes	Reading	Passing	Diameter		1.25"	100%	31.500 mm		
2	23	48.9%	0.0336 mm		1.0"	100%	25.000 mm		
5	23	48.9%	0.0213 mm		3/4"	100%	19.000 mm		
15	22	46.8%	0.0124 mm		5/8"	100%	16.000 mm		
30	20	42.5%	0.0088 mm		1/2"	100%	12.500 mm		
60	19.5	41.5%	0.0063 mm		3/8"	100%	9.500 mm		
250	16.5	35.1%	0.0031 mm		1/4"	100%	6.300 mm		
1440	15.5	33.0%	0.0013 mm		#4	100%	4.750 mm		
					#10	100%	2.000 mm		
% Gravel:	0.0%	L	iquid Limit: 55.8 %		#20	99%	0.850 mm		
% Sand:	19.4%	P	lastic Limit: 32.6 %		#40	98%	0.425 mm		
% Silt:	41.7%	Plast	ticity Index: 23.2 %		#100	89%	0.150 mm		
% Clay:	38.8%				#200	80.6%	0.075 mm		
					Silts	79.8%	0.074 mm		
						61.4%	0.050 mm		
						48.6%	0.020 mm		
					Clays	38.8%	0.005 mm		
					Collector	33.8%	0.002 mm		
					Colloids	25.1%	0.001 mm		
	USDA Soil	l Textural Clas							
Particle Size									
% Sand:		2.0 - 0.05 mm							
% Silt:		0.05 - 0.002 mm							
% Clay:		< 0.002 mm							
USDA Soil Textural Classification									
Clay Loam									

All results apply only to actual locations and materials tested. As a mutual protection to clients, the public and ourselves, all reports are submitted as the confidential property of clients, and authorization for publication of statements, conclusions or extracts from or regarding our reports is reserved pending our written approval.

Comments:

Meghan Blodgett-Carrillo



ASTM D4318- LIQUID LIMIT, PLASTIC LIMIT, & PLASTICITY INDEX OF SOILS -- PIT 1 @ 8-FT BGS



Comments:

Bladget and lo

Meghan Blodgett-Carrillo



SIEVE REPORT -- PIT 2 @ 6-FT BGS



Comments:

h Balget and b

Meghan Blodgett-Carrillo



HYDROMETER REPORT -- PIT 2 @ 6-FT BGS

Project: O.C. All American Geotechnical - 2021 Date Received: 13-Jul-21						Unified Soils Classification System			
Project #: 21S031 Sampled By: Client					MH. Sandy Elastic Silt				
Client : All American Geotechnical. Inc.			Date Tes	Date Tested: 16-Jul-21		Sample Color			
Source: Jackson Pit-2 @ 6 ft sample #3				By: C Kriss	grav-brown				
Sample#:	B21-1069		8						
ASTM D422, HYDROMETER ANALYSIS						ASTM C136			
Assumed Sp Gr :	2.70					Sieve An	alysis		
Sample Weight:	50.09	grams				Grain Size D	istribution		
Hydroscopic Moist.:	3.60%				Sieve	Percent	Soils Particle		
Adj. Sample Wgt :	48.35	grams		ACCREDITED	Size	Passing	Diameter		
				Certificate #: 1366.01	3.0"	100%	75.000 mm		
Hydrometer					2.0"	100%	50.000 mm		
Reading	Corrected	Percent	Soils Particle		1.5"	100%	37.500 mm		
Minutes	Reading	Passing	Diameter		1.25"	100%	31.500 mm		
2	12	22.4%	0.0359 mm		1.0"	100%	25.000 mm		
5	11.5	21.4%	0.0229 mm		3/4"	100%	19.000 mm		
15	9	16.8%	0.0134 mm		5/8"	100%	16.000 mm		
30	8	14.9%	0.0095 mm		1/2"	100%	12.500 mm		
60	6.5	12.1%	0.0068 mm		3/8"	99%	9.500 mm		
250	4	7.5%	0.0034 mm		1/4"	97%	6.300 mm		
1440	2	3.7%	0.0014 mm		#4	96%	4.750 mm		
					#10	91%	2.000 mm		
% Gravel:	4.4%	I	Liquid Limit: 34.9 %		#20	88%	0.850 mm		
% Sand:	27.9%	I	Plastic Limit: 23.2 %		#40	86%	0.425 mm		
% Silt:	58.0%	Plas	sticity Index: 11.7 %		#100	75%	0.150 mm		
% Clay:	9.7%				#200	67.7%	0.075 mm		
					Silts	66.6%	0.074 mm		
						38.7%	0.050 mm		
						20.0%	0.020 mm		
					Clays	9.7%	0.005 mm		
					~	4.8%	0.002 mm		
					Colloids	2.0%	0.001 mm		
	USDA Soil	Textural Cla							
Davide Size									
% Sand		2.0.005 mm							
% Salt:		2.0 - 0.05 mm							
% Clav:		< 0.002 mm							
70 Clay:		~ 0.002 11111							
USDA Soil Textural Classification									
		Sandy Loam							

In results apply only to actual locations and materials tested. As a minual protection to clients, the public and ourselves, all reports are submitted as the confidential property of clients, and authorization for publication of statements, conclusions or extracts from or regarding our rejorts is reserved pending our written approval.

Comments:

Meghan Blodgett-Carrillo



ASTM D4318- LIQUID LIMIT, PLASTIC LIMIT, & PLASTICITY INDEX OF SOILS -- PIT 2 @ 6-FT BGS



Comments:

Alabat anillo

Meghan Blodgett-Carrillo

