ADDENDUM NO. 1

Date: November 21, 2022

- PROJECT: Sam Collins Park Phase 1B
- BID NO.: RFB 25-1203
- BID DATE: August 29, 2024 at 2PM
- FROM: Kristina Malek Project Manager – Landscape Architecture Kimley-Horn 11700 Katy Fwy, Suite 800 Houston, Texas 77079

To: **Prospective Bidders and Interested Parties**

This addendum forms a part of the bidding documents and will be incorporated into the Contract Documents, as applicable. Insofar as the original Contract Documents, Specifications, and Drawings are inconsistent, this Addendum shall govern. Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum on the Bid Proposal form.

FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF ADDENDA ON THE BID PROPOSAL FORM MAY BE CAUSE FOR DISQUALIFICATION.

PRE-BID AGENDA:

- Bids due August 29, 2024 at 2:00 PM at the SRA Authority Toledo Bend Office of the Division Manager (450 TX-135 Spur, Burkeville TX 75932) (refer to Notice to Bidders). All bids shall be prepared, sealed and submitted in accordance with the instructions to bidders.
- 2. The Pre-Bid meeting is non-mandatory. Sign in sheet attached.
- 3. All questions regarding the project shall be submitted via email to: <u>purchasing@sratx.org</u>, or CIVCAST USA and due by end of day August 19, 2024 (10 days prior to bid opening).
- 4. Bid Documents required:
 - Signed Bid Proposal with acknowledgment of Addenda issued
 - Bid Bond
 - Bid Opening Form This is the Bid Amount that will be publicly read
 - Vendor Compliance Form
 - Bonding Company Information
 - Non-Collusion Affidavit
 - Form W-9

- Conflict of Interest Questionnaire
- 5. Contract Time is 180 consecutive calendar days to Substantial Completion
- 6. Contract includes liquidated damages in the amount of <u>\$500.00 per calendar day</u> over contract time (excludes weather days)
- 7. General Conditions
 - Provide a competent resident superintendent to be ON SITE all times that work is under progress.
 - Subcontracts Must be acceptable to the Owner prior to any work performed, and Contractor is solely responsible for any errors, acts and omissions by subcontractor.
 - Progress Payments submit pay request at the end of each month, for all work completed to date. Contractor maybe paid for materials on hand or properly stored onsite as necessary with suitable documentation provided per the general conditions.
 - Retainage 10% of amount due to contractor as noted in General Conditions
 - Final Payment shall be made upon completion of all work, receipt of all release of liens, and approval for final payment is made by Owner.
 - Project Schedule Contractor shall prepare and submit a contract schedule showing the work progression with dates of beginning and completion of major milestone.
 - Change Orders Contractor shall submit all claim for additional work or contract time in writing per the General Conditions Section 6. All claims shall be made in writing in a timely manner.
 - Review by Owner and Inspections Owner and authorized representatives of the Owner shall have access to the project site at all times to monitor and observe the progression of the project. All directives shall be given to the Contractors on site superintendent.
 - Insurance Contractor shall provide all liability and workers compensation insurance coverages in the amounts indicated in Section 26.
- 8. Performance and Payment Bonds Contractor to provide all bonds in accordance with the Contract conditions.
- 9. Scope of Work

Contractor shall complete all Work as specified or indicated in the Contract Documents. The Work is generally described as follows: site preparation, erosion control and tree protection, clearing and grubbing, demolition, grading, vehicular paving, parking lot striping and signage, pedestrian concrete paving, site furnishings, utilities construction, lighting and electrical connection, existing restroom renovations, existing pavilion renovations, sod re-stabilization and all items necessary to construct the Phase 1B Site Improvements, complete and in place as shown in the plans and specifications.

10. Project Timeline: This project must be complete by June 2025. Liquidated damages are in the contract for time exceeding contract time plus any approved time extensions.

- 11. This project includes a playground with long lead times. The playground must be purchased as soon as they are approved.
- 12. Sam Collins Park is anticipated to closed to the public during construction.
- 13. The contractor is required to secure the site as necessary to store material and equipment.
- 14. Grading: The contractor is expected to regrade all areas affected by construction and to reestablish grades that are smooth and uniform to ensure proper drainage and a pleasing aesthetic.
- 15. The contractor is required to field verify all existing utilities onsite especially the existing water line.
- 16. The contractor is expected to review the Alternates Plan and request any clarification necessary as to the scope of each alternate.
 - Alternate #1: Remove haul off and dispose of all existing concrete around pavilion; pavilion slab and adjacent sidewalks and install new concrete pavilion slab and adjacent concrete walks in their original locations. See Sheet C1.00, G0.02, and L1.00.
 - Alternate #2: Mill and Overlay of Ex. Asphalt from Entry Road to Site. See Sheet C1.01 and C2.01
- 17. SRA is sales tax exempt and will provide a form stating such.
- 18. SRA to provide construction testing via separate contract.

PRE-BID CONFERENCE QUESTION AND ANSWER

- 1. Question: Contact information for CXT and serial number/build number? Response: The building I.D. number is N0541182955
- Question: Will the underside of the pavilion tongue and groove decking require staining? Response: Yes, provide staining. Color to be selected by owner. See Sheet L3.03 and G0.02.
- Question: Replace R-panel roof? Response: Yes, replace metal R-panel roof ensure color to match existing. See Sheet L3.03 and G0.02.
- Question: Would you please confirm if the pre-bid conference is at 1 PM or 2 PM on August 20th? Response: 2pm CST
- 5. Question: Add unit item at pavilion rehab for "Re-coating steel members" to the plans, SOW, and bid proposal sheet

Response: Re-coating steel members added on sheet G0.02 and L3.03

- 6. Question: Pavilion specify the 1" x 6" tongue and groove panels Response: Note revised to include 1" x 6" on sheet G0.02 and L3.03
- 7. Question: Note that the 10" sleeve for daylight drain can be installed by open cut. Response: Note added on sheet L2.01
- Question: Note Kraftsmen and Playwell are approved manufacturers for the playground equipment. Response: Note added on sheet G0.02
- Question: Once removed, the picnic tables shall be stored on site for Owner's use (do not re-install) Response: Note added on sheet L3.03 and G0.02.
- 10. Question: Once removed, the pea gravel on the existing playground shall be stored on site for Owner's use. Response: Note added on sheet C1.00.
- Question: Are all items to be installed/replaced at the restroom building to be purchased directly from CXT?
 Response: Items not limited exclusively to CXT, nameplate information included for reference at contractor discretion.

TECHNICAL SPECS:

- 1. Bid Opening Document Added line for Alternate #2.
- 2. Scope of work Revised.
- 3. Geotechnical Report final report added.

CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS:

- 1. RAS report updates.
 - Ramps Note was added to Sheet L1.00 that ramps are ADA compliant.
 - Parking Spaces Note was added to Sheet L1.00 that parking spaces are compliant. ADA van parking space added to plans.
 - Playground Note added to Sheet G0.02 that playground vendor responsible for verifying play equipment compliance.
 - Water Fountains Note added to Sheet L3.03 that new water fountains to comply with ADA requirements.
 - Plumbing Note added to Sheet L3.03 that the new plumbing fixtures should comply with ADA requirements.
 - Bathroom Doorways Note added on Sheet G0.02 and L3.03 that door hardware should be switched to other side of the doors to comply with ADA ramp requirement.

- \circ Accessible Route Note added on Sheet L1.00 that accessible route to restroom and ramps are compliant.
- 2. Tongue and Groove decking staining note added to viewport 'A' and pavilion notes on L3.03 and G0.02
- 3. Replace and Relocate Restroom door hardware note to comply with ADA added to viewport 'B' and restroom notes on L3.03 and G0.02
- 4. Note added on sheet L3.03 and G0.02 to replace R-panel roof and ensure color to match existing.
- 5. Note to Re-coat steel members added to sheet G0.02 and L3.03.
- 6. Note to specify 1"x6" tongue and groove panels added to sheet G0.02 and L3.03.
- 7. Note about playground equipment approved manufacturers added on sheet G0.02.
- 8. Note about picnic tables being stored on site for Owner's use added on G0.02 and L3.03.
- 9. Note about pea gravel being stored on site for Owner's use added on C1.00.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1

Kristina Malek Project Manager – Landscape Architecture Kimley-Horn



Sign-In Sheet

Sam Collins Park - Phase 1B (RFB #25-1203) Tuesday, August 20, 2024 Toledo Bend Division Office

Printed Name	Signature	Company	Email Address	Phone Number
Mark Mann		SRA-TX	mmann@sratx.org	409-746-2192
Placido Ramos		SRA-TX	pramos@sratx.org	409-746-2192
Austin Williams	Mr. Ul.	Apeck	gus fin wa ape ck construct	m.con 337-718-997
Stephanic Stanley	Stephanie Stanley	SRA-TX	SStanlay @SPATK.ORG	409-746-2192
MARK MANN	ilif the	SRA-TK	man & srate org	409-746-2192
Brend Baker	Bit Bk.	Harman BU.	blakerehbeltd. Net	409-659-8225
SIDNEY ERRINGTON	Sidar Later	Atlas Technical Consultants	sednep ermatice oneatle	s.com 409-622-0120
Shown Sortena	& Sac	MK Constructors	Sales@mkconstructors.co	m 409-769-0089
Jimbo Williams	Sento William	CHANCE CONSTRUCTION	Jimbow Dahance Construct	W, COM HOY 594 6824
RandyMorgan	Radylig-	Construction Manyer SETA	FMORGAN CMOS OT , CON	936-707-7508
Nick Moore	14.2	CMOST	Amoore @ Comosety. com	936-676-6144
lalat Wagstaff	Juit with	CMOST	Twagstaff@Chusetx.com	409-289-4078
DON ILES	Arth	SRATX	diles@sraty.ovs	936-596-5269
Andrew Mills	H-	SRATY	amills estate org	409.565-2273

BID OPENING

In the space provided below, enter your total Base Bid amount for this project. Only this figure will be read publicly at the public bid opening.

It is understood and agreed by the bidder in signing the proposal that the total bid amount entered below is not binding on either the bidder or the Owner. It is further agreed that the official total bid amount for this proposal will be determined by multiplying the unit prices for each unit price pay item by the respective estimated quantities shown in this proposal, and then totaling all of the extended amounts plus the amounts bid for all lump sum items.

Project: Sam Collins Park- Phase 1B Burkeville, Texas

Owner: Sabine River Authority of Texas Orange County, Texas

\$
Total Base Bid Amount

\$
Alternate 1 Amount

\$

Alternate 2 Amount

Name of Bidder

Scope of Work

Contractor shall complete all Work as specified or indicated in the Contract Documents. The Work is generally described as follows: site preparation, erosion control and tree protection, clearing and grubbing, demolition, grading, vehicular paving, parking lot striping and signage, pedestrian concrete paving, site furnishings, utilities construction, lighting and electrical connection, existing restroom renovations, existing pavilion renovations, sod re-stabilization and all items necessary to construct the Phase 1B Site Improvements, complete and in place as shown in the plans and specifications.

All work shall comply with the Texas Accessibility Standards (TAS) of the Architectural Barriers Act Article 9102, Texas Civil Statutes, effective April 1, 1994 and subsequent adopted updates. This standard is prepared and administered by the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulations, Policies and Standards Division, Architectural Barriers Section, PO Box 12157, Austin, Texas 78711, 920 Colorado, Fourth Floor, Austin, Texas 78701, (512) 463-3211.

GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT



SAM F. COLLINS PARK - PHASE 1B

BURKEVILLE, TEXAS

GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT

Sam F. Collins Park - Phase 1B Burkeville, Texas

Prepared by:



Riner Engineering, Inc., a UES Company

Prepared for:

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. 11700 Katy Freeway, Suite 800 Houston, Texas 77079

Attention: Ms. Emily Chisholm Luong, PLA

August 22, 2024

RINER Project No. 23-0525

TEXAS ENGINEERING FIRM REGISTRATION NO. F-17076



August 22, 2024

Ms. Emily Chisholm Luong, PLA Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. 11700 Katy Freeway, Suite 800 Houston, Texas 77079

Re: GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT Sam F. Collins Park - Phase 1B Burkeville, Texas RINER Project No. 23-0525

Dear Ms. Luong:

Riner Engineering, Inc. (RINER), a UES Company, is pleased to submit this Geotechnical Engineering Report for the referenced project. We appreciate the opportunity of working with you. Please contact us if you have any questions or require additional services.

Respectfully submitted,

Arif Mohammad Aziz, M.S., E.I.

Project Engineer

nai

Gary Gai, Ph.D., P.E. Engineering Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.0	Introd	uction1
2.0	Field S	tudy2
3.0	Labora	atory Testing
4.0	Site Co	onditions 4
4.1	Gene	eral 4
4.2	Geol	ogy 4
4.3	Soil.	5
4.4	Grou	Indwater
5.0	Analys	is and Recommendations 6
5.1	Seisr	nic Site Classification
5.2	Pote	ntial Vertical Rise (PVR)7
5.3	Cons	struction Excavations7
5.4	Grou	Indwater Control
5.5	Eartl	hwork9
5	.5.1	Site Preparation
5	.5.2	Proofroll9
5	.5.3	Grading and Drainage9
5	.5.4	Wet Weather/Soft Subgrade 9
5	.5.5	Fill 10
5	.5.6	Testing10
5.6	Dem	olition Considerations11
5.7	Load	ling on Buried Structures11
5.8	Pave	ement
5	.8.1	Existing Asphalt Pavement Assessment12
5	.8.2	Traffic Information 13
5	.8.3	Flexible Pavement 13
5	.8.4	Pavement Subgrade 14
6.0	Gener	al Comments 15

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Project Location Diagrams

Appendix B - Boring Location Diagram

Appendix C - Boring Logs and Laboratory Results

Appendix D - Aerial Photographs

Appendix E - USGS Topographic Map

Appendix F - Site Photographs

Appendix G - Geologic Information

Appendix H - Unified Soil Classification System

GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT

Sam F. Collins Park - Phase 1B Burkeville, Texas

1.0 INTRODUCTION

<u>Project Location</u>. The project is located at Sam Forse Collins Recreational Park, in Burkeville, Texas. The general location and orientation of the site are provided in Appendix A - Project Location Diagrams.

<u>Project Description</u>. The project consists of the proposed asphalt parking lot, new asphalt road, repaved asphalt road, and assessment of existing asphalt pavement.

<u>Project Authorization</u>. This geotechnical study was authorized by Ms. Stephen Kelly with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. and performed in accordance with RINER Proposal No. P23-0874 dated July 21, 2023.

<u>Purpose and Methodology</u>. The principal purposes of this study were to evaluate the general soil conditions at the proposed site and to develop geotechnical engineering design recommendations. To accomplish its intended purposes, the study was conducted in the following phases:

- 1. Drill sample borings to evaluate the soil conditions at the boring locations and to obtain soil samples;
- 2. Conduct laboratory tests on selected samples recovered from the borings to establish the pertinent engineering characteristics of the soils; and
- 3. Perform engineering analyses, using field and laboratory data, to develop design criteria.

<u>Required Review</u>. Detailed design plans were not available at the time of preparation of this report. Recommendations in our report are contingent upon RINER reviewing and approving in writing the following design items prior to construction:

- Site grading plan,
- Traffic study, and
- Finalized pavement plans and cross-sections.

<u>Cautionary Statement Regarding Use of this Report</u>. As with any geotechnical engineering report, this report presents technical information and provides detailed technical recommendations for civil and structural engineering design and construction purposes. RINER, by necessity, has assumed the user of this document possesses the technical acumen to understand and properly utilize the information and recommendations provided herein.

RINER strives to be clear in its presentation and, like the user, does not want potentially detrimental misinterpretation or misunderstanding of this report. Therefore, we encourage any user of this report with questions regarding its content to contact RINER for clarification. Clarification will be provided verbally and/or issued by RINER in the form of a report addendum, as appropriate.

<u>Report Specificity</u>. This report was prepared to meet the specific needs of the client for the specific project identified. Recommendations contained herein should not be applied to any other project at this site by the client or anyone else without the explicit approval of RINER.

<u>This Report is NOT a Specification</u>. Recommendations in this report are not specifications. Geotechnical engineering requires significant experience and professional judgment. Conditions vary in the field which require and/or allow modification to recommendations provided herein at the discretion of the Geotechnical Engineer.

2.0 FIELD STUDY

<u>Subsurface Study</u>. The subsurface study for this project is summarized in the following table. Boring locations are provided in Appendix B - Boring Location Diagram.

Boring Nos.	Depth, feet bgs ¹	Date Drilled	Location ²			
B-01 to B-07	6	9/14/2023	Along the Proposed Road Alignment and at parking lot			
Notes:	Notes:					
1. bgs = below ground surface						
2. Boring locations provided in Appendix B - Boring Location Diagram were not surveyed and should						
be considered approximate. Borings were located by recreational hand-held GPS unit. Horizontal						
accurac	accuracy of such units is typically on the order of 20-feet.					

<u>Boring Logs</u>. Subsurface conditions were defined using the sample borings. Boring logs generated during this study are included in Appendix C - Boring Logs and Laboratory Results. Borings were advanced between sample intervals using continuous flight auger drilling procedures.

<u>Cohesive Soil Sampling</u>. Cohesive soil samples were generally obtained using Shelby tube samplers in general accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D1587. The Shelby tube sampler consists of a thin-walled steel tube with a sharp cutting edge connected to a head equipped with a ball valve threaded for rod connection. The tube is pushed into the undisturbed soils by the hydraulic pulldown of the drilling rig. The soil specimens were extruded from the tube in the field, logged, tested for consistency using a hand penetrometer, sealed, and packaged to maintain "in situ" moisture content.

<u>Consistency of Cohesive Soils</u>. The consistency of cohesive soil samples was evaluated in the field using a calibrated hand penetrometer. In this test a 0.25-inch diameter piston is

pushed into the undisturbed sample at a constant rate to a depth of 0.25-inch. The results of these tests are tabulated at the respective sample depths on the boring logs. When the capacity of the penetrometer is exceeded, the value is tabulated as 4.5+.

<u>Granular Soil Sampling</u>. Granular soil samples were generally obtained using split-barrel sampling procedures in general accordance with ASTM D1586. In the split-barrel procedure, a disturbed sample is obtained in a standard 2-inch outside diameter (OD) split barrel sampling spoon driven 18-inches into the ground using a 140-pound (lb) hammer falling freely 30 inches. The number of blows for the last 12-inches of a standard 18-inch penetration is recorded as the Standard Penetration Test resistance (N-value). The N-values are recorded on the boring logs at the depth of sampling. Samples were sealed and returned to our laboratory for further examination and testing.

<u>Groundwater Observations</u>. Groundwater observations are shown on the boring logs.

<u>Borehole Plugging</u>. Upon completion of the borings, the boreholes were backfilled from the top and plugged at the surface.

3.0 LABORATORY TESTING

RINER performs visual classification and any of several laboratory tests, as appropriate, to define pertinent engineering characteristics of the soils encountered. Tests are performed in general accordance with ASTM or other standards and the results included at the respective sample depths on the boring logs or separately tabulated, as appropriate, and included in Appendix C - Boring Logs and Laboratory Results. Laboratory tests and procedures routinely utilized, as appropriate, for geotechnical studies are tabulated in the following table.

Test Procedure	Description
ASTM D1140	Standard Test Methods for Amount of Material in Soils Finer than the No. 200 (75-µm)
	Sieve
ASTM D2166	Standard Test Method for Unconfined Compressive Strength of Cohesive Soil
ASTM D2216	Standard Test Method for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of
	Soil and Rock by Mass
ASTM D2487	Standard Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes (Unified Soil Classification
	System)
ASTM D2488	Standard Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedure)
ASTM D4220	Standard Practices for Preserving and Transporting Soil Samples
ASTM D4318	Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit and Plasticity Index of Soils
ASTM D4546	Standard Test Methods for One-Dimensional Swell or Settlement Potential of
	Cohesive Soils
ASTM D4643	Standard Test Method for Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil by the
	Microwave Oven Method
Manufacturer's	Soil Strength Determination Using a Torvane
Instructions	

4.0 SITE CONDITIONS

4.1 General

<u>Review of Aerial Photographs</u>. Historical aerial photographs of the site were reviewed for potential past alterations to the site which could impact geotechnical design conditions. Specifically, aerial photographs were reviewed to visually assess obvious areas of significant past fill on site. Aerial photographs reviewed for this study are identified in the following table and are included in Appendix D - Aerial Photographs.

Aerial Photographs Reviewed			
Year	Observations Since Prior Aerial Photograph		
1996	Currently existing asphalt roadway and restroom with associated driveway were noted.		
2004	No visible changes were noted.		
2009	No visible changes were noted.		
2012	No visible changes were noted.		
2015	No visible changes were noted.		
2021	No visible changes were noted.		
2023	No visible changes were noted.		

<u>Site Fills</u>. Our review of aerial photographs revealed no obvious areas of fill on-site.

<u>Limitations</u>. Due to the intermittent nature and relatively low resolution of aerial photographs, as well as our lack of detailed information regarding the past land use of the site, our review should not be interpreted as eliminating the possibility of cuts and/or fills on site which could detrimentally affect future construction.

<u>Topography</u>. A United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map of the site is provided in Appendix E - USGS Topographic Map. The map indicates the site is relatively flat.

<u>Site Photographs</u>. Representative photographs of the site at the time of this study are provided in "Appendix F - Site Photographs". Photographed conditions are consistent with the aerial photographs and topographic map.

4.2 Geology

<u>Geologic Formation</u>. Based on available surface geology maps and our experience, it appears this site is located in the Terrace Deposits near mapped contact with Catahoula Formation and Deweyville Formation. A geologic atlas and USGS formation description are provided in "Appendix G - Geologic Information". Soils within the Terrace Deposits can generally be characterized as sand, gravel, silt, and clay or mud. Soils within the Catahoula Formation can generally be characterized as mudstone, sand, and sandstone. Soils within

the Deweyville Formation can generally be characterized as sand, silt, clay or mud, and gravel.

<u>Geologic Faults</u>. A geologic fault study was beyond the scope of this study.

4.3 Soil

<u>Stratigraphy</u>. Descriptions of the various strata and their approximate depths and thickness per the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) are provided on the boring logs included in "Appendix C - Boring Logs and Laboratory Results". Terms and symbols used in the USCS are presented in "Appendix H - Unified Soil Classification System". A summary of the stratigraphy indicated by the borings is provided in the following table.

Generalized Subsurface Conditions along Proposed Road Alignment and Parking Lot					
		(Borings B-01	L to B-07)		
Nominal De	Nominal Depth, feet bgs				
(Except as Noted) General Detailed Description of			Detailed Description of		
Top of Layer	Bottom of Layer	Description	Soils/Materials Encountered		
0	4.5- to 13.5-	PAVEMENT	1.5- to 6.5-Inch ASPHALT over 3- to 8-Inch BASE.		
	inches				
4.5- to 13.5-	6	FAT CLAY AND	Soft to hard FAT CLAY WITH SAND (CH) / FAT CLAY		
inches		CLAYEY SAND	(CH) and soft to hard CLAYEY SAND (SC).		
Note: Boring Termination Depth = 6 feet bgs.					

Moisture Change Susceptibility of Near Surface Soils. The sandier soils encountered at and near the ground surface at this site are very susceptible to changes in moisture. The presence of surface water due to precipitation or groundwater may result in a decrease in the ability to compact and work with the soil. It is common for these soils to pump when subjected to high levels of moisture. In addition, these soils located at and near the ground surface will allow surface water to infiltrate until the water becomes perched on a less permeable layer at depth. Soils of this type are especially prone to requiring the implementation of wet weather/soft subgrade recommendations provided in this report.

<u>Swell Potential based on Atterberg Limits</u>. Atterberg (plastic and liquid) limits were performed on 11 shallow soil samples obtained at depths between 0- and 6-feet bgs. The plasticity index of the samples was between 34 and 72 with an average of 51 indicating that the soils have a high potential for shrinking and swelling with changes in soil moisture content.

<u>Swell Tests</u>. Swell tests were performed on selected clay soil samples. Swell test details are provided in "Appendix C - Boring Logs and Laboratory Results". The results of the tests are summarized in the following table.

Boring	Avg.	Moisture	Liquid Limit,	Plasticity	Applied	Swell
No.	Depth	Content, w,	LL	Index, Pl	Overburden	(%)
	(ft.)	%			Stress (psi)	
B-01	1	17	50	34	0.9	0.00
B-02	5	22	56	35	4.3	0.00
B-04	5	42	75	49	4.3	0.00
B-05	3	34	74	50	2.6	0.51
B-07	3	11	72	48	2.6	0.00

4.4 Groundwater

<u>Groundwater Levels</u>. The borings were advanced using auger drilling and intermittent sampling methods to observe groundwater seepage levels. Groundwater levels encountered in the borings during this study are identified in the following table.

Boring No.	Depth Groundwater Initially	Groundwater Depth after 15 Minutes		
	Encountered (feet, bgs) ¹	(feet, bgs) ¹		
B-01 to B-07	Not Encountered	Not Measured		
Note:				
1. Bgs = below ground su	Bgs = below ground surface.			

Long-term Groundwater Monitoring. Long-term monitoring of groundwater conditions via piezometers was not performed during this study and was beyond the scope of this study. Long-term monitoring can reveal groundwater levels materially different than those encountered during measurements taken while drilling the borings.

<u>Groundwater Fluctuations</u>. Future construction activities may alter the surface and subsurface drainage characteristics of this site. It is difficult to accurately predict the magnitude of subsurface water fluctuations that might occur based upon short-term observations. The groundwater level should be expected to fluctuate throughout the years with variations in precipitation.

5.0 ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Seismic Site Classification

The seismic site classification is based on the 2018 International Building Code (IBC) and is a classification of the site based on the type of soil encountered at the site and their engineering properties. Per Table 20.3-1 of ASCE 7-16, the seismic site classification for this site is D.

5.2 Potential Vertical Rise (PVR)

<u>Potential Vertical Rise</u>. Potential Vertical Rise, PVR, is the calculated upward heave of the ground surface due to expansive soils related to weather-related changes in soil moisture in the active zone. PVR only applies to upward movement. The term settlement applies to downward movement related to loads on the soil.

<u>Pavement Areas</u>. Because heave is generally associated with a source of water, it can occur differentially. Edge lift, excessive cracking, corner breaks, and poor ride quality are just a few of the many examples of pavement issues that can occur when in-situ PVR values are high. Strategies available for reducing potential soil movements include soil stabilization with lime or cement, removal of the on-site expansive soils and replacement with select fill or moisture conditioned soils.

<u>PVR or Equivalent Calculations.</u> The PVR or its equivalent can be estimated in several ways. RINER utilizes the TxDOT method and swell tests to provide the best possible understanding of expected PVR and its variability. *The calculated PVR can vary considerably with prolonged wet or dry periods.*

<u>Calculated PVR using TxDOT Method Tex-124-E</u>. PVR calculations were performed in general accordance with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Method Tex-124-E. The Tex-124-E method is empirical and is based on the Atterberg limits and moisture content of the subsurface soils. The calculated PVR is an empirical estimate of a soil's potential for swelling based upon the soil's plasticity index, applied loading (due to structures or overburden), and antecedent moisture condition. The PVR calculated using TxDOT Method Tex-124-E is about 2- to 3-inches assuming an average to dry antecedent moisture condition. The calculated PVR is consistent with soil moisture conditions at the time this study was conducted. An 8-feet zone of seasonal moisture variation was used in our analysis based on local experience.

<u>Calculated PVR using Swell Test Results.</u> The equivalent PVR based on the swell test results is about 1-inch. The PVR based on swell test results is dependent on the moisture conditions at the time of testing. An 8-feet zone of seasonal moisture variation was used in our analysis based on local experience.

5.3 Construction Excavations

<u>Applicability</u>. Recommendations in this section apply to short-term construction-related excavations for this project.

<u>Sloped Excavations</u>. All sloped short-term construction excavations on-site should be designed in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)

excavation standards. Borings from this study indicated that the soils may be classified per OSHA regulations as Type B from the ground surface to a depth of 10-feet bgs. Short-term construction excavations may be constructed with a maximum slope of 1:1, horizontal to vertical (H:V), to a depth of 10-feet bgs. If excavations are to be deeper than 10-feet, we should be contacted to evaluate the excavation. Recommendations provided herein are not valid for any long-term or permanent slopes on-site.

<u>Shored Excavations</u>. As an alternative to sloped excavations, vertical short-term construction excavations may be used in conjunction with trench boxes or other shoring systems. Shoring systems should be designed using an equivalent fluid weight of 85 pounds per cubic feet (pcf) above the groundwater table and 105 pcf below the groundwater table. Surcharge pressures at the ground surface due to dead and live loads should be added to the lateral earth pressures where they may occur. Lateral surcharge pressures should be assumed to act as a uniform pressure along the upper 10-feet of the excavation based on a lateral earth coefficient of 0.5. Surcharge loads set back behind the excavation at a horizontal distance equal to or greater than the excavation depth may be ignored. We recommend that no more than 200-feet of unshored excavation should be open at any one time to prevent the possibility of failure and excessive ground movement to occur. We also recommend that unshored excavations do not remain open for a period longer than 24-hours.

<u>Limitations</u>. Recommendations provided herein assume there are no nearby structures or other improvements which might be detrimentally affected by the construction excavation. Before proceeding, we should be contacted to evaluate construction excavations with the potential to affect nearby structures or other improvements.

<u>Excavation Monitoring</u>. Construction excavations and their related safety are the responsibility of the Contractor. Excavations should be monitored and documented by a competent professional to confirm site soil conditions consistent with those encountered in the borings drilled as part of this study. Discrepancies in soil conditions should be brought to the attention of RINER for review and revision of recommendations, as appropriate.

5.4 Groundwater Control

Groundwater was not encountered during the subsurface investigation. However, groundwater can be encountered during excavation and dewatering to bring the groundwater below the bottom of excavations may be required. Dewatering could consist of standard sump pits and pumping procedures, which may be adequate to control seepage on a local basis during excavation. Supplemental dewatering will be required in areas where standard sump pits and pumping are not effective. Supplemental dewatering could include submersible pumps in slotted casings, well points, or eductors. The contractor should

submit a groundwater control plan, prepared by a licensed engineer experienced in that type of work.

5.5 Earthwork

5.5.1 Site Preparation

In the area of improvements, all concrete, trees, stumps, brush, debris, septic tanks, abandoned structures, roots, vegetation, rubbish, and any other undesirable matter should be removed and properly disposed. All vegetation should be removed, and the exposed surface should be scarified to an additional depth of at least 6 inches. It is the intent of these recommendations to provide a loose surface with no features that would tend to prevent uniform compaction by the equipment to be used.

5.5.2 Proofroll

Paving subgrades should be proofrolled with a fully loaded tandem axle dump truck or similar pneumatic-tire equipment to locate areas of loose subgrade. In areas to be cut, the proofroll should be performed after the final grade is established. In areas to be filled, the proofroll should be performed prior to fill placement. Areas of loose or soft subgrade encountered in the proofroll should be removed and replaced with engineered fill, moisture conditioned (dried or wetted, as needed) and compacted in place.

5.5.3 Grading and Drainage

Every attempt should be made to limit the extreme wetting or drying of the subsurface soils because swelling and shrinkage of these soils will result. Standard construction practices for providing good surface water drainage should be used. A positive slope of the ground away from any pavement should be provided. Ditches or swales should be provided to carry the run-off water both during and after construction.

Root systems from trees and shrubs can draw a substantial amount of water from the clay soils at this site, causing the clays to dry and shrink. This could cause settlement beneath grade-supported slabs such as walks and paving. Trees and large bushes should be located a distance equal to at least one-half their anticipated mature height away from grade slabs.

5.5.4 Wet Weather/Soft Subgrade

Soft and/or wet surface soils may be encountered during construction, especially following periods of wet weather. Wet or soft surface soils can present difficulties for compaction and other construction equipment. If specified compaction cannot be achieved due to soft or wet surface soils, one of the following corrective measures will be required:

- 1. Removal of the wet and/or soft soil and replacement with select fill,
- 2. Chemical treatment of the wet and/or soft soil to improve the subgrade stability, or
- 3. If allowed by the schedule, dry by natural means.

Chemical treatment is usually the most effective way to improve soft and/or wet surface soils. RINER should be contacted for additional recommendations if chemical treatment is planned due to wet and/or soft soils.

5.5.5 Fill

<u>Fill</u>. The fill should consist of material approved by the Geotechnical Engineer with a liquid limit of less than 50. Fill should be placed in loose lifts not exceeding 8-inches and should be uniformly compacted to a minimum of 95 percent maximum dry density (per ASTM D-698) and within ±2 percent of the optimum moisture content.

<u>Lime-treated Native Clay Soil</u>. Based on the laboratory testing conducted for this investigation, the native clay on-site soils will not meet specifications for engineered fill outlined in the section titled "Fill". As an alternative to importing fill, the high plasticity native clay soil may be blended with lime to reduce the plasticity index to meet engineered fill requirements. Based on our experience, we expect that it will require between 3- and 5-percent lime (by dry unit weight) to reduce the plasticity index of the native clay soils to recommended fill requirements. Prior to selecting this alternative, lime series tests should be performed to assess the amount of lime required.

<u>Fill Restrictions</u>. The fill should consist of those materials meeting the requirements stated. Fill should not contain material greater than 4-inches in any direction, debris, vegetation, waste material, environmentally contaminated material, or any other unsuitable material.

<u>Unsuitable Materials</u>. Materials considered unsuitable for use as select fill or general fill include low and high plasticity silt (ML and MH), silty clay (CL-ML), organic clay and silt (OH and OL) and highly organic soils such as peat (Pt). These soils may be used for site grading and restoration in unimproved areas as approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. Soil placed in unimproved areas should be placed in loose lifts not exceeding 10-inches and should be compacted to at least 92 percent maximum dry density (per ASTM D-698) and at a moisture content within ±4 percentage points of optimum.

5.5.6 Testing

<u>Required Testing and Inspections</u>. Construction monitoring services must be provided for all construction activities according to TxDOT specifications. We recommended that at least three compaction tests (i.e. field density and moisture content test) be performed for every 1,000 linear feet of roadway per lift, per day.

<u>Liability Limitations</u>. Since proper field inspection and testing are critical to the design recommendations provided herein, RINER cannot assume responsibility or liability for recommendations provided in this report if construction inspection and/or testing is performed by another party.

5.6 Demolition Considerations

<u>Applicability</u>. Recommendations in this section apply to the removal of any existing utilities or pavement which may be present on this site.

<u>General</u>. Special care should be taken in the demolition and removal of existing floor slabs, foundations, utilities, and pavements to minimize disturbance of the subgrade. Excessive disturbance of the subgrade resulting from demolition activities can have serious detrimental effects on planned foundation and paving elements.

<u>Existing Utilities</u>. Existing utilities and bedding to be abandoned should be completely removed. Existing utilities and bedding may be abandoned in place if they do not interfere with planned development. Utilities which are abandoned in place should be properly pressure-grouted to completely fill the utility.

<u>Backfill</u>. Excavations resulting from the excavation of existing utilities should be backfilled in accordance with Section 5.5.5 - Fill.

<u>Other Buried Structures</u>. Other types of buried structures (wells, cisterns, etc.) could be located on the site. If encountered, RINER should be contacted to address these types of structures on a case-by-case basis.

5.7 Loading on Buried Structures

<u>Uplift</u>. Buried water-tight structures are subjected to uplift forces caused by differential water levels adjacent to and within the structure. Soils with any appreciable silt or sand content will likely become saturated during periods of heavy rainfall and the effective static water level will be at the ground surface. For design purposes, we recommend the groundwater level be assumed at the ground surface. Resistance to uplift pressure is provided by soil skin friction and the dead weight of the structure. Skin friction should be neglected for the upper 3 feet of soil. A skin friction of 200 pounds per square foot (psf) may be used below a depth of 3 feet.

<u>Lateral Pressure</u>. Lateral pressures on buried structures due to soil loading can be determined using an equivalent fluid weight of 105 pcf. This includes hydrostatic pressure

but does not include surcharge loads. The lateral load produced by a surcharge may be computed as 50 percent of the vertical surcharge pressure applied as a constant pressure over the full depth of the buried structure. Surcharge loads located a horizontal distance equal to or greater than the buried structure depth may be ignored.

<u>Vertical Pressure</u>. Vertical pressures on buried structures due to soil loading can be determined using an equivalent fluid weight of 125 pcf. This does not include surcharge loads. The vertical load produced by a surcharge may be computed as 100 percent of the vertical surcharge pressure applied as a constant pressure over the full width of the buried structure.

5.8 Pavement

Pavement design is the responsibility of the project Civil Engineer. We have recommended preliminary pavement sections based on geotechnical information and assumed/available traffic information. The applicability of our assumptions should be reviewed and approved by the project Civil Engineer before the pavement section is finalized. The recommended pavement sections assume good drainage quality prevails over the life of the pavement and that the pavement subgrade is exposed to moisture levels approaching saturation less than 25 percent of the time. Therefore, it is critical that the project Civil Engineer provide appropriate pavement drainage design to assure validity of the assumed drainage conditions.

Recommendations for flexible pavement and preparation of the pavement subgrade are provided in the following sections. Flexible asphaltic pavements subjected to soil-related shrinking and swelling do not perform as well as rigid pavements. As a result, the lifespan of flexible asphaltic pavement can be reduced substantially when compared to rigid pavement. The need for increased maintenance of flexible asphaltic pavements should be considered prior to its selection.

5.8.1 Existing Asphalt Pavement Assessment

Existing Asphalt Pavement Section. Five (5) borings were drilled in the existing pavement along the alignment of proposed paving improvement. The borings indicate the existing pavement consists of 1.5- to 6.5-inches of asphalt over 3- to 8-inches of base type material along the existing asphalt road. The subgrade soil encountered under the base material consists of clayey sand and fat clay. The lime check of subgrade soils at the boring locations was also conducted with phenolphthalein. No stabilized subgrade was encountered. The thickness and the subgrade stabilization type of the existing pavement at boring locations are summarized in the following table.

Boring Location	Approximate Asphalt Pavement Thickness (Inches)	Approximate Base Thickness (Inches)	Subgrade Stabilization under the Base
B-01	1.5	8.0	Not Encountered
B-02	4.0	7.0	Not Encountered
B-04	6.5	7.0	Not Encountered
B-05	4.5	Not Encountered	Not Encountered
B-07	5.5	3.0	Not Encountered

<u>Site Observation</u>. Based on our site observations, we noticed the existing asphalt pavement is distressed and heavily cracked with asphalt patches and overlays at many locations. Representative photographs of the distressed pavement at different locations along the existing asphalt road are provided in "Appendix F - Site Photographs". Overlaying the existing asphalt is not recommended since the existing cracks will progress into the asphalt overlay (reflection cracks). We recommend the existing asphalt pavement be removed and reconstructed per our recommendations provided in the next section.

5.8.2 Traffic Information

<u>Traffic Information</u>. A traffic study indicating the number and type of vehicles on which to base the pavement design was not available at the time of preparing this report. Therefore, our recommendations are based upon our experience with similar projects assuming normal vehicular loading. Any unusual loading conditions should be brought to our attention prior to finalizing the pavement design so that we may assess and modify our recommendations as necessary.

5.8.3 Flexible Pavement

<u>General</u>. Recommendations provided in this section are applicable to the proposed asphalt pavement and parking lot at Sam Forse Collins Recreational Park in Burkeville, Texas.

Paving Use	Asphalt Thickness (inches)	Aggregate Base Thickness (inches)	Chemically Stabilized Subgrade ¹ (inches)
Parking Areas for Automobiles and Light Trucks	2	8	6
Drive Lanes and Areas Receiving Medium to Heavy Trucks and Dumpsters	3	10	6
Note: 1. Details of subgrade treatmen	t are provided in section	5.8.4.	

<u>Pavement Section</u>. The following Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) paving sections are recommended:

Asphaltic concrete pavement should comply with TxDOT Standard Specifications, Item 340, "Dense-Graded Hot-Mix Asphalt (Method)", or local equivalent. The flexible base course

should comply with TxDOT Standard Specifications, Item 247, Grade 1-2, Type D, "Flexible Base", or equivalent. The flexible base material may consist of up to 20 percent of the Recycled Asphalt Pavement(RAP) provided that the mix meets the required gradation above.

<u>Alternate Flexible Pavement Section</u>. In the above provided flexible pavement sections, the 6-inch chemically stabilized subgrade can be substituted with a Tensar TriAx TX 5 Geogrid or equivalent placed under the base course (over the subgrade soil). **The prepared subgrade soil should be proof rolled no earlier than 72 hours prior to placement of the geogrid**.

5.8.4 Pavement Subgrade

Potential Vertical Soil Movements. We have assumed that site treatment will not be performed within the pavement areas for this project. As a result, pavements will be subjected to the calculated PVR for this site. Based on the information gathered during this study, a pavement constructed on-grade will be subject to potential vertical movements of up to about 3-inches. Because heave is generally associated with a source of water, it can occur differentially. Edge lift, excessive cracking, corner breaks, and poor ride quality are just a few of the many examples of pavement issues that can occur when in-situ PVR values are high. We should be contacted to provide PVR mitigation strategies to help reduce potential movements, if desired. Strategies available for reducing potential soil movements include soil stabilization with lime or cement, removal of the on-site expansive soils and replacement with select fill.

<u>Subgrade Preparation</u>. Clayey sand and fat clay soils are expected to be encountered or exposed at pavement subgrade. The pavement subgrade should be placed in loose lifts not exceeding 8-inches and should be uniformly compacted to a minimum of 95 percent maximum dry density (per ASTM D-698) and within ±2 percent of the optimum moisture content. We recommend the subgrade be stabilized using the following:

Reagent	Application Rate (pounds per square yard)	Application Depth (inches)	
Lime	27	6	

Lime stabilization should be performed in accordance with TxDOT Standard Specifications, Item 260, "Lime Stabilized Subgrade", or local equivalent.

Cement stabilized sand may be used as a substitute for in-place stabilized subgrade soil. Cement stabilized sand mixture should consist of not less than 1.5 sacks of Portland cement per ton of material mixture. Cement stabilized sand should confirm to the Harris County Specification Item 433, "Cement Stabilized Sand Bedding and Backfill Material".

<u>Cautionary Note Regarding Stabilized Subgrades</u>. Stabilized subgrades are not suitable for supporting heavy construction traffic. Stabilized subgrades that have been subjected to

heavy construction traffic should be re-inspected and re-stabilized as necessary prior to the construction of overlying pavement.

6.0 GENERAL COMMENTS

<u>Data Assumptions</u>. By necessity, geotechnical engineering design recommendations are based on a limited amount of information about subsurface conditions. In the analysis, the geotechnical engineer must assume subsurface conditions are similar to those encountered in the borings. The analyses, conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based on site conditions as they existed at the time of the field study and on the assumption that the exploratory borings are representative of the subsurface conditions throughout the site; that is, the subsurface conditions everywhere are not significantly different from those disclosed by the borings at the time they were completed. As a result, estimated movements provided in this study are not guarantees of performance. Actual movements may be more or less than estimates provided in this study.

<u>Subsurface Anomalies</u>. Anomalies in subsurface conditions are often revealed during construction. If during construction, different subsurface conditions from those encountered in our borings are observed, or appear to be present in excavations, we must be advised promptly so that we can review these conditions and reconsider our recommendations where necessary.

<u>Change of Conditions</u>. If there is a substantial lapse of time between submission of this report and the start of the work at the site, if conditions have changed due either to natural causes or to construction operations at or adjacent to the site, or if structure locations, structural loads or finish grades are changed, we should be promptly informed and retained to review our report to determine the applicability of the conclusions and recommendations, considering the changed conditions and/or time lapse.

<u>Design Review</u>. Recommendations in our report are contingent upon RINER reviewing and approving in writing the following design items prior to construction:

- Site grading plan,
- Traffic study, and
- Finalized pavement plans and cross-sections.

<u>Construction Materials Testing and Inspection</u>. RINER should be retained to observe earthwork and foundation installation and perform materials evaluation and testing during the construction phase of the project. This enables RINER's geotechnical engineer to stay abreast of the project and to be readily available to evaluate unanticipated conditions, to conduct additional tests if required and, when necessary, to recommend alternative solutions to unanticipated conditions. It is proposed that construction phase observation and materials testing commence by the project geotechnical engineer (RINER) at the outset of the project. Experience has shown that the most suitable method for procuring these services is for the owner to contact the geotechnical engineer directly. This results in a clear, direct line of communication between the owner and the owner's design engineers and the geotechnical engineer.

<u>Report Recommendations are Preliminary</u>. Until the recommended construction phase services are performed by RINER, the recommendations contained in this report on such items as final foundation bearing elevations, final depth of undercut of expansive soils for non-expansive earth fill pads and other such subsurface-related recommendations should be considered as preliminary.

<u>Liability Limitation</u>. RINER cannot assume responsibility or liability for recommendations provided in this report if construction inspection and/or testing recommended herein is performed by another party.

<u>Warranty</u>. This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the Client and their designated agents for specific application to design of this project. We have used that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised under similar conditions by reputable members of our profession practicing in the same or similar locality. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made or intended.

Appendix A - Project Location Diagrams

PROJECT LOCATION DIAGRAM - GENERAL





PROJECT LOCATION DIAGRAM - LOCAL





Appendix B - Boring Location Diagram

BORING LOCATION DIAGRAM





Appendix C - Boring Logs and Laboratory Results
	R	Riner Engineering, Inc. 4641 Kennedy Commerce Drive, Houston, TX 77032 Telephone: 281-469-3347; Fax: 281-469.3594	2					E	BOR	RING	9 NI	JMI	BEF PAGI	₹ B- ∃ 1 C	01 F 1
CLIE	NT <u>Kin</u>	nley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		PROJ		San	n F. C	ollins F	Park -	Phase	e 1B				
PRO		UMBER _23-0525		PROJ	ECT LOCA	TION	Burk	eville,	Texas	;					
DATE	E STAR	TED 9/14/23 COMPLETED 9/14/23		GROL	JND ELEVA	ATION			NC	ORTHI	NG				_
CON	ITRACT	OR RINER		GROL	JND WATE	R LEV	ELS:		EA	STING)				_
MET					INITIALLY	ENC	DUNTI	ERED	Not	Encou	ntered				
NOT		CHCHECKED BY _A.A.			AFTER 1	5 MIN.	Not I	Measu	red					_	
					AFIER							AT	TERBE	 ERG	F
o DEPTH (ft)	GRAPHIC LOG	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE NUMBER	RECOVERY % (RQD)	BLOW COUNTS (N VALUE)	POCKET PEN. (tsf)	TORVANE (tsf)	Compressive Strength (tsf)	Confining Pressure (psi)	DRY UNIT WT. (pcf)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	LIQUID			FINES CONTEN (%)
		PAVEMENT - 1.5-Inch ASPHALT over 8-Inch BASE.	RC												
		CLAYEY SAND (SC) - Soft, gray.	ST			1.00	0.6				17	50	16	34	44
		FAT CLAY (CH) / FAT CLAY WITH SAND (CH) - Firm to stiff, light gray, with iron nodules.	ST			1.50	0.5	1.1		81	39				
			ST			2.00	0.9								

C	R	Riner Engineering, Inc. 4641 Kennedy Commerce Drive, Houston, T Telephone: 281-469-3347; Fax: 281-469.359	X 77032 4					E	Bor	RINC	g Ni	UMI	BEF PAGI	₹ B- ≣ 1 C	02)F 1
CLIE	NT Kir	nley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		PRO		E Sar	n F. C	ollins l	[⊃] ark -	Phase	e 1B				
PRO	JECT N	UMBER _23-0525		PRO			Burk	eville,	Texas	6					
DATI	E STAR	TED _9/14/23 COMPLETED _9/1	4/23	GRO	UND ELEV	ATION			NC	ORTHI	NG _				_
CON	ITRACT	OR RINER		GRO	UND WATE	R LEV	ELS:		EA	STING	G				_
MET	HOD _				INITIALLY		OUNT	ERED	Not	Encou	nterec	ł			
LOG	GED BY	CH CHECKED BY A.	Α.		AFTER 1	5 MIN.	Not I	Measu	red						
NOT	ES <u>Au</u>	ger 0 to 6-feet			AFTER _										
EPTH (ft)	RAPHIC LOG	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	PLE TYPE JMBER	DVERY % RQD)	SLOW SUNTS VALUE)	KET PEN. (tsf)	RVANE (tsf)	npressive ngth (tsf)	onfining sure (psi)	UNIT WT. (pcf)	ISTURE TENT (%)				CONTENT (%)
	Б		SAME	REC(UZ UZ	POC	10	Con Stre	Pres	DRY	N N N N N N	E E	LIN LIN		INES
		PAVEMENT - 4-Inch ASPHALT over 7-Inc BASE.	ch R(E
 2		FAT CLAY (CH) / FAT CLAY WITH SANE - Soft, light gray, with sand seams.	9 (CH) S	-		0.50	0.4	-			38	70	24	46	81
- - - - - - - - - - - - -			S	-		0.25	0.3								
1651 ONLY 2 23-0526,GPJ NEW GNT TEMP.GDT 9/28/23 9 C		CLAYEY SAND (SC) - Soft, gray and brow	vn. S ⁻	-		1.00	0.3				22	56	21	35	43

Bottom of hole at 6.0 feet.

R		Riner Engineering, Inc. 4641 Kennedy Commerce Drive, Houston, TX 7703/ Telephone: 281-469-3347; Fax: 281-469.3594	2					E	BOR	RINC	g Ni	JME	3ER PAGE	₹ B- ≣ 1 0	03)F 1
CLIEN	T _Kim	ley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		PROJ	ECT NAME	San	1 F. C	ollins F	Park -	Phase	e 1B				
PROJE		IMBER _23-0525		PROJ	ECT LOCA		Burk	eville,	Texas						
DATES	START	ED _9/14/23 COMPLETED _9/14/23		GROL	JND ELEVA					RTHI	NG				
CONT	RACTO	DR RINER		GROL	JND WATE	R LEV	ELS:		EA	STING	6				
METH	OD				ΙΝΙΤΙΔΙ Ι Ν		ודאווכ	RED	Not I	Encou	ntered				
LOGGE	ED BY	CH CHECKED BY A.A.					Not	Measu	red		ntorod			_	
NOTES	Aug	er 0 to 6-feet			AFTER -		11011	vicasu	leu					_	
ртн t)	DHIC		E TYPE BER	ERY % 2D)	DW NTS LUE)	T PEN. sf)	/ANE sf)	essive th (tsf)	ining re (psi)	uIT WT. cf)	TURE INT (%)	ATT			ONTENT 6)
0 DEF ()	GRA LO		SAMPL	RECOV (RC	BL(COU	POCKE (tt	TOR' (tt	Compt Streng	Cont Pressu	DRY UI (p	MOIS	LIMIT	PLAST LIMIT	PLASTIC INDE)	FINES C
		FAT CLAY (CH) / FAT CLAY WITH SAND (CH) - Very stiff to hard, gray and light brown, with calcareous nodules.													
			ST			4.50+	2.4				34	73	22	51	98
2 		With silt seams at 2-feet to 6-feet.	ST	-		3.50	1.0	2.6		79	33				
			ST	-		3.50	0.4				45				

	R	Riner Engineering, Inc. 4641 Kennedy Commerce Drive, Houston, TX 77032 Telephone: 281-469-3347; Fax: 281-469.3594	2					E	BOR	RINC	g Ni	UMI	BEF PAGE	₹ B- ≣ 1 0	04)F 1
CLIE	NT Kin	nley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		PROJ		San	n F. C	ollins F	Park -	Phase	e 1B				
PRO	JECT N	JMBER _ 23-0525		PROJ	ECT LOCA		Burk	eville,	Texas						
DAT		FED 9/14/23 COMPLETED 9/14/23		GROL	JND ELEVA	ATION			NC	ORTHI	NG				_
CON	NTRACT	OR _RINER		GROL	JND WATE	R LEV	ELS:		EA	STING	G				_
MET					INITIALLY	(ENC	OUNTI	ERED	Not	Encou	ntered				
LOG	GED BY	CH CHECKED BY A.A.			AFTER 15	5 MIN.	Not I	Measu	red						
NOT	ES Auc	ger 0 to 6-feet			AFTER _			1			1				1
DEPTH (ft)	GRAPHIC LOG	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	MPLE TYPE NUMBER	ECOVERY % (RQD)	BLOW COUNTS (N VALUE)	DCKET PEN. (tsf)	TORVANE (tsf)	compressive trength (tsf)	Confining ressure (psi)	RY UNIT WT. (pcf)	MOISTURE DNTENT (%)				ES CONTENT (%)
0			SA	R		E C		00	Ē	Б	20		5	PLA –	N I
- - - -		PAVEMENT - 6.5-Inch ASPHALT over 7-Inch BASE.	RC	_											
- - - 2		- Firm to stiff, gray and reddish brown.	ST			2.00	0.8				36	98	26	72	98
- - - - - - - - - -			ST			2.50	1.3								
1EST ONLY 2 23-0526.GPU NEW GINT TEMP-GDT 9/28/22			ST			1.50	0.5				42	75	26	49	98

Bottom of hole at 6.0 feet.

		2	Riner Engineering, Inc. 4641 Kennedy Commerce Drive, Houston, TX 7703 Telephone: 281-469-3347; Fax: 281-469.3594	2					E	Bor	RINC	g Ni	JMI	BER PAGE	₹ B- ≣ 1 0	05)F 1
	LIE	NT Kim	ley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		PROJ		San	ו F. C	ollins F	Park -	Phase	e 1B				
P	RO		IMBER _23-0525		PROJ			Burk	eville,	Texas	;					
	DATE	E START	ED _9/14/23 COMPLETED _9/14/23		GROL	JND ELEVA					ORTHI	NG				
	CON	TRACTO	DR RINER		GROL	JND WATE	R LEV	ELS:		EA	STING	3				
	МЕТ	HOD						JUNTI	-RFD	Not I	Encou	ntered				_
L	.OGC	GED BY	CH CHECKED BY A.A.			AFTER 15	5 MIN	Not I	Measu	red		morea			_	
N	IOTE	ES Aug	er 0 to 6-feet			AFTER			nouou						_	
	(ft)	RAPHIC LOG	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	PLE TYPE JMBER	OVERY % (RQD)	BLOW OUNTS VALUE)	KET PEN. (tsf)	JRVANE (tsf)	npressive ength (tsf)	onfining ssure (psi)	UNIT WT. (pcf)	JISTURE ITENT (%)				CONTENT (%)
ľ	_	0		SAM	REC	_oz	POO	μ	Stre	D se	DRY	¥О	25	PLA	PLAS	INES
-	0		PAVEMENT - 4.5-Inch ASPHALT.	RC												
-	-		FAT CLAY (CH) / FAT CLAY WITH SAND (CH) - Stiff to very stiff, gray and light gray, with sand seams.						-							
-	-			ST			2.50	1.3				38	99	30	69	93
-	2				-											
_	3 -			ST			3.25	1.1				34	74	24	50	83
	-															
	5			ST			3.00	1.3								
	-															

	R	Riner Engineering, Inc. 4641 Kennedy Commerce Drive, Houston, TX 7703 Telephone: 281-469-3347; Fax: 281-469.3594	2					E	BOR	RINC	3 NI	JM	BER PAGE	₹ B- ≣ 1 0	06)F 1
CLIE	NT Kir	nley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		PROJ		San	n F. C	ollins F	Park -	Phase	e 1B				
PRO	JECT N	UMBER 23-0525		PROJ		TION	Burk	eville,	Texas						
DAT	E STAR	TED _9/14/23 COMPLETED _9/14/23		GROL		ATION			NC	ORTHI	NG				_
CON	NTRACT	OR RINER		GROL	JND WATE	R LEV	ELS:		EA	STING	G				_
MET					INITIALLY	Y ENCO	JUNTI	ERED	Not I	Encou	ntered				
LOG	GED BY	CH CHECKED BY A.A.			AFTER 1	5 MIN.	Not I	Measu	red						
NOT	ES Aug	ger 0 to 6-feet			AFTER ·										
Ŧ	U U H U		ER SER	ERY % D)	UE)	r PEN.	ANE)	ssive 1 (tsf)	ning e (psi)	IT WT.	URE \T (%)	AT		= RG } }	NTENT
DEP (ff)	GRAP	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE NUME	RECOVE (RQ)	BLO COUN (N VAI	POCKE1 (tsf	TORV, (tsf	Compre Strengt	Confir Pressure	DRY UN (pc)	MOIST	LIQUID	PLASTI0 LIMIT	PLASTICI INDEX	FINES CC (%
 		CLAYEY SAND (SC) - Hard, gray and brown, with calcareous nodules.	ST			4.50+	2.4				11	59	20	39	39
2 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -		FAT CLAY (CH) / FAT CLAY WITH SAND (CH) - Very stiff to hard, gray, with sand seams.	ST			4.50+	2.4	5.9		93	26				
			ST			4.50	2.3				25				

Bottom of hole at 6.0 feet.

	R	Riner Engineering, Inc. 4641 Kennedy Commerce Drive, Houston, TX 7703 Telephone: 281-469-3347; Fax: 281-469.3594	2					E	SOR	RINC	g Ni	UMI	BEF PAGE	₹ B- ≣ 1 C	07 DF 1
CLI	ENT Kir	nley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		PROJ		<u>Sar</u>	n F. C	ollins I	Park -	Phase	e 1B				
PRC	JECT N	UMBER _23-0525		PROJ	ECT LOCA	TION	Burk	eville,	Texas						
DAT	E STAR	TED _9/14/23 COMPLETED _9/14/23		GROL	IND ELEV	ATION			NC	ORTHI	NG _				_
co	NTRACT	OR RINER		GROL	IND WATE	R LEV	ELS:		EA	STING	3				_
ME	THOD _				INITIALLY	Y ENC	DUNTI	ERED	Not	Encou	ntered			_	
LOG	GED BY	CH CHECKED BY <u>A.A.</u>			AFTER 1	5 MIN.	Not I	Measu	red						
NO	ES Aug	ger U to 6-teet			AFTER _			1		1	<u> </u>				1.
DEPTH (#)	GRAPHIC LOG	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE NUMBER	RECOVERY % (RQD)	BLOW COUNTS (N VALUE)	POCKET PEN. (tsf)	TORVANE (tsf)	Compressive Strength (tsf)	Confining Pressure (psi)	DRY UNIT WT. (pcf)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)				INES CONTENT (%)
 		PAVEMENT - 5.5-Inch ASPHALT over 3-Inch BASE.	RC												
- - - - -		CLAYEY SAND (SC) - Very stiff, reddish brown.	ST	-		4.50	0.8				11	89	24	65	23
2 - - - - - - - - - - - - -		With minor gravel content up to 2-feet.	ST	_		3.50	0.5				11	72	24	48	23
TEST ONLY 2 23-0525 GPJ NEW GINT TEMP-GU1 9/28/23		Dottom of help of 0 fact	ST			3.50	0.3								

23-0525

ABSORPTION	SWELL TE	ST (ASTM I	04546) RES	SULTS		
Boring No.	B-01	B-02	B-04	B-05	B-07	
Average Sample Depth (ft)	1	5	5	3	3	
Sample Height (in)	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	
Sample Diameter (in)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	
Initial Sample Volume (cu in)	3.93	3.93	3.93	3.93	3.93	
Initial Sample Weight (gr)	117.6	111.0	113.6	109.4	126.5	
Initial Moisture (%)	17	22	42	34	11	
Final Moisture (%)	35	24	46	47	17	
Initial Wet Unit Weight (pcf)	114	108	110	106	123	
Initial Dry Unit Weight (pcf)	97	88	77	79	111	
Applied Over Burden (psi)	0.9	4.3	4.3	2.6	2.6	
Initial Dial Reading (in)	0.0558	0.0355	0.1378	0.0565	0.0386	
Final Dial Reading (in)	0.0558	0.0355	0.1378	0.0606	0.0386	
Swell (%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	

		UI	NC	:0	NF	-11	١E	D	С	:0	M	IP	R	ES	SS		10	1.	ТΕ	25	ST	
	2																				1	
	2																	_		_		
																		_				
	1.5																					
at a second s																		_				
, ts															_			_				
ess															_			_				
Str																		_				
e.	1							_										_		_	<u> </u>	
SS					\square													_				
bre				4														_				
Шо																		_				
U U																		_				
	0.5		\vdash														_	_				
		$ \square $			_													_				
		\square																_				
		H													_	_	_	_	_	_		
		H										_			_	_	_	_	_	_		
	0					5				10	<u> </u>				15					20		
		0				0							,		10					20		
								A	xia	St	rair	n, %	6									
Sample No												1										
Unconfined strend	ith ts	f										1.0	70							+		
Undrained shear s	strend	nth	tsf									0.5	35							+		
Failure strain. %		<u>.</u> ,										12	.6							+		
Strain rate, %/min												1.0)0							+		
Water content, %												39	.0									
Wet density, pcf		_										111	.9									
Dry density, pcf						_					_	80	.5	_					_			
Saturation, %												95	.7									
Void ratio											1	1.10)83									
Specimen diameter	ər, in.											2.7	71									
Specimen height,	in.											5.7	75									
Height/diameter ra	atio											2.1	2									
Description: Ligh	t gray	/ FA	T C	LA	(C	H)																
LL =	PL =				PI	=					As	sur	nec	I G	S=	2.7	2		Гур	e:	Shelby Tube	
Project No.: 23-05	525							Clie	ent	: K	iml	ley-	Hor	n a	nd .	Ass	soc	iate	es, I	nc		
Date Sampled: 9/	/14/23	3						_			~									-		
Remarks:								Pro	je	ct:	Sar	n F	. Co	ollin	s P	ark	- I	' ha	se 1	B		
									at	ion	• R	lori	n o F	3_ 0'	1							
								Sar	np	le I	Nu	mb	er:	2	•	Γ)er	oth	: 2'	- 4	1'	
												UN	CO	NF	INE	ED.	C	DM	PR	ES	SSION TEST	
Figuro												-		R	ine	r E	ng	ine	eri	ng	ı, Inc.	
															H	Ιοι	isto	on,	Τe	exa	IS	

	UNCO	NFIN	ED (CON	/IPF	RES	SSI	ON	I TI	EST	
	4										
					+						
щ. щ.	3										
, ts											
e ss											
Str											
Ke Ke	2			1	+			$\left \right $		1	
e ss		+						+	_		
ubre		+A+			+ +			++	_		
Con		+						++			
Ŭ											
	1										
	0										
	0	1		2			3			4	
			Axia	l Stra	in, %						
Sample No.					1						
Unconfined strength,	tsf				2.61	7					
Undrained shear stre	ngth, tsf			_	1.308	8	_				
Failure strain, %					1.9						
Strain rate, %/min.					1.00)	-				
Water content, %				_	33.0)					
vvet density, pct					104.9	9					
Dry density, pcr					8.9/ 0 דד	,					
Void ratio					1 1 5 7	9 16					
Specimen diameter	in.			_	2.76	. <u>.</u>				-	
Specimen height, in.					5.75						
Height/diameter ratio					2.08	5					
Description: Gray an	d light brown	FAT CL	AY (CH)							1
LL = PL	=	PI =		As	ssum	ed G	S= 2	.72	Ту	pe: Shelby T	ube
Project No.: 23-0525			Clien	t: Kin	nley-H	lorn a	and A	ssoci	ates,	Inc	
Date Sampled: 9/14/	23										
Remarks:			Proje	ct: Sa	ım F. (Colli	ns Pai	rk - P	hase	1B	
			Loca	tion	Boring	∍ B -0	3				
			Sam	ble Nu	umbe	r: 2	5	Dep	th: 2	' - 4'	
					UNC	ONF	INE		OMPF	RESSION TE	EST
Figure						R	iner Ho	Engi	neer on, Te	ing, Inc. exas	

		UNC	ONFI	NE	ED	СС	DM	PR	ES	SI	10	1 T	ES	ST	
	10													1	
	10			_		_		_							
				+		—		_							
				_				_							
				_				_							
	7.5			-				_							
şţ				-		_		_							
, So				+											
tres				+				1							
Ó O				-		1/	\vdash								
Siz	5			+										-1	
res															
du	-			1	1										
ပိ				X											
	25														
	2.5														
				_											
				_		_		_							
	0					<u> </u>	2			3					
		0	I			، ماد	<u>~</u>	01		5			4	,	
					Ax	ial S	train	, %							
Sample No.								1							
Unconfined streng	gth, ts	f				+	5	5.911					\top		+
Undrained shear	strenc	gth, tsf				\uparrow	2	.956							
Failure strain, %								2.3							
Strain rate, %/mir	ı							1.00							
Water content, %								26.4							
Wet density, pcf						\square	1	17.6							
Dry density, pcf						\square		93.1							
Saturation, %						\rightarrow		87.1							
Void ratio						+	0	.8246					_		
Specimen diamet	er, in.					+		2.74					_		
Specimen neight,	III.					+		$\frac{5.75}{2.10}$							
Description: Car			лти с и		(CII)			2.10							<u> </u>
	$\mathbf{PL} =$	CLAIV	PI =		(СП)	<u> </u>	Ass	ume	d GS	S= ?	72	Т	/pe·	Shelby Tube	
Project No.: 23-0	- <u>-</u> - 525]	Clie	⊾	Cimle	v-Ho	rn an	$d \Delta q$	3500	iates	Inc		
Date Sampled: 9	/14/23					r		<i>y</i> 110	all			iucs,	, me		
Remarks:	-				Proj	ject:	Sam	F. C	ollins	s Parl	k - I	Phase	1B		
						_									
					Loc	ation	n: Bo	oring	B-06		Dei		יי	41	
					San	ipie	<u>nun</u>		: 2)NFI		רפו הסר	י נות: אוס		+ SSION TEST	
							Ľ		Rir	ner F	Ena	inee	rinc	1, Inc.	
Figure										Но	usto	on, T	exa	as	

Appendix D - Aerial Photographs





























Appendix E - USGS Topographic Map

USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP





Appendix F - Site Photographs

SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



Facing Northwest at Boring B-01



Facing Northwest at Boring B-03



Facing Northeast at Boring B-02



Facing North at Boring B-04



SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



Facing Northeast at Boring B-05



Facing Northwest at Boring B-06



Facing Southwest at Boring B-07



SITE PHOTOGRAPHS - DISTRESSED PAVEMENT



Distressed Pavement Near Boring B-01



Asphalt Overlay Near Boring B-03



Distressed Pavement Near Boring B-02



Distressed Pavement Near Boring B-03

SITE PHOTOGRAPHS - DISTRESSED PAVEMENT



Distressed Pavement Near Boring B-04



Distressed Pavement Near Boring B-06



Longitudinal Crack Near Boring B-05



Distressed Pavement Near Boring B-07



Appendix G - Geologic Information

GEOLOGIC ATLAS







Mineral Resources On-Line Spatial Data

Mineral Resources > Online Spatial Data > Geology > by state > Texas

Terrace deposits

Terrace deposits

State Texas

Name Terrace deposits

Geologic age Phanerozoic | Cenozoic | Quaternary | Pleistocene Holocene

Original map label Qt

Comments Sand, silt, clay, and gravel in various proportions, with gravel more prodominent in older, higher terrace deposits. Locally indurated with calcium carbonate (caliche) in terraces along streams. Along Colorado River clasts mostly limest., chert, guartz, and various igneous and metamorphic rocks from Llano region and Edwards Plateau. Includes point bar, natural levee, stream channel deposits along valley walls; probably in large part correlatives of Deweyville, Beaumont, Lissie, and Willis deposits. In upland regions (Rolling Plains, Edwards Plateau, etc.) unit includes fluvial terrace deposits, undivided. Light-brown, reddish-brown, gray, or yellowishbrown, gravelly guartz and lithic sand and silt to sandy gravel (Moore and Wermund, 1993). Deposits become increasingly fine grained on Coastal and Nueces Plains. Locally, calcium carbonate-cemented guartz sand, silt, clay, and gravel intermixed and interbedded. Low terraces of major rivers are capped by 2-4 m of clayey sand and silt. Sandy gravel on higher terraces varies somewhat in composition from river to river. Gravel commonly is rounded to angular limestone and chert pebbles and cobbles, some boulders, sparse igneous pebbles along Brazos river in places. In Bastrop Co., a deposit 27 m above Colorado River contains the Lava Creek B (Pearlette O) volcanic ash (age 0.6 Ma). Along the Frio, Leona, and Sabinal Rivers east of Uvalde, gravel is chiefly basalt and pyclastic clasts, locally cemented by iro oxide. Gravel along the Rio Grande is subrounded clasts of locally derived limestone and chert and rounded clasts of basalt, volcanic

porphyry, quartzite, milky quartz, and banded chalcedony derived from the west.

Primary rock type terrace Secondary rock type sand Other rock types gravel; silt; clay or mud Lithologic constituents Major Unconsolidated > Fine-detrital > Silt (Bed) Unconsolidated > Coarse-detrital > Sand (Bed) Minor Unconsolidated > Coarse-detrital > Gravel (Bed) Unconsolidated > Fine-detrital > Clay (Bed) Map references Bureau of Economic Geology, 1992, Geologic Map of Texas: University of Texas at Austin, Virgil E. Barnes, project supervisor, Hartmann, B.M. and Scranton, D.F., cartography, scale 1:500,000

Unit references Moore, D.W. and Wermund, E.G., Jr., 1993a, Quaternary geologic map of the Austin 4 x 6 degree quadrangle, United States: U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Investigations Series Map I-1420 (NH-14), scale 1:1,000,000. [http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/i1420(NH14)]

Bureau of Economic Geology, 1975, Beeville-Bay City Sheet, Geologic Atlas of Texas, Bureau of Economic Geology, University of Texas at Austin, scale 1:250,000.

Bureau of Economic Geology, 1974, Seguin Sheet, Geologic Atlas of Texas, University of Texas, Bureau of Economic Geology, scale 1:250,000.

Counties Anderson - Angelina - Archer - Armstrong - Atascosa - Austin -Bandera - Bastrop - Baylor - Bee - Bell - Bexar - Blanco - Borden -Bosque - Bowie - Brazos - Brewster - Briscoe - Brown - Burleson -Burnet - Caldwell - Callahan - Camp - Cass - Cherokee - Childress -Clay - Coke - Coleman - Collin - Collingsworth - Colorado - Comal -Comanche - Concho - Cooke - Coryell - Cottle - Crane - Crosby -Dallam - Dallas - Delta - Denton - DeWitt - Dickens - Dimmit - Donley - Duval - Eastland - Ellis - Erath - Falls - Fannin - Fayette - Fisher -Foard - Franklin - Freestone - Frio - Garza - Gillespie - Glasscock -Goliad - Gonzales - Gray - Grayson - Gregg - Grimes - Guadalupe -Hall - Hamilton - Hansford - Hardeman - Hardin - Harris - Harrison -Hartley - Haskell - Hays - Hemphill - Henderson - Hidalgo - Hill - Hood - Hopkins - Houston - Hunt - Hutchinson - Jackson - Jasper - Jeff Davis - Jim Wells - Johnson - Jones - Karnes - Kaufman - Kendall - Kent -Kerr - Kimble - Kinney - Knox - Lamar - Lampasas - La Salle - Lavaca - Lee - Leon - Limestone - Lipscomb - Live Oak - Llano - McCulloch -McLennan - McMullen - Madison - Marion - Mason - Maverick - Medina -Menard - Midland - Milam - Mills - Mitchell - Montague - Montgomery -Moore - Morris - Motley - Nacogdoches - Navarro - Newton - Nolan -Oldham - Palo Pinto - Panola - Parker - Pecos - Polk - Potter - Rains -Reagan - Red River - Reeves - Refugio - Roberts - Robertson -Rockwall - Runnels - Rusk - Sabine - San Augustine - San Jacinto - San Patricio - San Saba - Schleicher - Scurry - Shackelford - Shelby -

Smith - Somervell - Starr - Stephens - Stonewall - Tarrant - Taylor -Throckmorton - Titus - Tom Green - Travis - Trinity - Tyler - Upshur -Uvalde - Val Verde - Van Zandt - Victoria - Walker - Waller -Washington - Webb - Wheeler - Wichita - Wilbarger - Williamson -Wilson - Wise - Wood - Young - Zapata - Zavala

Show this information as [XML] - [JSON]

U.S. Department of the Interior | U.S. Geological Survey URL: http://mrdata.usgs.gov/geology/state/sgmc-unit.php?unit=TXQt;0 Page Contact Information: Peter Schweitzer



Mineral Resources On-Line Spatial Data

Mineral Resources > Online Spatial Data > Geology > by state > Texas

Catahoula Formation

Catahoula Formation

State Texas

Name Catahoula Formation

Geologic age Phanerozoic | Cenozoic | Tertiary | Oligocene

Original map label Oc

Comments Crystal City-Eagle Pass Sheet (1976), upper member, Chusa Tuff Mbr is tuffaceous mudstone and sand and sandstone about 180 ft thick. next member descending is Soledad Volcanic Conglo. Mbr, abdt. pebbles, cobbles, and boulders up to one foot in size, rhyolite, trachyte, trachyandesite, thickness up to 75 ft; Fant Tuff Mbr, lowest mbr., tuff, claystone, and sandstone about 600 ft thick. Catahoula Fm. 120-300 ft thick on Seguin Sheet (1974) thins northward. In East Texas and Gulf Coast to Rio Grande: Mudstone and sand. Upper 300-500 ft mudst., tuffaceous, sandy, lt. gray, weathers dk gray. Some bentonitic clay. Lower 10-80 ft quartz sand, coarse grained, grains polished, opal cement common; fossil wood abdt. forms cuesta. Thickness 300-600 ft.

Primary rock type mudstone

Secondary rock type sand Other rock types tuff; sandstone; conglomerate

Lithologic constituents Major Sedimentary > Clastic > Mudstone (Bed) Unconsolidated > Coarse-detrital > Sand (Bed) Minor Sedimentary > Clastic > Conglomerate (Bed) Incidental Igneous > Volcanic > Felsic-volcanic > Trachyte Igneous > Volcanic > Felsic-volcanic > Rhyolite Sedimentary > Clastic > Mudstone > Claystone > Bentonite (Bed) Igneous > Volcanic > Mafic-volcanic > Andesite (*Pyroclastic, tuff*)

- Map references Bureau of Economic Geology, 1992, Geologic Map of Texas: University of Texas at Austin, Virgil E. Barnes, project supervisor, Hartmann, B.M. and Scranton, D.F., cartography, scale 1:500,000
- *Unit references* Bureau of Economic Geology, 1976, Crystal City-Eagle Pass Sheet, Geologic Atlas of Texas, University of Texas, Bureau of Economic Geology, scale 1:250,000.

Bureau of Economic Geology, 1967, Palestine Sheet, Geologic Atlas of Texas, Bureau of Economic Geology, University of Texas at Austin, scale 1:250,000.

Counties Angelina - Atascosa - Bee - Brazos - DeWitt - Fayette - Gonzales -Grimes - Jasper - Karnes - Live Oak - McMullen - Newton - Polk -Sabine - Trinity - Tyler - Walker - Washington - Webb

Show this information as [XML] - [JSON]

U.S. Department of the Interior | U.S. Geological Survey URL: http://mrdata.usgs.gov/geology/state/sgmc-unit.php?unit=TXOGc;0 Page Contact Information: Peter Schweitzer



Mineral Resources On-Line Spatial Data

Mineral Resources > Online Spatial Data > Geology > by state > Texas

Deweyville Formation

Deweyville Formation

State Texas

Name Deweyville Formation

Geologic age Phanerozoic | Cenozoic | Quaternary | Pleistocene Holocene (?)

Original map label Qd

Comments sand, silt, clay, and gravel. locally indurated with calcium carbonate (caliche); includes point bar, natural levee, stream channel, and locally, Recent and older sand dune deposits; surface shows relict meanders of much larger radius of curvature than those of present streams; thickness 50+ ft. Present at places along Guadalupe, Nueces, Jacinto, Trinity, Neches, and Sabine Rivers.

Primary rock type sand

Secondary rock type silt

Other rock types clay or mud

Lithologic constituents Major

Unconsolidated > Fine-detrital(Bed)Unconsolidated > Coarse-detrital(Bed)

- Map references Bureau of Economic Geology, 1992, Geologic Map of Texas: University of Texas at Austin, Virgil E. Barnes, project supervisor, Hartmann, B.M. and Scranton, D.F., cartography, scale 1:500,000
- Unit references Bureau of Economic Geology, 1975, Beeville-Bay City Sheet, Geologic Atlas of Texas, Bureau of Economic Geology, University of Texas at Austin, scale 1:250,000.

Bureau of Economic Geology, 1968, Beaumont Sheet, Geologic Atlas of Texas, Bureau of Economic Geology, University of Texas at Austin, scale 1:250,000.

Geographic coverage Calhoun - Goliad - Hardin - Harris - Houston - Jackson - Jasper -Jefferson - Jim Wells - Liberty - Live Oak - Madison - Montgomery -Newton - Nueces - Orange - Polk - Refugio - San Jacinto - San Patricio - Trinity - Tyler - Victoria - Walker

Show this information as [XML] - [JSON]

U.S. Department of the Interior | U.S. Geological Survey URL: http://mrdata.usgs.gov/geology/state/sgmc-unit.php?unit=TXQd;0 Page Contact Information: Peter Schweitzer Appendix H - Unified Soil Classification System
UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM



TERMS DESCRIBING SOIL CONSISTENCY							
Fine Grai	ned Soils	Coarse Grained Soils					
Description Soft Firm Stiff Very Stiff	Penetrometer <u>Reading (tsf)</u> 0.0 to 1.0 1.0 to 1.5 1.5 to 3.0 3.0 to 4.5	Penetration Resistance (blows/ft) 0 to 4 4 to 10 10 to 30 30 to 50	Description Very Loose Loose Medium Dense Dense	Relative Density 0 to 20% 20 to 40% 40 to 70% 70 to 90%			

Client: Sabine River Authority of Texas Project: Sam Collins Park - 1B

1B PHASE	E1				
Item No.	Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
1	Mobilization	1	LS		\$ -
2	SWPPP and Erosion Control Allowance	1	LS		\$ -
3	Demolition, Removal and Haul Off	1	LS		\$ -
4	Asphalt Demolition Haul Off and Removal	1	LS		\$ -
5	Fine Grade and Topsoil around Asphalt Demolition	1	LS		\$ -
6	Tree Removal	2	EA		\$ -
7	Tree Protection	1	LS		\$ -
8	Site Grading Allowance	1	LS		\$ -
9	Mill and Overlay of Ex. Asphalt	864	SY		\$ -
10	Asphalt Type D	7,881	SF		\$ -
11	Asphalt Stabilized Base	7,881	SF		\$ -
12	Misc. Lane Markings & Pavement Markers	1	LS		\$ -
13	4" Concrete Sidewalk	2,000	SF		\$ -
14	2" SCH 40 PVC Water Line, All Joints, All Bends, Thrust Restraint, Fittings, All Depths, Trench	320	LF		\$ -
4.5	Safety System, Complete in Place	50	. –		
15	Bore 2" SCH 40 PVC Water Line, All Depths, Complete in Place	53			\$ -
16	Waterline Connection Complete and and In Place	1	LS		\$ -
17	Hose Bibs	4	EA		\$ -
18	2" RPZ Backflow Preventer, Complete in Place	1	EA		\$ -
19	Renovation of Existing Shade Pavilion	1	LS		\$ -
20	Renovation of Existing Restrooms	1	LS		\$ -
21	Renovation Restroom - Chain Link Fence at Septic System	150	LF		\$ -
22	Renovation Restroom - Chain Link Bi-Parting Vehicular Gate at Septic System	1	LS		\$ -
23	Renovation Restroom - Chain Link Pedestrian Gate at Septic System	1	LS		\$ -
24	Concrete Curb at Playground	390	LF		\$ -
25	Concrete Mow Strip	90	LF		\$ -
26	Playground Equipment	1	LS		\$ -
27	Playground Surfacing PIP	4,532	SF		\$ -
28	Playground Surface EWF	260	CY		\$ -
29	Playground Sand	38	CY		\$ -
30	Playground Subdrainage Complete and in Place	1	LS		\$ -
31	Playground Toddler Fence and Gate	380	LF		\$ -
32	Site Furniture Complete and in Place	1	LS		\$ -
33	Landscape Boulders (By Playground, Parking Lot and Wheel Stops)	22	EA		\$ -
34	Landscape Moss Boulders (By Playground)	50	EA		\$ -
35	Boulder with Plaque on Cut Stone Complete and in Place	1	LS		\$ -
36	Water Fountain Complete and in Place	1	LS		\$ -
37	Re-Establish Turf with Sod	10,500	SF		\$
1B PHASE 1 Subtotal					\$ -

Cost Subtotal:	\$ -
Total:	\$ -

1B PHASE	ALTERNATE 1				
Item No.	Item Description		Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
1	Remove, Haul off and Replace 4" Concrete Pavement around Pavilion	2,500	SF		
1B PHASE Alternate 1 Subtotal				\$ -	
1B PHASE	E ALTERNATE 2				
2	2 Mill and Overlay of Ex. Asphalt from Entry Road to Site		SY		
1B PHAS	E Alternate 2 Subtotal				\$ -
		Cost Subtotal:		\$ -	
		Total:			\$ -



NATURAL GRAY MEDIUM BROOM FINISH 3000 PSI CONTROL JOINTS: SAWCUT (1/4 DEPTH OF CONCRETE) @ REGULAR INTERVALS (TYPICAL JOINT SPACING TO BE EQUAL TO WIDTH OF WALK) EXPANSION JOINTS: SEE PLANS FOR LOCATION, 30' MAX. SEE SPECIFICATIONS

TYPE D, DENSE GRADED HOT MIX REF. PLAN AND DETAILS FOR DEPTH SEE SPECIFICATIONS

(AT ADA RAMP)

CONCRETE PAVER KEYSTONE OR APPROVED EQUAL TRUNCATED DOME PAVERS TO BE SELECTED BY OWNER

4" CONCRETE SUBBASE, REF. DETAILS KEYSTONE DAVE HASNESS (713.467.6436) CUT SHEET. SAMPLE. MOCKUP

LANDSCAPE STRUCTURES PER MANUFACTURER'S DETAILS AND RECOMMENDATIONS PRIORITIZE SUBMITTAL IF THERE ARE LONG LEAD TIMES LONE STAR RECREATION OR KRAFTSMEN OR PLAYWELL VANESSA ZELAYA PH: 281-970-9010 E:VANESSA.ZELAYA@LONESTARRECREATION.COM REFER TO MANUFACTURER SPECS FOR ALL FINISHES, CONNECTION DETAILS, HARDWARE, AND INSTALL INSTRUCTIONS

HICKORY BEAM PER DETAIL I/L3.00 APEX STONE OR APPROVED EQUAL REFERENCE DETAIL PHOTOGRAPHS, AND SITE LAYOUT

MOSS BOULDERS PER DETAIL D/L3.01 APEX STONE OR APPROVED EQUAL REFERENCE DETAIL PHOTOGRAPHS, AND SITE LAYOUT

FRONT APPROACH DRINKING FOUNTAIN 440 SMFA

TO BE DECIDED BY OWNER PER MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS MOST DEPENDABLE FOUNTAINS, INC. OR APPROVED EQUAL CUT SHEET

DURAPLAY OR APPROVED EQUAL CONFIRM WITH LA PRIOR TO PURCHASE PER MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS LONESTAR RECREATION OR APPROVED EQUAL

KIDDIE KUSHION OR APPROVED EQUAL PER MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS NEW EARTH (281.574.0316) OR APPROVED EQUAL MUST CONFORM WITH ASTM F1292, ASTM F1951, ASTM F2075 CUT SHEET

CUSTOM FABRICATED BLACK VINYL COATED ONSITE MOCK UP OF INITIAL INSTALL

B79 SERIES CONTOUR 8' BENCH, PERFORATED STEEL W/ CUSTOM LOGO, THERMO-PLASTIC COATED B79/CW-8RN

IN-GROUND; COLOR: BROWN COLOR: FOREST GREEN PER MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS PLAYWELL OR APPROVED EQUAL CUT SHEET

IN-GROUND MOUNTED TRASH RECEPTACLE CN-R/RN-32 ROUND TRASH RECEPTACLE W/ PLASTIC DOME LID, LINER, & CHAIN KIT THERMOPLASTIC COATED PERFORATED STEEL W/ SRA LOGO PER MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS

BJ'S PARKS AND RECREATION PRODUCTS OR APPROVED EQUAL KEVIN HANES PH: 281-356-2110 E: KEVIN@BJSPARK.COM CUT SHEET AND COLORS

INSTALL TO MEET OR EXCEED ADA AND TAS REQUIREMENTS

MISCELLANEOUS CONT.

PLAYGROUND SAND (M-10) TYPE:

CLASS: SIZE: PRODUCT NUMBER: SAND NOTE: APPROVAL:

TYPE:

HEIGHT:

COLOR:

APPROVAL:

STONE VENEER

TYPE:

CONTACT:

INSTALL:

APPROVAL:

SIZE:

SAFE SAND UNDYED, NATURALLY WHITE MUST COMPLY WITH ASTM F963 STANDARD CUSTOMER SAFETY SPEC FOR TOY SAFETY SAMPLE



CHAIN LINK FENCE AND GATES AT EXISTING SEPTIC CUSTOM FABRICATED 8'-0" BLACK VINYL COATED WITH PRIVACY SLATS ONSITE MOCK UP OF INITIAL INSTALL



OWNER PROVIDED REF DETAIL E/L3.01



OKLAHOMA SUNSET CHOPPED STONE 2-5" HT X 6-18" WIDTH 5-STAR STONE TYLER TX OR APPROVED EQUAL PH: 903-266-9230 REF DETAIL H/L3.01 ONSITE MOCK UP OF INITIAL INSTALL





TGr

ΤG

C.I

POB

FG







Vavra, Madison Sheet Set:Kha Layout:C1.00 August 22, 2024 01:20:22pm K:\HOU_LALP\068925101_SRA Sam Collins 1B\Production\CAD\Sheets\Civil\C1.0 - DEMO PL





PAVILION: ITEMS LISTED ARE TO BE BID AS A PART OF THE OVERALL RENOVATION. 1. PRESSURE WASH PAVILION

- 4. REPLACE METAL R-PANEL ROOF ENSURE COLOR TO MATCH EXISTING
- 5. ADD 6" GUTTERS AND DOWNSPOUTS
- 6. ADD 1X6 TO CLAD EDGE OF ROOF
- COLOR TO BE SELECTED BY OWNER.
- NOT REINSTALL)
- 10. RE-COAT STEEL MEMBERS OF PAVILION

PROVIDE STAINING TO TONGUE AND GROOVE DECKING UNDER PAVILION ROOF. COLOR TO BE SELECTED BY OWNER.

> REPLACE IN KIND 1" X 6" TONGUE AND **GROOVE DECKING UNDER PAVILION ROOF**

> > PRESSURE WASH PAVILION

REPLACE METAL R-PANEL ROOF ENSURE COLOR TO MATCH EXISTING

ADD 1X6 TO CLAD EDGE OF ROOF

ADD 6" GUTTERS AND DOWNSPOUTS

ADD COLUMN MASONRY CLADDING AT ALL COLUMNS SEE H/L3.01

PICNIC TABLES SHALL BE STORED ON SITE FOR OWNER'S USE (CONTRACTOR TO NOT REINSTALL)

PRESSURE WASH ALL CONCRETE PAVING UNDER AND AROUND PAVILION

2. PRESSURE WASH ALL CONCRETE PAVING UNDER AND AROUND PAVILION 3. ADD COLUMN MASONRY CLADDING AT ALL COLUMNS SEE H/L3.01

7. REPLACE IN KIND 1" X 6" TONGUE IN GROOVE DECKING UNDER PAVILION ROOF 8. PROVIDE STAINING TO TONGUE AND GROOVE DECKING UNDER PAVILION ROOF.

9. PICNIC TABLES SHALL BE STORED ON SITE FOR OWNER'S USE (CONTRACTOR TO

