

April 26, 2021 HWA Project No. 2019-016 Task 8

City of Sammamish 801 228th Ave SE Sammamish, Washington 98075

Attn: Jed Ireland, P.E.

Subject: CITY OF SAMMAMISH ON-CALL 212th Avenue SE Borings Geotechnical Investigation Sammamish, Washington

Mr. Ireland:

In accordance with your request, HWA GeoSciences Inc. (HWA) completed a geotechnical investigation as part of an on-call contract with the City of Sammamish. This phase of work supported an investigation along a portion of 212th Avenue SE, in the vicinity of Ebright Creek. The purpose of our investigation was to assess subsurface conditions along this portion of the roadway to provide preliminary recommendations for a bridge planned here in the future.

BACKGROUND

On July 23, 2020, Bryan Hawkins, P.E. met with Ben Ressler at the project location where several sinkholes had formed below portions of the sidewalk on the west side of the road. Portions of the undermined sidewalk had started settling and it appeared that the sinkhole could be extending below the southbound travel lane. During our site visit we observed that the roadway shoulder/sidewalk along the west side of the road is supported by a gabion basket wall, which had either sunk/settled into the surrounding wetland or had corroded and disintegrated at the locations of the sinkholes/voids below the sidewalk allowing materials below the sidewalk and road to wash out into the wetland resulting in the voids below the sidewalk and road. It was further observed that quarry spalls existed below the pavement section, placed as part of embankment construction. At that time, we provided recommendations for filling the voids using CDF, or similar flowable materials. We understand that the City used some type of foam to repair these areas. The City then requested we perform seven drilled boreholes along the portion of roadway passing through the wetland in order to assess conditions for a bridge to replace the embankment supported roadway sometime in the future.

April 26, 2021 HWA Project No. 2019-016-21 Task 8

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

It is our understanding that the City of Sammamish intends to construct a bridge where 212th Avenue SE crosses the Ebright Creek marsh/wetland sometime in the future. Our investigation to assess subsurface conditions in the vicinity proposed bridge alignment consisted of performing seven geotechnical boreholes to depths of 30 to 50 feet below the roadway surface. Figure 1, Vicinity Map, shows the general location of the project. The locations of the boreholes are shown on Figure 2, Site & Exploration Plan.

GENERAL GEOLOGY

During the most recent glaciation in North America, the Puget lobe of the Cordilleran Ice Sheet covered most of western Washington between approximately 19,000 and 16,000 years before present. This period is known as the Vashon Stade of the Fraser glaciation. The ice sheet deposited advance outwash sands and gravels ahead of an advancing glacier in streams, rivers, and lakes. Advance outwash typically has minimal quantities of silt and clay; however, the base of the unit tends to have higher concentration of fine-grained sediments due to deposition in slower moving sediment choked meltwater streams and rivers. As the glacier continued to advance from north to south across the state, glacial till was deposited atop the advance outwash deposits. Glacial till consists of silts, sands, and gravels with varying amounts of clay that had become entrained in the base of the glacier and pulverized during movement and deposition. Both advance outwash and glacial till are dense to very dense having been overridden by an ice sheet up to 5,000-feet thick. At approximately 16,000 years before present the ice sheet had been receding for about 600 years and Lake Sammamish formed a connected drainage with Lake Washington, draining to the west through Lake Union. Meltwater from the receding glacier deposited recessional outwash on top of glacial till and advance outwash deposits in topographic lows and along newly formed drainage channels, some of which only existed during the recessional event. Recessional outwash consists of sands, gravels, silts, and clays deposited in streams and lakes and is typically loose to medium dense as it is normally consolidated. Many of the lakes and ponds we see today are relicts of the most recent recessional event. Over the last 16,000 years, alluvium, similar to recessional outwash, has been deposited on top of recessional outwash deposits as rivers and streams continue to work the existing glacial soil strata.

Surficial geologic information for this project was obtained from the *Geologic Map of the East Half of the Bellevue South 7.5' x 15' Quadrangle, Issaquah Area, King County, Washington* (Booth et. al., 2012). The project area is mapped as Quaternary wetland deposits in the Ebright creek drainage, surrounded by glacial till to the north, west, and south. Further east and northeast, recessional outwash deposits that have not yet been eroded away are present. Wetland deposits consist of alluvium as described above and may contain peat bogs and other organic deposits such as organic silts and clays in environments with standing water and vegetation growth.

Our boreholes confirmed the presence of alluvial deposits consisting of silt, clay, sand, and peat in the Ebright creek drainage below a layer of roadway embankment fill. The thickness of the alluvium ranged from about 7 to 30 feet in total thickness, with a peat deposit ranging from about 2 to 18 feet thick on top of clay. Glacial till, as mapped around the drainage, was not encountered in the borings and may have been eroded away during glacial recession. Advance outwash deposits were encountered below alluvium. Figure 3, Geologic Cross Section, shows the approximate spatial distribution of these deposits across the project site.

GEOTECHNICAL BOREHOLES

Seven geotechnical boreholes, designated BH-1 through BH-7, were performed between November 23 and 25, 2020 by Holt Services, of Edgewood, Washington, under subcontract to HWA. The borings were drilled to depths of approximately 30 to 50 feet using a track-mounted Terrasonic TSi 150 drill rig employing sonic drilling techniques. Sonic drilling was used due to the observed presence of quarry spalls below the pavement section during our original site investigation.

Continuous samples were collected using this drilling method. Standard Penetration Testing (SPT) was performed in accordance with ASTM D1586 using a 2-inch outside diameter (OD), split-spoon sampler advanced with a 140-pound auto hammer at intervals of about 5 to 20 feet to obtain density characteristics of the soils. During the SPT, samples were obtained by driving the sampler 18 inches into the soil with the hammer free falling 30 inches. The number of blows required for each 6 inches of penetration was recorded. The Standard Penetration Resistance ("N-value") of the soil was taken to be the number of blows required for the final 12 inches of penetration. If a total of 50 blows was recorded within a single 6-inch interval, the test was terminated, and the blow count was recorded as 50 blows for the number of inches of actual penetration. This resistance, or N-value, provides an indication of the relative density of granular soils and the relative consistency of cohesive soils.

In addition, two Shelby tube samples were taken in the peat to obtain relatively undisturbed soil samples for consolidation testing. Shelby tube samplers are 3-foot long, thin-walled, hollow steel tubes, which are pushed into the ground to extract a relatively undisturbed soil sample for use in laboratory testing. Each tube has one end that is chamfered to form a cutting edge and the upper end includes holes for securing the tube to a drive head. Shelby tubes are useful for collecting soils that are particularly sensitive to sampling disturbance, including fine cohesive soils, clays and peat. Since the Shelby tubes collect samples by being pushed continuously into the undisturbed soil, no N-values are obtained at depths where the Shelby tubes were used.

A geologist from HWA logged each of the explorations and recorded pertinent information, including sample depths, stratigraphy, soil engineering characteristics, and groundwater occurrence. Soil samples obtained from the explorations were classified in the field and reviewed at HWA laboratory where representative portions were placed in plastic bags for laboratory testing.

A Legend of Terms and Symbols Used on Exploration Logs is presented in Figure A-1, Appendix A. Summary borehole logs are presented in Figures A-2 and A-8. It should be noted that the stratigraphic contacts shown on the individual exploration logs represent the approximate boundaries between soil types; actual transitions may be more gradual. The soil and groundwater conditions depicted are only for the specific date and locations reported and, therefore, are not necessarily representative of other locations or times.

LABORATORY TESTING

Representative soil samples obtained from the boreholes were taken to the HWA laboratory for examination and testing. Laboratory tests were conducted on selected soil samples to characterize engineering properties of the soils. Laboratory tests, as described below, included moisture content determination, grain size distribution, Atterberg limits and consolidation testing. The results of the laboratory testing are presented in Appendix B.

Moisture Content and Organic Content of Soil: Selected samples were tested in general accordance with method ASTM D 2974, using moisture content method 'A' (oven dried at 105 C) and ash content method 'C' (burned at 440 C). The test results are summarized on the borehole logs in Appendix A and Figures B-1 through B-5, Appendix B.

Particle Size Analysis of Soils: Selected soil samples were tested to determine the particle size distribution of material in general accordance with ASTM D 6913 (wet sieve). The results are summarized on the Summary of Material Properties report, Figure B-1, and the Particle Size Analysis of Soils reports, Figures B-2 through B-5, Appendix B, which also provide information regarding the classification of the samples and the moisture content at the time of testing.

Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils (Atterberg Limits): Selected soil samples were tested to determine the liquid limit, plastic limit, and plasticity index of soils in general accordance with ASTM D 4318, multi-point method. The results are summarized on the Summary of Material Properties report, Figure B-1 and the Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit and Plasticity Index of Soils report, Figure B-6, Appendix B.

One-Dimensional Consolidation Properties of Soil: The consolidation properties of two select soil samples obtained in the organic silt/peat deposit were measured in general accordance with ASTM D 2435. Saturation was maintained by inundation of the sample throughout the test. The samples were subjected to increasing increments of total stress, the duration of which was selected to exceed the time required for completion of primary consolidation as defined in the Standard, Method B. Unloading of the sample was carried out incrementally. The test results are presented on the attached One-Dimensional Consolidation Properties of Soil reports, Figures B-7 and B-8, which contain both primary and secondary consolidation results.

The results of consolidation testing indicate the very soft peat is highly compressible and we anticipate that the very soft clay below the peat is highly compressible as well. The test performed on Sample S-2 from borehole BH-3 was run on very soft, dark brown organic silt with a moisture content of 325%. The organic content of a sample taken just above was 41.5%.

Consolidation testing indicated approximately 63% strain at the maximum loading of 32 kips per square foot (ksf). Test results indicate the material is normally consolidated with a preconsolidation pressure (maximum pressure the soils have experienced) of about 1,200 psf. If the soils at the sample depth experience any loading above this value, additional consolidation/settlement will occur.

The test performed on Sample S-2 from borehole BH-6 was run on very soft peat with a natural moisture content of 700%. The organic content of the peat was 81.6%. Consolidation testing indicated approximately 78% strain at the maximum loading of 32 kips per square foot (ksf). Test results indicate the material is normally consolidated with a preconsolidation pressure of about 800 psf.

Given the amount of time that the existing roadway embankment has been in place, we anticipate that most of the primary consolidation (due to increased loading) has taken place, although small magnitudes of settlement are likely ongoing. Given the thickness of the peat deposit is it likely that ongoing secondary consolidation, due to biodegradation/decay of the organic materials will continue indefinitely.

SEISMIC CONSIDERATIONS

Design Parameters

Earthquake loading for the site was developed in accordance with Section 3.4 of the *AASHTO Guide Specifications for LRFD Seismic Bridge Design*, 2nd Edition, 2011 and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) amendments to the AASHTO *Guide Specifications* provided in the *Bridge Design Manual (BDM)* (WSDOT, 2020). For seismic analysis, the Site Class is required to be established and is determined based on the average soil properties in the upper 100 feet below the ground surface. Based on our explorations and understanding of site geology, we conclude that the site generally classifies as Site Class F. For borings BH-1, BH-2, BH-3 and BH-7, this is due to the presence of liquefiable soils and for borings BH-4 and BH-5, this is due to the presence of more than 10 feet of peat soils. Classification as Site Class F would typically require a site-specific analysis; however, these analyses typically amplify structural periods above about 0.5 seconds. If structural periods are less than about 0.5 seconds it would likely be conservative to use the Site Class that would be assigned if no liquefiable or peat deposits are present. Without peat or liquefiable soils, the site would classify as Site Class C, and design values associated with this Site Class are provided.

The design parameters for the design level event (equal to a return period of 1,000 years) were obtained from the USGS Uniform Hazard Tool website using the U.S. 2014 Dynamic Conterminous edition (v4.2.0), a tool that provides the probabilistic seismic hazard parameters from the *2014 Updates to the National Hazard Maps* (Peterson, et al., 2014). Site coefficients were developed following the WSDOT BDM that adopts the site coefficients provided in ASCE 7-16. Table 1 presents the design coefficients to use assuming Site Class C for the site.

The applicability of these parameters should be evaluated once the bridge structure is designed, and the structural periods are determined to confirm they are less than about 0.5 seconds.

Table 1: Design Seismic Coefficients for Evaluation Using AASHTO 2011 with Modifications per WSDOT 2020

(Return period of 1,000-ye	ear)
----------------------------	------

Period (sec)	Mapped AASHTO LRFD Spectral Response Acceleration (g)		AASHTO LRFD Spectral ResponseSite CoefficientsDesign Spectral ResponseAASHTO LRFD Spectral Acceleration (g)Site ResponseDesign Spectral Response		Transition Point	Period (sec)		Seismic Design Category		
0.0	PGA	0.399	F _{PGA}	1.200	As	0.479	To	0.067		
0.2	Ss	0.921	Fa	1.200	S _{DS}	1.105				С
1.0	<i>S</i> ₁	0.246	F _v	1.500	S _{D1}	0.369	Ts	0.334		

Notes: *5% Probability of Exceedance in 50 years for Latitude 47.59538° and Longitude -122.05684° PGA = Peak ground acceleration $F_{PGA} = PGA$ site coefficient

As = Design Acceleration Coefficient, the design PGA adjusted for Site Class effects

 $S_s =$ Short period (0.2 second) Mapped Spectral Acceleration

 $S_1 = 1.0$ second period Mapped Spectral Acceleration

 S_{MS} = Spectral Response adjusted for site class effects for short period = Fa • S_S

 S_{M1} = Spectral Response adjusted for site class effects for 1-second period = Fv • S_1

 S_{DS} = Design Spectral Response Acceleration for short period = 2/3 • S_{MS}

 S_{D1} = Design Spectral Response Acceleration for 1-second period =2/3 • S_{M1}

Fa = Short Period Site Coefficients

Fv = Long Period Site Coefficients

 $T_0=0.2{\scriptstyle \bullet }S_{D1}/S_{DS}$

 $T_S \equiv S_{D1} / S_{DS} \label{eq:Ts}$

Liquefaction Considerations

Liquefaction is a temporary loss of soil shear strength due to earthquake shaking. Loose, saturated cohesionless soils are highly susceptible to earthquake-induced liquefaction. Certain silts and low-plasticity clays are also susceptible. Primary factors controlling the development of liquefaction include the intensity and duration of strong ground motions, the characteristics of subsurface soils, in-situ stress conditions and the depth to groundwater. To evaluate the liquefaction susceptibility of the soils along the project alignment, the simplified procedure originally developed by Seed and Idriss (1971), updated by Youd et. Al., (2001), and by Idriss and Boulanger (2004, 2006) was used.

The preliminary evaluation indicates that loose to medium dense fill and alluvial soils, where encountered below the groundwater table are susceptible to liquefaction under the design seismic event. The dense to very dense advance outwash deposits are not considered susceptible to liquefaction. Impacts of liquefaction depend on the site topography, the depths and extents of liquefied materials, and the sizes and locations of the proposed improvements. At this time, we understand a bridge is planned in the future; however, no details of the layout of the bridge and associated slopes and walls are currently available. Once the proposed improvements are selected, the existing data should be reviewed to determine the potential impacts of liquefaction to the structures.

Generally, liquefaction results in vertical settlement, particularly differential settlement, and can also result in horizontal displacement of the ground where the improvements are near existing or newly created slopes. For bridge foundations, the presence of liquefaction can result in downdrag loads acting on deep foundations such as piles or drilled shafts. Potential for development of slope instability impacting walls and abutments due to either lateral spreading or flow sliding would also need to be considered. Depending on the impacts, the bridge can either be designed to withstand the anticipated loads, or some method of ground improvement could be implemented. Suitable methods for mitigating for effects of liquefaction will need to be evaluated during future design phases of the projects.

FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of our borings it appears that drilled shafts bearing in the advance outwash would likely be the most economical foundation type for the subsurface conditions encountered. These foundations would obtain capacity from both the skin friction along the sides of the drilled shafts (within the advance outwash soils) as well as the end bearing at the bottom of the shafts. Depths to reach the advance outwash vary with the greatest depths near the middle to the wetland, in the vicinity of BH-4. The depth to the top of the advance outwash layer in BH-4 is approximately 40 feet in BH-4, while in BH-1 the depth to the top of the advance outwash layer is only about 13 feet. Drilled shaft diameters and depths of the foundations into the advance outwash layer will depend on structural loading but we anticipate shaft diameters of about 6 to 8 feet and depths of embedment within the advance outwash of about 20 feet.

CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS

We have prepared this report for the City of Sammamish for use in preliminary evaluations for this project. Experience shows that soil and groundwater conditions can vary significantly over small distances. Inconsistent conditions may occur between explorations that may not be detected by a geotechnical study of this nature. Within the limitations of scope, schedule and budget, HWA attempted to execute these services in accordance with generally accepted professional principles and practices in the fields of geotechnical engineering at the time the report was prepared. No warranty, express or implied, is made. The scope of our work did not include environmental assessments, pavement engineering, or evaluations regarding the presence or absence of wetlands or hazardous or toxic substances in the soil, surface water, or groundwater at this site.

April 26, 2021 HWA Project No. 2019-016-21 Task 8

We appreciate this opportunity to provide geotechnical and pavement engineering services on this project. If you have any questions or if we may be of further assistance, please contact the undersigned at (425) 774-0106.

Sincerely,

HWA GEOSCIENCES INC.

Bryan K. Hawkins, P.E. Senior Geotechnical Engineer

ATTACHMENTS:

Figure 1	Vicinity Map
Figure 2	Site and Exploration Plan
Figure 3	Geologic Cross Section
Appendix A	Borehole Logs
Appendix B	Laboratory Testing





LEGEND





C:\USERS\CFRY\DESKTOP\2019-016 T8 212TH AVE SE\2019-016 T8 CITY OF SAMMAMISH ON-CALL 212TH AVE SE.DWG <3> Plotted: 12/17/2020 6:11 PM

Appendix A Borehole Logs

RELATIVE DENSITY OR CONSISTENCY VERSUS SPT N-VALUE

	COHESIONLESS SO	DILS	COHESIVE SOILS			
Density	Density N (blows/ft)		Consistency	N (blows/ft)	Approximate Undrained Shear Strength (psf)	
Very Loose	0 to 4	0 - 15	Very Soft	0 to 2	<250	
Loose	4 to 10	15 - 35	Soft	2 to 4	250 - 500	
Medium Dense	10 to 30	35 - 65	Medium Stiff	4 to 8	500 - 1000	
Dense	30 to 50	65 - 85	Stiff	8 to 15	1000 - 2000	
Very Dense	over 50	85 - 100	Very Stiff	15 to 30	2000 - 4000	
			Hard	over 30	>4000	

USCS SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

	MAJOR DIVISIONS		GROUP DESCRIPTIONS			
Coarse Grained	Gravel and Gravelly Soils	Clean Gravel (little or no fines)	GV			
Soils	More than 50% of Coarse Fraction Retained	Gravel with Fines (appreciable amount of fines)	GI GI GI GI	∬ Silty GRAVEL		
	on No. 4 Sieve Sand and	Clean Sand				
More than 50% Retained	Sandy Soils 50% or More of Coarse	(little or no fines)	SI	Poorly-graded SAND		
on No. 200 Sieve		Sand with Fines (appreciable	SN	A Silty SAND		
Size	Fraction Passing No. 4 Sieve	amount of fines)	so so	Clayey SAND		
Fine	Silt		M	LSILT		
Grained Soils	and Clay	Liquid Limit Less than 50%	СІ	Lean CLAY		
				Organic SILT/Organic CLAY		
	Silt		M	H Elastic SILT		
50% or More Passing	and Clay	Liquid Limit 50% or More	CI	H Fat CLAY		
No. 200 Sieve Size			ы С	H Organic SILT/Organic CLAY		
	Highly Organic Soils		Г РЕАТ			

TEST SYMBOLS

	TEOTOTIMBOED
%F	Percent Fines
AL	Atterberg Limits: PL = Plastic Limit LL = Liquid Limit
CBR	California Bearing Ratio
CN	Consolidation
DD	Dry Density (pcf)
DS	Direct Shear
GS	Grain Size Distribution
к	Permeability
MD	Moisture/Density Relationship (Proctor)
MR	Resilient Modulus
PID	Photoionization Device Reading
PP	Pocket Penetrometer
	Approx. Compressive Strength (tsf)
SG	Specific Gravity
TC	Triaxial Compression
ΤV	Torvane Approx. Shear Strength (tsf)
UC	Unconfined Compression
	SAMPLE TYPE SYMBOLS
X	2.0" OD Split Spoon (SPT)
	(140 lb. hammer with 30 in. drop)
\perp	Shelby Tube
•	3-1/4" OD Split Spoon with Brass Rings
0	Small Bag Sample
	Large Bag (Bulk) Sample
	Core Run
\square	Non-standard Penetration Test (3.0" OD split spoon)
	GROUNDWATER SYMBOLS
$\overline{\Delta}$	Groundwater Level (measured at
T	time of drilling) Groundwater Level (measured in well or
-	

Groundwater Level (measured in well or open hole after water level stabilized)

DESCRIPTIVE TERMS

COMPONENT DEFINITIONS

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

< 5%	Clean
5 - 12%	Slightly (Clayey, Silty, Sandy)
12 - 30%	Clayey, Silty, Sandy, Gravelly

PROPORTION RANGE

30 - 50%

COMPONENT PROPORTIONS

Components are arranged in order of increasing quantities.

NOTES: Soil classifications presented on exploration logs are based on visual and laboratory observation. Soil descriptions are presented in the following general order:

Density/consistency, color, modifier (if any) GROUP NAME, additions to group name (if any), moisture content. Proportion, gradation, and angularity of constituents, additional comments. (GEOLOGIC INTERPRETATION)

Please refer to the discussion in the report text as well as the exploration logs for a more complete description of subsurface conditions.



City of Sammamish On-Call 212th Ave SE Borings Geotechnical Investigation Sammamish, Washington

MOISTURE CONTENT

Very (Clayey, Silty, Sandy, Gravelly)



FIGURE:

LEGEND OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS USED ON EXPLORATION LOGS

PROJECT NO.: 2019-016 T8

<u>A-1</u>





















A-5



















Appendix B Laboratory Testing

_		E			GRAVITY		ATTERBERG LIMITS (%)					NO	
EXPLORATION	TOP DEPTH (feet)	BOTTOM DEPTH (feet)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	ORGANIC CONTENT (%)	SPECIFIC GRA	LL	PL	PI	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% FINES	ASTM SOIL CLASSIFICATION	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION
BH-1,BGS-1	15.0	16.0	6.9						48.3	42.0	9.8	GP-GM	Olive-brown, poorly graded GRAVEL with silt and sand
BH-1,BGS-2	26.0	27.0	5.4						54.1	37.8	8.1	GW-GM	Olive-brown, well-graded GRAVEL with silt and sand
BH-2,BGS-1	7.0	8.0	158.9	22.2								PT	Very dark brown, PEAT
BH-2,BGS-2	16.0	17.0	4.8						46.8	44.4	8.8	GW-GM	Dark olive-brown, well-graded GRAVEL with silt and sand
BH-2,BGS-3	31.0	32.0	2.6						52.1	44.5	3.4	GP	Olive-brown, poorly graded GRAVEL with sand
BH-3,BGS-1	8.0	9.0	253.4	41.5								PT	Very dark brown, PEAT with gravel
BH-3,BGS-2	13.0	14.0	21.3			27	16	11				CL	Olive-brown, sandy lean CLAY with gravel
BH-3,BGS-3	27.0	28.0	8.1						18.2	57.5	24.3	SM	Olive-brown, silty SAND with gravel
BH-4,BGS-1	20.0	21.0	519.0	96.7								PT	Very dark grayish-brown, PEAT
BH-4,BGS-2	31.0	32.0	48.3			36	23	13				CL	Gray, lean CLAY
BH-5,BGS-1	19.0	20.0	661.9	95.4								PT	Very dark brown, PEAT
BH-5,BGS-2	26.0	27.0	39.1			32	19	13				CL	Dark gray, lean CLAY with sand
BH-5,BGS-3	29.0	30.0	4.1						41.1	37.9	21.1	GM	Gray, silty GRAVEL with sand
BH-6,BGS-1	11.0	12.0	721.9	81.6								PT	Very dark brown, PEAT
BH-6,BGS-2	16.0	17.0	35.9			35	20	15				CL	Dark gray, lean CLAY
BH-6,BGS-3	36.0	37.0	12.8						9.5	33.8	56.7	ML	Dark gray, sandy SILT
BH-6,BGS-4	38.0	39.0	19.7						0.8	83.9	15.3	SM	Dark gray, silty SAND
BH-7,BGS-1	11.0	12.0	19.5			24	15	9	5.8	39.2	55.0	CL	Dark gray, sandy lean CLAY
BH-7,BGS-2	25.0	26.0	8.5						13.7	41.9	44.4	SM	Dark grayish-brown, silty SAND

Notes: 1. This table summarizes information presented elsewhere in the report and should be used in conjunction with the report test, other graphs and tables, and the exploration logs. 2. The soil classifications in this table are based on ASTM D2487 and D2488 as applicable.



City of Sammamish On-Call 212th Ave SE Borings Geotechnical Investigation Sammamish, Washington

SUMMARY OF MATERIAL PROPERTIES

PAGE: 1 of 1

PROJECT NO.: 2019-016 T8 FI

FIGURE: B-1












City of Sammamish On-Call 212th Ave SE Borings Geotechnical Investigation Sammamish, Washington

LIQUID LIMIT, PLASTIC LIMIT AND PLASTICITY INDEX OF SOILS METHOD ASTM D4318

B-6

HWAATTB EXPANDED SAMPLE COLUMN 2019-016 T8.GPJ 12/18/20

PROJECT NO.: 2019-016 T8 FIGURE:



Tested By: DW

Checked By: SEG





$C_{\alpha} = 4.871$	L8 - 4.8716	= 0.0003	





C _α =	4.8066	-	4.7969	=	0.0097





C _α =	4.6693	-	4.6480	=	0.0213





C _α =	4.2203	-	4.0303	=	0.1900





C _α =	3.3484	-	3.0137	=	0.3348









Co	,= 1.853	1.5877	=	0.2660





C _α =	1.3465	-	1.1246	=	0.2219



Tested By: DW

Checked By: SEG





C _~ =	11.7684	_	11 7396	_	0 0289
−a	11.7004	-	11./390	-	0.0285









a			
C _α = 10.8598	- 1	=	0.1558





C _α =	9.4857	-	9.1888	=	0.2968





C _α =	7.5737 -	7.1760	=	0.3977
------------------	----------	--------	---	--------





C _α =	5.7194	-	5.2659	=	0.4534





C _α =	4.0704	-	3.6692	=	0.4012





C _α =	2.8427	-	2.5387	=	0.3040



