# FISHER SLOUGH RESTORATION PROJECT

# SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

## REPORT OF GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION FISHER SLOUGH RESTORATION PROJECT URS JOB NO. 33760911

Prepared for Tetra Tech Inc. 1420 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 550 Seattle, WA 98101

December 15, 2009



1501 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1400 Seattle, Washington 98101-1616



David Cline, P.E. Tetra Tech Inc. 1420 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 550 Seattle, WA 98101 December 15, 2009

Report of Geotechnical Investigation Fisher Slough Restoration Project Skagit County, Washington URS Job No. 33760911

Dear Mr. Cline,

URS is submitting herewith the final Report of Geotechnical Investigation at the site of the proposed Fisher Creek Restoration project near Conway, Washington in Skagit County. Work on this project was authorized by your Subconsultant Professional Services Agreement (Job T22391) signed on April 1, 2008, and was in general accordance with the scope of services identified in the April 2, 2008 Request For Proposal from Tetra Tech. This report presents the results of the initial phase of geotechnical investigation and testing, and later investigation phases, including modifications to certain conclusions and recommendations, are presented in subsequent design memoranda.

Please contact the undersigned if questions arise or additional information is required.



Sincerely,

URS CORPORATION

B. Surren dian . Suren Balendra, PE Project Engineer

Cu.m. hela

W. Martin McCabe, PE Geotechnical Project Manager

URS Corporation Century Square 1501 4th Avenue, Suite 1400 Seattle, WA 98101-1616 Tel: 206.438.2700

L:\Tella TechtFinal Geotech Report\Final Report\Final Geotech Rpt 12-15-09.doc

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.0	INTRODUCTION1							
2.0	PRO	POSED CON	STRUCTION	1				
3.0	SCO	Ъ						
4.0	SITE CONDITIONS							
	4.1	SURFACE	DESCRIPTION	2				
	4.2	GEOLOGI	C SETTING	2				
	4.3	SUBSURF	ACE CONDITIONS					
		4.3.1 Soi	[]					
		4.3.2 Gro	undwater conditions	5				
5.0	FIEL	D AND LAB	FESTING	5				
6.0	CON	CLUSIONS A	ND RECOMMENDATIONS	6				
	6.1	SOIL PROI	ILES AND SOIL PARAMETERS FOR DESIGN – GENERAL	6				
	6.2	SEISMIC C	ONSIDERATIONS	6				
	6.3	SETBACK	LEVEE					
		6.3.1 SIE	E SLOPES AND CUTOFF					
		6.3.2 CO	NSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS	9				
	6.4	BIG DITCH	I	10				
7.0	LIMI	TATIONS						
8.0	REFI	RENCES						
TABL	ES:							
Table	1	Summary o	f Recommended Soil Parameters					
Table	2	Recommen	led Soil Parameters For Estimating Lateral Earth Pressures					

#### FIGURES:

Figure 1	Vicinity Map
Figure 2	Layout - Drill Hole and Test Pit Location
Figure 3	Profile of Soil Logs - Siphon and Proposed Levee

#### **APPENDICES:**

A P P C I U I A A - I I L L D L A I L O R A I I O I	Appendix	A –	FIEL	D EXPL	<b>ORATIO</b>	V
---	----------	-----	------	--------	---------------	---

Key to Log of Boring and Descriptive Terms for Soil Logs of Borings AB-1, AB-2/GW-1, AB-3, AB-4, B-1 to B-4, GW-2, and GW-3 Logs of Test Pits ATP-1 to ATP-3, TP-1 to TP-6

Appendix B – LABORATORY TEST

Table B-1: Summary of Laboratory Test Results URS Atterberg Limits' Results of AB-2/GW-1, B-3, and B-4 URS Sieve Analysis Results of AB-2/GW-1 and GW-2 Analytical Resources' Consolidation etc Results of AB-1, AB-4, B-1, and B-2 Analytical Resources' Modified Proctor Testing Results of ATP-2, TP-1, TP-4, and TP-6

#### REPORT OF GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION FISHER SLOUGH RESTORATION PROJECT SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This report presents the results of a geotechnical investigation at the site of the proposed siphon replacement, levee setback, Big Ditch drainage channel realignment and wetland restoration project at Fisher Slough, one mile south of the Town of Conway in Skagit County, Washington. A site vicinity map is shown on Figure 1. The general purpose of the geotechnical investigation is to investigate soil and groundwater conditions throughout the site and provide recommendations suitable for design and construction of the project.

#### 2.0 PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION

Available information indicates that the existing north-south trending drainage channel currently referred to as the "Big Ditch" is to be re-routed and the siphon now used to carry the ditch flow beneath Fisher Slough will be re-located. The existing siphon, located two thousand feet upstream of the Fisher Slough bridge on Pioneer Highway, will be replaced by a new siphon located immediately upstream of the bridge and parallel to Pioneer Highway. The existing Big Ditch will be rerouted along the north side of Fisher Slough to the new siphon location and then along Pioneer Highway until it joins the existing channel at the junction of the old railroad grade and Pioneer Highway. Current preliminary plans indicate that the new siphon will consist of two pipes, one 4 feet in diameter and the other approximately 3.5 feet in diameter, extending a distance of approximately 250 feet between the inflow and outflow structures. The invert of the siphon pipes will be at roughly Elevation -8 (NAVD) in order to provide for at least 4 feet of cover below the bottom of Fisher Slough (bottom at approximately Elevation 0). The siphon pipe alignments run beneath the existing levees on the north and south side of Fisher Slough. During the construction period the water in the slough is expected to be in the Elevation range from about +3 to +5 feet. It is also proposed that the existing levee on the south side of Fisher Slough will be removed and a new setback levee will be constructed as shown in Figure 2. Associated modifications to Fisher Sough and the adjacent fields will be needed to provide habitat restoration features.

#### 3.0 SCOPE

The scope of services for this project is described in the December 2007 Request For Proposal provided by Tetra Tech, which included investigating subsurface conditions using drill holes and test pits, testing selected soil samples in the laboratory, evaluating shallow foundation support for a new siphon under static and seismic loading, assessing levee design criteria and analysis, assessing construction considerations, and providing a written report that presents the results of the investigation and geotechnical recommendations for the project.

The report is to provide information regarding the following issues:

- Suitability of foundation materials, anticipated settlement, seepage and piping potential, appropriate geometry and related considerations for the new setback levee.
- Suitability of foundation materials for the siphon replacement and siphon inlet and outlet structures, and discussion of alternative foundations as required.
- Channel side slope stability in the rerouted Big Ditch.
- Use of excavated materials from the Big Ditch reroute, old railroad alignment, and the existing levee along the south side of Fisher Slough for re-use in the new setback levee.
- Effects of excavation in the wetlands, sloughing, erosion potential, and boiling.
- Construction issues relating to shoring, dewatering, preloading earth fill for the levee and compaction requirements.
- Effects of seismic activity on the design and performance of the restoration features.
- Provide recommendations for seismic design of the setback levee and siphon per the requirements of the 2006 International Building Code.

#### 4.0 SITE CONDITIONS

#### 4.1 SURFACE DESCRIPTION

The existing Fisher Slough channel runs from the confluence of three small streams downstream through a set of parallel levees, under the bridge at Pioneer Highway and connects to the lower end of the South Fork of the Skagit River. Fisher Slough water levels are impacted by stream flow, Skagit River flows and tidal fluctuations in Puget Sound. A tide gate structure is located on the downstream side of the bridge to control higher tides and flood flows from the Skagit River from the flooding Fisher Slough and overtopping the existing levees. These levees protect homesteads and farm fields in the area. The fields are relatively flat and are currently farmed by local landowners. Big Ditch carries year round flows under Fisher Slough through an existing concrete siphon structure, runs east-west along an abandoned railroad embankment fill, turns south and runs beside Pioneer Highway.

#### 4.2 GEOLOGIC SETTING

The 2002 USGS Geologic Map of Washington Northwest Quadrangle (Dragovich et. al., 2002) indicates that the Fisher Slough Restoration Project site lies within an area of Quaternary alluvium (Qa) consisting of sorted combinations of silt, sand and gravel deposited in streambeds, alluvial fans and locally including peat and lacustrine deposits. Near the eastern border of the site, the alluvium transitions to undifferentiated glacial outwash (Qgo), characterized as recessional and proglacial stratified sand, gravel, and cobbles with minor silt and clay interbeds deposited in delta, ice-contact, beach, and melting water stream environments.

#### 4.3 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

#### 4.3.1 SOIL

Information on subsurface conditions were obtained from a previous report prepared by WSDOT for the Pioneer Highway bridge (WSDOT, 1984), and from borings drilled by URS during this phase of the work. The URS investigation included drilling eight bore holes (B-1 to B-4, AB-1 to AB-4), excavating nine test pits (TP-1 to TP-6, ATP-1 to ATP-3), and drilling and installing three groundwater monitoring wells (GW-1 to GW-3) at locations shown on Figure 2. Test Pits TP-1, TP-2 and ATP2 were excavated into the existing South Levee, and Test Pits TP-3 and TP-4 were excavated into the existing railroad embankment. The soil borings were drilled using a Mobile B-61 truck mounted drill rig. The test pits were excavated with a backhoe. The soil boring logs and test pit logs are presented in Appendix A. In general, the borings and test pits revealed soft marine and alluvial sediments with low to medium shear strength and moderate to high compressibility. The following is a summary of the soil layers encountered at locations off the existing levees/embankments, starting from the ground surface and proceeding downward:

#### Stratum 1: FILL- Soft to medium stiff SILT [ML/MH]

This layer was encountered in all of the borings drilled for this project, and is typically 4 to 9 feet thick. The soil is generally brown in color and soft to medium stiff in consistency. N-values range from 1 to 7 blows per foot. Approximate soil strength measured in the field from pocket penetrometer testing indicated that the undrained shear strength ranges between 250 and 750 pounds per square foot (psf) except at occasional locations where it increases to more than 750 psf , such as at Boring AB-2/GW-1. Laboratory sieve analysis tests on four samples indicate fines contents ranging from 73 to 98 percent. Modified Proctor compaction tests on samples from TP-1 and TP-6 indicate that the optimum moisture content is roughly 18 to 25 percent, which is considerably higher than the existing moisture content.

#### Stratum 2A - Very soft to soft clayey SILT [ML]

This unit was encountered below Stratum 1, and extended in some borings to the maximum depth drilled. It was dark gray to gray in color, and very soft to soft in consistency. The SPT sampler N-values that were recorded during drilling range from 0 to 10 blows per foot. Approximate soil strength measured in the field from pocket penetrometer testing indicated that the undrained shear strength ranges between 50 and 500 pounds per square foot (psf). Sea shell fragments were encountered in this layer. This layer was encountered in all of the borings drilled for the project. Laboratory tests on five samples indicate fines contents ranging from 54 to 98 percent, but with an average above 93 percent. Other tests showed this soil to be low to medium plasticity (plasticity Index values ranging from 5 to 24), moderately high compressibility, and low permeability.

#### Stratum 2B - Very loose to loose SILT/sandy SILT/silty SAND [ML/SM]

This unit was interpreted to be a sandier version of the Stratum 2A deposit described above. It was dark gray to gray in color, and very loose to loose in character. The SPT sampler N-values that were recorded during drilling range from 0 to 6 blows per foot. Approximate soil strength measured in the field in fine-grained zones using pocket penetrometer testing indicated that the undrained shear strength range between 110 and 250 pounds per square foot (psf). Sea shell fragments were encountered in this layer. This layer was

encountered at shallow depths less than 5 feet in borings B-1 and AB-4, and at depths greater than 9 to 12 feet in Borings AB-1, GW-2 and GW-3 and in Test Pits ATP-1, ATP-3 and TP-5. Laboratory tests on four samples indicate that the fines content of the Stratum 2B is typically in the range from 28 to 89 percent. One sample from Boring AB-1 showed a low permeability value similar to that of Stratum 2A, probably because there appeared to be a greater amount of fines (85 percent) in the test sample than is typical for this stratum.

#### Stratum 3 – Loose to medium dense silty SAND [SM]

This unit was encountered below Stratum 2A. It was dark gray to gray in color, and loose to medium dense in character. The SPT sampler N-values that were recorded during drilling range from 8 to 17 blows per foot. Sea shell fragments were encountered in this layer. This layer was encountered in three of the borings (B-3, B-4, and AB-2/GW-1) drilled for the project. Laboratory test indicates that this soil contains up to 28 percent fines.

#### Stratum 4 – Medium dense to dense silty SAND/sandy SILT with gravel [SM/ML]

This unit was encountered below either Stratum 2A or Stratum 3. It was dark gray to gray in color, and medium dense to very dense in character. The SPT sampler N-values that were recorded during drilling range from 24 to 63 blows per foot except at a particular location where the N-values increased to more than 100 at Boring AB-3. This high N-value might be attributed to presence of gravel. The gravel in this deposit ranges in shape from rounded to subangular. Four of the borings (B-3, B-4, AB-2/GW-1, and AB-3) drilled for this project were terminated in this material. A laboratory sieve analysis test on one sample showed 79 percent fines.

#### Existing Embankment Fill – South Levee

Most of the fill soil encountered in the test pits on the existing levee (TP-1, TP-2 and ATP-2) consists of a moist, low plasticity clayey silt (ML/CL) with sand content ranging from negligible to roughly 27 percent. This layer is typically 10 to 13 feet thick, and is generally brown in color and medium stiff to stiff in consistency. Approximate soil strength measured in the field from pocket penetrometer testing indicated that the undrained shear strength ranges between 500 and 1500 pounds per square foot (psf). At one location, only in ATP-2, the fill soil consisted of a silty gravelly sand to silty gravel (SM/GM) down to 10 feet depth.

#### Embankment Fill – Old Railroad Grade

Most of the fill soil encountered in the test pits on the existing rail embankment (TP-3 and TP-4) consists of a moist, low plasticity clayey silt (ML/CL) with sand content ranging from negligible to roughly 20 percent. This layer is typically 8 feet thick. This layer is generally brown in color and stiff to hard in consistency. Approximate soil strength measured in the field from pocket penetrometer testing indicated that the undrained shear strength ranges between 2000 and 4000 pounds per square foot (psf)

#### 4.3.2 **GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS**

Groundwater was encountered both in the test pits and borings during the early October 2008 investigation period. Water was encountered in two of the test pits (TP-5 and TP-6), and was encountered at depths of about 10 feet (Elevation -6) and 5 feet (Elevation 0) below the ground surface respectively. The ground water levels did not stabilize before backfilling of the test pit occurred. Seepage inflow rates ranged from slight to rapid. Water levels measured in the wells GW-1, GW-2 and GW-3 in November 2008, at least 2 months after installation, indicated that the water table was at depths of approximately 0.5 feet (Elevation 6) to 3 feet (Elevation 3) below the ground surface. There was some indication that the well water levels may have been influenced by the presence of ponded water on the ground surface at the well locations. Local residents typically report that water levels are near the ground surface in winter. Stabilized long term groundwater level data have not yet been collected. Groundwater levels are expected to fluctuate in response to the seasons, the rainfall level and the tide levels.

#### 5.0 FIELD AND LAB TESTING

The automatic hammer used for 2008 exploration program is now the standard of practice for geotechnical work because the N-values are less prone to operator and equipment influences than N-values from hammers previously used by the industry (e.g. safety hammers and donut hammers used with rope-andcathead equipment). However, information published in the literature and collected by URS show that Nvalues from an automatic hammer are moderately to substantially lower than N values obtained from older type hammers. Automatic hammer N-values should be multiplied by a correction factor to obtain equivalent N-values for comparison with older data and with published correlations between N-value and soil engineering characteristics. There is no unanimous opinion in the geotechnical engineering community as to the magnitude of the correction factor, which could range from 1.2 to 2 or more.

Soil samples were obtained from the borings and test pits for visual classification and laboratory testing for physical properties. Tests were performed to measure moisture content, percent fines, particle size gradation (sieve test), plasticity (Atterberg Limits test), permeability by rigid wall permeameter, compressibility (consolidation test) and compaction characteristics (Proctor compaction by ASTM D-1557 method). The results of all tests are presented Table B-1 in Appendix B. Results of the moisture content and most sieve analysis tests are presented on the boring or test pit logs opposite the sample location. The detailed lab data sheets and plotted results are also presented in Appendix B. All tests were performed in general accordance with the latest ASTM standards.

The description of each soil layer presented above in Section 4.3.1 also discusses some of the laboratory test data for each layer.

Pocket penetrometer tests were conducted on fine grained soils to measure the approximate unconfined compressive strength. The results are shown on the boring logs at the depth of the sample tested. The results indicate undrained shear strength values for the Stratum 1 were typically about 500 psf. In the Stratum 2 (A and B) very soft clayey SILT, the pocket penetrometer values indicated the average undrained shear strength values of about 300 psf. It should be noted that pocket penetrometer measurements listed as 0

tsf in the boring logs actually mean that the undrained shear strength of the soil is approximately 100 to 200 psf when the resolution of the device is considered.

#### 6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 6.1 SOIL PROFILES AND SOIL PARAMETERS FOR DESIGN – GENERAL

In general, the soil profile in the west half of the site is dominated by the deep alluvium deposited by the Skagit River, while the soil profile in the east half of the site apparently transitions to the glacial outwash soil described in Section 4.2 Geologic Setting. Borings drilled by WSDOT in 1984 indicate that the soft or loose alluvium at the bridge location extends to at last 80 feet depth. Figure 3 shows an estimated soil profile along the future setback levee alignment, illustrating the reduced thickness of alluvium and the appearance of shallow dense glacial soils towards the eastern end.

The soil encountered within the area to be occupied by the new facility can be used for foundation support with certain precautions, and with the expectation that large total and differential settlements may occur after construction due to the soft nature of the soil (Stratum 2A and 2B).

A table of estimated soil parameters for each of the soil strata encountered at the site is provided at the end of the text (Table 1) to assist design, site preparation and construction of the proposed facility. The values provided in the table have been estimated using a combination of current measured field and laboratory data together with published data on similar soils. It should be noted that in most cases the values listed in Table 1 are intended to represent average or slightly on the conservative side of average conditions. Natural variations in stratigraphy and soil parameters are expected throughout the site, and the Table 1 values may not be strictly representative of all locations.

#### 6.2 SEISMIC CONSIDERATIONS

The geotechnical-related parameters to be used for seismic design in accordance with 2006 IBC provisions are evaluated as described in Section 1613.5 of the 2006 IBC Code. The spectral response accelerations for the "Maximum Considered Earthquake", which has a 2 percent probability of being exceeded in 50 years (i.e. return period of 2500 years), are obtained from the USGS Earthquake Ground Motion Parameters (PGA) Version 5.0.9 software based on the 2006 IBC Code corresponding to the site with a latitude 48.32 degrees and a longitude of -122.34 degrees. The recommended values for Site Class B are:

 $S_s = 112.7 \% g = 1.13 g$  (short period, or 0.2 second spectral response)  $S_1 = 38.7 \% g = 0.39 g$  (1.0 second spectral response)

The Site Class is selected using the definitions in Table 1613.5.2 considering the average properties of soils in the upper 100 feet of the soil profile at the site. Information from the current and previous borings indicates that a Site Class E ("Soft Soil Profile") is the generally the most appropriate for this location. A Site Class F may need to be considered for local areas where a significant thickness of potentially liquefiable Stratum 2B exists, for example near Borings B-1 and AB-4 adjacent to the existing bridge.

The site coefficient values, obtained from Section 1613.5.3 of the 2006 IBC, are used to adjust the mapped spectral response acceleration values to get the adjusted spectral response acceleration values for the site. The recommended Site Coefficient values for Site Class E are:

 $F_a = 0.9$ (short period, or 0.2 second spectral response)  $F_v = 2.4$ (1.0 second spectral response)

A peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGA) of 0.27g was estimated based on guidelines in 2006 IBC. That is, the damped design spectral acceleration value  $S_{DS}$  was divided by 2.5 as directed in Section 1802.2.7 of the 2006 IBC.

The potential for seismic-induced liquefaction in some portions of the site is high because of the very loose to medium dense nature of the primarily granular soils of Stratum 2B and Stratum 3 and the shallow depth of the water table. If seismic-induced liquefaction does occur, it will be accompanied by ground settlement, the magnitude of which will depend on the thickness of liquefiable sediments and the severity of shaking. The liquefaction induced settlement will be in addition to the magnitude of settlement due to consolidation from static loads. The potentially liquefiable Stratum 2B was encountered at shallow depths (less than 5) at only two locations, at Borings B-1 near the north end of the future setback levee and further north along Pioneer Highway at AB-4. This liquefiable soil was encountered at depths greater than 9 to 12 feet at the following locations:

- along or near the north end of the future setback levee in Boring AB-1 and Test Pit ATP-3
- on the property north of Fisher Slough in wells GW-2 and GW-3 and Test Pit TP-5
- near the south end of the future setback levee in well GW-1 and Test Pit ATP-1. •

The potential for significant "lateral spread" of liquefied soil appears to be low in the vicinity of the project area because a "free face" condition, as described in Youd, Hansen, and Bartlett (2002) and Bartlett and Youd (1995), is not generally present at this location. However, loss of shear strength in liquefied soils and increased pore pressures in non-liquefied soils generated by earthquake shaking can potentially reduce the stability of existing or new embankments. During the design phase of the project, stability analyses for the new setback levee should incorporate reduced shear strength values for foundation soils in areas where liquefaction is expected. The only obvious location of likely liquefaction effects on the levee is in the vicinity of Boring B-1 where Stratum 2B is present at shallow depths.

If liquefaction occurs, pipelines and subsurface chambers and vaults such as those associated with the siphon will react in a manner that depends on their position with respect to the groundwater table. Structures above the groundwater table will likely settle an amount equal to the settlement of the surrounding ground surface. Structures below the groundwater table will be subjected to upward buoyancy forces that must be resisted by the overlying backfill soil. Insufficient resistance will allow the structure to "float" to the surface. For structures not located within the liquefaction area (i.e. not in Stratum 2B), the seismic shaking could cause compressive or tensile stresses from the passage of seismic surface waves through the ground.

#### 6.3 SETBACK LEVEE

#### 6.3.1 SIDE SLOPES AND CUTOFF

Side slopes for the new levees should be approximately 2.5H:1V (2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical) or flatter as determined during design stability analysis. Slightly steeper slopes may be possible depending on the height of embankment selected.

Erosion and scour control measures should be adopted to reduce loss of surficial soils on the upstream face of the levee. The erosion control measures could consist of gravel, cobbles, boulders, woody debris, geotextile or welded wire-reinforced layers, and/or planted vegetation that has been selected and placed following standard soil-bioengineering practices.

A cutoff trench is recommended by the State of Washington for permanent "dams", while a cutoff is not necessarily required by FEMA levee guidance. The typical objectives of a cutoff are to control seepage quantities and effects when the foundation soil is primarily granular and permeable, and to increase the resistance to sliding at the base. Soils expected to serve as the foundation for the new levee will be somewhat mixed, with a primarily fine grained nature over most of the length, but with the sandier Stratum 2B near the north end of the levee. The State of Washington guidance is that the cutoff should be wide enough to accommodate self-propelled compaction equipment, i.e. about 8 feet. However, given the limited size of this levee, a 6-foot wide trench to a depth of 4 feet below the base of the dam is expected to provide a suitable cutoff. A cutoff deeper than 4 or 5 feet could require dewatering efforts.

Since the cutoff is being contemplated, the embankment and foundation soils are expected to consist of relatively low permeability materials, and the relocated Big Ditch will be present on the downstream side, so a toe drain is not recommended for the new setback levee.

#### 6.3.2 FOUNDATION

The foundation for the new setback levee will be located on Stratum 1 Fill material, which is present along the proposed levee alignment. As described in Section 4.3.1, Stratum 1 is a cohesive fine grained material, soft to medium stiff in consistency, and typically 4 to 9 feet thick. Therefore, URS expects that stability and piping (exit gradient) are likely not issues. However, due to the soft nature of the soil (Strata 2A and 2B), the levee will experience considerable settlement, both during and after construction. URS roughly estimated anticipated the maximum settlements for a typical levee (11 feet height, 12 feet top width, 2H:1V slopes) at three locations, as listed below:

- parallel to Pioneer Highway between B-1 and AB-1; settlement = 4.5 feet
- along abandoned railroad embankment near B-2; settlement = 2.5 feet
- near east end of levee between GW-1 and B-4; settlement = 2.6 feet

Approximately 30 percent of the above settlements are expected to occur within 6 months following the construction of the levee, with the remainder occurring over a period of roughly 6 to 10 years or more. These values need to be re-evaluated during the design phase based on the actual levee geometry.

Preloading of the foundation area, i.e. placement of fill soil prior to the start of construction, could be used to pre-induce some of the settlement. Even if a preload of magnitude equal to the full weight of the future setback levee embankment could be placed along the levee alignment, some rebound of the ground surface would occur and subsequently a small amount of "recompression" settlement when the new embankment is placed. Use of pre-fabricated geotextile wick drains could be used to accelerate the rate of settlement by a factor of 5 or more.

It should be noted that the new proposed levee can induce stresses in and settlement of soil beneath the nearby existing structures such as the roadway embankment and bridge. As a simplified approximation, it should be assumed that the settlement magnitude will decrease to a negligible amount at a horizontal distance from the toe of the base of the new proposed levee that is approximately equal to the width of the base of the new proposed levee. If the roadway embankment is within the above influence zone, the roadway embankment will likely settle due to the proposed levee. In order to avoid roadway embankment settlement, the distance between the toe of the base of the new proposed levee and roadway embankment toe should be at least approximately equal to the width of the base of the new proposed levee. Alternatively, installation of an appropriately designed sheet pile wall between the levee and the existing roadway embankment could reduce the magnitude of roadway settlement.

#### 6.3.2 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

Levee embankment fill materials can consist of silt, clays, sands and/or gravels with a minimum of 25 percent fines, i.e. passing the #200 sieve (considering only material less than 3 inch). Levee embankment fill should be placed in lifts approximately 6 to 8 inches thick, moisture-conditioned as necessary (moisture content of soil should be within 2 percent of the optimum moisture), and compacted to 95 percent of the maximum dry density based on ASTM Test Method D-698.

Before starting earthwork, site preparation should begin with stripping any surficial grass, roots, and topsoil from within the limits of earthwork. URS expects surface stripping may typically be necessary to depths of about approximately 0.5 feet.

Fill material identified in test pits within the existing south levee (TP-1, TP-2, and ATP-1) and within the existing railroad embankment (TP-3 and TP-4) are considered suitable for construction of the new levee. The Stratum 1 soils encountered in test pits TP-5 and TP-6 in the Junquist parcel, test pit ATP-1 in the Smith B parcel, and test pit ATP-3 in TNC field are also considered suitable for use as structural fill for the new levee. It should be noted soil encountered in test pit ATP-2 in the existing south levee does not have a sufficiently high percentage of fines, and therefore is not in its present condition suitable for use as fill for the new levee. The extent of this gravelly soil in ATP-2 is not known, but its presence is believed to be related to the dredging of Fisher Slough in past years. The native Stratum 2A SILT Stratum 2B SILT/sandy SILT/silty SAND encountered at the site are generally unsuitable for use as structural fill, i.e. to support structures or construct levee. These soils are difficult to compact unless the moisture level is close to the optimum moisture content, and are difficult to moisture condition. The Stratum 1 fill is considered suitable for re-use as structural fill for levee construction. However, natural moisture content tests performed on Stratum 1 silt or clayey silt encountered in Borings B-1 and B-4 were relatively high (39 to 49 percent), and this soil will be difficult to moisture condition and compact to the required densities.

Earthwork quantities may be estimated using the following information about the on-site fill sources:

- Shallow Fill Soils Not Associated with Existing Levees (Stratum 1) The surficial soil throughout the project area typically consists of a fill ranging in thickness from about 4 to 9 feet. This material is being referred to as Stratum 1. It is primarily a non-plastic to low plasticity silt to clayey silt with less than 10 percent fine sand and some occasional lenses of organic material. A shrinkage factor of 0.90 is recommended when converting "bank" volume to "compacted" volume.
- Fill Soil Comprising the Existing Levee/Embankments (Stratum 1A and Stratum 1B) Most of the fill soil encountered in the test pits on the existing levee (TP-1, TP-2 and ATP-2) and rail embankment TP-3 and TP-4) consist of a moist low plasticity clayey silt (ML/CL) with sand content ranging from negligible to roughly 20 percent. For purposes of discussing fill properties, this soil is being referred to as Stratum 1A. At one location, only in ATP-2, the fill soil consisted of a silty gravelly sand to silty gravel (SM/GM) down to 10 feet depth. The gravelly material is being referred to in this discussion as Stratum 1B. A shrinkage factor of 0.95 is recommended for both of these soil types.

To estimate the volume of soil that will be generated by the fill compaction effort using the on-site soils, multiply the "bank" volume (i.e. volume now existing in the ground) by the "shrinkage factor" recommended above.

Depending on final setback levee location, continuous monitoring of settlement of the existing roadway embankment and bridge may be required during construction.

The native Stratum 2A SILT and Stratum 2B SILT/sandy SILT/silty SAND are considered a Type C soil from the standpoint of OSHA/WISHA regulations for excavation, trenching and shoring. This means that temporary cuts greater than 4 feet deep in this deposit should be inclined at no steeper than 1.5 Horizontal to 1 Vertical (1.5H: 1V). The fill Stratum 1 is also considered a Type C soil, and may be temporarily inclined at 1.5H:1V.

The silty sand to sandy silt soils expected to be exposed at the subgrade level for the new levee (i.e. Strata 1, 2A and 2B) are considered moderately to highly erodible in a disturbed condition. Erosion control efforts during construction should be adopted, and Best Management Practices (BMP's) applied as necessary to protect the nearby creek. BMP's may include mulching of exposed surfaces, protecting drainage ditches by placing straw bales or similar sediment trapping materials, erecting check dams or silt fencing that is properly keyed into the base, and applying final seeding upon completion of construction. Protection of compacted soil embankment slopes should be selected considering the velocity of the water that may be flowing towards or along the sloping surface.

#### 6.4 BIG DITCH

#### 6.4.1 CHANNEL DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Reconnaissance of Fisher Slough, Big Ditch and the three upper creek banks indicates that the Stratum 1 SILT is present at the ground surface. As described in Section 4.3.1, Stratum 1 is a cohesive fine grained material, soft to medium stiff in consistency, and typically 4 to 9 feet thick. Accordingly, the recommended

inclination of permanent slopes up to 4 feet in height is 2H:1V. Slopes from 4 to 10 feet in height should be inclined at 2.5H:1V. Slopes greater than 10 feet in height should be inclined at 3H:1V or flatter, unless specifically evaluated using standard slope stability evaluation methods.

The Stratum 1 silt is considered moderately to highly erodible. Erosion and scour control measures should be adopted to reduce loss of stream channel banks soil during high flow periods. The erosion control measures could consist of gravel, cobbles, boulders, woody debris, geotextile or welded wire-reinforced layers, and/or planted vegetation that has been selected and placed following standard soil-bioengineering practices.

#### 6.4.2 SIPHON DESIGN – GENERAL

A preferred siphon design concept for economically carrying the Big Ditch flows beneath the Fisher Slough has not yet been selected. Potential siphon designs include:

- Continuous rigid pipe with elbows and bends as needed; constructed in shored or unshored excavations as appropriate for the depth of burial, or constructed partly by trenchless methods (pipe ramming, auger-bore-pipe jacking, or directional drilling).
- Continuous flexible pipe with bends as needed; constructed by the same methods as mentioned above for rigid pipe.
- Rigid or flexible pipe routed through precast concrete inlet and outlet chambers/vaults on either side of the Fisher Slough undercrossing; inlet and outlet pipes constructed in open cut excavations, the chambers/vaults in shored excavations, the indercrossing pipe rammed or augerbored and jacked into place.

Both the pipe and the chamber/vault can be supported on pile foundations for limiting either downward or upward movement, or shallow foundation support can be provided on improved or unimproved subgrade soils, or a combination of shallow and deep foundations can be provided.

#### 6.4.3 FOUNDATION SUPPORT - SHALLOW

Design of foundations for the siphon structures must consider the potential for a bearing capacity failure as well as the effect of settlements that may occur following construction. Only if the structure under consideration actually applies significantly more vertical pressure at the foundation subgrade level than originally occurred from the overburden pressure of the soil is consideration of bearing capacity and settlement necessary. For buried structures such as pipes and vaults, the bearing capacity failure is not usually a concern, since the actual pressure applied by the structure is typically less than or not much more than the pressure removed in excavating the soil. In fact flotation, i.e. uplift pressure from buoyancy, may be a greater concern and should be checked. For structures that will result in an increase in vertical downward pressure, settlement must be controlled to a magnitude that is tolerable for the structure and its connections. Alternatively the design of the structure must be modified to accommodate the settlement.

Assuming that only the chambers/vaults could result in increased applied downward pressure on the foundation subgrade, allowable bearing pressures and settlements should be considered. The foundations

for the future siphon inlet and outlet structures will likely be supported on the Stratum 2B SILT/sandy SILT/silty SAND, for which an allowable soil bearing value of 1000 psf or less should be used. Depending on the design of the vault, the actual applied pressure will likely be less than 1000 psf.

The embedment depth of the chamber/vault may below the water table, i.e. greater than 6 to 8 feet below the ground surface. Therefore the subgrade is expected to be exposed by excavation using a sheet pile shoring system. Subgrade preparation should include placement of a minimum 6-inch thick layer of rockfill or crushed stone. If the actual applied pressure is 500 psf, long term settlement of approximately 6 to 8 inches is estimated if the plan dimension of the chamber/vault is approximately 6 feet by 12 feet in plan dimension. Approximately 50 percent of the settlement will occur within 2 to 3 months after the load is applied. This settlement has been estimated by ignoring the potentially beneficial effect of the presence of the inflow and outflow pipes, which will act to further spread out the load of the chamber/vault. The estimated settlement will be larger than 6 to 8 inches if the actual pressure is higher than 500 psf or the width of the chamber/vault is larger than 6 feet. Preloading of the chamber/vault location will result in final post-construction settlements of less than 1 or 2 inches, depending on the magnitude of the preload.

Recommended values of the modulus of subgrade reaction k (also commonly called the "coefficient of subgrade reaction" or the "subgrade reaction coefficient") are presented for each existing soil layer and for a typical granular compacted fill in Table 2. These values are typical of those obtained from tests using a 30-inch diameter plate, and are consistent with values recommended for slabs and pavements by the Portland Concrete Association and the American Concrete Institute.

The siphon foundations should have an embedment depth sufficient to resist undermining by Fisher Slough bed scour, or the foundation area should be provided with scour protection in the form of rip-rap, gabions, or similar materials. Scour depths have not been estimated for this project.

The embedment depth of the proposed Siphon structure is not available at this stage of investigation. However, URS expects that shoring may be necessary to install proposed Siphon structure. Based on the nature of the soil and shallow groundwater at proposed Siphon structure locations, sheet pile shoring is recommended.

#### 6.4.3 SIPHON FOUNDATION - DEEP

Easily installed deep foundations such as helical piles can be used to either reduce the magnitude of settlement of the chamber/vault, or to resist the uplift forces if a net buoyant situation is predicted. The "deep" foundations can consist of drilled-in helical piles (anchors) such as those manufactured by the Chance Company. A helical anchor consists of a steel shaft with one to four circular helical plates ("helix") attached at the bottom. When the anchor is screwed into a competent soil layer, both downward and upward loads applied to the top of the shaft are resisted by the soil above and below the helices. The more helices that are attached to the shaft, the higher the resistance to applied loads. The diameter of the available helices varies from 8 to 14 inches. The load carrying capacity of the helix increases with increasing diameter of the helix. The ultimate load that can be carried by an individual helix can be estimated using expressions presented in the manufacturer's Bulletin01-9601 dated January 2000. The expressions are similar to those used for estimating the ultimate load for a pile foundation, and have been developed using case history data.

Typical allowable downward or uplift loads in the soft soils encountered at this site would be roughly 10 kips to 15 kips for a 4-helix pile approximately 15 feet long. When load is applied to the anchor either in the downward or upward direction, some movement of the anchor should be expected.

#### 6.4.4 SIPHON DESIGN - LATERAL EARTH PRESSURES

Lateral earth pressures are required for designing temporary excavation (shoring) support structures, permanent subsurface walls, and for estimating the resistance to lateral loads on shallow foundations.

The recommended values of earth pressure coefficients are presented in Table 1, and recommended values of equivalent fluid unit weight (earth pressure coefficient multiplied by soil unit weight) for estimating lateral earth pressures are presented in Table 2.

The active case usually applies to walls that are permitted to rotate or translate away from the retained soil by approximately 0.002H, where H is the height of the wall. This case would be appropriate for a retaining wall. The at-rest case applies to unyielding walls, such as a rigidly connected vault walls. The passive value includes a factor of safety of 1.5. Above the groundwater level, the drained condition ("above water") values can be used. If water is constantly pumped out at all times and a positive drainage system is provided to lower the groundwater table in the vicinity of the structure, drained conditions ("above water") could be used. Otherwise, undrained conditions ("below water") should be used below the groundwater level.

Earthquake shaking effects on lateral earth pressures may be ignored for relatively small subsurface structures, such as chambers and vaults that may be considered as siphon components.

For larger structures and retaining walls, the active and at-rest pressures will temporarily increase and the passive pressures will temporarily decrease, as described by Whitman (1990) using the Mononobe Okabe equation and by Sherif et al (1982) using bench-scale experimentation. For walls greater than 6 feet in height, the increase in active and at-rest components should be taken as a uniformly distributed pressure equal to 5H (in psf), where H is the height of the wall. This seismic-induced pressure acts over the full height of the subsurface portion of wall, and must be added to the static component of earth pressure. For the passive case, the equivalent fluid unit weight given in Table 2 above should be reduced by 25 percent. These recommendations were developed assuming a peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGA) of 0.27g. Note that the active and at-rest seismic earth pressures have been developed using a seismic coefficient equal to 50% of this PGA value. The value of seismic induced pressure has been estimated considering the informally-reported very favorable performance of basement walls during post earthquake inspections.

Use of heavy rolling equipment to compact fill soil directly behind subsurface walls will cause an increase in horizontal earth pressures beyond those values given above. The magnitude of additional pressures will depend on the weight and characteristics of the roller. A similar increase will occur if backhoe-mounted compaction equipment (e.g. Hoepac) is used. The increase will be negligible if the heavy equipment is kept at least 6 feet from the wall. Compaction in this 6-foot zone directly behind the wall should be accomplished using hand operated or walk-behind equipment.

The lateral earth pressures on subsurface walls will increase where loads applied to the soil from nearby structures, traffic or other sources (i.e. surcharge loads) are close enough to the new wall to exert an

influence. The vertical surcharge pressure applied will result in increased lateral earth pressures on nearby vertical walls that extend below the applied load level. The magnitude of these lateral surcharge pressures are estimated by multiplying the vertical surcharge pressure by 1/3 for the active earth pressure case and  $\frac{1}{2}$  for the at-rest earth pressure case.

Lateral forces on the structure may be resisted by soil-to-concrete friction at the base of footings or mats. Allowable friction coefficients for soil layers that are expected to provide foundation support are listed in Table 2.

#### 6.4.5 SHORING, DEWATERING AND OTHER CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

Stratum 2B soil is generally considered to be poorly to moderately drained material which may yield small quantities of perched water that will flow from local sandy pockets into the excavation during construction. These sandy zones are expected to flow for short periods of time until re-charged by additional surface water inflow and infiltration. Some free-draining zones may occur within this layer, and will yield moderately high quantities of inflow if encountered. The high inflow rate encountered at test pit TP-5 is an example of one of these free draining zones. The prudent approach is to be prepared to dewater using a well installed within sheet pile shoring for foundations of the chambers/vaults (if included in the design) or for the pipe. If the pipe depth is shallow, it may be possible to employ open cut excavations with dewatering using sumps and pumping as needed. Flowing sand conditions can be expected at some locations. Shallow well points could also be used if water and ground control problems are encountered. As the current concept is that the siphon pipe inverts will be at roughly Elevation -8, which is approximately 14 to 16 feet below the ground surface and at least 10 feet below the groundwater along much of the siphon alignment, shoring by steel sheet piles is anticipated.

Near the middle of Fisher Slough, the top of the sheet pile wall is expected to be at about Elevation +7 (2 feet of freeboard), while the bottom of the trench would be at approximately Elevation -9, i.e. a sheet pile wall height of 16 feet. Where the siphon pipes pass beneath the existing north and south levees, the tops of which are at roughly Elevation 16 to 17, the pipe inverts will be up to 25 feet below the ground surface.

The width of the sheet pile shored trench should be established by providing a 1.5-foot spacing between the two siphon pipes and between the outside wall of the pipes and the adjacent sheet piles. For the two-pipe configuration in the current preliminary plan, a trench width of about 12 to 14-feet would be required. Dewatering by wells or well points inside the shoring can be used to work "in the dry". Dewatering outside of enclosed sheet pile shoring systems could result in settlement of nearby ground surfaces due to loss of buoyancy. This possibility should be considered if the siphon is constructed close to the existing Pioneer Highway. However, dewatering for the pipe installation can be eliminated if the entire installation is performed "in the wet", i.e. no attempt is made to dewater during both the excavation and pipe/backfill placement process.

Sheet pile embedment depths must consider both the potential for "piping" (soil washing into the excavation) from seepage beneath the sheet piles, and the potential for bottom heave or excessive deformation if earth pressure imbalances occur. The embedment depths can be estimated using methods

presented in the U.S. Navy Design Manuals DM-7.1 and DM-7.2. The two cases are discussed separately below:

- Piping/Seepage If installation of the inlet and outlet structures or the pipes occur in the dry, a minimum sheet pile embedment of at least 8 feet below the bottom of the excavation is recommended. For construction in the wet, where the water level in the excavations are not more than about 2 feet below the surrounding water in the slough or the surrounding groundwater, a minimum sheet pile embedment of at least 5 feet is recommended.
- Stability The required embedment depth will be primarily influenced by whether the piles are designed as cantilever walls or alternatively if intermediate restraints from internal braces or external deadman anchors are incorporated. The limit to the excavation depth for a cantilever sheet pile shoring wall is considered to be approximately 15 feet, and somewhat less in weak soil. As the soil at the siphon location is relatively weak, an embedment of at least 2 times the depth of the excavation is recommended when cantilever walls are used (i.e. a 30 ft embedment for a cantilever wall height of 15 feet). If the sheet pile wall is properly supported using a system of internal or external braces, the embedment can be reduced to not less than 10 feet below the bottom of the excavation.

Details of the sheet pile shoring design must be developed when the final geometry and construction methods are selected.

Installation of sheet piles by vibratory methods will likely induce settlement of the Stratum 2B silty sands during both installation and withdrawal. The structural and hydraulic system should be designed to accommodate this movement, which could be up to several inches.

If an "in the wet" shored trench installation approach is used, the bedding and backfill soil for the pipes should consist of clean sand and gravel that can be placed below the water and compacted using vibrators similar to those employed for concrete placement. Not more than approximately 1.5 feet of loose backfill should be placed in each lift before vibratory compaction effort is applied.

If Stratum 2B soils predominate at the siphon location, use of an auger for trenchless installation of the undercrossing portion of the pipe may result in unacceptable amounts of flowing sands, thereby posing a risk of sinkhole formation during construction. A pipe ramming approach would be less risky, but would be considered marginally feasible for the proposed 250-foot length of installation and the relatively large 4-foot diameter pipe. A steel pipe would be needed for the pipe ramming option.

#### 7.0 LIMITATIONS

The recommendations and descriptions presented in this report are based on the soil conditions disclosed by the field exploration conducted at the site in September and October 2008. The subsurface information referred to herein does not constitute a direct or implied warranty that the soil conditions between test pit locations can be directly interpolated or extrapolated or that subsurface conditions and soil variations different from those disclosed by the test pits will not be revealed. If, during construction, subsurface

conditions different from those described herein are observed, or if the structures and loading conditions described here are modified, URS Corporation should review such conditions and the recommendations given herein should be revised, if necessary.

#### 8.0 **REFERENCES**

- Bartlett, S. F. and T. L. Youd. 1995. Empirical Prediction of Liquefaction-Induced Lateral Spread. Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, ASCE, Vol. 121, No. 4.
- Dragovich, J. D., Logan, R. L., Schasse, H. W., Walsh, T. J, Lingley, W. S., Norman, D. K., Gerstel, W. J., Lapen, T. J., Schuster, J. E., and Meyers, K. D., 2002, Geological Map of Washington Northwest Quadrant, Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Geologic Map GM-50.
- Youd, L. T., C.M. Hansen, and S.F. Bartlett. 2002. Revised Multilinear Regression Equations for Prediction of Lateral Spread Displacement. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, ASCE, Vol. 128, No.12.

#### **TABLES**

- Table 1
- Summary of Recommended Soil Parameters Recommended Soil Parameters For Estimating Lateral Earth Pressures Table 2

#### TABLE 1 - Summary of Recommended Soil Parameters

	Imported Fill	Stratum 1 SILT	Stratum 2A clayey SILT	Stratum 2B SILT/sandy SILT /silty SAND	Stratum 3 silty SAND	Stratum 4 silty SAND/sandy SILT with gravel
ITEM	Sand	soft to medium stiff	very soft to soft	very loose to loose	loose to medium dense	medium dense to very dense
Typical Uncorrected N-values (bpf)	N/A	1 to 7	0 to 10	0 to 6	8 to 17	24 to 63
Total Unit Weight $\gamma$ (pcf)	130	110	95	100	110	130
Friction Angle $\phi$ (degrees)	36	20 <sup>(*)</sup>	18 <sup>(*)</sup>	18 <sup>(*)</sup>	28	40
Cohesion c (psf)	0	250	125	125	0	0
Static Elastic Modulus E (ksf)	1200	200	100	100	300	1200
Poisson's Ratio v	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.3	0.3
Active Earth Pressure Coeff Ka <sup>(**)</sup>	0.26	0.49	0.53	0.53	0.36	0.22
At-Rest Earth Pressure Coeff Ko <sup>(**)</sup>	0.4	0.66	0.69	0.69	0.53	0.36
Passive Earth Pressure Coeff Kp <sup>(***)</sup>	2.6	1.36	1.26	1.26	1.85	3.1
Soil-Concrete Friction Coeffcient(****)	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	0.35
Modulus Subgrade Reaction k (pci)	300	160	140	140	200	225
Compression Index $C_{ce}$	N/A	0.15	0.2	0.2	N/A	N/A
Re-compression Index $C_{r_{E}}$	N/A	0.015	0.02	0.02	N/A	N/A

Notes: <sup>(\*)</sup> Equivalent effective friction angle of silt for drained conditions <sup>(\*\*)</sup> Calculated based on estimated friction angles of silt for drained condition and Rankine equations <sup>(\*\*\*)</sup> Calculated based on estimated friction angles of silt for drained condition using Rankine equations and a factor of safety of 1.5 <sup>(\*\*\*)</sup> A factor of safety of 1.5 was applied to the ultimate value of friction coefficient

#### TABLE 2 - Recommended Soil Parameters For Estimating Lateral Earth Pressures

	Condition	Soil Unit Weight	Friction Angle	EQUIVALENT FLUID UNIT WEIGHT (PCF)			
Soli Type	Condition	(pcf)	(degree)	Active Case	At-Rest Case	Passive Case <sup>(***)</sup>	
	Above Water	130	36	34	52	320	
Granular Backfill	Below Water <sup>(**)</sup>	68	36	17	27	170	
	Above Water	110	20 <sup>(*)</sup>	54	73	150	
Stratum 1	Below Water <sup>(**)</sup>	48	20	24	32	65	
	Above Water	95	18 <sup>(*)</sup>	50	66	120	
Stratum 2A	Below Water <sup>(**)</sup>	33	18	17	23	42	
	Above Water	100	18 <sup>(*)</sup>	53	69	126	
Stratum 2B	Below Water <sup>(**)</sup>	38	18	20	26	48	

Notes: (\*) Equivalent effective friction angle of silt for drained conditions

(\*\*) Considered to be the "submerged condition", and hydrostatic pressure must be added to active and at-rest soil pressures to get total pressure.

(\*\*\*) A factor of safety of 1.5 was applied to the passive earth pressure coefficient.

#### FIGURES

Figure 1	Vicinity Map
Figure 2	Layout - Drill Hole and Test Pit Location
Figure 3	Profile of Soil Logs - Siphon and Proposed Levee



SOURCE: USGS 1:100,000 scale topographic quadrangle, Port Townsend, Washington, 1993



Figure 1 Site Location

Fisher Slough Restoration Project Soil Investigation Skagit County, Washington

#### Job No. 33760911





AND TES	<u>ST PIT LE(</u>	<u>GEND</u>	2008 2008 2008 2008
59ft 39ft 39ft 39ft 39ft 39ft	TEST PITS TP-1 TP-2 TP-3 TP-4 TP-5 TP-6	13ft 13ft 9ft 11ft 13ft 13ft	Da Designed D. HAWK/D. CLINE/ AUG Drawn S. BALENDRA Drawn APPROBER AUG Checked R. DENHERDER AUG Approved MARTIN MC CABE OCT
27.5ft 59ft <u>WELLS</u> 20ft 20ft	⊕ ATP−1 ATP−2 ATP−3	10ft 14ft 12.5ft	PROJECT
20tt			FISHER SLOUGH RESTORATION INVESTIGATION PLAN SOIL INVESTIGATION PLAN SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON
			Diamand Bill Seattle, Washington 98101 206-728-9655 Fax: 206-728-9670
	NUL FOR CO	JNSTRUCTION	Sheet 1 of 1



#### **APPENDIX A**

#### FIELD EXPLORATION

Key to Log of Boring and Descriptive Terms for Soil Logs of Borings AB-1, AB-2/GW-1, AB-3, AB-4, B-1 to B-4, GW-2, and GW-3 Logs of Test Pits ATP-1 to ATP-3, TP-1 to TP-6

## Key to Log of Boring and Descriptive Terms for Soil

	Maior Divisio	ns	Sym	bols	Typical Description	ns
0 4		Graph	Letter			
	Coarse	Clean Gravels		GW	Well-Graded Gravels, Gravel-Sand Mi Fines	ixtures, Little or no
/e Size	<b>vels</b> 0% of 0 ained ir eve	(less than 5% fines)		GP	Poorly-Graded Gravels, Gravel-Sand I Fines	Mixtures, Little or no
<b>Soils</b> 00 Siev	Gra than 5 ion Ret Si	Gravels with Fines		GM	Silty Gravels, Gravel-Sand-Silt Mixture	es
<b>ained</b> No. 20	More	(more than 12 % fines)		GC	Clayey Gravels, Gravel-Sand-Clay Mix	tures
rse Gr 0% of	Coarse Irough	Clean Sand		SW	Well-Graded Sands, Gravelly Sands,	Little or no Fines
Coal than 5	<b>nds</b> 0% of C ssing th Sieve	(less than 5% fines)		SP	Poorly Graded Sands, Gravelly Sands	s, Little or no Fines
More	Sal than 5( ion Pas No. 4	Sands with Fines		SM	Silty Sands, Sand-Clay Mixtures	
	More Fract	(more than 12 % fines)		SC	Clayey Sands, Sand-Clay Mixtures	
is Size				ML	Inorganic Silts and very Fine Sands, F Clayey Fine Sands or Clayey Silts wit	Rock Flour, Silty or h Slight Plasticity
<b>oils</b> aterial Sieve S	Silts	Liquid Limit		CL	Inorganic Clays of Low to Medium Plasticity, Gravelly Clays, Sandy Clays, Silty Clays, Lean Clays	
ອີບັດ Clays		ess man 50%		OL	Organic Silts and Organic Silty Clays	of Low Plasticity
e Grai an 50% an No.				MH	Inorganic Silts, Micaceous or Diatoma Sand or Silty Soils	aceous Fine
Fin 1ore th aller th	Silts and Gr	Liquid Limit eater than 50%		СН	Inorganic Clays of High Plasticity, Fat	Clays
≥ ms	Clays			ОН	Organic Clays of Medium to High Plas Silts	sticity, Organic
Highly Organic Soils			PT	Peat, Humus, Swamp Soils with High Contents (see ASTM D4427-92)	Organic	
		Rolat		neitu	or Consistency	
	`oareo_Cra			FISILY	Fine Grained Se	sile
Relative Density N, SPT Blows / ft			Relative Consistency	N, SPT Blows / ft		
Very lo	ose sand	0 -	4		Very soft	< 2
Ĺ	oose	4 -	10		Soft	2 - 4
Mediu	m dense	10 -	30		Medium stiff	4 - 8

#### Unified Soil Classification System (ASTM D2487 & D2488)

#### Abbreviations

SA M DD AL HA C Pc Pf DS TX TV LV PP OVA OC N	Sieve Analysis Moisture Dry Density Atterberg Limits Hydrometer Analysis Consolidation Constant Head Permeability Falling Head Permeability Direct Shear Triaxial Torvane Shear Laboratory Vane Shear Pocket Penetrometer Organic Vapor Analyzer Organic Content Number of hammer blows for last 12 inches sampled				
3" O.D. Spl Sample wit rings	it Spoon h brass	S	3" O.D. Shelby Tube Sample		
Core		Ρ	Piston Sample		
Non-standa penetration	ard test	€ <sup>®</sup> N	Grab Sample		
2" O.D. Split Spoon with 140lb Hammer and 30-inch drop (SPT)					
Typical Well Graphic Symbols					
One pipe in bentonite pellets			One slotted pipe in filter pack		
One pipe ir pack	n filter		Bentonite Seal		

#### NOTES:

Trace

Dense

Very dense

Clayey, silty, sandy, gravelly

Very (clayey, silty, sandy, gravelly)

 Descriptions and stratum lines are interpretive; field descriptions may have been modified to reflect lab test results. Descriptions on these logs apply only at the specific boring locations and at the time the borings were advanced; they are not warranted to be representative of subsurface conditions at other locations or times.

**Moisture Content** 

Moist Damp but no visible water

Visible free water, from

below the water table

Absence of moisture, dusty

8 - 15

15 - 30

Over 30

Stiff

Very stiff

Hard

Dry

Wet

2. Dual Symbols are used to indicate borderline soil classifications

30 - 50

Over 50

0 - 5%

12 - 30%

30 - 50%

**Minor Descriptors** 

Slightly (clayey, silty, sandy, gravelly) 5 - 12%



## Log of Boring AB-1

Sheet 1 of 2

Date(s) Drilled	9/29/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked WMM By
Drilling Method	Hollow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole <b>39.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig Type	Mobile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Elevation 6.0 feet
Groundwate	er Level Not Measured	Sampling Method(s)	SPT and/or Shelbey Tube	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion	Bentonite Chips	Location		



## Log of Boring AB-1

Sheet 2 of 2



## Log of Boring AB-2/GW-1

Sheet 1 of 2

Date(s) Drilled	9/26/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked By WMM
Drilling Method	Hollow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole <b>39.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig Type	Mobile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Elevation <b>7.0 feet</b>
Groundwat	ter Level 0.5 feet on 12/14/08	Sampling Method(s)	SPT	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion	Bentonite Chips	Location		



## Log of Boring AB-2/GW-1

Sheet 2 of 2



## Log of Boring AB-3

Sheet 1 of 1

Date(s) Drilled	9/26/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked WMM By
Drilling Method	Hollow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole 27.5 feet
Drill Rig Type	Mobile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Elevation 8.0 feet
Groundwat	ter Level Not Measured	Sampling Method(s)	SPT	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion	Bentonite Chips	Location		

		SAMPLES							ତ ୍ର ତି					
Elevation feet	Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	nscs	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content (%<#200 Siev	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS	
	0						ML	Brown SILT, medium stiff, moist [Fill]						
-5	5-		D-1	2 2 4 N=6	100		SM/	<ul> <li>with stratified dark brown decomposed wood (probably peat)</li> <li>dark gray silty SAND/sandy SILT with sea shell, very loose to         medium dense, wet, rapid dilatancy</li> </ul>	-				PP = 0.25 ~ 0.5 tst	
0/61/71 109:0			D-2	5 9	89			- - dark grav sandy SII T/silty SAND with trace gravel (rounded)	-					
AJ.GLD UROGENU	10-			15 N=24			SM	_ medium dense to very dense, moist	-					
	15-		D-3	12 24 38 N=62	100			- - -	-					
	20-		D-4	7 19 26 N=45	100			-	-					
	25-		D-5	23 50/3" N>100	100			- - - -	-					
		-						<ul> <li>terminated at 27.5 feet at 9 Am on Friday, 26 th September 2008</li> <li>backfilled with cuttings and chips.</li> </ul>						
	30-	I		I	1	1				I	I			
~ <u> </u>														

## Log of Boring AB-4

Sheet 1 of 2

Date(s) Drilled	9/30/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked WMM By
Drilling Method	Hollow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole 59.0 feet
Drill Rig Type	Mobile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Elevation <b>5.0 feet</b>
Groundwat	ter Level Not Measured	Sampling Method(s)	SPT and/or Shelbey Tube	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion	Bentonite Chips	Location		

				<u>SAMPL</u>	<u>ES</u>		1		50	a				
	teet Denth	feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	nscs	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
<b>-</b> 5								ML	Brown SILT, soft, moist [Fill]					
		5-		D-1	1 1 2 N=3	100		SM/	<ul> <li>with stratified dark brown decomposed wood (probably peat)</li> <li>dark gray silty SAND/sandy SILT , very loose , moist</li> </ul>	-				PP = 0.25
UKSSEA3.GUI 12/15/00 		- - - 10		D-2	0 2 2 N=4	72			- - clayey SILT from 8 to 9 ft, very soft - -	-	85.2	29.63	70.4	PP = 0.21
.GPJ UKSSEA3.GLB			S	S-3 D-4	0/1.5' N=0	29 67			- - _ from 12.5 to 22.5ft: with sea shell, wet, rapid dilatancy	-	00.2	20.00	10.4	
AND IESI PII LOGS	0	15			0/1					-				
	5 2	- 20 -		D-5	2 N=2	100				-				
КА ІЕСИЧІЗЛЕК ОГ/	0 2	- - 25		D-6	0/1.5' N=0	100		ML/ CL	<ul> <li>dark gray clayey SILT/silty CLAY with sea shell, very soft, moist, slow to none dilatancy</li> <li></li></ul>	-				PP = 0.05 tsf
DEA_WELLDRIN GATE	E ,			D-7	0/1.5' N=0	100			-	-				PP = 0.17
יייייי <b>יייייייייייייייייייייייייייייי</b>	<u> </u>													

## Log of Boring AB-4

Sheet 2 of 2

ſ		SAMPLES				ES					(5			-
	5 feet	<b>D</b> epth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	nscs	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completion Schematic	Fines Content /%<#200 Sieve	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
		- - - 35-		D-8	0/1.5' N=0	100			- · ·	-				PP = 0.14
	35	- - 40		D-9	0/1.5' N=0	100			- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-				₽₽ = 0.18 ¥st
URSSEA3.GDT 12/15/08	-40	- - 45		D-10	0/1.5' N=0	100			- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-				₽Р = 0.17 \$d
LOGS.GPJ URSSEA3.GLB	-45	- - 50		D-11	0/1.5' N=0	100		SM/ ML	dark gray silty SAND/sandy SILT with sea shell, very loose , moist, rapid to slow dilatancy	-				PP = 0.17
HIFIEL DIBORING AND TEST PIT	50	- - 55		D-12	0/1.5' N=0	100			grades to SILT with sea shell, very soft, slow to none dilatancy .					PP = 0.15
SATETRA TECHVFISHER SLOUG	55	- - 60 -		D-13	0/1.5' N=0	100			moist to wet, rapid dilatancy terminated at 59 feet at 10.15 Am on Tuesday, 30 th September 2008 backfilled with cuttings and chips	-				
GEO_SEA_WELL3RIN G	60	- 65—							TRS					

## Log of Boring B-1

Sheet 1 of 2

Date(s)	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked WMM
Drilled 9/29/08 - 4/18/07	By		By
Drilling	Drill Bit	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth
Method Hollow Stem Auger	Size/Type		of Borehole 59.0 feet
Drill Rig	Drilling	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate
Type Mobile Drill B-61	Contractor		Surface Elevation <b>5.0 feet</b>
Groundwater Level Not Measured	Sampling Method(s)	SPT and/or Shelbey Tube	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion Bentonite Chips	Location		


# Log of Boring B-1

Sheet 2 of 2

ſ				SAMPLES							(			
	Elevation feet	b Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ ft	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	USCS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completion Schematic	Fines Content (%<#200 Sieve	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
	-23	50	S	S-7		100		1	grades to soft					
-	30	- - 35-		D-8	0/1.5' N=0	100			- _ grades to clayey SILT, slow to none dilatancy, soft - 	-				PP =0.25 ¥
_	35	- - - 40-		D-9	0/1.5' N=0	100			- - _ grades to clayey SILT, slow to none dilatancy - 	-				PP ≈0.25 Isf
JRSSEA3.GDT 12/15/08	- <b>-4</b> 0	- - - 45		D-10	0/1.5' N=0	100		ML/ SM	- - - dark gray sandy SILT/silty SAND with sea shell, very loose, - wet to moist, rapid to slow dilatancy 	-				PP =0 tsf PP = 0.25
GS.GPJ URSSEA3.GLB L	45	- - 50		D-11	0/1.5' N=0	100		ML/ CL	<ul> <li>dark gray clayey SILT with sea shell, very soft, moist to wet, slow to none dilatancy</li> </ul>	-				U PP =0.18
NBORING AND TEST PIT LOO	50	- - 55-		D-12	0/1.5' N=0	100			- _ grades to SILT, soft, rapid to slow dilatancy - 	-				PP =0.25
FISHER SLOUGHVFIELD	EF	- - -		D-13	0/1.5' N=0	100			grades to SILT, very soft, slow dilatancy terminated at 59 feet at 10.15 Am on Monday, 29 th September 2008	-				PP =0.17 Isf
3RIN G:\TETRA TECH\F		60— - -							backfilled with cuttings and chips	-				
GEO_SEA_WELL	60	65-							URS					

# Log of Boring B-2

Date(s) 9/2	5/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked By	WMM
Drilling Method Hol	llow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole	39.0 feet
Drill Rig Type Mo	bile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Eleva	tion 8.0 feet
Groundwater Le	evel Not Measured	Sampling Method(s)	SPT and/or Shelbey Tube	Hammer Data	SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion Be	entonite Chips	Location			

					SAMPL	ES		_		50	a	ł		
Flevation	feet	Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	NSCS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content (%<#200 Sieve	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
		0-						ML	Brown SILT, stiff, moist [Fill]					
-1	5	- - 5		D-1	1 1 2 N=3	100			<ul> <li>with stratified dark brown decomposed wood (probably peat)</li> </ul>	-				PP = 0.5 tsf
55EA3.GUI 12/15/08	)	-		D-2	0 4 1 N=5	100		ML	- _ dark gray SILT with trace sand, very soft, wet -	-				PP = 0 tsf
JOS.GFJ UROSEAJ.GLB UR	5	10	S	S-3		100			 - - -	-	53.9	33.33	79.7	PP = 0.25 - 0.5 tsf
		15							_ possible poorly graded sand layer between 14.5 to 17.5 ft _	-				
	10	- - - <b>20</b> —		D-4	0/1' 1 N=1	100			- - heave at 17 ft - -	-				PP= 0 tsf
	15	- - - 25-		D-5	0/1.5' N=0	100		ML/ CL	- - _ dark gray clayey SILT/SILT with sea shell, very soft, wet - -	-				PP= 0 tsf
סיורויא שיורייא 	20	- - -		D-6	0/1.5' N=0	100			-	-				PP= 0 tsf
		30							URS					

### Log of Boring B-2

Sheet 2 of 2



# Log of Boring B-3

Date(s) Drilled	9/25/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked WMM By
Drilling Method	Hollow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole <b>39.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig Type	Mobile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Elevation <b>7.0 feet</b>
Groundwate	er Level Not Measured	Sampling Method(s)	SPT	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion	Bentonite Chips	Location		

	SAMF		SAMPL	ES				50	(i)					
	Elevation feet	Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	USCS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content /%<#200 Sieve	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
		0-						ML	Brown SILT, soft to medium stiff, moist [Fill]					
	-5	- - 5		D-1	2 1 1 N=2	100		ML	<ul> <li>with stratified dark brown decomposed wood (probably peat)</li> <li>dark gray SILT, very soft, wet</li> </ul>	-	95.4	32.5		PP = 0.75 Isf
	-0	- - - 10-		D-2	0/1' 1 N=1	100			- - - - -	-		44.3		PP = 0.14
רטפסיפרט טרססבאטיטר	5	- - - 15		D-3	0/1.5' N=0	100			- _ grades to with trace sand - 	-				PP = 0.12 - 0.25 tsf
	10	- - - <b>20</b> —		D-4	0/1.5' N=0	100		SM	grades to loose silty SAND with sea shell, wet dark gray silty SAND with sea shell, loose, wet, rapid dilatancy	-				PP = 0.18
	15	- - - 25-		D-5	4 4 5 N=9	100			- - - -	-	27.8	19.4		PP = 0.25 tsf
	- <b>-2</b> 0	- - - <b>30</b>		D-6	0 3 5 N=8	100			-	-				
J و									UKS					

### Log of Boring B-3

Sheet 2 of 2



# Log of Boring B-4

Date(s) Drilled	9/25/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked WMM By
Drilling Method	Hollow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole <b>39.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig Type	Mobile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Elevation <b>7.0 feet</b>
Groundwat	ter Level Not Measured	Sampling Method(s)	SPT	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion	Bentonite Chips	Location		

				SAMIFL	<u></u>				1 5 0	a la	1		
Elevation feet	Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	nscs	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content /%<#200 Sieve	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
	0						ML	Brown SILT, soft, moist [Fill]	<u> </u>				
-5	- - - 5-		D-1	3 2 1 N=3	100		ML	<ul> <li>with stratified dark brown decomposed wood (probably peat)</li> <li>dark gray SILT, very soft, moist</li> </ul>	-		48.9		PP = 0.25 ~ 0.5 tsf
	- - - 10		D-2	0 3 3 N=6	100			- - - -	-	95.3	37.5		PP = 0.15 - 0.21 tsf
- <b>-5</b>	- - - 15-		D-3	0/1.5' N=0	100			- grades to very loose silty SAND with sea shell -	-				PP = 0.25 ~ 0.5 tsf
- <b>-10</b>	- - - 20-		D-4	5 6 5 N=11	100		SM	<ul> <li>dark gray silty SAND with sea shell, medium dense, moist, none dilatancy</li> </ul>	-				
- <b>-15</b>			D-5	15 28 35 N=63	100		SM/	driller indicated dense at 20 feet	-				
- <b>-20</b>	25- - - -		D-6	10 25 26 N=51	100				-	78.9	15.9		
	30-						:1						

### Log of Boring B-4

Sheet 2 of 2



### Log of Boring GW-2

Date(s) Drilled	9/26/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked By WMM
Drilling Method	Hollow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole 20.0 feet
Drill Rig Type	Mobile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Elevation 6.0 feet
Groundwat	ter Level 3.0 feet on 12/14/08	Sampling Method(s)	SPT	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion	Bentonite Chips	Location		



# Log of Boring GW-3

Date(s) Drilled	9/29/08	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked WMM By
Drilling Method	Hollow Stem Auger	Drill Bit Size/Type	4.25" O.D.	Total Depth of Borehole <b>20.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig Type	Mobile Drill B-61	Drilling Contractor	Environmental Drilling, Inc.	Approximate Surface Elevation <b>5.0 feet</b>
Groundwate	er Level 1.0 feet on 12/14/08	Sampling Method(s)	SPT	Hammer SPT: 140-lb Auto Hammer, Data 30-inch Drop
Borehole Completion	Bentonite Chips	Location		

<u> </u>	SAMPLES				ES				Ξu				
Elevation feet	Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	NSCS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completio Schematio	Fines Content (%<#200 Sieve	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
-5	U						ML	Brown SILT, medium stiff, moist [Fill] - 1.0 ft -					concrete and monument hentonite
	-		D-1	1 2 3 N=5	100			_ with stratified dark brown decomposed wood (probably peat)					seal PP = 0.75
-0	5 -						ML	dark gray SIL I, very soft, moist, rapid to slow dilatancy					
	-		D-2	0/1.5' N=0	100								iser pipe and pack PP = 0.15 tsf
- <b>-5</b>	- 10						SM/ SP	gray to dark gray silty SAND/poorly graded fine SAND, loose, wet, rapid dilatancy					slotted (.020
- <b>-10</b>	- - 15—		D-3	5 2 2 N=4	100					•			'n) and sand pack
	-		D-4	0/1' 2 N=2	100					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
- <b>-15</b>	<b>20</b> - -							terminated at 20 feet at 2.30 Pm on Monday, 29 th September 2008 Install well 2 inch diameter PVC Well tag: APQ793 Water level measurement (below existing ground surface): -12/14/08 at 16:15: 1.0 feet in observation well					
- <b>-20</b>	- 25 -								-				
-25	- - 30								-				

## Log of Boring ATP-1

Date(s)	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked WMM
Drilled <b>10/6/08</b>	By		By
Drilling	Drill Bit		Total Depth
Method	Size/Type		of Borehole <b>10.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig	Drilling	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate
Type <b>120 Excavator</b>	Contractor		Surface Elevation 8.0 feet
Groundwater Level Not Observed	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

			SAMPLES						Бо	(6			
Elevation feet	Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	nscs	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
-5	- - -						ML/ CL	Brown clayey SILT/SILT with/with out trace sand, Medium stiff to stiff, moist to dry [Fill]	-				
	5 - -						SM/		-				
	- 10 -						ML	<ul> <li>@ 10 feet: gray silty SAND/sandy SILT with gravel, moist, dense to very dense</li> <li>terminated at 10 feet at 3.00 Pm on Monday, 6 th October 2008.</li> <li>No groundwater was encountered during excavation.</li> </ul>	-				
- <b>-5</b>	- - 15								-				
- <b>-10</b>	- - 20-								-				
15	- - - 25—								-				
- <b>-20</b>	2J - - -								-				
	30-							TTB\$					

## Log of Boring ATP-2

Date(s)	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked WMM
Drilled <b>10/6/08</b>	By		By
Drilling	Drill Bit		Total Depth
Method	Size/Type		of Borehole <b>14.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig	Drilling	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate
Type <b>120 Excavator</b>	Contractor		Surface Elevation <b>16.0 feet</b>
Groundwater Level Not Observed	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

					SAMPL	ES		4		50	a			
	5				÷		bo			nati	tent		Ś	REMARKS
	atic	Ê.		2	, 6ir	ery "	ic L		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	und all		te %	nsit	AND
	eet	eet	e .	ğ L	NS/	hes	aph	SCS		∣≥ວັຑັ	es (	stur	ے م	OTHER
	<u> т</u>			2	BIG	la cl	Ű	S			Fin.	C Mo		TESTS
		0						SM/	Dark brown silty SAND with gravel/silty GRAVEL with sand,		10.5	2.92		
F	-15	-						GM		1				
		-							-	-				
		-							-	-				
		_							-					
		F												
		5-												
	-10	-							-	-				
7		-							-	-				
פר		-							-	_				
EA3		_							-	_				
2021		40												
'n		10-						ML	Dark gray SILT with trace sand, soft to medium stiff, moist					
5.5-	-5	-							-	-				
200		-							-	-				
2		-							-	_				
5.0		_								_				
5		15							terminated at 14 feet at 2.00 Pm on Monday, 6 th October 2008.					
2		13							No groundwater was encountered during excavation.					
2	-0	-							-	1				
- N		-							-	-				
ע פ		-							-	-				
EX 2 2		-							-	_				
		20-								_				
	- 5													
2000	-0	]												
202		-							-	1				
		-							-	-				
		-							-	-				
		25-								-				
È	10	_							-					
Z		1								1				
		-							+	1				
		-							-	-				
		30												
ίL									IIBS					

# Log of Boring ATP-3

Date(s)	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked WMM
Drilled <b>10/6/08</b>	By		By
Drilling	Drill Bit		Total Depth
Method	Size/Type		of Borehole <b>12.5 feet</b>
Drill Rig	Drilling	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate
Type <b>120 Excavator</b>	Contractor		Surface Elevation <b>5.0 feet</b>
Groundwater Level 11.5 feet on 10/0/08	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

ſ					SAMPL	ES	_				50	(0	-		
n Elevation foot	Denth	feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	-	USCS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
<b>F</b> <sup>3</sup>		0						Ν	ИL	Brown SILT , medium stiff to very stiff, moist [Fill]	T				PP = 2.5 tsf
		-								-	1				
										-	1				PP = 0.5 tsf
										-	1				
		_								-	1				
<sub>2</sub>		<b>9</b> -						N	ИL	Gray SILT , very soft, moist	1				
1/61/7										-	]				
										_					
EA3.0										_					
-5		10-													
GLB										-	_				
SEA3.		_							SP	Gray poorly graded fine to medium SAND, loose, wet	<u>_</u>				
CKU C		-						<u></u>		heaving at 11.5 feet terminated at 12.5 feet at 11.30 Am on Monday, 6 th October	-				
0.67		_								2008. – Groundwater was encountered at 11.5' below ground surface	-				
<u>الا</u>	) .	15-								(large inflow rate).	-				
		-								-	-				
		-								-	-				
AN AN		-								-	-				
BORI		-								-	-				
	5 2	20-									-				
100		-								-	-				
( SECO		-								-	-				
SHEF		-								-	-				
		-								-	1				
≝ 20	) :	25–									-				
		-								-	-				
N		-								-	1				
VELLS		-								-	1				
										-	1				
″i <b>⊢-25</b>	5	30-⊥				1	1				1	1	ı		
										—— UKS ———					

# Log of Boring TP-1

Date(s) <b>10/6/08</b>	Logged By	S.Balendra	Checked By WMM
Drilling Method	Drill Bit Size/Type		Total Depth of Borehole <b>13.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig Type <b>120 Excavator</b>	Drilling Contractor	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate Surface Elevation <b>17.0 feet</b>
Groundwater Level Not Observed	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

				SAMPL	ES				50	1	+		
Elevation	Depth,	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Granhic Log	NSCS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
-15	ŭ	-					ML/ SM	Brown sandy SILT/silty SAND with gravel, very dense, dry to moist [Fill]		32.4	4.45		
000	5	-					ML	Brown SILT, medium stiff, moist [Fill]	-				
		-						- · · · ·	-	73.5	5.66		PP = 0.5 tsf
-5	10								-				
	15	-						terminated at 13 feet at 12.30 Pm on Monday, 6 th October 2008. No groundwater was encountered during excavation.	-				
		-						- · · ·	-				
- <b>-5</b>	20	-						 	-				
	25	-							-				
	)	-						- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-				
	30												

# Log of Boring TP-2

Date(s)	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked
Drilled <b>10/6/08</b>	By		By WMM
Drilling	Drill Bit		Total Depth
Method	Size/Type		of Borehole <b>13.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig	Drilling	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate
Type <b>120 Excavator</b>	Contractor		Surface Elevation 17.0 feet
Groundwater Level Not Observed	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

				SAMPL	ES					50	a a			
Elevation feet	Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	USCS		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completic Schemati	Fines Content	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
	0						ML		Brown SILT with sand and trace gravel, stiff to very stiff, dry [Fill]					
-15	-						ML		Brown SILT, stiff, moist [Fill]	-				PP = 1.5 tsf
	-								-					T
	5									-				
	-							+	-	-				
	-								-					
	-							-	-	-				
	10-						ML	/	Gray clayey SILT, medium stiff to stiff, moist					PP = 1 tsf
5	-								-	-				
	-					I	1		terminated at 13 feet at 1.00 Pm on Monday, 6 th October					
	- 15								No groundwater was encountered during excavation.					
	-							-	-	-				
-0	-							ŀ	-	-				
	-								-	]				
	20							-		-				
5	-								-	_				
	-								-	-				
	-							-	-	-				
	25													
10	-							-	-	-				
	-								-	-				
	- 30								-	1				
									URS					

# Log of Boring TP-3

Date(s)	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked WMM
Drilled 10/6/08	By		By
Drilling	Drill Bit		Total Depth
Method	Size/Type		of Borehole 9.0 feet
Drill Rig	Drilling	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate
Type <b>120 Excavator</b>	Contractor		Surface Elevation <b>12.5 feet</b>
Groundwater Level Not Observed	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

				SAMPL	ES				50	<i>(</i>			
Elevation feet	Depth, feet	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	NSCS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Completic Schemati	Fines Content (%<#200 Sieve	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (acf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
	U						ML	Brown SILT , very stiff to hard, dry [Fill]					PP =4.0 tst
-10	-							Locally: Well graded GRAVEL with sand, rounded, medium					_
	_						ML	Brown SILT with/with out trace sand, stiff, moist [Fill]					tsf
0	5								1				
0/61 /	-							-	1				
5	-							-	-				
A3.G	-						ML	Gray SILT, very soft, moist	-				
	-							terminated at 9 feet at 3.30 Pm on Monday, 6 th October					
	10							No groundwater was encountered during excavation.	1				
D.02	-							-	1				
0-10	-							-	-				
	-							-	-				
2.65	-							-	1				
	15							-	1				
0	-							-	1				
5	-							-					
	-							-	1				
	-							-	1				
	20-								1				
	-							-	1				
<sup>7</sup> ⊢-10	-							-	1				
	-							-	]				
	-							-	1				
EX.	25-							Γ	7				
	-							ſ	]				
₹ <u></u> 15	-								]				
	-								]				
	20							<u> </u>					
	30												
~ <b></b>													

# Log of Boring TP-4

Date(s)	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked WMM
Drilled 10/6/08	By		By
Drilling	Drill Bit		Total Depth
Method	Size/Type		of Borehole <b>11.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig	Drilling	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate
Type 120 Excavator	Contractor		Surface Elevation <b>12.0 feet</b>
Groundwater Level Not Observed	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

				SAMPL	ES				50	( .			
Elevation	Depth,	Type	Number	Blows/ 6in.	Recovery - Inches	Graphic Log	USCS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Well Completio Schematic	Fines Content	Moisture Content. %	Dry Density, (pcf)	REMARKS AND OTHER TESTS
-10	Ū	-					GM/ SM ML/ CL	Brown silty GRAVEL with sand/ silty SAND with gravel, dense, dry to moist [Fill] Brown clayey SILT, stiff to hard, moist [Fill]	-	81.5	20.18		PP = 2 to 4 tsf
<sup>90/GL/ZL</sup> – <b>5</b>	5	-							-				
UNSOEAS.UN	10	-					ML	Gray SILT, very soft, moist	-				
	15	-						No groundwater was encountered during excavation.	-				
		-							-				
- <b>-1</b>	20 )	-							-				
	25	-							- - -				
	5 30	-						- · · ·	-				
Ľ								IIBS					

# Log of Boring TP-5

Date(s) 10/6/08	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked WMM
Drilled	By		By
Drilling	Drill Bit		Total Depth
Method	Size/Type		of Borehole <b>13.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig	Drilling	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate
Type <b>120 Excavator</b>	Contractor		Surface Elevation <b>4.0 feet</b>
Groundwater Level 10.5 feet on 10/06/08	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

			SAMPL	ES		1		Б o	e)	•		
Ę			<u>.</u>	.	bo			nati	ent		, K	REMARKS
atic	Ë.	5	6ir	ery	- 		MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	le del	Sont	te %	nsit	AND
et e	eet	a m	NS/	hes	hqe	S		∣≥ວັຑັ	es (	stur	De	OTHER
Шщ	ц <u>е</u>	Nu Type	Blo	Ъ.	ъ	S			Fine	C Moi	Dry	TESTS
	0					ML/	Brown clayey SILT with/with out trace sand, soft to stiff, moist					PP = 2 tst
	-					CL	_ [Fm] .	1				<b></b>
	-							-				to 0.5 tsf
	-				IIN			_				
L	_				ЦИ							
	_					ML	Gray SILT, very soft, moist					
	5							1				
	-							-				
3	-							-				
20	-							_				
- <b>-</b>												
	10							2				
	-					SP	<ul> <li>Gray poorly graded fine to medium SAND, loose</li> <li>heaving at 11 feet</li> </ul>	-				
	-						-	-				
	_											
							terminated at 13 feet at 10.00 Am on Monday, 6 th October					
; <b>−-10</b>	-						Ground water was encountered at 10.5' below ground surface					
-	15						_ (large inflow rate)	-				
	-							-				
	-							_				
	_											
5 <b>15</b>	-						-	1				
	20-							1				
	-							-				
2	_							4				
2	-											
-20	-						-	1				
	25-							+				
2	-							-				
Ď	-							1				
	-	]					-	1				
-25	-							1				
	30-											
Ľ,							IIDC					

# Log of Boring TP-6

Date(s) 10/6/08	Logged	S.Balendra	Checked WMM
Drilled	By		By
Drilling	Drill Bit		Total Depth
Method	Size/Type		of Borehole <b>13.0 feet</b>
Drill Rig	Drilling	Catapult Heavy Construction	Approximate
Type <b>120 Excavator</b>	Contractor		Surface Elevation <b>5.0 feet</b>
Groundwater Level 5 feet on 10/06/08	Sampling Method(s)	Grab Sample	Hammer Data
Borehole Completion	Location		

				<u>SAMPL</u>	ES		1		50	a a			1
ы				Ľ.	-	bo-			pletic	Siev	%	ťζ,	REMARKS
evati	t bt		ber	s/ 6i	very	hic I	S	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Vell	CO	ure ent. °	ensi	AND
Ele	De	[ype	Mum	Blow	Recc	Grap	lsc		-00	ines ***	Aoist Conte		TESTS
-5	0-		2	ш		ΠĮ	 	Brown clayey SILT/SILT with/with out trace sand, Medium stiff	+ ·	77.2	3.61		PP = 2.0 tsf
		1					CL	_ to stiff, moist [Fill]	1				_ <b>_</b>
		1						-	1				PP = 1.5 tsf PP = 0.5
		1					1	-	-				- <b>L</b> tsf
		1					1	-					
<b>0</b>	5-	1				НK		water perched at 5 feet	-				
0/61/2		1					IVIL	- Gray SIL I, very soft, moist					
		1						-	1				
EA3.6								-					
	10_												
	10-							_					
EA3.0								_					
CK50													
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1								terminated at 13 feet at 10.30 Am on Monday, 6 th October 2008.					
<sup>3</sup> -10	15-							Perched water was encountered at 5' below ground surface _ (slight inflow rate).					
	-							-	_				
								-	_				
G AIN		-						-	-				
20KIN		-						-	-				
∐ <b>-1</b> 5	20-	-							-				
L L L								-	-				
srut		-						-	-				
SHEK		-						-	-				
		-						-	-				
¦ <b>⊢-20</b>	25-	-							-				
		-						-	-				
								-	1				
ELLO		-						-	1				
		-						-	1				
⊼i <b>⊢-25</b>	30-						<u> </u>			1			
5								URS					

#### **APPENDIX B**

#### LABORATORY TESTING

Table B-1: Summary of Laboratory Test Results URS Atterberg Limits' Results of AB-2/GW-1, B-3, and B-4 URS Sieve Analysis Results of AB-2/GW-1 and GW-2 Analytical Resources' Consolidation etc Results of AB-1, AB-4, B-1, and B-2 Analytical Resources' Modified Proctor Testing Results of ATP-2, TP-1, TP-4, and TP-6

Boring Number	Sample Depth (ft)	USCS Soil Classification	Stratum No.	Moisture Content (%)	% Fines	% Gravel	Dry Unit Weight (pcf)	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index	Modified Proctor Maximum Density (pcf)	Modified Proctor Optimum Moisture (%)	Modified Proctor Maximum Density (pcf) (Corrected <sup>2</sup> )	Modified Proctor Optimum Moisture (%) (Corrected <sup>2</sup> )	Compression Index Cc (strain)	Coefficient of Consolidation Cv (ft²/day)	Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/s)
B-1	2.5	ML/CL	1	39.4	98.2												
	12.5	SM/ML	2B	44.4	88.6												
	17.5	SM/ML	2B	30.8	45.7												
	29-31	ML/CL	2A	30.6	93.1		81.9	43	26	17					0.10	0.19	
B-2	12.5-14.5	ML/CL	2A	33.3	53.9		79.7	25	20	5					0.09	18.0	3.61E-07
B-3	2.5	ML	1	32.5	95.4												
	7.5	ML	2A	44.3				41	25	16							
	22.5	SM	2B	19.4	27.8												
B-4	2.5	ML	1	48.9				58	33	25							
	7.5	ML	2A	37.5	95.3												
	27.5	SM/ML	4	15.9	78.9												
AB-1	25-27	ML/CL, CH	2A	38.8	97.5		71.1	51	27	24					0.14	0.28	
AB-2/GW-1	7.5	ML	2A	42.6	98.4												
	12.5	ML	2A	27.4				33	22	11							
	17.5	SM	2B		38.8	1											
	22.5	SM	3	20.8	25.1												
AB-4	10-12	SM/ML	2B	29.6	85.2	0.9	70.4										3.58E-07
GW-2	12.5-14	SM	3		30.3	12.5											
TP-1	0-4	ML/SM	Fill	4.5	32.4						133.5	8.4					
	7.5	ML	Fill	5.7	73.5						95.8	25.3					
TP-4	2-4	ML/CL	Fill	20.2	81.5						102.3	20.9					
TP-6	0-2	ML/CL	Fill	3.6	77.2						94.1	18.1					
ATP-2	0-4	SM/GM	Fill	2.9	10.5	58.9					138.9	6.5	147.2	4.7			

#### Table B-1: Summary of Laboratory Test Results

Notes:

1. Consolidation  $C_V$  is at a vertical stress of 1,000 psf.

2. Modified MDD and OMC for Sample ATP-2 at 0-4 feet was corrected for gravel content.







November 2, 2008

Mr. Suren Balendra, P.E. URS Corporation Century Square 1501 – 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 1400 Seattle, WA 98101-1616

#### RE: Client Project: Fisher Slough ARI Project: NS66

Dear Mr. Balendra;

The following pages provide the information you requested. Please call me to discuss any questions or comments you may have on the data or its presentation.

Best Regards,

Analytical Resources, Inc.

Harthe Berry

Harold Benny Geotechnical Laboratory Manager 206-695-6246 haroldb@arilabs.com

Enclosures

cc: Files NS66



Client: URS Corporation

Project No.: NS66

Client Project: Fisher Slough

#### Case Narrative

- 1. Four samples were submitted for testing. They were received on October 3, 2008, in good condition.
- 2. The moisture content was measured according to ASTM D2216.
- 3. The samples were extruded and visually examined. Samples for consolidation and permeability were taken and set up. Soil for the other tests were taken from the trimmings and unused portions of the tube.
- 4. The consolidation testing was conducted using a GeoTAC Sigma-1 automated testing system and associated software. The samples were trimmed into a test ring and placed in the loading device. The loads were applied according to the test schedule, and the next load was applied after reaching 100 percent of primary consolidation, plus a delay factor based on the time to reach this point, or after 4 hours, whichever was less. For some loads the automated system had trouble calculating the end of primary consolidation. On these loads, the data was downloaded and manual calculations were performed based on ASTM D2435, method B.
- 5. The Atterberg limits were conducted according to ASTM D4318.
- 6. Flexible wall hydraulic conductivity tests were run according to ASTM D5082. The samples had low conductivity.
- 7. The grain size analysis was run according to ASTM D422. Only the sieve portion of the analysis was run.
- 8. The percent fines were measured according to ASTM D1140.
- 9. The data is provided in summary tables and plots.
- 10. There were no other noted anomalies in the samples or methods on this project.

Approved by: 7

Title:

Geotechnical Division Manager

**Chain of Custody** 

ARI Assigned Number

Record & Laboratory Analysis Request	Park	666 \$955 5288
Turn-around Requested:	Date: 1の/2/0 名	Analytical Resources, Inc
RS, Seattle Phone: 206 438 2333	Page: / of /	4611 South 134th Place, 1
en Bylendra	No. of Cooler Coolerst Temps.	100-695-6200 206-695-6
sher Slough	くり ヴ・ナソ Analysis Requested	Notes/Comn
09/1 Samplers:	12ha 	

NSGO				רמוס.	01410	6				Analy	tical Resources, Incorporate	'n
Client Company: U.R.S. Seat He	2 Phone:	24 202	8 2333	Page:		of /				Analy 4611	tical Chemists and Consulta South 134th Place Suite 10	ats c
									7	Tukwi	la WA 98168	,
ni contact: SUVEA Byle	-1 dra			No. of Coolersa		Cooler Temps				206-6	95-6200 206-695-6201 (fa	$\widehat{\mathbf{v}}$
int Project Name: Fisher SID	いたい			ε. Ο (		2	Analysis Re	equested			Notes/Comments	
nt Project #: $337609/1$ Samplers:				z¢1 150!11	(.q===	, Jun	872ha -15w 813					1
Sample ID Date	Time	Matrix	No. Containers	0.254 0.500 <b>)</b>	wrzd	5-345 -1-1-01	: 415# 17 9~3+++	<del>.</del>	Ənə <u>i</u> s			
2 -1 5 29-31 / 1/2/08	6	1 jos	-	$\prec$		×	( ×	$\times$		_		
AB-1 Q 25-27 9/29/06	9	(.		X		X		×				T
A2-4 @ 10'-11 9/30/00	d	:	1	, ,	×	5	·		X			<u> </u>
B-2 @ 12 5-14-1 9/2010	8	4	-	×	X	$\checkmark$	$\times$	X				1
												<u> </u>
												<del></del>
												<del></del>
												1
Dollaristical					-(							<del>1 –</del>
	₽ Å Š	eda.	Heceived by: (Signature)		7		Relinquished by	24		Received t	:/c	<del>7 –</del>
Shell of Printed Name.	04	lende	Printed Name:		100	,	Printed Name:			Printed Na	me:	
Company.					D		ompany:			Company:		<u> </u>
	po los	21115	Pate Time		0,0	4	late & Time:			Date & Tin	10:	
	0 2 1			0/								

meets standards for the industry. The total liability of ARI, its officers, agents, employees, or successors, arising out of or in connection with the requested services, shall not exceed the Involced amount for said services. The acceptance by the client of a proposal for services by ARI release ARI from any liability in excess thereof, not withstanding any provision to the contrary in any contract, purchase order or co-Limits of Liability: ARI will perform all requested services in accordance with appropriate methodology following ARI Standard Operating Procedures and the ARI Quality Assurance Program. This program signed agreement between ARI and the Client.

Sample Retention Policy: All samples submitted to ARI will be appropriately discarded no sooner than 90 days after receipt or 60 days after submission of hardcopy data, whichever is longer, unless alemate reterition schedules have been established by work-order or contract

. :•

١.

:

. :,

.

·....

÷ ;

.

### Fisher Slough

Sample Identification	Percent Fines (-#200 Sieve)
B-1 @ 29-31	93.1
AB-1 @ 25-27	97.5
B-2 @ 12.5-14.5	53.9

NS66

URS Corporation Fisher Slough Percent Finer Than Indicated Size, By ASTM D422

#200	85.2
#100	88.3
09#	90.1
#40	92.0
#20	94.5
#10	96.9
7#	99.1
3/8"	100.0
1/2"	100.0
3/4"	100.0
ŧ	100.0
1.5"	100.0
2"	100.0
ъ.	100.0
Moisture Content (%)	29.63
Depth (ft)	10'-12'
Sample ID	AB-4

NS66

URS Corporation Fisher Stough Percent Retained in Each Size Fraction, By ASTM D422

<75	85.2
150-75	3.2
250-150	1.7
425-250	2.0
850-425	2.5
2000-850	2.3
4750-2000	2.2
3/8-#4	0.9
1/2-3/8"	0.0
3/4-1/2"	0.0
1-3/4"	0.0
1.5-1"	0.0
2-1.5"	0.0
3-2"	0.0
Sieve Size (microns)	AB-4

NS66

の第二





Boring Number	Sample Number	Depth (ft)	As-Received Moisture Content	Plasticity Index	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	USCS
B-1	0	29-31	30.59	17.2	43.2	26.0	CL
AB-1	0	25-27	38.81	24.0	51.4	27.4	CH
B-2	0	12.5-14.5	33.33	4.9	24.8	19.9	CL

**NS66** 

**URS** Corportation Fisher Slough

Hydraulic Conductivity 3.58E-07 3.61E-07 (cm/s) Gradient <u>1.82</u> 1.76 (1/4) Moisture Content 32.8 32.8 (%) After Test Sample Parameters Saturation 1.131 0.911 Test Results for Flexible Wall Hydraulic Conductivity Testing Total Porosity 0.435 0.488 Wet Density (lbs/ft<sup>3</sup>) 124.2 112.4 Moisture Content (%) 42.8 35.1 As Received Sample Parameters Saturation 0.842 0.879 Total Porosity 0.574 0.514 Density (lbs/ft<sup>3</sup>) 100.6 108.6 Wet 12.5-14.5 (ft) (ft) 10-12 Sample Identification Sample AB-4 Sample B-2

Notes:

The samples were tested in accordance with ASTM D-5084.
 The tests were performed using tap water for the permeant.
 The porosity and the saturation were calculated using an assumed specific gravity value of 2.65.

Dimensions
and
ption
·=
ပ္ဆ
ഗ്പ
Ä
Ц
Φ
ō
Ĕ
긆
ŝ

NS66

### URS Corporation Fisher Slough

#### Moisture and Density of Consolidation Samples

Sample ID	Wet Density (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)
B-1 @ 29-31 ft	107.0	30.6	81.9
AB-1 @ 25-27 ft	98.7	38.8	71.1
B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 ft	106.3	33.3	79.7

### Fisher Slough B-1 @ 29'-31'

	Vertical	Machine	H <sub>0</sub> (in)	0.900	Vertical			
Step	Stress	Deflections	S <sub>100</sub>	H <sub>100</sub>	Strain	H <sub>50</sub>	t <sub>50</sub>	C,
No.	(psf)	(in.)	(in.)	(in.)	(%)	(in.)	(min.)	(ft <sup>2</sup> /day)
1	100	0.0000						#N/A
2	125	0.0000	0.0209	0.8791	2.32			#N/A
3	250	0.0002	0.0086	0.8707	3.61	0.8750	3.34	0.11
4	500	0.0006	0.0168	0 8511	5.52	0.8595	3.78	0.10
5	1000	0.0016	0.0179	0.8334	7 79	0.8424	1.85	0.19
6	2000	0.0033	0.0218	0 8098	10.33	0.8207	0.92	0.36
7	4000	0.0050	0.0275	0.7813	13.19			#N/A
8	8000	0.0077	0.0305	0 7534	16.28			#N/A
9	2000	0.0036	-0.0068	0.7563	15.97			#N/A
10	500	0.0010	-0.0073	0.7610	15.40	0.7573	0.56	0.51
11	125	0.0000	-0.0107	0,7711	14.33			#N/A
[								
				I				
				I				
[	(			1			,	
	[						,	
	(			i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i				
	(			í				l.
				í				
	1			1				
				1				
	1							
					[			

#### Fisher Slough B-1 @ 29-31



#### Fisher Slough B-1 @ 29-31 250 psf Load

.

0.0140



#### Fisher Slough B-1 @ 29-31 500 psf Load


## Fisher Slough B-1 @ 29-31 1,000 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-1 @ 29-31 2,000 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-1 @ 29-31 8,000 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-1 @ 29-31 2,000 psf Load (rebound)



# Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27

	Vertical	Machine	H <sub>0</sub> (in)	0.900	Vertical			
Step	Stress	Deflections	S <sub>100</sub>	H <sub>100</sub>	Strain	H <sub>50</sub>	t <sub>50</sub>	C <sub>V</sub>
No.	(psf)	(in.)	(in.)	(in.)	(%)	(in.)	(min.)	(ft²/day)
1	100	0.0000						#N/A
2	125	0.0000	0.0115	0.8887	1.45	0.8944	1.70	0.23
3	250	0.0002	0.0121	0.8750	2.78			#N/A
4	500	0.0006	0.0116	0.8637	4.78	0.8695	1.37	0.27
5	1000	0.0016	0.0229	0.8351	7.19	0.8465	1.25	0.28
6	2000	0.0033	0.0290	0.8079	11.12	0.8224	1.00	0.33
7	4000	0.0050	0.0408	0.7609	15.46			#N/A
8	8000	0.0077	0.0411	0.7224	19.73			#N/A
9	2000	0.0036	-0.0075	0.7259	19.35			#N/A
10	500	0.0010	-0.0113	0.7346	18.38			#N/A
11	125	0.0000	-0.0098	0.7433	17.14	0.7384	3.17	80.0
				[				
				L				
				L				
	<u></u>							
				k i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i				

## Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27



## Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27 125 psf Load



## Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27 125 psf Load



## Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27 250 psf Load



## Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27 500 psf Load



## Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27 1,000 psf Load



#### Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27 2,000 psf Load



## Fisher Slough AB-1 @ 25-27 4,000 psf Load



# Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5

	Vertical	Machine	H <sub>0</sub> (in)	0.900	Vertical			
Step	Stress	Deflections	S <sub>100</sub>	H <sub>100</sub>	Strain	H <sub>50</sub>	t <sub>50</sub>	C <sub>V</sub>
No.	(psf)	(in.)	(in.)	(in.)	(%)	(in.)	(min.)	(ft²/day)
1	100	0.0000						#N/A
2	125	0.0000	0.0146	0.8853	1.95	0.8926	1.38	0.28
3	250	0.0002	0.0096	0.8731	2.99	0.8779	0.04	10.54
4	500	0.0006	0.0179	0.8555	4.95	0.8645	0.05	7.67
5	1000	0.0016	0.0179	0.8386	6.82	0.8476	0.02	18.05
6	2000	0.0033	0.0215	0.8187	9.03	0.8295	0.03	13.24
7	4000	0.0050	0.0236	0.7969	11.45	0.8087	0.22	1.46
8	8000	0.0077	0.0259	0.7737	14.04	0.7867	0.03	9.52
9	2000	0.0036	-0.0068	0.7763	13.74	0.7729	0.02	15.01
10	500	0.0010	-0.0072	0 7809	13.23	0.7773		#N/A
11	125	0.0000	-0.0071	0.7870	12.55	0.7835		#N/A
								#N/A
								#N/A
								#N/A
			1		<u> </u>			#N/A
								#N/A
								#N/A
				(				#N/A
						<u> </u>	[]	#N/A
								#N/A
								#N/A
				I		J		#N/A
								#N/A
				í		J	J	#N/A
				( <u> </u>				#N/A
1	l i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i							#N/A
			1	<b>.</b>		1		#N/A

## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 250 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 125 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 250 psf Load



.

## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 500 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 1,000 psf Load



t

## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 2,000 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 4,000 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5 8,000 psf Load



## Fisher Slough B-2 @ 12.5-14.5





November 2, 2008

Mr. Suren Balendra, P.E. URS Corporation Century Square 1501 – 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 1400 Seattle, WA 98101-1616

## RE: Client Project: Fisher Slough ARI Project: NU48

Dear Mr. Balendra;

The following pages provide the information you requested. Please call me to discuss any questions or comments you may have on the data or its presentation.

Best Regards,

Analytical Resources, Inc.

111

Harold Benny Geotechnical Laboratory Manager 206-695-6246 haroldb@arilabs.com

Enclosures

cc: Files NU48



Client: URS Corporation

Project No.: NU48

Client Project: Fisher Slough

## Case Narrative

- 1. Five samples were submitted for Modified Proctor testing. They were received on October 15, 2008, in good condition.
- 2. The Modified Proctor testing was run according to ASTM D1557, method C. Material greater than the <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> inch sieve was removed.
- 3. The grain size analysis was run according to ASTM D422. Only the sieve portion of the analysis was run.
- 4. The percent fines were measured according to ASTM D1140.
- 5. The data is provided in summary tables and plots.
- 6. There were no other noted anomalies in the samples or methods on this project.

Date: 11/2

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: G

Geotechnical Division Manager

ഗ
Ă
- 73
_ <u>X</u>
Φ
~~~
<u> </u>
48
- V)
ഗ
- 5
_
_
7
-
~
<u>د</u>
Ā
<u> </u>
- 52
. 03
1
- 0
ž
٠ų
~X
~
_
0
<u> </u>
0
- X
Q
a)
æ
щ
Å
v Re
Iv Re
dy Re
ody Re
tody Re
stody Re
stody Re
ustody Re
Sustody Re
<b>Custody Re</b>
Custody Re
f Custody Re
of Custody Re
of Custody Re
n of Custody Re
in of Custody Re
ain of Custody Re
ain of Custody Re

	:					18/12	3			Analytical Resources, Incorport
I Client Company: 110 C	ectile	Phone: 2	0647	0 77 2	Page:		of			Analytical Chemists and Consu 4611 South 134th Place. Suite 1
			5	ہ <del>،</del> ا		_				Tukwila WA 98168
ient Contact: こいての	Balero	tra			No. of Coolers:		Cooler Temps:			206-695-6200 206-695-6201 (
ent Project Name:		7					- A	alysis Requeste		Notes/Comments
ent Project #: 227 /	Samplers:			1	र स्टब्स् १९५२	-			<u></u>	
ILLOGIC					99 7 1 9 9	2				
Sample ID	Date	Time	Matrix	No. Containers	wLst dwp)	N9(2			<u> </u>	
18-1 20-41	80/9/01				×	×				
TP-1 @ 25'	80/9/01				×	x				
ATP-2 @ 0-41	20/9/01				$\times$	X				
TP-4 (2) 2-4	2019/01				$\times$	γ				
$\pm 0 - 6 \bigcirc 0.2$	<b>Xa</b> 19/c1				$\left  \boldsymbol{\chi} \right $	$\frac{1}{\alpha}$				
mments/Special Instructions	Relinqushed by:	6	V	Received by:			Ba	inquished by:		Received by:
Sail .	(Signature)	12°SV24	ede	(Signature)		t	۹ ۱	jnature)		(Signature)
w cher	Printed Name:	הרבה ב	Lendre	Pripted Name:	Kac	₹ ₹	Ha K	nted Name:		Printed Name:
J.	Company: U.C.	S) See.	Hue	Company:	LL1		වි	npany:		Company:
	Date & Time: 1 D / / 3	100			5	is l	رم م	e & Time:		Date & Time:

standards for the acceptance by the client of a proposal for services by ARI release ARI from any liability in excess thereof, not withstanding any provision to the contrary in any contract, purchase order or co-signed agreement between ARI and the Client.

Sample Retention Policy: All samples submitted to ARI will be appropriately discarded no sooner than 90 days after receipt or 60 days after submission of hardcopy data, whichever is longer, unless alemate retention schedules have been established by work-order or contract.

.

: :

. :•

!

:

:

. :.

.

. . .

Bars 567 198, X24

.....

# Fisher Slough

Sample Identification	Moisture Content (%)	Percent Fines (-#200 Sieve)
TP-A @ 0-4	4.45	32.4
TP-1 @ 7.5	5.66	73.5
TP-4 @ 2-4	20.18	81.5
TP-6 @0-2	3.61	77.2

URS Corporation Fisher Slough Percent Finer Than Indicated Size, By ASTM D422

200	0.5
# 00	2.5
#	12
09#	14.9
#40	19.3
#20	25.4
#10	32.4
#4	41.1
3/8"	52.7
1/2"	58.5
3/4"	73.6
÷	87.2
1.5"	92.8
5"	100.0
ŗ	100.0
Moisture Content (%)	2.92
Depth (ft)	0-4'
Sample ID	ATP-2

URS Corporation Fisher Slough Percent Retained in Each Size Fraction, By ASTM D422

75	9.5
	Ĕ
150-75	1.9
250-150	2.4
425-250	4.5
850-425	6.1
2000-850	7.0
4750-2000	8.7
3/8-#4	11.6
1/2-3/8"	5.9
3/4-1/2"	15.1
1-3/4"	13.7
1.5-1"	5.6
2-1.5"	7.2
3-2"	0.0
Sieve Size (microns)	ATP-2





# **Fisher Slough**











