OCTOBER 28, 2021 MODIFIED FOR SR400 PHASE 1 BRIDGE DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT

 Project No: Project No: Fulton Counties, Georgia

PREPARED FOR: AECOM 1360 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 500 Atlanta, Georgia 30309

AECOM Project 60558412 NOVA Project Number 2018089 - Task Order 5

February 21, 2020 (Revision 1)

February 21, 2020 (Revision 1)

AECOM

1360 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 500 Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Attention: Scott A. Gero, P.E. - Project Manager

This report has been produced for the sole and exclusive use of AECOM, HNTB and the Georgia Department of Transportation. Distribution of this report to others shall be for information purposes only. Use and reliance on this report or any of its contents by others is at their sole risks.

OCTOBER 28, 2021 BODY OF REPORT REDACTED TO ONLY INCLUDE THE INFORMATION NEEDED FOR THE SR400 BRIDGE DESIGN BUILD PROJECT.

Subject: BFI Geotechnical Data Report a provincia de la provincia del provincia del provincia del provincia del provincia del provincia del provincia i i strati i stra ٦ı S Project No: MSL00-0001-00(757) PI NO. 0001757 Fulton Counties, Georgia AECOM Project 60558412 NOVA Project Number 2018089 – Task Order 5

Dear Mr. Gero,

NOVA Engineering and Environmental, LLC (NOVA) has completed the Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Geotechnical Data Report (GDR) for bridges associated with the GDOT **SR 400** project in Fulton **Counties, Georgia. This work has been performed under Task Order 5 of this** project with Purchase Order Number 102551 and in general accordance with GDOT requirements and modified based on scoping meetings with HNTB and United Consulting.

This December 27, 2019 report supersedes the October 18, 2019 version and includes data for borings subsequently drilled in the Chattahoochee River after obtaining approval from the National Park Service. An OMAT historical search for GDOT BFI reports, a Pavement Evaluation Study, a Soil Survey (SS) GDR, **Fig. 1. The Study of Study**, a Soil Survey (SS) GDR, **reports were** submitted previously under separate cover.

We thank you for the opportunity to assist you with this project and look forward to working with you on future projects.

Sincerely, NOVA ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LLC

Mahalingam Bahiradhan, P.E. J. Stephen Willenborg, Project Engineer Project Manager

Eric K. Tay, P.E. \sim Randall L. Bagwell, P.E.

Senior Engineer **Project Principal**

PROFESSIONAL | PRACTICAL | PROVEN 3900 Kennesaw 75 Parkway, Suite 100, Kennesaw, Georgia 30144 t. 770.425.0777 / f. 770.425.1113 / usanova.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

Figure 2: General Project Geology Map

ATTACHMENTS: Proposed, Replaced or Modified Bridges - BFI Geotechnical Data Reports (Includes available historical GDOT BFI data)

ATTACHMENTS CONTINUED: Proposed Bridges – Historical GDOT BFI Data Only

Attachment T: Pitts Road over SR 400; BSN:121-0476-0 Attachment U: Kimball Bridge Road. over SR 400; BSN:121-0475-0

SPT HAMMERS ENERGY CALIBRATIONS

S&ME- CME 55 (SN 328245) S&ME- CME 550X (SN 292103) S&ME- Diedrich D-50 Track (SN 382) Betts- CME 75 (SN 164447) Betts- CME 55 (SN 54005) Tri-State-CME 45 Barge Rig (SN 31692402)

IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT THIS GEOTECHNICAL-ENGINEERING REPORT

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT

PI No. 0001757, Fulton Counties, Georgia

February 21, 2020 (Revision 1)

2. BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATIONS

Soil borings were drilled based on proposed bridge layouts provided by AECOM at the time of our field exploration. Please note that proposed bridge locations, configurations and number of spans, etc. may have changed since conducting our field explorations.

In addition, NOVA searched the archive files at GDOT Office of Materials and Testing (OMAT) to obtain historical BFI geotechnical data. Historical BFI geotechnical data found and compiled were provided to AECOM previously. Based on review of these historical BFI geotechnical data, NOVA was instructed to conduct additional foundation investigation borings on specific planned bridges. Excerpts of historical BFI data found at or in the immediate vicinity of the proposed bridges where NOVA conducted foundation investigations are included with the individual BFI GDR in Attachments

We have also compiled excerpts of historical GDOT BFI reports for proposed bridges where NOVA was not requested to conduct additional foundation investigation drilling. These are compiled in Attachments by bridge names and bridge structure numbers.

3. GENERAL GEOLOGY

The site is located in the Piedmont Geologic Region, a broad northeasterly trending province underlain by crystalline rocks up to 600 million years old. The Piedmont region is bounded by the Blue Ridge Range of the Appalachian Mountains to the northwest, and by the leading edge of Coastal Plain sediments, commonly referred to as the "Fall Line" to the southeast. Numerous episodes of crystal deformation have produced varying degrees of metamorphism, folding and shearing in the underlying rock. The resulting metamorphic rock types in the project area are predominantly a series of Precambrian-Paleozoic age.

Residual soils in the region are primarily derived from the in-situ parent rock by chemical weathering. The extent of the weathering is influenced by the mineral composition of the rock and defects such as fissures, faults and fractures. The residual profile can generally be divided into three zones:

- An upper zone near the ground surface consisting of red clays and clayey silts which have undergone the most advanced weathering,
- An intermediate zone of less weathered micaceous sandy silts and silty sands, frequently described as "saprolite", whose mineralogy, texture and banded appearance reflects the structure of the original rock, and
- A transitional zone between soil and rock termed partially weathered rock (PWR).

The boundaries between zones of soil, partially weathered rock, and bedrock are erratic and poorly defined. Weathering is often more advanced next to fractures and joints that transmit water, and in mineral bands. Boulders and rock lenses are sometimes encountered within PWR or soil matrix. Consequently, significant fluctuations in depths to materials may occur over short horizontal distances.

The General Project Geology Map is shown as Figure 2.

4. SCOPE OF WORK

Our scope of work included the following:

- 1. Field Exploration
- 2. Soil Classification and Laboratory Testing
- 3. Preparation of BFI Geotechnical Data Report

4.1 FIELD EXPLORATION

The number of borings and their locations for each bridge were determined by reviewing available subsurface investigation data, proposed locations of the new (or to be replaced or modified) bridges, the planned number of bridge spans per structure, and given/estimated bent locations in general accordance with GDOT requirements and as modified based on scoping meetings with HNTB and United Consulting. Boring locations were established in the field by NOVA personnel using the provided (then-current) site plans, a handheld GPS device, and measuring distances from permanent site landmarks. Boring locations were selected close to the proposed bents as practically possible. Some boring locations were offset to safe distances from marked utility lines at the time of drilling. Utilities at the proposed boring locations were located by calling Georgia 811 prior to drilling test borings.

GDOT Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) buried fiber optics cables were not located by Georgia 811. NOVA coordinated with the GDOT ITS Department and were provided with drawings of the Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) Plans for the project corridor. NOVA's field engineers met with GDOT ITS Supervisor and personnel from the GDOT Traffic Management Center (TMC) on site at several locations to go over fiber optic line plans. Our field personnel also observed remnants of water-soluble paint markings and/or flags for marking of utilities for the Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) efforts for the project. Some of the boring locations required private utility locator services to locate utilities. Hand clearing/dozer clearing were required to access some of the boring locations.

Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) was provided by Area Wide Protective (AWP) Services for borings drilled in travel lanes or close to travel lanes/shoulders. A Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) and cruiser with "blue lights" were included at some locations for added safety. Traffic Interruption Reports (TIR) and MOT Plans were prepared and submitted to the GDOT Traffic Management Center (TMC) in advance for approval and to obtain TIR numbers. Our field engineers called in to the GDOT TMC prior to temporary lane closures and after completion of our daily field operations. Night work was conducted for drilling operations on SR 400.

Our drilling subcontractors, S&ME, Betts Drilling, and Tri-State Drilling, performed all test borings under the direction of a NOVA Project Engineer. Borings were drilled with All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV), truck mounted drill-rigs, or barge platform equipped with hollow-stem continuous flight augers and/or wash boring augers. Standard Penetration Test (SPT) were

obtained using automatic hammers. Calibration information for the SPT hammers utilized on this project are included with this report.

The Standard Penetration Test (SPT) with a standard 1.4-inch I.D., 2.0-inch O.D., split-tube sampler as per ASTM D1586 was performed at depth intervals in general accordance with GDOT OMAT guideline. SPT includes driving the sampler through 18-inches using a 140 pounds hammer free falling through 30 inches. The number of blows required to drive the sampler through every 6 inches were recorded. The SPT "N-value" (Penetration Resistance) were recorded as the sum of the number of blows required to drive the sampler through the last 12 inches or a portion thereof. Representative portions of the soil samples, obtained from the sampler, were placed in air-tight glass jars and transported to our laboratory for further evaluation and laboratory testing.

Auger refusal occurs when very hard or very dense material, frequently boulders or the upper surface of bedrock, is encountered and cannot be penetrated by a power auger. In some cases, when auger refusal was encountered at shallow depths that were not supported by the surficial features, offset borings were required to verify auger refusal/presence of partially weathered rock (PWR) at deeper depths. Partially weathered rock (PWR) is a transitional material between soil and the underlying parent rock that is defined as residual materials that exhibit a standard penetration resistance (SPT N-value) exceeding 100 bpf.

In addition to the split-spoon samples, "undisturbed" Shelby tube samples were also obtained at some locations where boring depths exceeded 75 feet and loose strata were encountered. Shelby tube samples not tested are stored in a climate control storage facility for additional laboratory testing, if requested.

Rock coring were done according to ASTM D2113–Standard Practice for Rock Core Drilling and Sampling of Rock for Site Exploration.

The groundwater levels reported on the Test Boring Records represent measurements made at the completion of the soil test boring. The soil test borings were backfilled immediately after their completion with soil cuttings and patched with asphalt/concrete when needed.

Coordinates and elevations of the boring locations were surveyed and provided by ACCURA Engineering after the borings have been completed. The elevations at the borings are based on the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88).

4.2 SOIL CLASSIFICATION AND LABORATORY TESTING

Soil Classification: Soil classification provides a general guide to the engineering properties of various soil types and enables the engineer to apply past experience to current problems. In our explorations, samples obtained during drilling operations are classified by an engineer using the visual-manual procedures in general accordance with ASTM D2488. The soils are classified according to relative density/consistency (based on SPT N-values), color and composition. Visual classification is confirmed/corrected based on the laboratory test results from representative soil samples obtained from each major soil layer. These final soil classification descriptions included on our "Test Boring Records" are based on using the Unified Soil Classification System in general accordance with ASTM D2487.

Laboratory Testing: The following laboratory index testing were performed on representative samples collected during the field exploration to assist in the soil classification:

- Grain Size Analysis *ASTM D6913*
- Moisture Content *ASTM D2216*
- Atterberg Limits *ASTM D4318*
- Unconfined Compressive Strength of Rock– *ASTM D7012*
- Soil Resistivity *ASTM G187*
- pH of Soil *ASTM G51, AASHTO T289*
- Chloride of Soil *ASTM D512, AASHTO T291*
- Sulfate of Soil *ASTM C1580, D516, AASHTO T290*

Grain Size Analysis: The grain size analysis consists of determining the amounts of various sizes of soil particles using a series of standard sieve openings. The percentage of soil, by weight, passing the individual sieves is then recorded and generally presented in a graphical format. The percentage of fines passing through the No. 200 sieve is generally considered to represent the amount of silt and clay of the tested soil sample. The sieve analysis test was conducted in general accordance with ASTM D6913 - Standard Test Methods for Particle Size Distribution Using Sieve Analysis.

Moisture Content: In a given soil-air-water matrix, the moisture content is the ratio expressed as a percentage of the weight of water to the weight of the soil particles. This test was conducted in general accordance with ASTM D2216 - Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass.

Atterberg Limits: The Atterberg Limits are different descriptions of the moisture content of fine-grained soils as it transitions between a solid to a liquid-state. For classification purposes the two primary Atterberg Limits used are the Plastic Limit (PL) and the Liquid Limit (LL). The Plasticity Index (PI) is also calculated for soil classification, which is defined as the difference between Liquid Limit and Plastic Limit. The Plastic Limit (PL) is the moisture content at which a soil transitions from a semisolid state to a plastic state. The Liquid Limit (LL) is defined as the moisture content at which a soil transitions from a plastic state to a liquid state. Atterberg

Limits tests were performed in general accordance with ASTM D4318 - Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils.

Unconfined Compressive Strength: Unconfined strength test of rock was performed to assist the designers in determining the required embedded length of drilled shafts, if used, and to provide some input in selecting the core bit types and the capacity of the excavation equipment for drilled shafts, if used. Unconfined compressive strength tests of intact rock specimens were performed in general accordance with ASTM D7012 (Method C) - Standard Test Methods for determining unconfined compressive strength of intact rock core specimens.

Soil Resistivity: The resistivity of the surrounding soil environment is a factor in the corrosion of underground structures. Soil resistivity may affect the material selection of a structure. Soil resistivity tests were performed in accordance with ASTM G187 - Standard Test Method for Measurement of Soil Resistivity Using the Two-Electrode Soil Box Method.

pH of Soil: The principle use of the test is to supplement soil resistivity measurements to determine the corrosion potential of soils for the materials of a buried structure. Soil pH tests were performed in accordance with ASTM G51 - Standard Test Method for Measuring pH of Soil for Use in Corrosion Testing.

Chloride and Sulfate Contents of Soil: Attack on precast, cast-in-place concrete occurs in soils with high sulfate or chloride concentrations. The solubility of the sulfate or chloride are among factors influencing the rate of deterioration on concrete piles. Chloride content of soil were determined in accordance with ASTM D512, AASHTO T291 - Chloride Ion Content in Soil. Sulfate content of soil were determined in accordance with ASTM C1580, D516, AASHTO T290 - Sulfate Ion Content in Soil.

4.3 GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORTS

The results of our study are presented as individual Geotechnical Data Report (GDR) for each bridge where NOVA conducted foundation investigation drilling. Each individual GDR (Attachments A through S) includes the following:

- Introduction: The introduction provides a description of proposed bridge location. Existing bridge structure IDs are referenced in the reports for replacement or widening bridges. Site photographs are referenced in the Appendix A of each Attachment.
- Geology: A brief general geology of the bridge area is included along with a geology map of the individual area in Appendix A of each Attachment.
- Field and Laboratory Testing: A description and summary of the field and laboratory testing performed are included. In Appendix A of each Attachment, a boring location plan is provided along with the proposed bridge location or modification. Subsurface data provided in Appendix B of each Attachment includes a subsurface data profile and Test Boring Records. Test Boring Records include the standard penetration test

(SPT) resistances, USCS soil types and their depths, engineering soil properties, rock descriptions, and depth of groundwater encountered in the borings. Laboratory data provided in Appendix C of each Attachment includes a summary of laboratory test results and laboratory test results sheets.

• Historical Geotechnical Data: If previous geotechnical data was available, excerpts of the relevant historical GDOT BFI data records are included in Appendix D of each of the individual geotechnical data reports. Please also note that historical records were not found for all of the project's bridge locations.

5. OMAT HISTORICAL BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA

Excerpts of historical data are included as Appendix D in each GDR where NOVA conducted foundation investigation drilling. For proposed bridges where NOVA was not requested to conduct foundation investigation drilling, the excerpts of available historical GDOT BFI data are compiled as Attachments T through V by bridge names and bridge structure numbers. The historical boring location plans provided by us represents our understanding of the locations of historical soil borings with respect to the existing structures. We have assumed that the bridge locations on the historical reports are the same as the current locations of existing bridges. The user needs to verify this assumption prior to using the respective historical data.

6. LIMITATIONS

This report includes the summary of our data collection effort within the scope of our work and is based on the generally accepted geotechnical engineering practices. The stratification lines and depth designations in the Test Boring Records represent approximate boundaries between various subsurface strata. Actual transitions between soil strata may be gradual. No warranties/guarantees are expressed or implied. NOVA is not responsible for accuracy or missing information associated with the historical documents or the reports/documents prepared by others for this project.

This report is intended for the sole use of AECOM, HNTB and the Georgia Department of Transportation only. The scope of work performed during this study was developed for purposes specifically intended by AECOM, HNTB and the Georgia Department of Transportation and may not satisfy other users' requirements. Use of this report or the findings will be at the sole risk of the user. NOVA is not responsible or liable for the interpretation by others of the data in this report, nor their conclusions, recommendations or opinions.

Our professional services have been performed, our findings obtained and presented in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering principles and practices in the State of Georgia. This report is intended to be a geotechnical data report with no engineering conclusions or recommendations provided.

FIGURES

https://mrdata.usgs.gov/geology/state PROFESSIONAL | PRACTICAL | PROVEN Scale: NTS

NOVA Project Number 2018089 – Task Order 5

ATTACHMENTS

This Report has been produced for the sole and exclusive use of AECOM, HNTB and the Georgia Department of Transportation. Distribution of this report to others shall be for information purposes only. Use and reliance on this report or any of its contents by others is at their sole risks. $\overline{}$

l

ATTACHMENT B

Bridge 2 - Roberts Drive over SR 400

Project No: MSL00-0001-00(757) PI NO. 0001757

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

1. INTRODUCTION

Existing bridge on Roberts Drive over SR 400 (Structure ID 121-0316-0), as shown in Figure 1 of Appendix A, is a four-span structure that crosses over SR 400 at a skew angle. The new longer bridge replaces the existing bridge at approximately 50 feet south of current location as part of

the \blacksquare

, PI No. 0001757).

2. SITE GEOLOGY

According to the "Geology of the Greater Atlanta Region" by McConnell and Abrams, 1984, the site as shown in Figure 2 of Appendix A, is generally underlain by the "fs: Sandy Springs Group" Formation. This geologic formation typically includes an upper unit of graphite-garnet-mica schist with lesser amounts of biotite gneiss and amphibolite.

3. FIELD AND LABORATORY PROCEDURES

3.1 FIELD EXPLORATION

Our field exploration included five soil test borings (B2-1 through B2-3A) drilled to depths of 4.1 to 18.7 feet below the existing ground surface. Table 1 shows a summary of field testing, locations and quantities. The approximate boring locations are shown on Figure 3 of Appendix A. The results of the field exploration, USCS soil classifications, and laboratory test results are presented in Test Boring Records in Appendix B.

BORING No.	LOCATION				
	ATITUDE	ONGITUDE	SURFACE ELEVATION GROUND (feet) 冚	DEPTH (feet) BORING	TOTAL SPT
$B2-1$	33.99145926	-84.33860112	1050.2	18.7	4
$B2-2$	33.99158441	-84.33817267	1034.4	4.1	$\overline{2}$
B2-2A	33.99158441	-84.33817267	1034.4	6.6	3
B2-3	33.99149878	-84.33787676	1032.7	6.2	1
B2-3A	33.99149878	-84.33787676	1032.7	7.5	1
			Total	43.1	11

Table 1: Summary of Field Testing and Test Hole Quantities

3.2 LABORATORY TESTING

The laboratory test results are presented in the Appendix C with Table A showing the summary of all laboratory test results. The Test Boring Records attached in Appendix B include Atterberg limits (Plastic Limit and Liquid Limit) and moisture content within the "Graphic Depiction" of the log. Table 2 provides number of laboratory tests performed.

Table 2: Number of Laboratory Tests Performed

4. HISTORICAL DATA

Previous soil boring data at the vicinity of the proposed bridge location was obtained from GDOT OMAT archive files and is included in Appendix D of this report. NOVA is not responsible for the presented historical BFI geotechnical data prepared by others and found in GDOT OMAT archive file storage. Both historical BFIs were described as bridges over SR 400 (North Fulton Expressway). Appears the historical BFI for the 5/9/68 is probably for the current bridge with four spans. Figure 4 of Appendix D represents our understanding of the locations of historical soil borings with respect to the existing structure. The user should review the attached documents and confirm these locations for their use.

APPENDIX A

FIGURES

FIGURE 1 BRIDGE 2 – Roberts Drive over SR 400 EXISTING BRIDGE SOURCE: GDOT Bridge Inspection Report

– PI No. 0001757

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT Fulton **Counties**, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 - Task Order 5

pfu cpq fs

Sandy Springs Group (Higgins and McConnell, 1978a: Kline, 1980; this report): Similar to sequence observed in northern Piedmont and at least partially equivalent to Atlanta Group (see text). Includes a lower unit of intercalated biotite gneiss, mica schist and amphibolite (pfu); a middle unit composed of micaceous quartzite, mica schist and graphitic schist (cpq); and an upper unit of graphite-garnetmica schist with lesser amounts of biotite gneiss and amphibolite (f_s) .

FIGURE 2 BRIDGE 2 – Roberts Drive over SR 400 SITE GEOLOGY SOURCE: McConnell & Abrams, 1984

PI No. 0001757 BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT Fulton Counties, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 – Task Order 5

–

FIGURE 3 BRIDGE 2 - Roberts Dr over SR 400 **BORING LOCATION PLAN** SOURCE: Google Earth Aerial Photos SCALE: Not to Scale

- PI No. 0001757

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT **Fulton** Counties, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 - Task Order 5

APPENDIX B SUBSURFACE DATA

KEY TO SYMBOLS AND CLASSIFICATIONS

Drilling Symbols

Strata Symbols

Paving

Gravel /Graded Aggregate Base

Fill

Clayey Sand

Sandy Silt/Silt

Partially Weathered Rock

High Plasticity Clay

Topsoil

Poorly Graded Sand with Silt

CORRELATION OF PENETRATION RESISTANCE WITH RELATIVE DENSITY AND CONSISTENCY

DRILLING PROCEDURES

Soil sampling and standard penetration testing performed in accordance with ASTM D1586. The standard penetration resistance is the number of blows of a 140 pound hammer falling 30 inches to drive a 2-inch O.D., 1%inch I.D. split spoon sampler one foot. The undisturbed sampling procedure is described by ASTM D1587.

SOIL CLASSIFICATION CHART

PARTICLE SIZE IDENTIFICATION

APPENDIX C LABORATORY TEST DATA

PAGE 1 0f 1

Table A: Bridge 2 Summary of Laboratory Tests Results

NP: Non-Plastic

Tested By: ML Smith

Tested By: ML Smith

Tested By: ML Smith

Tested By: ML Smith

Tested By: MLS

Tested By: AB

Tested By: MLS

Tested By: AB

Tested By: MLS

Tested By: AB

Tested By: MLS

Tested By: AB

APPENDIX D HISTORICAL DATA

FIGURE 4 BRIDGE 2 – Roberts Dr over SR 400 HISTORICAL BORING LOCATION PLAN SOURCE: Google Earth Aerial Photos SCALE: Not to Scale

– PI No. 0001757

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT Fulton & Forsyth Counties, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 - Task Order 5 FORM H_2 0, 66

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

C. A. Marmelstein, State Highway Bridge Engineer

SUBJECT

 T^{\bullet}

Bridge Foundation Investigation $APD-F-056-1$ (6) Fulton North Fulton Expressway Underpass Roberts Drive Bridge No. 14

As requested, a bridge foundation investigation has been made at the above listed project. Attached are the results of this work. If any additional information is needed, please notify us.

Very truly yours,

W. F. Abercrombie Engineer of Materials and Tests

WFA:TDM:kab

BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION

 $APD-F-056-1$ (6) FULTON NORTH FULTON EXPRESSWAY UNDERPASS ROBERTS DRIVE BRIDGE NO. 14

 $1.$ LOCATION-

This bridge is to be located over the proposed North Fulton Expressway approximately 1.3 miles south of the Chattahoochee River crossing. It will be geologically located in a cut section containing dense residual soils underlain by weathered granite gneiss bedrock.

2. SUBSURFACE DETAILS-Reference should be made to the attached boring logs and subsurface details. Some pertinent details are as follows:

> a. The ground water table was between elevation 1024 and 1026.5 during this investigation.

b. Soils encountered near proposed footing elevations consisted chiefly of dense silty micaceous sands (residual soils) except at bent 4 right (boring #7). Soils encountered in boring 7 were noticeably looser.

Dense soil is located conveniently for safe support c . of spread footing foundations at all bents. These highly micaceous soils are easily disturbed when exposed to weathering; consequently, footings should be poured immediately after excavation.

Steel "H" piles used in pile bents are suitable foundations for the end bents. The maximum bridge borings recommended for "H" piles at this site, based on soil strength are as follows:

> $10''$ BP $42'$ s 40 Tons $12"$ BP $53's$ 55 Tons

These piles will be chiefly end bearing piles with pile tips seated in weathered rock. Pile tip elevations are estimated to range near elevation 1037 at bent 1 and near elevation 1050 at bent 7. Piles may be driven to bearing by the dynamic formula.

Spread Footings - Spread footings are also applicable for end bent foundations. These footings may be placed on dense soil as follows:

END BENT FOUNDATIONS- \mathcal{F}

BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION

 $APD-F-056-1$ (6) FULTON NORTH FULTON EXPRESSWAY UNDERPASS ROBERTS DRIVE BRIDGE NO. 14 Page 2

> Slope paving and a cap to shoulder point berm width of at least 2' are recommended with this spread footing design. A minimum cover of 2' should also be provided.

INTERMEDIATE BENT FOUNDATIONS- Spread footings are recommended for all intermediate 4. bent foundations. These footings may be placed on medium dense to dense soils as follows:

All spread footingsat this site should be poured as soon after excavation as possible to prevent disturbance of underlying soil.

> Thomas D. Moreland Civil Engineer V

TIM: DAM: kab

March 29, 1967

TH.D.490 . STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

H.D.490 · STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

PROPOSED FOOTING ELEV.

 $\mathcal{A}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

PARTY CHIEF COGGIN

H.D.490 STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA H.D.490

PROPOSED FOOTING ELEV. ____________

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

SAM- σ_o $%$ $\cancel{\beta}$ PLE BLOW BORING LOG **REMARKS** W ELEV. γ $C₅$ \mathbf{C} . BC LL. \mathbf{P} I 200 $CLAY$ C_4D , ELEV, DENSE -MULTICOLORED TUG YOUAG $(MQ \setminus ST)$ 1050 1040 $\overline{5}$ 140 ISM VERY DENSE $60 - G$ 59 23 $(5AME)$ 35 $103c$ CHAMMER 43 BOULGO WEATHERED 54. 24 lSm $51/27$ ROCK 1020 REFUSAL ON ROCK. \sim

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA H.D.490

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

PROJECT APD-F-056-1(6) COUNTY FULTON $\frac{1}{2}$ DATE 3-14-67

 B^2 BORING NO. 5 LOCATION ROBERTS DR.

BENT NO. $\frac{3}{5}$ FOOTING RT.

HLD.490 . STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

H.D.490. STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

PROPOSED FOOTING ELEV. _________________________________ PARTY CHIEF STONE

 $\Theta_{\rm{max}}$ and $\Omega_{\rm{max}}$

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA H D.490

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$.

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

and the company of

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA $H.D.490$

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

LOCATION ROBERTS DR. BR.[#]14 BORING NO. 10

BENT NO. 6 FOOTING LT. GROUND ELEV. 1059.5

HLD.490 STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

 $\label{eq:1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}$

H.D.490 STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

COAM H.D. 66

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

Thomas D. Moreland, State Highway Materials Engineer

TO

R. L. Chapman, Jr., State Highway Bridge Engineer

SUBJECT

Bridge Foundation Investigation $APD-F-056-1$ (6) Fulton Roberts Drive Relocation Over North Fulton Expressway Bridge No. 14 Mainline Station 41450.0

As requested, a bridge foundation investigation has been made at the above listed site. Attached are the results of that work. If any additional information is needed, please notify us.

Very truly yours,

Thomas D. Moreland State Highway Materials Engineer

TDM: DAM: kab

a Tirin
Matukin

 $\frac{1}{2}$

BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION

APD-F-056-1 (6) FULTON ROBERTS DRIVE RELOCATION OVER NORTH FULTON EXPRESSWAY BRIDGE NO. 14 MAINLINE STATION 41+50.0

1. LOCATION-

This bridge is to be located over the proposed North Fulton Expressway approximately 1.2 miles south of the Chattahoochee River crossing. It will be geologically sited in a cut section containing dense residual soils underlain by weathered granite gneiss bedrock.

 $2.$ SUBSURFACE DETAILS- Reference should be made to the attached boring logs and subsurface profile. Some pertinent details are as follows:

a. Hard rock was encountered above the footing elevations at bents 2 and 3. Blasting will be necessary to reach the footing elevations at these bents.

b. Rock cores were taken at bents 2, 3, and 4 at this site.

END BENT FOUNDATIONS-3. Pile bents using steel "H" piles are suitable foundations for the end bents. The maximum recommended design bearings for "H" piles at this site are as follows:

Estimated tip elevations for the end bent piles are listed below:

Plan Driving Objectives - The plan driving objective for the end bent piles is practical refusal after the following minimum tip elevations are reached; 1035.0 at bent 1 and 1025.0 at bent 5.

INTERMEDIATE BENT FOUNDATIONS- Spread footings are recommended for the intermediate bent foundations. These footings may be spread on

BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION

 $APD-F-056-1$ (6) FULTON ROBERTS DRIVE RELOCATION OVER NORTH FULTON EXPRESSWAY BRIDGE NO. 14 MAINLINE STATION 41+50.0 Page 2

hard rock as follows:

David A. Mitchell, Sr. Civil Engineer IV

DAM: JLM: kab May 9, 1968

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST. ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

PROJECT $APD.F.OD6-(6)$ COUNTY $FULTON$ DATE $4-9.68$ LOCATION ROBERTS DRIVE OVERPASS (RELOCATION)BORING NO. _______ φ GROUND ELEV. 1057.99 $RENT NQ.$ \qquad $FQQTNRQ$

PROPOSED FOOTING ELEV. 1051.5 PILE CUTOFF PARTY CHIEF CRISLER

H.D.490

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

PROJECT $APD-F-056-/(6)$ COUNTY $FULTON$ DATE $4-9-68$ LOCATION ROBERTS DR. OVERPASS (RELOC.) BORING NO. 2 BENT NO. <u>C</u> FOOTING LT OFFSET 2LT AFORWERROUND ELEV. 1062.25

PROPOSED FOOTING ELEV. 1024.0 PARTY CHIEF $2RISLER$

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

PROJECT $APD-F-C56-(6)$ COUNTY $FULTON$ DATE 4-16-68 LOCATION ROBERTS DR. OVERPASS (RELOC.) BORING NO. 6 BENT NO. $\frac{4}{5}$ FOOTING $\frac{27}{5}$ GROUND ELEV. $\frac{1060}{15}$

PROPOSED FOOTING ELEV. $\frac{1021.75}{\sqrt{211.75}}$ PARTY CHIEF $\frac{CRTSLER}{T}$

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

PROJECT $APD-F-056-1(6)$ COUNTY $FULTON$ DATE 4-9-68 LOCATION ROBERTS DR. OVERPASS (RELOC.) __ BORING NO. 8 BENT NO. 5 FOOTING $\frac{f}{f}$ OFF SET 4' LT. GROUND ELEV. 1060.53

PROPOSED FOOTING ELEV. 1053.31 PILE CUTOFE PARTY CHIEF CRISLER

FOR DIFFERENTIAL ON SOUDLE ACTING STEAM OR AIR HAMMERS. USE MANUFACTURER'S ENERGY RATING.

 \sim

 \sim

FOR LINK-SELT, CONVERT BOUNCE CHAMBER PRESSURE READING TO "WH" VALUE BY MEANS OF CHART: USE IN S. A. FORMULA.

 \bar{z}

 \mathcal{A}

 \sim

 \sim

 \mathcal{A}^{max} and \mathcal{A}^{max}

 $\frac{1}{3}$

 $\ddot{}$

Ĥ.

From An Excel And March

TEST PILE NO LELER REPORT LE CONTINUED. PAGE NO 2008

<u> 1999 - Januar County, american et al.</u>

 $H_{1,2}$, 520-3. nan messed
||al Qruss || 1
|a

 \mathbf{r}

 $\mathcal{A}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\label{eq:2} \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{$

SPECIAL REMARKS:

Variations From Specifications

 \mathbf{a}

موالو الأمراني

 \sim \sim

Contractor

Respectfully submitted. ENGINEER OF MATERIALS & TESTS

SPECIAL REMARKS:

 $\tau = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$

 \mathbb{R}^2

 \bar{z}

 \mathbf{r}

 α is a second one.

 \sim \bullet

aka Rosan Khanda E

ENGINEER OF MATERIALS & TESTS

 λ

 ~ 0.000 . The ~ 0.000

 \Box

 \bar{t}

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TESTS Atlanta, Georgia

SOIL SURVEY REPORT

Proj. $F-056-1$ (6)

County Fulton

Date Sampled__________________Reported__4-22-68

PHYSICAL TESTS

SPECIAL REMARKS:

 ϵ , as $\ddot{}$

 \mathbf{z} , where \mathbf{z} is a set of

This report has been produced for the sole and exclusive use of AECOM, HNTB and the Georgia Department of Transportation. Distribution of this report to others shall be for information purposes only. Use and reliance on this report or any of its contents by others is at their sole risks. ed
the ly.
Dy

ATTACHMENT T

Pitts Road over SR 400 – BSN: 121-0476-0

Project No: MSL00-0001-00(757) PI NO. 0001757

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Figures Appendix B – Historical Data

1. INTRODUCTION

Existing bridge on Pitts Road over SR 400 (Structure ID 121-0476-0), as shown in Figure 1 of Appendix A, is a four-span structure that crosses over SR 400 at a skew angle. The new longer bridge replaces the existing bridge at approximately 40 feet south of current location to accommodate the SR 400 widening associated with the

project (Project No: MSL00-0001-00(757), PI No.

0001757).

2. SITE GEOLOGY

According to the "Geology of the Greater Atlanta Region" by McConnell and Abrams, 1984, the site as shown in Figure 2 of Appendix A, is generally underlain by the "pfu: Sandy Springs Group" Formation. This geologic formation typically includes a lower unit of intercalated biotite gneiss, mica schist and amphibolite.

3. HISTORICAL DATA

Previous soil boring data at the vicinity of the proposed bridge location was obtained from GDOT OMAT archive files and is included in Appendix B of this report. NOVA is not responsible for the presented historical BFI geotechnical data prepared by others and found in GDOT OMAT archive file storage. Figure 3 of Appendix B represents our understanding of the locations of historical soil borings with respect to the existing structure. The users should review the attached documents and confirm these locations for their use.

APPENDIX A

FIGURES

FIGURE 1 Pitts Road over SR 400 EXISTING BRIDGE SOURCE: GDOT Bridge Inspection Report

– PI No. 0001757

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT Fulton & Forsyth Counties, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 - Task Order 5

pfu cpq fs

Sandy Springs Group (Higgins and McConnell, 1978a: Kline, 1980; this report): Similar to sequence observed in northern Piedmont and at least partially equivalent to Atlanta Group (see text). Includes a lower unit of intercalated biotite gneiss, mica schist and amphibolite (pfu); a middle unit composed of micaceous quartzite, mica schist and graphitic schist (cpq); and an upper unit of graphite-garnetmica schist with lesser amounts of biotite gneiss and amphibolite (f_s) .

FIGURE 2 Pitts Road over SR 400 SITE GEOLOGY SOURCE: McConnell & Abrams, 1984

PI No. 0001757 BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT
Fulton Counties, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 – Task Order 5

–

APPENDIX B HISTORICAL DATA

FIGURE 3 Pitts Road over SR 400 HISTORICAL BORING LOCATION PLAN SOURCE: Google Earth Aerial Photos SCALE: Not to Scale

– PI No. 0001757

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT Fulton **Counties**, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 - Task Order 5 STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

SUBJECT

Bridge Foundation Investigation PR-5610 D Fulton County Pitts Road Over N. Fulton Expressway

As requested, a bridge foundation investigation has been made at the above listed site. Attached are the results of that work. If any additional information is needed, please notify us.

Very truly yours,

W. F. Abercrombie Engineer of Materials and Tests

WFA: TDM: sev

BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim σ

PR-5610 D Fulton County Pitts Road Over N. Fulton Expressway

These will be chiefly end bearing piles.

Intermediate Bent Foundations - Spread footings are recommended for all intermediate $5.$ bent foundations except bent 4 right. These footings may be safely placed at or below elevation 1037.5 with a maximum safe design pressure of 5 ksf.

BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION

PR-5610 D Fulton County Pitts Road Over N. Fulton Expressway Page 2

The footing at bent 4 right could be spread at elevation 1028.5 with a safe design pressure of 7 ksf. However, a "H" pile footing appears more suitable with the footing near elevation 1037.5. Estimated pile tip elevation for the maximum bearings given in section 3 of this report is 1027.0 at this footing.

Danger From Fill Settlement -6. No danger.

 $7.$ Displacement Piles - Displacement piles were not recommended because of the limited penetration available at bent 4 right and because of possible driving difficulty at bent 5. Irregular pile lengths are also indicated by the dense layered soil and soft rock strata.

> Thomas D. Moreland Highway Materials Engineer

TDM: DAM: sev

 $7 - 27 - 65$

 $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$

 $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. As $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$

 \bar{z}

ò,

v.

 33

43

 55

 63

 75

<u>දිද</u>

9s|

 -105

∤lls|

 \underline{N}

10201

 $\overline{1001}$

<u>lಯ</u>

 790

SAME

SAME

SAME (VERY DENSE)

CHEIDIUM DENSE)

SAME

REFUSAL ON

ROCK

(VERY DENSE)

(MEDIUM DENSE)

 23 16

 $\overline{18}$

 ζ 3

 34

 \mathbb{Z}

 $60 - 9$

 22

 ω

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 \mathcal{L}_{max}

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 \mathbb{Q}

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{d\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}}{d\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}}\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}}\right)^{2} \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}}\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}}\right)^{2}$

 \bar{z} Ŷ,

 \mathcal{L}

به
این صری

HD 500-B $(10-66)$

 $\ddot{}$

FOR LINK GELT, CONVERT BOUNCE CHAMBER PPESSURE PEADING TO "WH" VALUE BY MEANS OF CHART: USE IN S. A. FORMULA.

 \sim

595 600 $rac{+07}{358}$ $\frac{1}{3}7^{5}$ Bents of deal of c)
V MRS. FRANCES W. PITTS fD Slope easement 290 + 00 (272) $\widetilde{\sqrt{73}}$ $\overline{200}$ 30B $63'$ $F_{(772)}$ Call@ni23 22^{n} $\frac{266}{266}$ 180 758 2984 JOHN THOMAS PITTS ١Ë $\frac{1}{2}$. $\frac{1}{2}$ 22°37'45" E \mathcal{F} πP HARMON $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ $\frac{1}{Q}$ $\frac{1}{Q}$ $258'$ $\frac{+57}{123}$ 99 وسريدا $\frac{1}{4}$ ิงั่ 190 106' - 00
175 \sum Easernen. 161 J.D. NEWTON Slope easement $\frac{+20}{288}$ $+$ 00 303 ROAD. -7 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ $\frac{+76}{402}$ $+00$ J.C. & TERSA $\overline{656}$ DELONG $ELIZ$ 522

This report has been produced for the sole and exclusive use of AECOM, HNTB and the Georgia Department of Transportation. Distribution of this report to others shall be for information purposes only. Use and reliance on this report or any of its contents by others is at their sole risks. ed
the

ATTACHMENT U

Kimball Bridge Road over SR 400 – BSN: 121-0475-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Figures Appendix B – Historical Data

, PI No.

1. INTRODUCTION

Existing bridge on Kimball Bridge Road over SR 400 (Structure ID 121-0475-0), as shown in Figure 1 of Appendix A, is a four-span structure that crosses over SR 400 at a skew angle. The new bridge replaces the existing bridge at approximately 63 feet south of current location to accommodate the SR 400 widening associated with the

0001757).

2. SITE GEOLOGY

According to the "Geology of the Greater Atlanta Region" by McConnell and Abrams, 1984, the site as shown in Figure 2 of Appendix A, is generally underlain by the "pfu: Sandy Springs Group" Formation. This geologic formation typically includes a lower unit of intercalated biotite gneiss, mica schist and amphibolite.

3. HISTORICAL DATA

Previous soil boring data at the vicinity of the proposed bridge location was obtained from GDOT OMAT archive files and is included in Appendix B of this report. NOVA is not responsible for the presented historical BFI geotechnical data prepared by others and found in GDOT OMAT archive file storage. Figure 3 of Appendix B represents our understanding of the locations of historical soil borings with respect to the existing structure. The users should review the attached documents and confirm these locations for their use.

APPENDIX A

FIGURES

FIGURE 1 Kimball Bridge Road over SR 400 EXISTING BRIDGE SOURCE: GDOT Bridge Inspection Report

– PI No. 0001757

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT Fulton **Counties**, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 - Task Order 5

pfu cpq fs

Sandy Springs Group (Higgins and McConnell, 1978a: Kline, 1980; this report): Similar to sequence observed in northern Piedmont and at least partially equivalent to Atlanta Group (see text). Includes a lower unit of intercalated biotite gneiss, mica schist and amphibolite (pfu); a middle unit composed of micaceous quartzite, mica schist and graphitic schist (cpq); and an upper unit of graphite-garnetmica schist with lesser amounts of biotite gneiss and amphibolite (f_s) .

FIGURE 2 Kimball Bridge Road over SR 400 SITE GEOLOGY SOURCE: McConnell & Abrams, 1984

PI No. 0001757 BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT
Fulton Counties, Georgia Counties, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 – Task Order 5

–

APPENDIX B HISTORICAL DATA

FIGURE 3 Kimball Bridge Road over SR 400 HISTORICAL BORING LOCATION PLAN SOURCE: Google Earth Aerial Photos SCALE: Not to Scale

– PI No. 0001757

BFI GEOTECHNICAL DATA REPORT Fulton Counties, Georgia NOVA Project Number 2018089 - Task Order 5

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

Thomas D. Moreland, State Highway Materials Engineer FROM

ĩΟ

R. L. Chapman, Jr., State Highway Bridge Engineer

SUBJECT

Bridge Foundation Investigation $APD-F-056-1$ (6) Fulton Kimball Bridge Road Bridge No. 24

As requested, a bridge foundation investigation has been made at the above listed site. Attached are the results of this work. If any additional information is needed, please notify us.

Very truly yours,

Thomas D. Moreland State Highway Materials Engineer

TDM: DAM: pml

BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION

APD-F-056-1 (6) FULTON KIMBALL BRIDGE ROAD BRIDGE NO. 24

 \sim \sim

 1 . LOCATION -

 2.1 SUBSURFACE DETAILS - This bridge is to be located 4 miles east of Alpharetta, Georgia. It will be geologically sited in the Biotite Gneiss and Schist Formation of the Georgia Piedmont Region.

Reference should be made to the attached boring logs and subsurface profile. Some pertinent details are as follows:

The ground water table was at or near elevation $a.$ 1073.0 during this investigation.

b. Soils present consist chiefly of loose to medium dense sandy silt underlain by very dense shallow rock.

 $3.$ END BENT FOUNDATIONS -Pile bents using steel "H" piles are suitable foundations for the end bents. Maximum recommended design bearings for "H" piles at this site are as follows:

Estimated pile tip elevations for these bearings are as follows:

4. PLAN DRIVING OBJECTIVE - The PDO for end bent piles should be dynamic bearing after a minimum tip elevation of 1085.0 is achieved.

INTERMEDIATE BENT FOUNDATIONS- Spread footings are recommended for intermediate 5. These footings may be placed on very dense bents. sandy silt with a maximum design bearing of 2 T.S.F. as follows:

BRIDGE FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION

 $APD-F-056-1$ (6) FULTON KIMBALL BRIDGE ROAD BRIDGE NO. 24 Page 2

> The footings at Bents 2 and 3 are below the ground water table; therefore, extreme care should be taken to keep footings dry during construction. Pumping should be done from a sump outside the footing area, and at least 12" deeper than footing excavation. Footing excavation should not be done until immediately before the forms are to be set.

6. DANGER FROM FILL SETTLEMENT -No danger is anticipated.

> David A. Mitchell, Sr. Civil Engineer IV

DAM: JCK: pml May 29, 1968

"AS-BUILT" BRIDGE FOUNDATION REPORT

DATA FOR BRIDGE ENGINEER, ATLANTA

 \ldots (3-67) 9.36^{10}

ELEVATIONS OF BOTTOMS OF FOOTINGS (= BF) & LOWEST AND HIGHEST ELEVATIONS OF PILE TIPS (= LOW, HIGH) (Express this data in whole numbers only - NO DECIMALS)

÷

The control of the control of the control of the control of the control of

Bent Bent Bent 1 North end 11. 1108.16 South end El. 1106.32 Bent 5 North and El. 1098.3: South end El. 1096. Of Limit of slope paving -Working line
(fangent af Sta. 78+08.07) $1098.$ \mathcal{E} First Kimball Bridge Road (Construction, $G(Y)$ End bridge BAPR Bent 5 Sta. 79+60.20 El 1104,15 Limit of stope paving W. LQ''

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

H.D.490

 $B F$

 SWT

1070

1060

 20

1270

 M_{\odot}/\odot

SANDY SILT

 σ^2 $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{r}_{\text{max}}}$

TENID
DRILLING –

25

 $\overline{S}S$

45

55 65

 75

 $|9S|$

 $60 = 8$ 5M

 SM

 $5M$ SM-SP

 ML

 SM

 SM

 $5M-5P$

.SM

 $60 - 5$

 $50 = 7'$

 $60 - 5$

55 $60 - 5$

 $8560=5$

 $10560 = .3$

 $60 - 8$

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BRIDGE SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

lsam. \mathcal{O}'_{O} $\%$ PLE BLOW W $\cancel{\beta}$ ELEV. BORING LOG **REMARKS** γ $\bf{G}s$ \mathbf{C} . BC LL. PI 200 $CLAY$ SR.ELEY, LOOSE-MIRE. DV:NSE- 1277 **SANDY SILT** $1090⁺$ <u> 1080 T</u> \mathcal{E}/\mathcal{F} 15° 10 ML $40,0$ 56.3 9.3 Q70 - KERY DENSE 25 60=.6 | 5M 20.0 31,6 5,2 $60 - 5$ 35 SM 19.2 $(SAME)$ \mathcal{N} 23,6 4,0 4560.9 $5M$ 45.0 43.760 WEATHERED ROCK $60 - 5$ $S\overline{M}$ 55 22.6 29.0 5.1 $60 - 2^{1}$ 65 <u> 1060.</u> 75 $60 - 2$ **HAMMER** 485 **REFUSAL IOSO JON ROCK-**

H.D.490

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

DIVISION OF MATERIALS AND TEST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

FORM H. D. 66

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

R. L. Chapman, Jr. State Highway Bridge Engineer

RLCJr./LRP/kg

- T. D. Moreland $cc:$ State Highway Materials Engineer
	- McRay Newsom, A.F.D.E. $cc:$ 21 Claire Drive, S. W. Atlanta, Georgia 30315
	- Rogers Bridge Company, Inc.
P. O. Box 8,220 (2730 Sullivan Road) $cc:$ College Park, Georgia 30337

cc: J. T. Kratzer

المتابع والمتواصل والمتعاون والمتعاون والمتعارف والمستحقق والمتعارض والمتحدث

 $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r})$

 \sim

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$, where $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ is a set of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

الع التي يستخدم المعتبر المعتبر المعادل والتي العام والمعاملات المداوي التي وساوس وسود والمداور المداور المداو

 \sim \sim

 $\bar{\beta}$

 \sim

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A})$

 $\sim 10^7$

OR GRAVITY AND POWER HAMMERS.

 \mathcal{L}

 $\frac{1}{2}$

FOR DIFFERENTIAL OR DOUBLE ACTING STEAM OR AIR HAMMERS. USE MANUFACTURER'S ENERGY RATING.
FOR LINK-BELT, CONVERT BOUNCE CHAMBER PRESSURE READING TO "WH" VALUE BY MEANS OF CHART: USE IN S. A. FORMULA, .
In the company company of the contract of the company of the company of the company of the company of the compa

SPT HAMMERS ENERGY **CALIBRATIONS**

S&ME- CME 55 (SN 328245)

SIE

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME CME 55 Truck (SN 328245) Black River, North Carolina S&ME Project No. 6235-17-020

PREPARED FOR:

North Carolina Department of Transportation Geotechnical Engineering Unit 1589 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699

PREPARED BY:

S&ME, Inc. 9751 Southern Pine Boulevard Charlotte, NC 28273

September 20, 2018

September 20, 2018

North Carolina Department of Transportation Geotechnical Engineering Unit 1589 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699

Attention: Dr. Shunyi (Chris) Chen, Ph.D., P.E.

Cc: Ms. Cheryl A. Youngblood, L.G.

Reference: **Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME CME 55 Truck (SN 328245)** Charlotte, North Carolina S&ME Project No. 6235-17-020

Dear Dr. Chen:

We have completed the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) energy measurements on the automatic hammer mounted on our CME 55 truck-mounted drill rig with a serial number of 328245. This service was performed by our Mr. Robert E. Kral, P.E. on September 6, 2018. SPT energy testing was performed in general accordance with ASTM D4633 and the most recent revision of the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), Geotechnical Engineering Unit's requirements. The testing procedures, equipment used during testing, and detailed results are presented in this report.

1.0 Dynamic Testing Methodology

Testing was performed using a model PAX (Serial No. 3733L) Pile Driving Analyzer™ (PDA) manufactured by Pile Dynamics, Inc. The PDA was used to record and interpret data from two piezoresistive accelerometers (Serial Nos. K10181 and K10182) bolted to a 2-foot long AWJ drill rod (SN203) internally instrumented with two strain transducers. The instrumented AWJ drill rod has a cross-sectional area of 1.20 square inches, an outside diameter of approximately 1.75 inches, and an inside diameter of 1.25 inches at the gauge location. The accelerometers and strain gauges, which are mounted on opposing axis near the middle of the instrumented rod, monitor acceleration and strain for each hammer blow. The analyzer converts the data to velocities and forces and computes the maximum transferred hammer energies with the "EFV" method described in ASTM D4633. Preliminary results are recorded and displayed in real time for each blow. Calibration sheets for the accelerometers and the instrumented rod are included in the Appendix.

2.0 Testing and Observations

S&ME personnel were on site on September 6, 2018, to observe and perform high-strain dynamic testing during SPT sampling on the CME 55 truck-mounted drill rig operated by T. Miller of S&ME. The measurements were taken during drilling operations for the NCDOT I-5986A project in Black River, North Carolina. High-strain dynamic testing was performed at Boring EB1-Y10, the Field Borelog (not redlined) is attached in Appendix II. SPT energy measurements were recorded during three intervals at depths of approximately 43½, 48½, and 53½ ft below the existing ground surface. The information presented in the tables below summarizes the equipment tested and tooling used during the SPT energy measurements.

Table 2-1: Drill Rig Information

Table 2-2: Hammer Information

Table 2-3: Drilling and Instrumented Rod Information

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME CME 55 Truck (SN 328245) Charlotte, North Carolina S&ME Project No. 6235-17-020

3.0 Dynamic Testing Results

The total rod length from the instrumentation to the tip of the split-spoon sampler was determined by adding 3.60 ft to the required drill rod length at each sample depth. Based on the test data, the automatic hammer on the CME 55 truck-mounted drill rig operated at a rate of about 51.4 to 52.0 blows per minute (bpm) during dynamic testing. The measured transferred hammer energy (EFV) was generally in the range of about 292.1 to 325.6 ft-lbs, which corresponds to Energy Transfer Ratio (ETR) values of about 83.5 to 93.0%, respectively. The SPT Energy Measurement Data Summary tables in the Appendix present the test data from every hammer blow at each sampling interval along with representative force and velocity traces for each test interval. The reported blow counts, obtained by the drill rig personnel, and a summary of the test data and average computed hammer energy and transfer ratio values are provided in Table 3-1. Plots and tables of the following are also included in the Appendix and present the test data with depth for each test interval:

- Penetration vs. BLC
- Penetration vs. CSX
- Average ETR vs. Rod Length
- ETR vs. Rod Length

Penetration vs. EFV

• Penetration vs. FMX

- Penetration vs. VMX
- Penetration vs. ETR

Table 3-1: Summary of Dynamic Testing Results

The average hammer rate, transferred energy, and transfer ratio were calculated for each depth interval. Per ASTM D4633, only the blows from the final foot of each sample interval (i.e. the blows that determine the N-value) were included when computing the average values shown in Table 3-1. The overall average transferred hammer energy for the automatic hammer on the CME 55 truck-mounted drill rig (for all the depth intervals tested) was 316.2 foot-pounds, with an average ETR of 90.3%.

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME CME 55 Truck (SN 328245) Charlotte, North Carolina S&ME Project No. 6235-17-020

4.0 Limitations of Report

This report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practice for specific application to this project. The conclusions contained in this report were based on the applicable standards of our profession in this geographic area at the time this report was prepared. No other warranty, express or implied, is made.

5.0 Closing

S&ME appreciates the opportunity to provide this report to the North Carolina Department of Transportation, Geotechnical Engineering Unit. Please let us know if you have any questions concerning this report.

Sincerely,

S&ME, Inc.

Principal Engineer Transportation Services Project Manager N.C. Registration No. 042642

Appendices:

- Appendix I CME 55 Truck (SN 328245) SPT Energy Measurements Summary Plots and Tables
- Appendix II SPT Energy Evaluation Form (Field Log) and Field Borelog
- Appendix III Instrumented Rod and Accelerometer Calibration Sheets
- Appendix IV Certificate of Proficiency

Appendices
Appendix I

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 1 of 6

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 9/20/2018 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 9/20/2018

CME 55 (328245) EB1-Y10

F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 212.32 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 212.63 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

Sample Interval Time: 10.40 seconds.

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 2 of 6

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 9/20/2018 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 9/20/2018

F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 212.32 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 212.63 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

Pile Dynamics, Inc. Page 3 of 6 SPT Analyzer Results PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 9/20/2018

Sample Interval Time: 37.08 seconds.

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 4 of 6

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 9/20/2018 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 9/20/2018

F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 212.32 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 212.63 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

Pile Dynamics, Inc. Page 5 of 6 SPT Analyzer Results PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 9/20/2018

Sample Interval Time: 38.32 seconds.

Summary of SPT Test Results

Appendix II

SPT Energy Evaluation Form

Weather: Brill Rod Type: 9/6/2018 CLEAR (NIGHT) / 70's AWJ

Notes:

NOTE: (1) Note any unusual hammer operating conditions that affect the hammer performance, or changes in operating conditions (e.g. veritcality, weather, or lubrication between trials). (2) Note any changes in rod diameter along drill string and record locations of short rod sections.

Digitally signed by: rkral@smeinc.com

 $DN: CN = \text{rkral@smeinc.com}$

Prepared By (print/signature) Date

9/6/2018

SHEET $\frac{1}{1}$ of $\frac{3}{1}$

NCDOT GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING UNIT
FIELD BORELOG (ENGLISH) \odot

 ϵ

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

Form GEU-001e Revised 2/6/2007

NCDOT GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING UNIT STO FIELD BORELOG (ENGLISH)

 \bigoplus

SHEET 2 OF 3

 \mathcal{A}

NCDOT GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING UNIT FIELD BORELOG (ENGLISH)

Ġ,

Ì.

Appendix III

Smart Sensor

Smart Chip Programmed By X M. W. on 4 DEC 17 CRC Value 6 A D 7

Smart Sensor

Smart Chip Programmed By 7. M.W. on 4 DEC17 CRC Value 1798

PDI Certificate of Calibration

PDI SPT Drill Rod Serial # 203 AWJ

Cal Date: $3 - 6 - 17$

Cal Due: $3-6-19$

Temperature: 69.2 deg. F

Humidity $42%$

Manufactured by Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Calibrated at: Pile Dynamics, Inc., 30725 Aurora Road, Cleveland, OH 44139 Procedure used: SPT Drill Rod Calibration Procedure 2016-4, Revision 20160422 Calibration Data: Attach SPT Rod Data Sheet DS-17

Equipment was found to be

 $\sqrt{}$ in tolerance As Received out of tolerance As Received

in tolerance As Returned

out of tolerance As Returned

Calibration Standards Utilized

1. PDI SPT Calibration Signal Conditioning Unit #000001, verified on 20160302

2. PDI Load Cell #75, Certificate #3482090006

3. Capacitec Displacement Sensor #2034, Certificate #3482090004

- 4. Capacitec Displacement Sensor #2040, Certificate #3482090004
- 5. Capacitec Displacement Mainframe #4004-671, Certificate #3482090004
- 6. Brown & Sharpe Digital Caliper #8G028506, Certificate #3482090001
- 7. National Instruments USB-6210 DAQ serial number 159AFDE, Certificate

#3482090002

Calibration performed by:

Burrell Technician

Revigwed by:

Robert Sprenger, Production Manager

SPT CC-16 Issued 20160425

30725 Aurora Road · Cleveland, Ohio 44139 USA · +1-216-831-6131 · Fax +1-216-831-0916 E-mail: info@pile.com . www.pile.com

Quality Assurance for Deep Foundations

SPT Calibration Data Sheet Revision number 20160426 Use Calibration Procedure Number 2016-8, Revision 20160422

SPT Drill Rod Data

Calibration performed in accordance with PDI SPT Calibration Procedure 2016-4, Revision 20160422

As Received (circle one): Operational Malfunctioning - Damaged

Calibration data 1. 8152 2.8045 3.808) Pre-Load:

 $1.186452.179663.9859$ Total Load:

Common typical theoretical EA values based on SPT Rod Type: AW: 35400 NW: 43100 or 68100 N3: 70800 BW:52344

EA Theoretical $35,400$ EA Measured $36076,68$ Error 1.91 % Within 4% Tolerance, \mathcal{V}/N

Alternative EA verification: Measure wall thickness, calculate area and multiply by 30000. (use spreadsheet for calculation)

Calibration values

Channel 1: As Found: (last cal): Channel 2: As Found: (last cal): $BA:$ As Found: (last cal):

 215.26 As Left: 212.63 Within 5% Tolerance: $\frac{1}{2}$ N 215.52 As Left: $3/2$ 32 Within 5% Tolerance: \mathbb{Z}/N 35465 As Left: 362% & Difference: 1.2 %

Calibration performed by:

David Burrell, Technician

Reviewed by:

Robert Sprenger, Production Manager

 $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$

 \mathbf{I}

 α

 λ

×

 $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$

Bridge Excitation (V)
Shunt Resitor (ohm)

 $\,$ 5 $\,$ 60.4k

Calibrated by:
Calibrated Date: 2/24/2017

Pile Dynamics Inc
30725 Aurora Rd
Solon, OH 44139

Traceable to N.I.S.T.

Appendix IV

This documents that

Robert E. Kral S&ME, Inc.

has on May 20, 2016 achieved the rank of

ADVANCED

on the Dynamic Measurement and Analysis Proficiency Test.

The individual identified on this document demonstrated to the degree granted above an understanding of theory, data quality evaluation, interpretation and signal matching for high strain dynamic testing of deep foundations. It is recommended that Individuals at the Advanced level seek Master or Expert levels through additional study within six years of the date of this document.

The ability of the individual named to provide appropriate knowledge and advice on a specific project is not implied or warranted by the Pile Driving Contractors Association or Pile Dynamics, Inc. This certificate can be verified at www.PDAproficiencytest.com. The Pile Driving Contractors Association or Pile Dynamics, Inc. assumes no liability for foundation testing and analysis work performed by the bearer of this certificate.

Steven A. Hall, Executive Director Pile Driving Contractors Association

alend Filcino

Garland Likins, Senior Partne Pile Dynamics, Inc.

No. 2072

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

S&ME- CME 550X (SN 292103)

S &

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME CME 550X ATV (SN 292103) Duluth , Georgia S&ME Project No. 1280-18-100

NOVA Engineering and Environmental, LLC 3900 Kennesaw 75 Parkway, Suite 100 Kennesaw, Georgia 30144

PREPARED BY:

S&ME, Inc. 4350 River Green Parkway, Suite 200 Duluth, Georgia 30096

April 22, 2019

April 22, 2019

NOVA Engineering and Environmental, LLC 3900 Kennesaw 75 Parkway, Suite 100 Kennesaw, Georgia 30144

Attention: Mr. Eric Tay, P.E.

Reference: **Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME CME 550X ATV (SN 292103)** Duluth, Georgia S&ME Project No. 1280-18-100

Dear Mr. Tay:

S&ME, Inc. (S&ME) completed the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) energy measurements on the automatic hammer mounted on our CME 550X ATV-mounted drill rig with a serial number of 292103. This service was performed by our Mr. Adam Jennings of S&ME on January 21, 2019 prior to field exploration on the State Route 400 Major Mobility Improvement Project (MMIP) in Atlanta, Georgia. SPT energy testing was performed in general accordance with ASTM D4633. The testing procedures, equipment used during testing, and detailed results are presented in this report.

1.0 Dynamic Testing Methodology

Testing was performed using a model PAX (Serial No. 3733L) Pile Driving Analyzer™ (PDA) manufactured by Pile Dynamics, Inc. The PDA was used to record and interpret data from two piezoresistive accelerometers (Serial Nos. K10181 and K10182) bolted to an approximately 2-foot long AWJ drill rod (SN203) internally instrumented with two strain transducers. The instrumented AWJ drill rod has a cross-sectional area of 1.20 square inches, an outside diameter of approximately 1.75 inches, and an inside diameter of approximately 1.25 inches at the gauge location. The accelerometers and strain gauges, which are mounted on opposing axes near the middle of the instrumented rod, monitor acceleration and strain for each hammer blow. The analyzer converts the data to velocities and forces and computes the maximum transferred hammer energies with the "EFV" method described in ASTM D4633. Preliminary results are recorded and displayed in real time for each blow. Calibration sheets for the accelerometers and the instrumented rod are included in the Appendix.

S&ME Project No. 1280-18-100

2.0 Testing and Observations

On January 21, 2019, we perform high-strain dynamic testing during SPT sampling on the CME 550X ATVmounted drill rig operated by Mr. Michael Burnash of S&ME. The measurements were taken during drilling operations at the Western Gwinnett Bikeway Project in Duluth, Georgia. The energy measurements were obtained during SPT sampling at a test location labeled B-1, which was about 5 feet from a previously completed boring, labeled RW10-03. The boring log for RW10-03 is included in the Appendix. SPT energy measurements were recorded during three intervals at depths of approximately 23½, 28½, and 33. The information presented in the tables below summarizes the equipment tested and tooling used during the SPT energy measurements.

Table 2-1: Drill Rig Information

Table 2-3: Drilling and Instrumented Rod Information

S&ME Project No. 1280-18-100

3.0 Dynamic Testing Results

The total rod length from the instrumentation to the tip of the split-spoon sampler was determined by adding 3.65 ft to the required drill rod length at each sample depth. Based on the test data, the automatic hammer on the CME 550X ATV-mounted drill rig operated at a rate of about 50 to 51 blows per minute (bpm) during dynamic testing. The measured transferred hammer energy (EFV) ranged from 307.0 to 336.8 ft-lbs, which corresponds to Energy Transfer Ratio (ETR) values of 87.7 to 96.2%, respectively. The SPT Energy Measurement Data Summary tables in the Appendix present the test data from every hammer blow at each sampling interval, along with representative force and velocity traces for each test interval. The reported blow counts, obtained by the drill rig personnel, and a summary of the test data and average computed hammer energy and transfer ratio values are provided in Table 3-1. Plots and tables of the following are also included in the Appendix and present the test data with depth for each test interval:

- Penetration vs. BLC
- Penetration vs. CSX
	-
- Average ETR vs. Rod Length
	- ETR vs. Rod Length

Penetration vs. EFV

Penetration vs. FMX

 Penetration vs. VMX Penetration vs. ETR

Table 3-1: Summary of Dynamic Testing Results

The average hammer rate, transferred energy, and transfer ratio were calculated for each depth interval. Per ASTM D4633, only the blows from the final foot of each sample interval (i.e. the blows that determine the N-value) were included when computing the average values shown in Table 3-1. The overall average transferred hammer energy for the automatic hammer on the CME 550X ATV-mounted drill rig (for all the depth intervals tested) was 320.0 foot-pounds, with an average ETR of 91.4%.

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME CME 550X ATV (SN 292103) Duluth, Georgia

S&ME Project No. 1280-18-100

4.0 Limitations of Report

This report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practice for specific application to this project. The conclusions contained in this report were based on the applicable standards of our profession in this geographic area at the time this report was prepared. No other warranty, express or implied, is made.

5.0 Closing

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service on this project. Please let us know if you have any questions concerning this report.

Sincerely,

S&ME, Inc.

for

David L. Schoen, P.E. (SC) Case Contract of Leftrey A. Doubrava, P.E. Project Engineer Vice President / Senior Engineer dschoen@smeinc.com in the interval of doubrava@smeinc.com

Appendices:

- Appendix I CME 550X ATV (SN 292103) SPT Energy Measurements Summary Plots and Tables
- Appendix II SPT Energy Evaluation Form (Field Log) and nearby SPT Field Boring Log
- Appendix III Instrumented Rod and Accelerometer Calibration Sheets

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME CME 550X ATV (SN 292103)

Duluth, Georgia S&ME Project No. 1280-18-100

Appendices

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 1 of 7

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/8/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/8/2019

CME-550X (SN 292103) 23.5 to 25.0 A. Jennings Test date: 1/21/2019 $rac{B-4}{AR: 1.20}$ AR: 1.20 in^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3

LE: 28.65 ft EM: 30000 ksi EM: 30000 ksi WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 212.63 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1 F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 212.32 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

 $\overline{}$

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 3 of 7

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/8/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/8/2019

CME-550X (SN 292103) 23.5 to 25.0 A. Jennings Test date: 1/21/2019 $rac{B-4}{AR: 1.20}$ Arin^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3

AR: 30000 ksi LE: 33.65 ft WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 212.63 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1 F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 212.32 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

Pile Dynamics, Inc. Page 4 of 7 SPT Analyzer Results PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/8/2019

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 5 of 7

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/8/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/8/2019

CME-550X (SN 292103) 23.5 to 25.0 A. Jennings Test date: 1/21/2019 $rac{B-4}{AR: 1.20}$ AR: 1.20 in^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3

LE: 38.65 ft EM: 30000 ksi WS: 16807.9 ft/s

EM: 30000 ksi

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 212.63 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1 F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 212.32 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

Pile Dynamics, Inc.	
SPT Analyzer Results	

Pile Dynamics, Inc. Page 6 of 7 SPT Analyzer Results PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/8/2019

Summary of SPT Test Results

SPT Energy Evaluation Form

SA SI SA SI SA SI SI SA

WR

WR

 (y/n)

y

У

У

Notes:

12/19/2018

12/19/2018

12/19/2018

12/19/2018

12/19/2018

12/19/2018

(ft to ft)

 $23.5 - 25.0$

 $28.5 - 30.0$

 $33.5 - 35.0$

(military)

NOTE: (1) Note any unusual hammer operating conditions that affect the hammer performance, or changes in operating conditions (e.g. veritcality, weather, or lubrication between trials). (2) Note any changes in rod diameter along drill string and record locations of short rod sections.

 $(B) + (C) + (D)$

(BPM)

 $6"$

 τ

 \mathcal{L}

5

 $12"$

 15

 $\overline{7}$

9

 $18"$

37

 17

 $50/3$

N-Value

 52

24

 (C)

 $\mathbf{H} =$

Smart Sensor

Smart Chip Programmed By X M. W. on 4 DEC 17 CRC Value 6 A D 7

Smart Sensor

Smart Chip Programmed By 7. M.W. on 4 DEC17 CRC Value 1798

 $\bar{\star}$

Bridge Excitation (V)
Shunt Resitor (ohm)

 $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{r} = 0$

 $\mathbf 5$ 60.4k

ø. .
W

<u>e</u>ffects 'an Calibrated by: __
Calibrated Date: Λ 2/26/2019

Pile Dynamics Inc
30725 Aurora Rd
Solon, OH 44139

Traceable to N.I.S.T.

S&ME- Diedrich D-50 Track (SN 382)

SI &

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME Diedrich D-50 Track (Serial No. 382) Spartanburg, South Carolina S&ME Project No. 6235-17-020

North Carolina Department of Transportation Geotechnical Engineering Unit 1589 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699

PREPARED BY:

S&ME, Inc. 9751 Southern Pine Boulevard Charlotte, North Carolina 28273

March 6, 2019

March 6, 2019

North Carolina Department of Transportation Geotechnical Engineering Unit 1589 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699

Attention: Dr. Shunyi (Chris) Chen, Ph.D., P.E.

Cc: Ms. Cheryl A. Youngblood, L.G.

Reference: **Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME Diedrich D-50 Track (Serial No. 382)** Spartanburg, South Carolina S&ME Project No. 6235-17-020 NC PE Firm License No. F-0176

Dear Dr. Chen:

We have completed the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) energy measurements on the automatic hammer used with our Diedrich D-50 track-mounted drill rig (Serial No. 382). This service was performed by Mr. Joseph Williamson, P.E. of our firm on February 15, 2019, in general accordance with ASTM D4633 and the most recent revision of the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Geotechnical Engineering Unit's requirements. Review of the data quality and analyses was performed by Mr. Gregory Canivan, P.E. of our firm. Copies of the Certificates of Proficiency issued by Pile Dynamics based on the Dynamic Measurement and Analysis Proficiency Test for Mr. Williamson and Mr. Canivan are included in the Appendix. The testing procedures, equipment used during testing, and detailed results are presented in this report.

1.0 Dynamic Testing Methodology

Testing was performed using a model PAX (Serial No. 3733L) Pile Driving AnalyzerTM (PDA) manufactured by Pile Dynamics, Inc. The PDA was used to record and interpret data from two piezoresistive accelerometers (Serial Nos. K10181 and K10182) bolted to a 2.65-foot long BW drill rod (Serial No. 102) internally instrumented with two strain transducers. Calibration sheets for the accelerometers and the instrumented rod are included in the Appendix. The instrumented BW drill rod has a cross-sectional area of 1.82 square inches and an outside diameter of approximately 2.125 inches. Therefore, we calculate the inside diameter to be approximately 1.5 inches at the gauge location. The accelerometers and strain gauges, which are diametrically opposed near the middle of the instrumented rod, monitor acceleration and strain for each hammer blow. The analyzer converts the data to velocities and forces and computes the maximum transferred hammer energies with the "EFV" method described in ASTM D4633. Preliminary results are recorded and displayed in real time for each blow.

2.0 Testing and Observations

S&ME personnel were on site February 15, 2019, to observe and perform high-strain dynamic testing during SPT sampling on the Diedrich D-50 track-mounted drill rig operated by Justin Millwood of S&ME. The measurements were taken during drilling and sampling of a test hole at S&ME's office in Spartanburg, South Carolina. SPT energy measurements were recorded during seven sampling intervals at depths of approximately 28.2, 33.2, 38.2, 43.2, 48.2, 53.2, and 58.2 ft below the ground surface. The 33.2, 38.2, and 43.2-ft sample intervals did not meet the NCDOT blow count requirements and were not included in the data analysis. The information presented in the tables below summarizes the equipment and tooling used during the SPT energy measurements.

Table 2-1: Drill Rig Information

Table 2-2: Hammer Information

Table 2-3: Drilling and Instrumented Rod Information

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME Diedrich D-50 Track (Serial No. 382) Spartanburg, South Carolina S&ME Project No. 6235-17-020

3.0 Dynamic Testing Results

The total rod length from the instrumentation to the tip of the split-spoon sampler was determined by adding 4.35 ft to the drill rod length at each sample depth. The SPT Energy Measurement Data Summary tables in the Appendix present the test data from every hammer blow at each sampling interval, along with representative force and velocity traces for each test interval. Per ASTM D4633, only the blows from the final foot of each sample interval (i.e. the blows that determine the N-value) are considered when computing the average measurement values of each test interval.

The reported blow counts obtained by the drill rig personnel, a summary of the test data, and average computed hammer energy and transfer ratio values are provided in Table 3-1. Based on the test data, the automatic hammer on the Diedrich D-50 operated at an average rate of about 42 blows per minute (bpm) during dynamic testing. The measured average transferred hammer energy (EFV) of the four sample intervals tested ranged from 337 to 347 ft-lbs, which corresponds to Energy Transfer Ratio (ETR) values of 96.4 to 99.1%, respectively. Plots and tables of the following are also included in the Appendix and present the test data with depth for each test interval:

- Penetration vs. $BLC¹$
- Penetration vs. $CSX⁴$

Penetration vs. VMX⁵

- ETR vs. Rod Length
- Average ETR vs. Rod Length

Penetration vs. EFV³

Penetration vs. FMX²

Penetration vs. ETR⁶

Table 3-1: Summary of Dynamic Testing Results

The overall average transferred hammer energy for the automatic hammer on the Diedrich D-50 track-mounted drill rig was 343 foot-pounds, with an average ETR of 98.1%.

³ EFV – Maximum Transferred Energy

5 VMX – Maximum Velocity

6 ETR – Energy Transfer Ratio – Ratio of Calculated Energy to Theoretical Energy of 140 lb hammer falling 30 inches

¹ BLC - Blow Count per 6-in. increment 2 FMX - Maximum Compressive Force

⁴ CSX – Maximum Compressive Stress

Report of SPT Energy Measurements S&ME Diedrich D-50 Track (Serial No. 382) Spartanburg, South Carolina S&ME Project No. 6235-17-020

028593

4.0 Limitations of Report

This report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practice for specific application to this project. The conclusions contained in this report were based on the applicable standards of our profession in this geographic area at the time this report was prepared. No other warranty, express or implied, is made.

5.0 Closing

S&ME appreciates the opportunity to provide this report to the North Carolina Department of Transportation, Geotechnical Engineering Unit. Please let us know if you have any questions concerning this report.

> DocuSianed by: Greg Lannan 8C4BAC9729DB487

Sincerely,

S&ME, Inc.

Joseph Wilh Williamson, P.E. Gregory J. Canivan, P.E. Joseph William

Project Engineer Technical Principal N.C. Registration No. 042168 N.C. Registration No. 028593

Appendices:

- Appendix I Certificates of Proficiency
- Appendix II Instrumented Rod and Accelerometer Calibration Sheets
- Appendix III Diedrich D-50 Track (SN 382) SPT Energy Measurements Summary Plots and Tables
- Appendix IV SPT Energy Evaluation Form (Field Log)

Appendices

Appendix I

This documents that

Joseph Williamson S&ME

has on October 31, 2017 achieved the rank of

INTERMEDIATE

on the Dynamic Measurement and Analysis Proficiency Test.

The individual identified on this document demonstrated to the degree granted above an understanding of theory, data quality evaluation, interpretation and signal matching for high strain dynamic testing of deep foundations. It is recommended that Individuals at the Intermediate level seek Advanced. Master or Expert levels through additional study within four years of the date of this document.

The ability of the individual named to provide appropriate knowledge and advice on a specific project is not implied or warranted by the Pile Driving Contractors Association or Pile Dynamics, Inc. The Pile Driving Contractors Association or Pile Dynamics, Inc. assumes no liability for foundation testing and analysis work performed by the bearer of this certificate. This certificate can be verified at www.PDAproficiencytest.com.

Steven A. Hall, Executive Director Pile Driving Contractors Association

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Garland Likins, Senior Partner Pile Dynamics, Inc.

No. 2426

 \mathcal{L}

This documents that

Greg Canivan S&ME Inc.

has on October 8, 2014 achieved the rank of

MASTER

on the Dynamic Measurement and Analysis Proficiency Test.

The individual identified on this document demonstrated to the degree granted above an understanding of theory, data quality evaluation, interpretation and signal matching for high strain dynamic testing of deep foundations. It is recommended that individuals at the Master level seek to attain Expert level through additional study within five years of the date of this document

The ability of the individual named to provide appropriate knowledge and advice on a specific project is not implied or warranted by the Pile Driving Contractors Association or Pile Dynamics, Inc. The Pile Driving Contractors Association or Pile Dynamics, Inc. assumes no liability for foundation testing and analysis work performed by the bearer of this certificate. This certificate can be verified at www.PDAproficiencytest.com.

Steven A. Hall, Executive Director Pile Driving Contractors Association

and Lilcino

Garland Likins, President Pile Dynamics, Inc.

No. 721

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Appendix II

Smart Sensor

Smart Chip Programmed By X M. W. on 4 DEC 17 CRC Value 6 A D 7

Smart Sensor

Smart Chip Programmed By 7. M.W. on 4 DEC17 CRC Value 1798

 ϵ

 γ

 \bar{z}

 χ

 \mathcal{R}_1

Bridge Excitation (V)
Shunt Resitor (ohm)

 $_{\rm c}$ – α

 $\sqrt{5}$ 60.4k

Calibrated by: David Burn

Pile Dynamics Inc 30725 Aurora Rd Solon, OH 44139

Traceable to N.I.S.T.

Appendix III

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 1 of 1

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/17/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/17/2019

DIEDRICH D-50 SN382 28.2-29.7 FEET JRW Test date: 2/15/2019 TEST HOLE 2
AR: 1.82 in^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3
EM: 30000 ksi LE: 33.35 ft WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F1 : [102 BW-1] 211.09 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1 F2 : [102 BW-2] 211.37 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

Sample Interval Time: 11.46 seconds.

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 1 of 1

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/17/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/17/2019

DIEDRICH D-50 SN382 48.2-49.7 FEET JRW Test date: 2/15/2019 TEST HOLE 2 AR: 1.82 in^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3 LE: 53.35 ft EM: 30000 ksi WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F1 : [102 BW-1] 211.09 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1 F2 : [102 BW-2] 211.37 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

Sample Interval Time: 14.42 seconds.

Pile Dynamics, Inc. Page 1 of 2

Page 1 of 2 SPT Analyzer Results and the set of 2 SPT Analyzer Results and the SPT Analyzer Results and the SPT Analyzer Results PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/17/2019

DIEDRICH D-50 SN382 53.2-54.7 FEET JRW Test date: 2/15/2019 TEST HOLE 2
AR: 1.82 i $\frac{\text{ln} \gamma}{\text{ln} \gamma}$ SP: 0.492 k/ft3 LE: 58.35 ft EM: 30000 ksi WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F1 : [102 BW-1] 211.09 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1 F2 : [102 BW-2] 211.37 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

BPM: Blows/Minute CSX: Compression Stress Maximum

EMX: Maximum Force CSX: Compression Stress Maximum

DFN: Final Displacement DFN: Final Displacement VMX: Maximum Velocity EFV: Maximum Energy DMX: Maximum Displacement ETR: Energy Transfer Ratio - Rated BL# LP BC BPM FMX VMX DMX CSX DFN EFV ETR ft /6" bpm kips ft/s in ksi in ft-lb % 53.28 6 1.9 47 20.4 1.32 25.8 1.00 328 93.7 53.37 6 41.5 50 21.7 1.31 27.6 1.00 360 102.9 53.45 6 41.4 47 20.6 1.30 26.0 1.00 360 102.8 53.53 6 41.2 46 20.4 1.25 25.3 1.00 357 102.1 53.62 6 42.0 44 19.8 1.17 24.2 1.00 344 98.2 53.70 6 41.7 45 20.6 1.14 24.8 1.00 347 99.0 53.76 8 41.9 42 21.1 1.01 23.2 0.75 338 96.6 53.83 8 41.4 45 21.7 1.01 24.5 0.75 350 99.9 53.89 8 41.7 43 20.9 0.96 23.9 0.75 345 98.7 53.95 8 41.5 41 20.6 0.92 22.8 0.75 341 97.5 54.01 8 41.3 42 20.6 0.94 22.8 0.75 348 99.3 54.08 8 41.4 41 19.8 0.76 22.3 0.75 333 95.1 54.14 8 41.6 41 19.6 0.77 22.5 0.75 335 95.8 54.20 8 40.8 42 19.9 0.83 23.3 0.75 350 100.0 54.25 10 41.3 43 20.1 0.75 23.4 0.60 343 98.1 54.30 10 40.7 41 20.3 0.73 22.7 0.60 343 97.9 54.35 10 41.2 40 20.0 0.73 21.8 0.60 340 97.3 54.40 10 41.0 42 20.1 0.72 22.8 0.60 336 96.0 54.45 10 40.6 41 20.6 0.67 22.8 0.60 343 97.9 54.50 10 41.1 41 20.4 0.71 22.7 0.60 342 97.8 54.55 10 40.8 40 20.2 0.69 22.0 0.60 340 97.0 54.60 10 40.7 40 19.9 0.64 21.9 0.60 333 95.1 54.65 10 41.0 41 20.6 0.64 22.7 0.60 332 95.0 54.70 10 40.8 40 20.1 0.62 22.0 0.60 336 95.9

Sample Interval Time: 33.41 seconds.

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 1 of 2

PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/17/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/17/2019

DIEDRICH D-50 SN382 58.2-59.7 FEET JRW Test date: 2/15/2019 TEST HOLE 2 AR: 1.82 in^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3 LE: 63.35 ft EM: 30000 ksi WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F1 : [102 BW-1] 211.09 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1 F2 : [102 BW-2] 211.37 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

 $\overline{}$

Pile Dynamics, Inc. Page 2 of 2 SPT Analyzer Results PDA-S Ver. 2018.30 - Printed: 2/17/2019

28	58.89	21	41.1	43	19.8	0.51	23.8	0.29	345	98.6
29	58.91	21	41.2	42	19.9	0.51	23.2	0.29	342	97.6
30	58.94	21	41.2	42	20.0	0.51	23.3	0.29	349	99.8
31	58.96	21	41.5	43	20.0	0.49	23.6	0.29	345	98.6
32	58.99	21	41.7	43	20.0	0.49	23.9	0.29	344	98.4
33	59.01	21	41.2	44	20.3	0.50	24.2	0.29	346	98.8
34	59.03	21	41.6	44	20.0	0.49	24.1	0.29	340	97.1
35	59.06	21	41.5	44	20.2	0.50	24.2	0.29	349	99.8
36	59.08	21	41.8	42	19.6	0.49	22.9	0.29	343	97.9
37	59.10	21	41.6	44	20.3	0.50	24.1	0.29	351	100.2
38	59.13	21	42.0	44	20.2	0.50	24.1	0.29	344	98.4
39	59.15	21	41.8	43	20.0	0.50	23.6	0.29	340	97.2
40	59.18	21	41.8	43	20.0	0.51	23.6	0.29	350	99.9
41	59.20	21	41.5	41	19.5	0.49	22.5	0.29	340	97.2
42	59.22	24	41.9	43	20.1	0.50	23.8	0.25	348	99.4
43	59.24	24	42.0	42	19.6	0.48	22.8	0.25	342	97.7
44	59.26	24	41.7	43	19.8	0.47	23.4	0.25	344	98.2
45	59.28	24	41.8	42	19.7	0.47	23.1	0.25	345	98.7
46	59.30	24	41.9	45	20.5	0.47	24.6	0.25	355	101.4
47	59.33	24	42.0	44	20.4	0.45	24.1	0.25	344	98.3
48	59.35	24	41.9	44	20.5	0.46	24.1	0.25	351	100.3
49	59.37	24	41.8	43	20.4	0.47	23.9	0.25	343	98.1
50	59.39	24	42.0	45	20.5	0.48	24.6	0.25	349	99.8
51	59.41	24	41.5	44	20.6	0.47	24.4	0.25	354	101.1
52	59.43	24	42.3	44	20.3	0.47	24.1	0.25	350	100.1
53	59.45	24	42.0	44	20.4	0.48	24.2	0.25	355	101.4
54	59.47	24	42.0	44	20.6	0.48	24.3	0.25	352	100.5
55	59.49	24	41.9	43	20.1	0.47	23.5	0.25	350	99.9
56	59.51	24	41.9	43	20.2	0.47	23.5	0.25	344	98.2
57	59.53	24	42.2	45	20.9	0.49	24.9	0.25	353	101.0
58	59.55	24	41.9	43	20.4	0.47	23.7	0.25	344	98.3
59	59.58	24	42.0	43	20.4	0.49	23.4	0.25	353	100.8
60	59.60	24	42.0	42	20.5	0.47	23.3	0.25	345	98.4
61	59.62	24	42.2	45	20.9	0.49	24.6	0.25	351	100.2
62	59.64	24	42.2	41	20.1	0.47	22.7	0.25	335	95.6
63	59.66	24	41.8	44	21.0	0.48	24.3	0.25	344	98.3
64	59.68	24	42.2	43	20.6	0.48	23.4	0.25	342	97.7
65	59.70	24	41.9	43	20.9	0.48	23.7	0.25	348	99.5
	Average Std Dev Maximum		41.7	$\overline{43}$	20.2	0.49	23.7	0.27	347	99.1
			0.4	$\mathbf{1}$	0.4	0.02	0.5	0.02	5	1.3
			42.3	45	21.0	0.52	24.9	0.29	355	101.4
		Minimum	40.6	41	19.5	0.45	22.5	0.25	335	95.6
					N-value: 45					

Sample Interval Time: 91.98 seconds.

Summary of SPT Test Results

Appendix IV

SPT Energy Evaluation Form

Notes:

NOTE: (1) Note any unusual hammer operating conditions that affect the hammer performance, or changes in operating conditions (e.g. veritcality, weather, or lubrication between trials). (2) Note any changes in rod diameter along drill string and record locations of short rod sections.

Wilh ×, brach Prepared By (print/signature) Date

2/15/2019

Betts- CME 75 (SN 164447)

Betts Environmental 361 Airport Square Adel, Georgia 31620

April 18, 2019

Offices In: · Daytona Beach, FL · Fort Myers, FL · Fort Pierce, FL · Gainesville, FL · Jacksonville, FL · Leesburg, FL · Miami, FL · Norcross, GA · Ocala, FL • Orlando, FL · Palm Coast, FL · Panama City, FL · Pensacola, FL · Rockledge, FL · Sarasota, FL · St. Augustine, FL · Tampa, FL • West Palm Beach, FL

Subject**: Dynamic Testing Report SPT Hammer Energy Measurement- CME-75 (S/N 164447)** 156 N Johnson Street Newborn, Georgia 30056 UES Project 0950.1900024.0000

UES has completed the high strain dynamic (i.e. PDA) testing for the Soil Test Boring drill rig designated CME-75 in use at the above referenced project. Dynamic monitoring was conducted during performance of a soil test boring in order to determine energy transferred by the Standard Penetration Test hammer to the drill rods during split spoon sampling. The dynamic testing was conducted using the Pile Driving AnalyzerTM (PDA) Model 8G, which records, digitizes, and processes the force and acceleration signals. The dynamic testing was carried out in accordance with ASTM D4945 *Standard Test Method for High Strain Dynamic Testing of Piles and* ASTM D4633 *Standard Test Method for Energy Measurement for Dynamic Penetrometers.*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Overview

The SPT hammer calibration testing was performed on site at the property located at 156 N Johnson Street in Newborn, Georgia. The SPT hammer calibration testing was performed at five (5) depths during sampling of an SPT Test Boring on April 12, 2019. The SPT hammer calibration testing was performed the following sampling depths; 33.5 to 35.0 feet (Sample 1), 38.5 to 40.0 feet (Sample 2), 43.5 to 45.0 feet (Sample 3), 48.5 to 50.0 feet (Sample 4), and 53.5 to 55.0 feet (Sample 5).

SPT Testing Overview

Numerous technical publications exist regarding the Standard Penetration Test (SPT). Of these publications, ASTM D1586 *Standard Test Method for Penetration Test and Split-Barrel Sampling of Soils* is considered to be the industry standard. This standard was last approved in January, 1999. In addition, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers Engineering Technical Letter (ETL) 1110-1-138 (dated March, 1988) is also a commonly used standard reference.

The Standard Penetration Test (SPT) consists of a drive weight assembly (i.e. hammer and anvil), split spoon sampler, and drill rods. The drive weight system consists of a 140 lb hammer raised by a number of mechanical means. The split spoon sampler is placed at the end of the drill rods in a borehole. The 140 lb hammer is raised 30 inches and then dropped to impact the drill rods. This procedure is repeated until the sampler has penetrated 18 inches into the underlying soil. The number of blows required to advance the split spoon sampler 12 inches is recorded as the "N" value for the test. Typically, the test is performed every $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ft for the upper 10 ft of a boring and then at 5 ft intervals thereafter. The standard dimensions of the split spoon sampler are shown in Figure 1, while a typical SPT setup is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 1. Split Spoon Sampler (after Rogers, 2004, adapted from ASTM D1586).

There are three (3) types of SPT hammers currently used in drilling practice today: the donut hammer, the automatic hammer, and the safety hammer. In addition, there are three (3) main types of hammer lifting mechanisms: cathead-rope system, spooling wench, or chain driven systems. Drill rods vary from AW (1 $\frac{3}{4}$ in O.D.) to NW (2 5/8 in O.D.), with drill rod lengths varying between 2 ft to 10 ft increments. Methods for advancing boreholes for the SPT test include mud rotary drilling, hollow stem augers, and water drilling with steel casing.

Figure 2. Typical SPT Setup.

SPT Energy Measurements

A number of factors can influence the SPT test and the subsequent N value. These include but are not limited to the following:

- Hammer
- Hammer Lifting System
- Operator Field Procedures
- Drill Rod Diameter and Length
- Borehole Drilling Method and Size
- Spilt Spoon Sampler

A graphical representation of various SPT system variables is provided in Figure 3.

CME-75 (S/N 164447)

Figure 3. SPT Testing System Variables (after Lamb, 1997).

In order to account for these system variables, standardized SPT corrections have been developed. The corrected blow count is referred to as the N_{60} value. The N_{60} value is derived from the assumed efficiency of the original SPT (Mohr) hammer (Rogers, 2004). The following equation defines N_{60} values:

$$
N_{60} = C_{60}C_bC_sC_rN
$$

Where:

 N_{60} = SPT N Value corrected for field procedures and apparatus

 C_{60} = Hammer Efficiency Correction

 C_b = Borehole Diameter Correction

 C_s = Sample Barrel Correction

 C_r = Rod Length Correction

 $N = Raw SPT value$

In addition, the N value is influenced by the overburden pressure. Laio and Whitman (1986) proposed the following overburden correction for N_{60} , termed $(N_1)_{60}$:

$$
(N_1)_{60} = N_{60} \frac{\sqrt{2000 \, psf}}{\sigma'_{v}}
$$

SPT Energy Report The Energy Report Constant Consta CME-75 (S/N 164447) April 18, 2018 Newborn, FL Page 5 of 9

Where: σ'_{v} = Effective vertical overburden stress

The hammer efficiency correction (C_{60}) is based on the Energy Transfer Efficiency (ER_i) and the 60% of the theoretical transferred hammer energy of 350 ft-lbs (i.e. 140 lbs multiplied by a 30 inch drop). The following equations show the derivation of C_{60} :

$$
ER_i = \frac{E_i}{E_{th}}
$$

Where:

 $ER_i = Energy Transfer Efficiency$ E_i = Measured Transferred Energy E_{th} = Theoretical Transferred Energy (i.e. 350 ft-lb)

and

$$
C_{60} = \frac{ER_i}{60\%}
$$

For liquefaction analysis using SPT N values, transferred energy measurements are required to determine $(N_1)_{60}$. The methods for determining the normalized penetration resistance for liquefaction potential are presented in ASTM D6066 *Standard Practice for Determining the Normalized Penetration Resistance of Sands for Evaluation of Liquefaction Potential.*

Transferred (i.e. delivered) energy measurements of SPT testing (i.e. the energy delivered by the hammer to the drill rods) are commonly taken in engineering practice through the use of several types of instruments. The most common of these is the Pile Driving Analyzer (PDA), developed and marketed by Pile Dynamics Inc. of Cleveland, Ohio. The PDA is a computer fitted with a data acquisition and a signal conditioning system and is typically used to conduct high strain dynamic load testing of driven piles, which is analogous to the SPT test. Strain gages and accelerometers which are connected to the PDA are attached to the pile or drill rods (for SPT testing). During pile driving or SPT testing, the strain and acceleration signals are recorded and processed for each hammer blow. The strain signal is converted to a force record and the acceleration signal is converted to a velocity record. The PDA saves selected hammer blows containing this information to disk and determines the compressive stresses, displacement, and

energy at the point of measurement (pile top). The maximum transferred energy (EMX) is derived from the dynamic measurements using the following equation:

$$
EMX = \int_{b}^{a} F(t)V(t)dt
$$

Where:

a = Time Energy Transfer Begins

b = Time Energy Transfer End

 $F = Force$

 $V = Velocity$

 $t = Time$

Refer to Abou-matar and Goble (1997) for additional details of SPT energy measurements using the PDA. Literature regarding the PDA is provided in the Appendix.

SPT Rig/Hammer System

The tested drill rig is designated CME-75 and is manufactured by Central Mine Equipment, Inc. The drill rig was parked on existing grade in a grassy area for this project. We understand that the drill rig was built on October 29, 1984 and is identified with Serial Number 164447. The CME-75 drill rig is fitted with an automatically operated hammer system. The drill rig and SPT hammer were operated by Mr. Chris Golden.

The method of drilling for the rig during testing was hollow stem auger (HSA), with Standard Penetration Testing being performed with AWJ drill rods. AWJ drill rod sections have nominal outside diameter of 1-5/8 inches and wall thickness of 3/16 inches. The instrumented subassembly (i.e. where gauges were attached) consisted of a two feet long section of AWJ rod that was threaded into the top drill rod at each testing interval.

Dynamic Load Test Instrumentation

The dynamic pile testing instrumentation consisted of a 2-feet long AWJ instrumented drill rod which is fitted with two strain gauges by Pile Dynamic Inc., in addition two (2) accelerometer transducers are attached a distance of approximately 1 foot below the top (i.e. in the center) of a two feet long instrumented AWJ drill rod. One strain gauge and one accelerometer are on opposite faces of the sub-assembly to minimize the effects of uneven hammer impact and rod bending.

A Model 8G Pile Driving Analyzer[™] (PDA), manufactured by Pile Dynamics Inc., was used to collect the instrumentation data. The PDA is a computer fitted with a data acquisition and a signal conditioning system. During driving, the strain and acceleration signals are recorded and processed for each hammer blow. The strain signal is converted to a force record and the acceleration signal is converted to a velocity record. The sampling frequency used during the SPT Energy Measurement Testing was 20,000 hertz (20 kHz). The PDA saves selected hammer blows containing this information to disk and determines the energy at the point of measurement.

DYNAMIC TESTING RESULTS

Hammer Performance

The transferred energy monitored during the sampling is summarized in Table 1. Note that the values are those recorded during the second and third 6-inch sampling interval at each depth. Hammer Efficiency is based on measured transferred energy divided by the energy generated with a 140 pound hammer dropping 30 inches (0.35 kip-ft).

Table 1. CME-75 Rig SPT Energy Measurement Summary

The following figure shows the SPT rig tested.

Figure 1: SPT drill rig.

SPT Energy Report CME-75 (S/N 164447) Newborn, FL

UES Project No. 0950.1900024.0000 April 18, 2018 Page 9 of 9

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is our opinion that the SPT hammer on the drill rig designated CME-75 is operating within a normal range for a semi-automatic SPT hammer.

UES appreciates the opportunity to provide this report. This report is for the sole use of this project and should not be relied upon otherwise. Should the project change significantly, we can review and modify our recommendations as needed. If you have questions concerning the contents herein, please contact us.

Sincerely,

VNIVERSAL ENGINEERING SCIENCES, INC. Universal Florida Certificate of Authorization No. 549

Joshua C. Adams

Deep Foundation Engineer **HSDPT Certified - Master Level**

Attachments: PDA Data Output (PDIPLOT Graphs and Tables)

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results **PEDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3** - Printed 18-April-2019

PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Total number of blows analyzed: 11

BL# Sensors

1-11 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.02); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.02); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.98); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.98)

BL# Comments

11 End of Set 1. n=10

Time Summary

Drive 13 seconds 1:46 PM - 1:46 PM BN 1 - 11

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Total number of blows analyzed: 31

BL# Sensors

1-31 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.12); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.12); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.88); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.88)

Georgia SPT - SPT 2 Sample 2
OP: NVT

BL# Comments

31 end of set 2. N=28

Time Summary

Drive 41 seconds 1:56 PM - 1:56 PM BN 1 - 31

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results **PEDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3** - Printed 18-April-2019 PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Rod of area 1.18 square inches on CME 75
Date: 12-April-2019

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Total number of blows analyzed: 36

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results **PEDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3** - Printed 18-April-2019 PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Georgia SPT - SPT 2 Sample 3 Rod of area 1.18 square inches on CME 75
OP: NVT Date: 12-April-2019 Date: 12-April-2019

BL# Sensors

1-36 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.12); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.12); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.88); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.88)

BL# Comments

36 End of Set 3. n=33

Time Summary

Drive 49 seconds 2:14 PM - 2:14 PM BN 1 - 36

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results **PEDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3** - Printed 18-April-2019 PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

I otal number of blows analyzed: 45

BL# Sensors

1-45 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.12); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.12); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.88); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.88)

BL# Comments

45 end of set 4. n=39

Time Summary

Drive 1 minute 2 seconds 2:27 PM - 2:28 PM BN 1 - 45

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results **PEDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3** - Printed 18-April-2019 PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Georgia SPT - SPT 2 Sample 5 Rod of area 1.18 square inches on CME 75

Total number of blows analyzed: 71

BL# Sensors

1-71 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.12); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.12); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.88); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.88)

BL# Comments

71 end of set 5. n=51

Time Summary

Drive 1 minute 41 seconds 2:42 PM - 2:43 PM BN 1 - 71

Betts- CME 55 (SN 54005)

Betts Environmental 361 Airport Square Adel, Georgia 31620

April 18, 2019

Offices In: · Daytona Beach, FL · Fort Myers, FL · Fort Pierce, FL · Gainesville, FL · Jacksonville, FL · Leesburg, FL · Miami, FL · Norcross, GA · Ocala, FL • Orlando, FL · Palm Coast, FL · Panama City, FL · Pensacola, FL · Rockledge, FL · Sarasota, FL · St. Augustine, FL · Tampa, FL · West Palm Beach, FL

Subject**: Dynamic Testing Report SPT Hammer Energy Measurement- CME-55 (S/N 54005)** 156 N Johnson Street Newborn, Georgia 30056 UES Project 0950.1900024.0000

UES has completed the high strain dynamic (i.e. PDA) testing for the Soil Test Boring drill rig designated CME-55 in use at the above referenced project. Dynamic monitoring was conducted during performance of a soil test boring in order to determine energy transferred by the Standard Penetration Test hammer to the drill rods during split spoon sampling. The dynamic testing was conducted using the Pile Driving AnalyzerTM (PDA) Model 8G, which records, digitizes, and processes the force and acceleration signals. The dynamic testing was carried out in accordance with ASTM D4945 *Standard Test Method for High Strain Dynamic Testing of Piles and* ASTM D4633 *Standard Test Method for Energy Measurement for Dynamic Penetrometers.*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Overview

The SPT hammer calibration testing was performed on site at the property located at 156 N Johnson Street in Newborn, Georgia. The SPT hammer calibration testing was performed at seven (7) depths during sampling of an SPT Test Boring on April 12, 2019. The SPT hammer calibration testing was performed the following sampling depths; 6.5 to 8.0 feet (Sample 1), 12.0 to 13.5 feet (Sample 2), 18.5 to 20.0 feet (Sample 3), 23.5 to 25.0 feet (Sample 4), 33.5 to 35.0 feet (Sample 5), 38.5 to 40.0 feet (Sample 6), and 43.5 to 45.0 feet (Sample 7).

SPT Testing Overview

Numerous technical publications exist regarding the Standard Penetration Test (SPT). Of these publications, ASTM D1586 *Standard Test Method for Penetration Test and Split-Barrel Sampling of Soils* is considered to be the industry standard. This standard was last approved in January, 1999. In addition, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers Engineering Technical Letter (ETL) 1110-1-138 (dated March, 1988) is also a commonly used standard reference.

The Standard Penetration Test (SPT) consists of a drive weight assembly (i.e. hammer and anvil), split spoon sampler, and drill rods. The drive weight system consists of a 140 lb hammer raised by a number of mechanical means. The split spoon sampler is placed at the end of the drill rods in a borehole. The 140 lb hammer is raised 30 inches and then dropped to impact the drill rods. This procedure is repeated until the sampler has penetrated 18 inches into the underlying soil. The number of blows required to advance the split spoon sampler 12 inches is recorded as the "N" value for the test. Typically, the test is performed every $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ft for the upper 10 ft of a boring and then at 5 ft intervals thereafter. The standard dimensions of the split spoon sampler are shown in Figure 1, while a typical SPT setup is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 1. Split Spoon Sampler (after Rogers, 2004, adapted from ASTM D1586).

There are three (3) types of SPT hammers currently used in drilling practice today: the donut hammer, the automatic hammer, and the safety hammer. In addition, there are three (3) main types of hammer lifting mechanisms: cathead-rope system, spooling wench, or chain driven systems. Drill rods vary from AW $(1\frac{3}{4}$ in O.D.) to NW $(2\frac{5}{8})$ in O.D.), with drill rod lengths varying between 2 ft to 10 ft increments. Methods for advancing boreholes for the SPT test include mud rotary drilling, hollow stem augers, and water drilling with steel casing.

Figure 2. Typical SPT Setup.

SPT Energy Measurements

A number of factors can influence the SPT test and the subsequent N value. These include but are not limited to the following:

- Hammer
- Hammer Lifting System
- Operator Field Procedures
- Drill Rod Diameter and Length
- Borehole Drilling Method and Size
- Spilt Spoon Sampler

A graphical representation of various SPT system variables is provided in Figure 3.

Figure 3. SPT Testing System Variables (after Lamb, 1997).

In order to account for these system variables, standardized SPT corrections have been developed. The corrected blow count is referred to as the N_{60} value. The N_{60} value is derived from the assumed efficiency of the original SPT (Mohr) hammer (Rogers, 2004). The following equation defines N_{60} values:

$$
N_{60} = C_{60}C_bC_sC_rN
$$

Where:

 N_{60} = SPT N Value corrected for field procedures and apparatus

 C_{60} = Hammer Efficiency Correction

 C_b = Borehole Diameter Correction

 C_s = Sample Barrel Correction

 C_r = Rod Length Correction

 $N =$ Raw SPT value

In addition, the N value is influenced by the overburden pressure. Laio and Whitman (1986) proposed the following overburden correction for N_{60} , termed $(N_1)_{60}$.

$$
(N_1)_{60} = N_{60} \frac{\sqrt{2000 \, psf}}{\sigma'_{v}}
$$

Where: σ'_{v} = Effective vertical overburden stress

The hammer efficiency correction (C_{60}) is based on the Energy Transfer Efficiency (ER_i) and the 60% of the theoretical transferred hammer energy of 350 ft-lbs (i.e. 140 lbs multiplied by a 30 inch drop). The following equations show the derivation of C_{60} :

$$
ER_i = \frac{E_i}{E_{th}}
$$

Where:

 $ER_i = Energy Transfer Efficiency$ E_i = Measured Transferred Energy E_{th} = Theoretical Transferred Energy (i.e. 350 ft-lb)

and

$$
C_{60} = \frac{ER_i}{60\%}
$$

For liquefaction analysis using SPT N values, transferred energy measurements are required to determine $(N_1)_{60}$. The methods for determining the normalized penetration resistance for liquefaction potential are presented in ASTM D6066 *Standard Practice for Determining the Normalized Penetration Resistance of Sands for Evaluation of Liquefaction Potential.*

Transferred (i.e. delivered) energy measurements of SPT testing (i.e. the energy delivered by the hammer to the drill rods) are commonly taken in engineering practice through the use of several types of instruments. The most common of these is the Pile Driving Analyzer (PDA), developed and marketed by Pile Dynamics Inc. of Cleveland, Ohio. The PDA is a computer fitted with a data acquisition and a signal conditioning system and is typically used to conduct high strain dynamic load testing of driven piles, which is analogous to the SPT test. Strain gages and accelerometers which are connected to the PDA are attached to the pile or drill rods (for SPT testing). During pile driving or SPT testing, the strain and acceleration signals are recorded and processed for each hammer blow. The strain signal is converted to a force record and the acceleration signal is converted to a velocity record. The PDA saves selected hammer blows containing this information to disk and determines the compressive stresses, displacement, and

energy at the point of measurement (pile top). The maximum transferred energy (EMX) is derived from the dynamic measurements using the following equation:

$$
EMX = \int_{b}^{a} F(t)V(t)dt
$$

Where:

- a = Time Energy Transfer Begins
- b = Time Energy Transfer End

 $F = Force$

 $V =$ Velocity

 $t = Time$

Refer to Abou-matar and Goble (1997) for additional details of SPT energy measurements using the PDA. Literature regarding the PDA is provided in the Appendix.

SPT Rig/Hammer System

The tested drill rig is designated CME-55 and is manufactured by Central Mine Equipment, Inc. The drill rig was parked on existing grade in a grassy area for this project. We understand that the drill rig was built on July 29, 1970 and is identified with Serial Number 54005. The CME-55 drill rig is fitted with an automatically operated hammer system. The drill rig and SPT hammer were operated by Mr. Chris Golden.

The method of drilling for the rig during testing was hollow stem auger (HSA), with Standard Penetration Testing being performed with AWJ drill rods. AWJ drill rod sections have nominal outside diameter of 1-5/8 inches and wall thickness of 3/16 inches. The instrumented subassembly (i.e. where gauges were attached) consisted of a two feet long section of AWJ rod that was threaded into the top drill rod at each testing interval.

Dynamic Load Test Instrumentation

The dynamic pile testing instrumentation consisted of a 2-feet long AWJ instrumented drill rod which is fitted with two strain gauges by Pile Dynamic Inc., in addition two (2) accelerometer transducers are attached a distance of approximately 1 foot below the top (i.e. in the center) of a two feet long instrumented AWJ drill rod. One strain gauge and one accelerometer are on opposite faces of the sub-assembly to minimize the effects of uneven hammer impact and rod bending.

A Model 8G Pile Driving Analyzer[™] (PDA), manufactured by Pile Dynamics Inc., was used to collect the instrumentation data. The PDA is a computer fitted with a data acquisition and a

signal conditioning system. During driving, the strain and acceleration signals are recorded and processed for each hammer blow. The strain signal is converted to a force record and the acceleration signal is converted to a velocity record. The sampling frequency used during the SPT Energy Measurement Testing was 20,000 hertz (20 kHz). The PDA saves selected hammer blows containing this information to disk and determines the energy at the point of measurement.

DYNAMIC TESTING RESULTS

Hammer Performance

The transferred energy monitored during the sampling is summarized in Table 1. Note that the values are those recorded during the second and third 6-inch sampling interval at each depth. Hammer Efficiency is based on measured transferred energy divided by the energy generated with a 140 pound hammer dropping 30 inches (0.35 kip-ft).

Table 1. CME-55 Rig SPT Energy Measurement Summary

CME-55 (S/N 54005) Newborn, FL

The following figure shows the SPT rig tested.

Figure 1: SPT drill rig.

SPT Energy Report CME-55 (S/N 54005) Newborn, FL

UES Project No. 0950.1900024.0000 April 18, 2018 Page 9 of 9

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is our opinion that the SPT hammer on the drill rig designated CME-55 is operating within a normal range for a semi-automatic SPT hammer.

UES appreciates the opportunity to provide this report. This report is for the sole use of this project and should not be relied upon otherwise. Should the project change significantly, we can review and modify our recommendations as needed. If you have questions concerning the contents herein, please contact us.

Sincerely,

UNIVERSAL ENGINEERING SCIENCES, INC.

Universal Florida Certificate of Authorization No. 549

Joshua^VC. Adams

Deep Foundation Engineer HSDPT Certified - Master Level

Attachments: PDA Data Output (PDIPLOT Graphs and Tables)

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results PERENTE: PERENTE 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019 PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

BL# Sensors

1-10 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.10); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.10); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.90); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.90)

BL# Comments

10 END of Drive 1

Time Summary

Drive 9 seconds 8:44 AM - 8:44 AM BN 1 - 10

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results PERENTE: PERENTE 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Total number of blows analyzed: 12

BL# Sensors

1-12 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.12); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.12); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.88); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.88)

BL# Comments

12 END of Set 2

Time Summary

Drive 10 seconds 8:59 AM - 8:59 AM BN 1 - 12

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results PERENTE: PERENTE 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Total number of blows analyzed: 12

BL# Sensors

1-12 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.11); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.11); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.89); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.89)

BL# Comments

12 end of set 3

Time Summary

Drive 11 seconds 9:08 AM - 9:09 AM BN 1 - 12

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results PERENTE: PERENTE 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Total number of blows analyzed: 12

BL# Sensors

1-12 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.15); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.15); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.85); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.85)

BL# Comments

11 end of set 4. N=9

Time Summary

Drive 11 seconds 9:20 AM - 9:20 AM BN 1 - 12

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results Test started: 12-April-2019

PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Total number of blows analyzed: 28

BL# Sensors

1-28 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.12); F2: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.12); A1: [55385] 915.0 (0.88); A2: [50148] 1065.0 (0.88)

BL# Comments

28 ;End of Set 5. N=15

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. Page 2 Case Method & iCAP® Results PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Georgia SPT - SPT 1 Sample 5 Rod of area 1.18 square inches OP: NVT Date: 12-April-2019

Time Summary

Drive 26 seconds 9:34 AM - 9:34 AM BN 1 - 28

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. - PDIPLOT2 Ver 2017.2.58.3 - Case Method & iCAP® Results

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results PERENTE: PERENTE 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Total number of blows analyzed: 15

BL# Sensors

1-15 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.12); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.12); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.88); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.88)

BL# Comments

14 End of Set 6. N=12

Time Summary

Drive 14 seconds 9:44 AM - 9:44 AM BN 1 - 15

Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
Case Method & iCAP® Results PERENTE: PERENTE 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

PDIPLOT2 2017.2.58.3 - Printed 18-April-2019

Total number of blows analyzed: 19

BL# Sensors

1-19 F1: [357AWJ1] 212.0 (1.10); F4: [357AWJ2] 211.2 (1.10); A2: [55385] 915.0 (0.90); A3: [50148] 1065.0 (0.90)

BL# Comments

19 End of Set 7. N=16

Time Summary

Drive 18 seconds 9:53 AM - 9:54 AM BN 1 - 19

Tri-State- CME 45 (SN 31692402)

S &

Report of SPT Energy Measurements Tri-State CME 45 Barge Rig Roswell, Georgia S&ME Project No. 1280-18-101

NOVA Engineering and Environmental, LLC 3900 Kennesaw 75 Parkway, Suite 100 Kennesaw, Georgia 30144

PREPARED BY:

S&ME, Inc. 4350 River Green Parkway, Suite 200 Duluth, Georgia 30096

December 19, 2019

December 19, 2019

NOVA Engineering and Environmental, LLC 3900 Kennesaw 75 Parkway, Suite 100 Kennesaw, Georgia 30144

Attention: Mr. Eric Tay, P.E.

Reference: **Report of SPT Energy Measurements Tri-State CME 45 Barge Rig** Roswell, Georgia S&ME Project No. 1280-18-101

Dear Mr. Tay:

S&ME, Inc. (S&ME) completed the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) energy measurements on the automatic hammer mounted on Tri-State Drilling's CME 45 barge-mounted drill rig. This service was performed by Mr. Adam Jennings of S&ME on December 17, 2019, following the field exploration on the State Route 400 Major Mobility Improvement Project (MMIP) in Atlanta, Georgia. SPT energy testing was performed in general accordance with ASTM D4633 and pursuant to S&ME Proposal No. 12-1800360 dated August 27, 2018. The testing procedures, equipment used during testing, and detailed results are presented in this report.

1.0 Dynamic Testing Methodology

Testing was performed using a model PAX (Serial No. 3733L) Pile Driving Analyzer™ (PDA) manufactured by Pile Dynamics, Inc. The PDA was used to record and interpret data from two piezoresistive accelerometers (Serial Nos. K10181 and K10182) bolted to an approximately 2-foot long AWJ drill rod (SN203) internally instrumented with two strain transducers. The instrumented AWJ drill rod has a cross-sectional area of 1.19 square inches, an outside diameter of approximately 1.75 inches, and an inside diameter of approximately 1.25 inches at the gauge location. The accelerometers and strain gauges, which are mounted on opposing axes near the middle of the instrumented rod, monitor acceleration and strain for each hammer blow. The analyzer converts the data to velocities and forces and computes the maximum transferred hammer energies with the "EFV" method described in ASTM D4633. Preliminary results are recorded and displayed in real time for each blow. Calibration sheets for the accelerometers and the instrumented rod are included in the Appendix.

Roswell, Georgia S&ME Project No. 1280-18-101

2.0 Testing and Observations

On December 17, 2019, we perform high-strain dynamic testing during SPT sampling on the CME 45 bargemounted drill rig operated by Mr. Sawyer Blevins with Tri-State Drilling. The measurements were taken during drilling of a test hole in Tri-State Drilling's yard in Roswell, Georgia. SPT energy measurements were recorded during three intervals at depths of approximately 28½, 32, and 33½ ft below the top of the barge which was sitting on the ground. The information presented in the tables below summarizes the equipment tested and tooling used during the SPT energy measurements.

Table 2-1: Drill Rig Information

Table 2-2: Instrumented Rod Information

3.0 Dynamic Testing Results

The total rod length from the instrumentation to the tip of the split-spoon sampler was determined by adding 3.4 ft to the required drill rod length at each sample depth. Based on the test data, the automatic hammer on the CME 45 barge-mounted drill rig operated at a rate of about 55 to 56 blows per minute (bpm) during dynamic testing. The measured transferred hammer energy (EFV) of all the individual blows ranged from 278 to 348 ft-lbs, which corresponds to Energy Transfer Ratio (ETR) values of 79.3 to 99.3%, respectively. The SPT Energy Measurement Data Summary tables in the Appendix present the test data from every hammer blow at each sampling interval, along with representative force and velocity traces for each test interval. The reported blow counts, obtained by the drill rig personnel, and a summary of the test data and average computed hammer energy and transfer ratio values are provided in Table 3-1. Plots and tables of the following are also included in the Appendix and present the test data with depth for each test interval:

Report of SPT Energy Measurements Tri-State CME 45 Barge Rig

Roswell, Georgia S&ME Project No. 1280-18-101

Penetration vs. BLC

 Penetration vs. FMX Penetration vs. EFV

Penetration vs. CSX

 Penetration vs. VMX Penetration vs. ETR

- Average ETR vs. Rod Length
- ETR vs. Rod Length

Table 3-1: Summary of Dynamic Testing Results

The average hammer rate, transferred energy, and transfer ratio were calculated for each depth interval. Per ASTM D4633, only the blows from the final foot of each sample interval (i.e. the blows that determine the N-value) were included when computing the average values shown in Table 3-1. The overall average transferred hammer energy for the automatic hammer on the CME 45 barge-mounted drill rig (for all the depth intervals tested) was 328 foot-pounds, with an average ETR of 93.7%.

4.0 Limitations of Report

This report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practice for specific application to this project. The conclusions contained in this report were based on the applicable standards of our profession in this geographic area at the time this report was prepared. No other warranty, express or implied, is made.

Report of SPT Energy Measurements Tri-State CME 45 Barge Rig

Roswell, Georgia S&ME Project No. 1280-18-101

5.0 Closing

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service on this project. Please let us know if you have any questions concerning this report.

Sincerely,

S&ME, Inc.

R. 12

R. Heath Forbes, P.E. (SC) The South of the Music of A. Doubrava, P.E. Project Engineer Vice President / Senior Engineer hforbes@smeinc.com in its interest of the inter

Appendices:

- Appendix I Tri-State CME 45 Barge Rig SPT Energy Measurements Summary Plots and Tables
- Appendix II Instrumented Rod and Accelerometer Calibration Sheets

Appendices

1 - Blow count = 50 blows over 3 in.
Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 1 of 3

PDA-S Ver. 2019.30.82 - Printed: 12/19/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2019.30.82 - Printed: 12/19/2019

Tri-State CME 45 Barge Rig 28.5 to 30.0 ft JAJ Test date: 12/17/2019 Test Hole
AR: 1.19 in^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3
ft EM: 30000 ksi LE: 33.05 ft EM: 20000 ksi WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 214.45 PDICAL (1) FF6 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF6

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 214.31 PDICAL (1) FF6 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF6

Pile Dynamics, Inc. Page 2 of 3 SPT Analyzer Results PDA-S Ver. 2019.30.82 - Printed: 12/19/2019

Sample Interval Time: 24.69 seconds.

Summary of SPT Test Results

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 1 of 3

PDA-S Ver. 2019.30.82 - Printed: 12/19/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2019.30.82 - Printed: 12/19/2019

Tri-State CME 45 Barge Rig 32.0 to 33.5 ft 32. JAJ Test date: 12/17/2019 Test Hole
AR: 1.19 in^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3
ft EM: 30000 ksi LE: 35.40 ft WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 214.31 PDICAL (1) FF1 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1 F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 214.45 PDICAL (1) FF1 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF1

Pile Dynamics, Inc. Page 2 of 3 SPT Analyzer Results PDA-S Ver. 2019.30.82 - Printed: 12/19/2019

N-value: 39

Sample Interval Time: 48.39 seconds.

Summary of SPT Test Results

Pile Dynamics, Inc.

Page 1 of 3

PDA-S Ver. 2019.30.82 - Printed: 12/19/2019 PDA-S Ver. 2019.30.82 - Printed: 12/19/2019

Tri-State CME 45 Barge Rig 33.5 to 35.0 ft JAJ Test date: 12/17/2019 Test Hole
AR: 1.19 in^2 SP: 0.492 k/ft3
ft EM: 30000 ksi LE: 38.40 ft WS: 16807.9 ft/s

F1 : [203 AWJ-1] 214.31 PDICAL (1) FF4 A1 (PR): [K10181] 356 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF4 F2 : [203 AWJ-2] 214.45 PDICAL (1) FF4 A2 (PR): [K10182] 368 mv/6.4v/5000g (1) VF4

 $\frac{1}{2}$

Sample Interval Time: 63.51 seconds.

Summary of SPT Test Results

Smart Sensor

Smart Chip Programmed By X M. W. on 4 DEC 17 CRC Value 6 A D 7

Smart Sensor

Smart Chip Programmed By 7. M.W. on 4 DEC17 CRC Value 1798

 $\bar{\star}$

Bridge Excitation (V)
Shunt Resitor (ohm)

 $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{r} = 0$

 $\mathbf 5$ 60.4k

ø. .
W

<u>e</u>ffects 'an Calibrated by: __
Calibrated Date: Л 2/26/2019

Pile Dynamics Inc
30725 Aurora Rd
Solon, OH 44139

Traceable to N.I.S.T.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT THIS GEOTECHNICAL-ENGINEERING REPORT

Geotechnical-Engineering Report Important Information about This

Subsurface problems are a principal cause of construction delays, cost overruns, claims, and disputes.

While you cannot eliminate all such risks, you can manage them. The following information is provided to help.

The Geoprofessional Business Association (GBA) has prepared this advisory to help you – assumedly a client representative – interpret and apply this geotechnical-engineering report as effectively as possible. In that way, clients can benefit from a lowered exposure to the subsurface problems that, for decades, have been a principal cause of construction delays, cost overruns, claims, and disputes. If you have questions or want more information about any of the issues discussed below, contact your GBA-member geotechnical engineer. Active involvement in the Geoprofessional Business Association exposes geotechnical engineers to a wide array of risk-confrontation techniques that can be of genuine benefit for everyone involved with a construction project.

Geotechnical-Engineering Services Are Performed for Specific Purposes, Persons, and Projects

Geotechnical engineers structure their services to meet the specific needs of their clients. A geotechnical-engineering study conducted for a given civil engineer will not likely meet the needs of a civilworks constructor or even a different civil engineer. Because each geotechnical-engineering study is unique, each geotechnicalengineering report is unique, prepared *solely* for the client. *Those who rely on a geotechnical-engineering report prepared for a different client can be seriously misled*. No one except authorized client representatives should rely on this geotechnical-engineering report without first conferring with the geotechnical engineer who prepared it. *And no one – not even you – should apply this report for any purpose or project except the one originally contemplated.*

Read this Report in Full

Costly problems have occurred because those relying on a geotechnicalengineering report did not read it *in its entirety*. Do not rely on an executive summary. Do not read selected elements only. *Read this report in full*.

You Need to Inform Your Geotechnical Engineer about Change

Your geotechnical engineer considered unique, project-specific factors when designing the study behind this report and developing the confirmation-dependent recommendations the report conveys. A few typical factors include:

- the client's goals, objectives, budget, schedule, and risk-management preferences;
- the general nature of the structure involved, its size, configuration, and performance criteria;
- the structure's location and orientation on the site; and
- other planned or existing site improvements, such as retaining walls, access roads, parking lots, and underground utilities.

Typical changes that could erode the reliability of this report include those that affect:

- the site's size or shape;
- the function of the proposed structure, as when it's changed from a parking garage to an office building, or from a light-industrial plant to a refrigerated warehouse;
- the elevation, configuration, location, orientation, or weight of the proposed structure;
- the composition of the design team; or
- project ownership.

As a general rule, *always* inform your geotechnical engineer of project changes – even minor ones – and request an assessment of their impact. *The geotechnical engineer who prepared this report cannot accept responsibility or liability for problems that arise because the geotechnical engineer was not informed about developments the engineer otherwise would have considered*.

This Report May Not Be Reliable

Do not rely on this report if your geotechnical engineer prepared it:

- for a different client;
- for a different project;
- for a different site (that may or may not include all or a portion of the original site); or
- before important events occurred at the site or adjacent to it; e.g., man-made events like construction or environmental remediation, or natural events like floods, droughts, earthquakes, or groundwater fluctuations.

Note, too, that it could be unwise to rely on a geotechnical-engineering report whose reliability may have been affected by the passage of time, because of factors like changed subsurface conditions; new or modified codes, standards, or regulations; or new techniques or tools. *If your geotechnical engineer has not indicated an "apply-by" date on the report, ask what it should be*, and, in general, *if you are the least bit uncertain* about the continued reliability of this report, contact your geotechnical engineer before applying it. A minor amount of additional testing or analysis – if any is required at all – could prevent major problems.

Most of the "Findings" Related in This Report Are Professional Opinions

Before construction begins, geotechnical engineers explore a site's subsurface through various sampling and testing procedures. *Geotechnical engineers can observe actual subsurface conditions only at those specific locations where sampling and testing were performed*. The data derived from that sampling and testing were reviewed by your geotechnical engineer, who then applied professional judgment to form opinions about subsurface conditions throughout the site. Actual sitewide-subsurface conditions may differ – maybe significantly – from those indicated in this report. Confront that risk by retaining your geotechnical engineer to serve on the design team from project start to project finish, so the individual can provide informed guidance quickly, whenever needed.

This Report's Recommendations Are Confirmation-Dependent

The recommendations included in this report – including any options or alternatives – are confirmation-dependent. In other words, *they are not final*, because the geotechnical engineer who developed them relied heavily on judgment and opinion to do so. Your geotechnical engineer can finalize the recommendations *only after observing actual subsurface conditions* revealed during construction. If through observation your geotechnical engineer confirms that the conditions assumed to exist actually do exist, the recommendations can be relied upon, assuming no other changes have occurred. *The geotechnical engineer who prepared this report cannot assume responsibility or liability for confirmationdependent recommendations if you fail to retain that engineer to perform construction observation*.

This Report Could Be Misinterpreted

Other design professionals' misinterpretation of geotechnicalengineering reports has resulted in costly problems. Confront that risk by having your geotechnical engineer serve as a full-time member of the design team, to:

- confer with other design-team members,
- help develop specifications,
- review pertinent elements of other design professionals' plans and specifications, and
- be on hand quickly whenever geotechnical-engineering guidance is needed.

You should also confront the risk of constructors misinterpreting this report. Do so by retaining your geotechnical engineer to participate in prebid and preconstruction conferences and to perform construction observation.

Give Constructors a Complete Report and Guidance

Some owners and design professionals mistakenly believe they can shift unanticipated-subsurface-conditions liability to constructors by limiting the information they provide for bid preparation. To help prevent the costly, contentious problems this practice has caused, include the complete geotechnical-engineering report, along with any attachments or appendices, with your contract documents, *but be certain to note conspicuously that you've included the material for informational purposes only*. To avoid misunderstanding, you may also want to note that "informational purposes" means constructors have no right to rely on the interpretations, opinions, conclusions, or recommendations in the report, but they may rely on the factual data relative to the specific times, locations, and depths/elevations referenced. Be certain that constructors know they may learn about specific project requirements, including options selected from the report, *only* from the design drawings and specifications. Remind constructors that they may

perform their own studies if they want to, and *be sure to allow enough time* to permit them to do so. Only then might you be in a position to give constructors the information available to you, while requiring them to at least share some of the financial responsibilities stemming from unanticipated conditions. Conducting prebid and preconstruction conferences can also be valuable in this respect.

Read Responsibility Provisions Closely

Some client representatives, design professionals, and constructors do not realize that geotechnical engineering is far less exact than other engineering disciplines. That lack of understanding has nurtured unrealistic expectations that have resulted in disappointments, delays, cost overruns, claims, and disputes. To confront that risk, geotechnical engineers commonly include explanatory provisions in their reports. Sometimes labeled "limitations," many of these provisions indicate where geotechnical engineers' responsibilities begin and end, to help others recognize their own responsibilities and risks. *Read these provisions closely*. Ask questions. Your geotechnical engineer should respond fully and frankly.

Geoenvironmental Concerns Are Not Covered

The personnel, equipment, and techniques used to perform an environmental study – e.g., a "phase-one" or "phase-two" environmental site assessment – differ significantly from those used to perform a geotechnical-engineering study. For that reason, a geotechnicalengineering report does not usually relate any environmental findings, conclusions, or recommendations; e.g., about the likelihood of encountering underground storage tanks or regulated contaminants. *Unanticipated subsurface environmental problems have led to project failures*. If you have not yet obtained your own environmental information, ask your geotechnical consultant for risk-management guidance. As a general rule, *do not rely on an environmental report prepared for a different client, site, or project, or that is more than six months old.*

Obtain Professional Assistance to Deal with Moisture Infiltration and Mold

While your geotechnical engineer may have addressed groundwater, water infiltration, or similar issues in this report, none of the engineer's services were designed, conducted, or intended to prevent uncontrolled migration of moisture – including water vapor – from the soil through building slabs and walls and into the building interior, where it can cause mold growth and material-performance deficiencies. Accordingly, *proper implementation of the geotechnical engineer's recommendations will not of itself be sufficient to prevent moisture infiltration.* Confront the risk of moisture infiltration by including building-envelope or mold specialists on the design team. *Geotechnical engineers are not buildingenvelope or mold specialists.*

Telephone: 301/565-2733 e-mail: info@geoprofessional.org www.geoprofessional.org

Copyright 2016 by Geoprofessional Business Association (GBA). Duplication, reproduction, or copying of this document, in whole or in part, by any means whatsoever, is strictly prohibited, except with GBA's specific written permission. Excerpting, quoting, or otherwise extracting wording from this document is permitted only with the express written permission of GBA, and only for purposes of scholarly research or book review. Only members of GBA may use this document or its wording as a complement to or as an element of a report of any kind. Any other firm, individual, or other entity that so uses this document without being a GBA member could be committing negligent