

**NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL
ENGINEERING, INC.**

TERRA FIRMA TESTING



GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT

For the

ACLT KITCHEN ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Prepared for:

Spark Design, LLC
5401 Cordova Street, Suite 301
Anchorage, Alaska

Prepared by:

Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc. *d.b.a.* Terra Firma Testing

MARCH 2025



March 14, 2025

NGE-TFT Project #7289-25

Spark Design, LLC
5401 Cordova Street, Suite 301
Anchorage, Alaska

Attn: Jessica Stine – Architect / Interior Designer

**RE: GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED ACLT
KITCHEN LOCATED IN THE MOUNTAIN VIEW SUBDIVISION –
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA**

Jessica,

We (Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc. *d.b.a.* Terra Firma Testing) have completed a geotechnical engineering assessment of the aforementioned project site. Our assessment suggests that the native, undisturbed soil deposits (mostly gravel and sand soils) present at the project site are generally suitable to support the proposed improvements provided that our engineering recommendations are used in the design and construction process.

In the following report, we provide a breakdown of the subsurface conditions and our laboratory findings from the samples collected. Engineering conclusions and design recommendations based on the laboratory findings are provided to support our assessment of the project site.

Subsurface conditions can vary across a project site. As such, we recommend that The Observational Method (described in more detail in Appendix B of this report) be followed.

We greatly appreciate the opportunity to provide you with our professional service. Please contact us directly with any questions or comments you may have regarding the information that we present in this report, or if you have any other questions, comments, and/or requests.

Sincerely,

Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc. *d.b.a.* Terra Firma Testing

Jacob Stephens
Project Engineer

Daniel J. Light, P.E.
Project Engineer




Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	PROJECT OVERVIEW	1
3.0	PREVIOUS WORK.....	2
4.0	SITE CHARACTERIZATION ACTIVITIES.....	2
4.1	Infiltration Testing.....	2
5.0	LABORATORY TESTING.....	3
6.0	DESCRIPTION OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS	3
6.1	General Subsurface Profile.....	3
6.2	Groundwater.....	3
6.3	Frozen Soils.....	3
7.0	ENGINEERING CONCLUSIONS	4
8.0	DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS	5
8.1	Earthworks	5
8.2	Seismic Design Parameters	6
8.3	Shallow Foundations.....	6
8.3.1	Warm Shallow Foundations.....	6
8.3.2	Cold Shallow Foundations.....	8
8.3.3	Shallow Foundation Uplift Resistance.....	9
8.3.4	Lateral Loads for Foundation and Retaining Walls.....	10
8.4	Insulation.....	11
8.5	Underground Utilities.....	11
8.6	Pavement Sections.....	12
8.6.1	Confirmation Testing.....	13
8.6.1	Material Specifications	13
8.7	Surface Drainage.....	14
9.0	CONSTRUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS.....	14
9.1	Earthwork.....	14
9.1.1	Winter Construction.....	15
9.2	Shallow Foundations	15
9.2.1	Warm Shallow Foundations.....	15
9.2.2	Cold Shallow Foundations.....	16
9.3	Pavement.....	16
9.4	Insulation.....	16
10.0	CLOSURE	17

List of Figures

Figure 1	Project Site Location Map
Figure 2	Current Site Layout and Approximate Exploration Locations Map
Figure 3	Proposed Improvements
Figure 4	Blow Count Corrections
Figure 5	Uninsulated Shallow Foundation Configurations
Figure 6	Insulated Shallow Foundation Configurations
Figure 7	Footing Uplift Capacity Diagram
Figure 8	Lateral Retaining Wall Pressure Schematics
Figure 9	Material Specifications

List of Tables

Table 1: Equivalent Fluid Specific Weight for Lateral Loading Design	10
Table 2: Parking Areas: Recommended Uninsulated Pavement Section for F2 subgrade	12
Table 3: Sidewalk: Recommended Uninsulated Pavement Section for F2 subgrade	12
Table 4: Type A, Class 2 Geotextile Fabric Strengths.....	13

List of Appendices

Appendix A.....	Graphical Exploration Borehole Logs
Appendix B	Additional Report Details
Appendix C	Infiltration Test Data
Appendix D.....	Laboratory Test Results
Appendix E	ASCE 7 Seismic Hazard Report



1.0 INTRODUCTION

Project Site: Four (4) lots within the Mountain View Subdivision, Anchorage, Alaska

Client: Spark Design, LLC

Service Fee Proposal: #25-031 dated February 12, 2025

Authorization of Services: Signature of Service Fee Proposal on February 18, 2025 by Deanna Nafzger - Partner and Architect – Spark Design, LLC

Scope:

- characterize the subsurface conditions across the project site;
- provide foundation design values;
- provide a water infiltration rate for designing a stormwater drainage system;
- provide pavement design recommendations; and
- provide general foundation and earthworks engineering and construction recommendations.

2.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

Project Site Location: The site borders Mountain View Drive (to the South) and is located on the block between Price Street and N Bragaw Street, Anchorage, Alaska (Figure 1)

Legal Description of Project Site:

- Lot 4A, block 1 of the Mountain view Subd., Anchorage, Alaska – 0.31 acres
- Lot 3 W3 S2, block 1 of the Mountain view Subd., Anchorage, Alaska – 0.15 acres
- Lot 3 M3 S2, block 1 of the Mountain view Subd., Anchorage, Alaska – 0.15 acres
- Lot 3 E3 S2, block 1 of the Mountain view Subd., Anchorage, Alaska – 0.15 acres

Project Site Size: Approximately 0.76 acres combined

Current Site Conditions: (Figure 2)

- Relatively flat and paved with some unpaved areas on the north side of the project site;
- mostly unvegetated with some low-lying shrubs and trees with most of the shrubs and trees existing on the south end of the site; and
- an existing shed on Lot 4A that will be relocated.

Proposed Improvements to Site: (Figure 3)

- Construction of commercial kitchen building;
- construction of a paved parking area and concrete sidewalks; and
- construction of associated underground utilities.

3.0 PREVIOUS WORK

We previously conducted a geotechnical evaluation of the closely located site for the CIHA Brewster Multi-family Housing Project, which is detailed in our geotechnical report:

“Geotechnical Engineering Report for the CIHA Brewster Multi-family Housing Project, Anchorage, Alaska” dated November 17, 2022.

4.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION ACTIVITIES

Date of Exploration: February 20, 2025

Subsurface Exploration Contractor: Discovery Drilling, Inc. (DDI)

Number and Type of Soil Explorations: five (5) hollow-stem auger soil borings

Exploration Locations: Figure 2 of this report

Exploration Depths: Approximately 11.5 to 31.5 feet below the ground surface (bgs)

Sampling Method: Grab Samples and Modified Penetration Test (MPT) split-spoon sampler

Drop-Hammer Type & Correction Factor (CF): 340-lb automatic drop-hammer, CF=1.1

Field Blow Count Correction: Figure 4 of this report

Graphical Borehole Logs: Appendix A of this report

For more details regarding field activities refer to Appendix B (Section 1.0) of this report.

4.1 Infiltration Testing

Location: Borehole four (B4)

Procedures Followed:

- Falling head percolation test procedure outlined in Table 3.9 of the EPA On-site Water Treatment & Disposal Systems Manual
- EPA falling head test method as outlined in the Municipality of Anchorage Drainage Design Guidelines, Section 9.2.1.

Results: 1.5 minutes per inch (Data Sheet in Appendix C)

For more details regarding infiltration testing refer to Appendix B (Section 1.3) of this report.

5.0 LABORATORY TESTING

We tested select soil samples in general accordance with the respective ASTM standard test methods including:

- moisture content analysis (ASTM D-2216);
- determination of fines content (a.k.a. P200 – ASTM D-1140); and
- grain size sieve and hydrometer analysis (ASTM D-6913 & D-7928) (*See Appendix B (Section 2.0) for an important note about these test methods*).

Laboratory Test Results: Appendices A (graphical exploration logs) and D (laboratory data sheets)

6.0 DESCRIPTION OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

We compiled our field observations with the results from our laboratory analyses to produce graphical logs of each subsurface exploration (Appendix A). The graphical exploration logs depict the subsurface conditions that we identified at each exploration location and help us to interpret/extrapolate the subsurface conditions for areas adjacent to, and immediately surrounding, each exploration location across the project site.

6.1 General Subsurface Profile

The general subsurface conditions at the project site between the depths of 0.25 feet and 5.0 feet bgs consists of silty sand and gravel, and dense well graded gravel with silt and sand (B4). Between the depths of 5.0 feet and 10.0 feet bgs, the subsurface conditions consist of mostly well graded gravel, sand, and some silt. After 10 feet bgs, the conditions consist of a mix of well and poorly graded gravel/sand. The presence of silt decreases with exploration depth. Soil blow counts indicate dense material throughout the project site explorations.

A top layer of approximately three (3) inch thick asphalt exists at B1, B2, B4, and B5.

6.2 Groundwater

No groundwater was encountered at the time of drilling at the project site. The groundwater level was monitored at the location of borehole four (4) and groundwater was not encountered.

6.3 Frozen Soils

We observed indications of frozen soil at depths ranging from 1.0 feet bgs to 4.0 feet bgs at all exploration locations except for B4. We do not expect permafrost to occur at the project site.

7.0 ENGINEERING CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of our field work, laboratory testing, and engineering analysis efforts, it is our conclusion that:

General:

1. The subgrade soils are generally suitable to support the proposed improvements provided that our concerns and recommendations are addressed by the design and construction processes.

Earthworks:

2. Any organic rich material should be excavated out to its horizontal and vertical extent within the footprint of the proposed improvements.
3. Coarse-grained material may be re-used on-site as structural fill assuming that the material is free of any organic material (or other deleterious debris) and that the material is compactible.

Foundations:

4. A conventional shallow foundation is suitable for the project site.
5. There is a low potential for soil liquefaction and earthquake-induced lateral spreading and pressure ridges are unlikely.
 - a. Low liquefaction potential can be maintained by properly placing structural fill as discussed in Section 8.1 and 9.1 of this report.

Underground Utilities:

6. Underground utilities can be founded directly onto the existing subgrade soils.

Pavement:

7. The pavement section design needs to consider the somewhat frost susceptible (F1 to F2) Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) frost classification of the near surface subgrade soils.

Settlements:

8. Total settlement for shallow concrete foundations placed on recommended bearing materials (defined in Section 8.1) is anticipated to be less than three-quarters (3/4) of an inch, with differential settlements comprising about one-half (1/2) of the total anticipated settlement.
 - a. Settlement amounts could increase substantially if the structural fill material used to bring any foundation pads to grade is not properly compacted.

- b. Most of the settlements should occur as the building loads are applied, such that additional long-term settlements should be relatively small and within tolerable limits.
9. Settlements under driveways and parking areas are expected to vary more than under any buildings, especially where utility trenches are located.
 - a. The settlement potential can be reduced by performing all utility excavation and backfill efforts as early in the construction schedule as possible and placing any pavement as last in the construction schedule as possible.

8.0 DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

We have presented our design recommendations in the general order that the project site will most likely be developed. Our design recommendations can be used in parts (as needed) for the final design configuration.

8.1 Earthworks

Our general recommendations for earthworks are:

- Foundations should be placed on recommended bearing materials.
 - Recommended bearing materials: undisturbed gravel and sand or properly compacted structural fill above undisturbed gravel and sand
- Structural fill materials should be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the modified Proctor density.
- To reuse excavated coarse-grained material as structural fill it:
 - should have less than approximately 15 percent passing the #200 sieve; and
 - must not contain any organic/deleterious material.

Slopes at the project site should:

- not exceed a 2:1 slope (if constructed);
- have properly keyed in fill; and
- have erosion control.

We recommend the following quality control inspections:

- bottom-of-hole inspections;
- fill gradation classification; and
- in-situ compaction testing.

A bottom-of-hole inspection should be conducted (by a qualified geotechnical engineer, geologist, or special inspector) before any foundation construction begins.

8.2 Seismic Design Parameters

Assumptions: ASCE/SEI 7-22 and Seismic Risk Category II

Seismic Site Classification: *D*

ASCE 7 Hazards Report: Appendix E

8.3 Shallow Foundations

For the purposes of this report, we consider a shallow foundation to be any foundation which is shallower than ten (10) feet bgs. We have separated our recommendations for warm (i.e., heated) and cold (i.e., unheated) shallow foundations into Sections 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 of this report.

8.3.1 Warm Shallow Foundations

For the purposes of this report, we consider a warm shallow foundation to be any shallow foundation located within or along the direct perimeter of an enclosed, climate-controlled space that maintains an internal ambient air temperature above 40°F.

8.3.1.1 Soil Bearing Capacity

Concrete foundations placed on recommended bearing materials (defined in Section 8.1) and at the burial depths of a perimeter footing as described in Section 8.3.1.3 may be designed with a:

- 4000 pounds per square foot (psf) soil bearing capacity; and
- one-third (1/3) increase to accommodate short-term wind and/or seismic loads.

Larger footings (smallest dimension greater than two feet in plan dimension) may be designed for greater bearing capacities at a rate of 300 psf for every additional horizontal linear foot of footing up to a maximum value of 7000 psf.

8.3.1.2 Continuous Strip Footings and Spread Footings

The minimum horizontal dimensions for continuous strip footings and/or spread footings founded directly onto recommended bearing materials (defined in Section 8.1) are:

- 16 inches for continuous strip footings
- 24 inches for individual spread footings

8.3.1.3 Footing Burial Depths

For the project site, the minimum burial depth for any uninsulated shallow foundation footings should be as follows (measured from the bottom of the foundation footing):

1. 12 inches (D_1 in Figure 5) for interior footings located entirely within an enclosed, continuously heated space* (measured from the bottom of the footing to the top of the floor slab) and
2. 42 inches (D_2 in Figure 5) for foundation footings located along the perimeter of an enclosed, continuously heated space* (measured from the bottom of the footing to the exterior finished grade).

**The temperature of an enclosed, continuously heated space must be maintained above 40 °F and allow for adequate heat transfer to foundation soils in order for our recommendations to apply.*

We have provided our recommended insulation configurations Figure 6 of this report. We should be consulted if alternative foundation insulation configurations are to be utilized for this project so that we can evaluate their suitability as it pertains to the existing site conditions and proposed foundation design.

If foundation burial depths are reduced through the use of insulation, then the allowable bearing capacity of the foundation may also be reduced. As such, we should be consulted to re-evaluate our minimum allowable bearing capacities if foundation depths are to be shallower than those which we recommend above.

We provide more details about frost development and protection in Appendix B (Section 3.1) of this report.

8.3.1.4 Thickened Edge Slab Foundations and Floor Slabs

Thickened slab edges (i.e., perimeter slab footings) should extend to a minimum of 16 inches below the finished exterior grade to achieve the recommended allowable soil bearing capacity and help resist any lateral forces. Warm thickened edge slab foundations and/or floor slabs can be founded directly onto the recommended bearing materials (defined in Section 8.1) with a pad that consists of:

- adequate amounts of insulation (Figure 6);
- relatively free draining sands and gravels with less than about 15% of the fill material passing through a #200 sieve for the upper structural fill material (at or above the footing grade); and
- free draining material with less than 3% passing the #200 sieve for the top four to six inches beneath the slabs.

Concrete slabs constructed directly on the recommended bearing materials (defined in Section 8.1, may be designed using a modulus of subgrade reaction of $k_I=140$ pci (k_I is the value for a 1-ft × 1-ft rigid plate) and the equations presented in Appendix B (Section 3.2) for modulus of subgrade reaction for load footprints.

8.3.2 Cold Shallow Foundations

For the purposes of this report, we consider a cold shallow foundation to be any shallow foundation whose subgrade is subjected to freezing temperatures for any amount of time. We do not recommend the construction of cold shallow foundations. However, in the event that cold shallow foundations cannot be avoided, we provide cold shallow foundations recommendations in the following Subsections of this report.

Deep foundation systems can serve as an alternative means of cold foundation support. Cost and constructability will typically be the driving force behind which type of cold foundation system is ultimately selected for a given project.

We provide more details about frost development and protection as well as deep foundation systems in Appendix B (Section 3.1) of this report.

8.3.2.1 Soil Bearing Capacity

The bearing capacity of cold shallow foundations will be a function of both the configuration (i.e., dimensions) and burial depth of the foundation. The warm shallow foundation bearing capacity defined in Section 8.3.1.1 of this report may be used for a cold shallow foundation. We can provide allowable bearing capacities for various footing burial depths once a foundation configuration has been determined.

8.3.2.2 Footing Burial Depths

For the project site, the minimum burial depth (measured from the bottom of the footing to the lowest elevation of either the interior or exterior finished grade – including any floor slabs) for any uninsulated cold shallow foundation footings should be 96 inches (D3 in Figure 5).

The minimum footing burial depth for any cold shallow foundation may be reduced, if the foundation is placed onto a granular structural pad constructed of NFS fill material where:

- the NFS material has less than 3% of the material finer than 0.02 mm in diameter;
- the NFS fill subgrade extends a minimum of 96 inches below the planned finished grade (interior or exterior - whichever is lower); and
- the minimum foundation burial for a cold shallow foundation bearing onto a structural NFS fill pad should be the same as our minimum recommended burial depth for a warm shallow foundation (D2 in Figure 5).

Artificial insulation may be used in lieu of some of the NFS backfill where:

- a minimum of 18 inches of NFS fill is present between the bottom of any shallow foundation footing and the top of any insulation; and
- one inch of rigid foam board insulation is considered equivalent to one foot of NFS fill (in terms of insulating properties).

We detail our recommended insulation configurations for cold shallow foundations in Figure 6 of this report. We should be consulted if alternative shallow foundation insulation configurations are to be utilized for this project so that we can evaluate their suitability.

We provide more details about frost development and protection in Appendix B (Section 3.1) of this report.

8.3.2.3 Grade-level Design Elements

Any cold shallow foundation design elements which are to exist at (or very close to) grade level (e.g., grade beams, connecting structural members, exterior siding, etc.) should be designed to accommodate a minimum of six inches of vertical ground movement

We can evaluate the frost heaving pressures that may develop (for use in the structural design) if the design cannot accommodate our recommended air gap. If planned grade-level design elements cannot withstand any vertical movements, then they should not be used with a cold shallow foundation system.

8.3.3 Shallow Foundation Uplift Resistance

The uplift capacity of a foundation is a function of its weight, configuration, and depth and can be determined using:

- 80 percent of the weight of the foundation plus 80 percent of the weight of the effective soil mass (Figure 7) located above the footing;
- an effective unit weight of 130 pcf for granular structural backfill material; and
- no increase in uplift capacity for short-term loading, as the ultimate uplift load includes any short-term load factors.

Shallow foundation footings should extend laterally a minimum of one-eighth ($1/8$) of the footing width beyond any foundation walls to help resist any anticipated uplift/overturning forces (Figure 7).

We can calculate the uplift capacity for other foundation configurations upon request and once we have been provided with a general foundation design.

8.3.4 Lateral Loads for Foundation and Retaining Walls

Retaining walls (such as perimeter foundation stem walls for buildings with basements or crawl spaces) must be designed to resist lateral earth pressures. The magnitude of the pressure exerted on a retaining wall is dependent upon several factors, including:

- 1) whether the top of the wall is allowed to deflect after placement of backfill;
- 2) the type of backfill used;
- 3) compaction effort; and
- 4) wall drainage provisions.

Any foundation stem walls that are not designed to carry lateral loads should be backfilled on both sides simultaneously to prevent differential lateral loading of the foundation stem wall.

The lateral soil pressures can be represented by equivalent fluid pressures. The pressure distribution is a function of wall restraint, seismic loading, and drainage conditions. In Table 1 of this report, we provide the unit weights to be used with the pressure distribution diagrams for various loading conditions provided in Figure 8 of this report. We assumed that structural fill (containing less than ten percent fines) is used as backfill, and that the fill is compacted to at least 90 percent of the modified Proctor density.

Table 1: Equivalent Fluid Specific Weight for Lateral Loading Design

LOADING CONDITION	DRAINED EQUIVALENT FLUID SPECIFIC WEIGHT		UN-DRAINED EQUIVALENT FLUID SPECIFIC WEIGHT	
	SPECIFIC WEIGHT (pcf)	SYMBOL	SPECIFIC WEIGHT (pcf)	SYMBOL
ACTIVE	35	t_1	21	t_2
AT-REST	55	t_3	32	t_4
PASSIVE	442	t_5	259	t_6
SEISMIC	16 (UNRESTRAINED)	t_7	9 (RESTRAINED)*	t_8

*For wall heights less than 8 ft

Lateral forces may also be resisted by friction between the concrete foundations and the underlying soil. The frictional resistance may be calculated using a coefficient of friction of 0.4 between the concrete and soil.

We provide more details about lateral earth pressure in Appendix B (Section 3.3) of this report.

8.4 Insulation

Any subgrade insulation used should:

- consist of extruded polystyrene such as DOW Styrofoam™ Highload or UC Industries Foamular;
- not absorb more than 2% water per ASTM Test Method C-272;
- not have a thermal conductivity (k) that exceeds 0.25 BTU-in/hr-ft²-°F when tested at 75°F;
- be installed with proper bedding material that provides a flat, smooth surface; and
- be closed cell, board stock with a minimum compressive strength of:
 - 60 psi (at 5% deflection) for use under structural slabs.
 - 25 psi (at 5% deflection) for use around the exterior of any foundations.

8.5 Underground Utilities

In general, the soils in which deep utility trenches (6-10 feet bgs) are to be constructed are composed of dense gravel and sand. Any gravity-fed utility trenches extending into the dense gravel and sand should be a minimum of three feet wide at the bottom with the utility piping located in the center of the trenches. Structural fill should be used to bring the gravity-fed utilities to the proper installation grade.

Underground utilities which are susceptible to damage from freezing:

- Need to be frost-protected by sufficient amounts of backfill, insulation, and/or active freeze protection systems (e.g., heat tape, thaw wire, etc.); or some combination of the above.
- Need to contain some level of additional frost-protection (e.g., insulation, active freeze protection systems, or a combination of both) if they are planned to be constructed less than eight feet below the planned finished grade.
- Should not be constructed within four feet of the planned finished grade (regardless of insulation measures or active freeze-protection systems).

Any insulation used should:

- conform to the specifications detailed in Section 8.4 of this report; and
- extend a minimum of two feet (and a maximum of four feet) perpendicular to either side of the proposed utility alignment.

The thickness of the insulation used will be a function of the burial depth. In general, one inch of insulation is equal to approximately 12 inches of compacted NFS backfill.

8.6 Pavement Sections

Design Considerations:

- There are cut and fill activities planned at the project site
- The near surface subgrade soils classify as F1 to F2 on the MOA frost classification scale.

We provide more details about frost development in pavement sections in Appendix B (Section 3.1) of this report.

We detailed our recommended pavement section for construction of the parking areas and sidewalk above the F2 soils in Tables 2 through 3 of this report, respectively.

Table 2: Parking Areas: Recommended Uninsulated Pavement Section for F2 subgrade

SECTION THICKNESS	MATERIAL
2 INCHES MIN.	ASPHALT CONCRETE (AC) PAVEMENT
2 INCHES MAX.	NFS LEVELING COURSE (A.K.A. “D-1” or “RAP”)
12 INCHES	TYPE II-A
12 INCHES	TYPE II or II-A
N/A	GEOTEXTILE FABRIC (OPTIONAL)
N/A	F2 SUBGRADE (NATIVE OR FILL)

Table 3: Sidewalk: Recommended Uninsulated Pavement Section for F2 subgrade

SECTION THICKNESS	MATERIAL
4 INCHES MIN.	PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE (PCC) PAVEMENT
2 INCHES MAX.	NFS LEVELING COURSE (A.K.A. “D-1”)
12 INCHES	TYPE II-A
N/A	F2 SUBGRADE (NATIVE OR FILL)

Rigid, closed-cell foam board insulation (as we specify in Section 8.4 of this report) can be used to reduce the amount of Type II material that we specify in our recommended F2 pavement section (Tables 2 and 3) at a rate of one inch of insulation for 12 inches of Type II/II-A fill. However, given the relatively thin overall section of our recommended pavement section, it is likely that insulation will not be a cost effective option for this project.

8.6.1 Confirmation Testing

Confirmation frost classification testing of the subgrade soils located within the extents of the proposed parking areas should be conducted after the completion of all overburden removal and any utility installation activities at a frequency of:

- one test per 5,000 sqft feet of the exposed subgrade surface, and
- one test per 10,000 sqft feet at a depth of approximately 12 inches below the exposed subgrade surface.

The results of the confirmation frost classification testing can be used to ensure that the proper pavement section is used for the soil conditions exposed. If the confirmation testing indicates that the subgrade soils are NFS, then an alternative (thinner) pavement section can be used (as we discuss above). However, if the conformation testing indicates that the frost classification of the subgrade soils is higher than MOA F2, then alternative pavement section designs, including thicker structural sections and/or the use of artificial insulation may be required.

8.6.1 Material Specifications

Permeable geotextile fabric is optional but not required for this project. Any geotextile fabric used should meet the specifications in the 2015 Municipality of Anchorage Standard Specifications (MASS), Section 20.25 For the project site, we recommend a Type A, Class 2 (i.e., separation) geotextile fabric. The geotextile fabric may be either: 1) woven, or 2) non-woven with perforations. We have provided the various strengths for both woven and non-woven Type A, Class 2 geotextile fabric in Table 4 of this report.

Table 4: Type A, Class 2 Geotextile Fabric Strengths

FABRIC PROPERTY	ASTM STANDARD USED TO DETERMINE STRENGTH	WOVEN FABRIC STRENGTH	NON-WOVEN FABRIC STRENGTH
GRAB STRENGTH	D4632	250	160
SEWN SEAM STRENGTH	D4632	225	140
TEAR STRENGTH	D4533	90	56
PUNCTURE STRENGTH	D6241	495	310

Note: Units in lbs per foot.

The leveling course, Type II, and Type II-A materials used should conform to the specifications we provide in Figure 9 of this report and be placed in thin lifts compacted to a minimum of 95 % of the modified Proctor density.

Any leveling course used should be NFS; however, it is our experience that the “D-1” leveling course material currently available in Anchorage area may not be NFS following compaction, and as such we recommend:

- using two inches of recycled asphalt pavement (RAP) for the leveling course; or
- keeping the leveling course thickness to two inches or less.

We provide more details about pavement material specifications in Appendix B (Section 3.4) of this report.

8.7 Surface Drainage

After the property is brought to grade it should be relatively flat, such that storm water will tend to accumulate and flow off the site slowly.

Water accumulation will have a detrimental effect on foundations, retaining structures, and pavement sections and as such we recommend:

- 1) grading the ground surface around the proposed developments such that surface runoff is channel away from foundations/retaining structures/pavement sections;
- 2) tightly compacting the surface soils;
- 3) diverting roof, parking lot and driveway drainage away from foundation; and
- 4) making tight-line connections from roof drain collectors to storm sewer (if available).

9.0 CONSTRUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS

We have presented our construction recommendations in the general order that the project site will most likely be developed. Our construction recommendations are intended to aid the construction contractor(s) during the construction process.

9.1 Earthwork

Structural fill should be:

- compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the modified Proctor density as determined by ASTM D-1557 (unless specifically stated otherwise in other sections of this report); and
- placed in individual lifts of less than one-foot in thickness (typical);
 - thickness will be determined based on the equipment used, the soil type, and existing soil moisture content.

All earthworks should be completed with quality control inspection.

Excavated coarse-grained material should:

- have less than approximately 10 to 15 percent passing the #200 sieve and not contain any organic/deleterious material to be used as structural fill; and
- be protected from additional moisture inputs (precipitation, etc.) through the use of plastic tarps, etc. if stockpiled on-site.

Soils with higher silt contents can be used within the foundation footprint. However, the effort required to achieve proper compaction of silt-rich soils may be more costly than purchasing better grade materials. Time of year, existing moisture content, rainfall, air temperature, and fill temperature can all have an impact on the effort required to adequately compact silt-rich material.

9.1.1 Winter Construction

To ensure proper placement and compaction of structural fill during winter months the following additional guidelines should be followed:

- ambient soil temperatures need to be above 37 °F;
- fill material needs to be completely thawed before placement; and
- subgrade soils (fill or native) need to be completely thawed prior to the placement and compaction of additional lifts of thawed fill material.

9.2 Shallow Foundations

Care should be taken during foundation excavation activities to limit the disturbance of the bottom of any foundation excavations. The bottom of any foundation excavation should be moisture conditioned and proof-rolled as necessary to return the exposed soils to their original in-situ density.

In general, the soils in which the proposed foundation pads are to be constructed consist primarily dense gravel and sand. As such, any surface water (*e.g.*, from precipitation, snowmelt, etc.) that enters into foundation excavations will tend to dissipate slowly. Excess water will have a negative impact on any backfill and compaction efforts. Therefore, if surface water does accumulate in any open foundation excavations it can be controlled by excavating a shallow drainage trench around the perimeter of the excavation. The drainage trench will collect surface water and direct it to a sump area, which should be located outside of the foundation footprint. The excess water can then be pumped from the sump area and be discharged at an appropriate location away from the excavation and any other existing foundations.

9.2.1 Warm Shallow Foundations

Warm shallow building foundation must remain thawed continuously through construction;

- if construction occurs during the winter months tenting (temporary enclosures) and heat should be applied to keep the foundation bearing material thawed
- consequences of freezing are described in Section 4.1 of Appendix B

9.2.2 Cold Shallow Foundations

We do not recommend the construction of any cold (unheated) shallow foundations without freeze protection, as they may experience ice lens development and/or thaw-weakening, which could result in damage to the proposed foundations. As we mention in Section 8.3.2.2 of this report, the minimum cold foundation burial depth (D_3) can be reduced, if the foundation is placed on a structural pad constructed of NFS fill. The NFS structural pad thickness may be reduced by using insulation at a rate of one inch of insulation to one foot of NFS material.

9.3 Pavement

The following are our construction recommendations for pavement sections:

- Confirmation frost classification testing of the exposed subgrade should be completed.
- All of the earthwork within any areas to be paved should be completed as early in the construction schedule as possible, and the pavement placed as late in the construction schedule as possible.
 - Underground utility piping should be installed prior to construction of any pavement sections such that trenching is done through the subgrade soils only.
 - This will give the subgrade soils time to settle, compress, and stabilize prior to placement of the pavement.
- Any structural fill used should be placed in thin lifts (less than one foot in thickness) and each lift should be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the modified Proctor density.
- Prior to paving, any surface fill material should be re-leveled and re-compacted.
- All backfill and paving materials should be inspected and tested for material specification compliance and compaction.

The minimum thickness for any asphalt concrete (AC) pavement surfaces is two inches. The minimum thickness of any Portland cement concrete (PCC) pavement surfaces will be a function of the reinforcement required. All applicable ACI and IBC standards should be followed.

9.4 Insulation

The satisfactory performance of any subsurface insulation is in part controlled by the details of construction including: 1) the care taken to ensure that the board stock lies flat on a smooth, level surface; and 2) the adjoining ends of the insulation are closely butted together. Any vertical joints should be staggered where more than one layer of insulation is used.

10.0 CLOSURE

We (Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc. d.b.a. Terra Firma Testing) prepared this report exclusively for the use of Spark Design, LLC and their consultants/contractors/etc. for use in the design and construction of the proposed improvements. We should be notified if significant changes are to occur in the nature, design, or location of the proposed improvements in order that we may review our conclusions and recommendations that we present in this report and, if necessary, modify them to satisfy the proposed changes.



This report should always be read and/or distributed in its entirety (including all figures, exploration logs, appendices, etc.) so that all of the pertinent information contained within is effectively disseminated. Otherwise, an incomplete or misinterpreted understanding of the site conditions and/or our engineering recommendations may occur. Our recommended best practice is to make this report accessible, in its entirety, to any design professional and/or contractor working on the project. Any part of this report (e.g., exploration logs, calculations, material values, etc.) which is presented in the design/construction plans and/or specifications for the project should have an adequate reference which clearly identifies where the report can be obtained for further review.

Due to the natural variability of earth materials, variations in the subsurface conditions across the project site may exist other than those we identified during the course of our geotechnical assessment. Therefore, a qualified geotechnical engineer, geologist, and/or special inspector be on-site during construction activities to provide corrective recommendations for any unexpected conditions revealed during construction (see our discussion of the Observational Method in Section 5.0 of Appendix B of this report for more detail). Furthermore, the construction budget should allow for any unanticipated conditions that may be encountered during construction activities.

We conducted this evaluation following the standard of care expected of professionals undertaking similar work in the State of Alaska under similar conditions. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made.



REPORT FIGURES



 = APPROXIMATE PROJECT SITE

BASE MAP OBTAINED FROM MOA MAPIT! APP





NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC.
TERRA FIRMA TESTING

FIGURE TITLE:
PROJECT SITE LOCATION MAP
PROJECT NAME:
ACLT KITCHEN — MOUNTAIN VIEW
PROJECT LOCATION:
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA


PROJECT ID:
7289-25
FIGURE NUMBER:
1



APPROXIMATE BOREHOLE EXPLORATION LOCATIONS: 

APPROXIMATE GROUNDWATER MONITORING/INFILTRATION TESTING WELL LOCATION: 

BASE MAP OBTAINED FROM MOA MAPIT! APP



CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION NO. R&M CONSULTANTS, INC. #AEC02111

R&M CONSULTANTS, INC.
 2000 W. 10th Ave., Suite 200
 Anchorage, Alaska 99507
 Phone: (907) 532-1700 • Fax: (907) 532-1455
 rconsult.com • email@rconsult.com

ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY LAND TRUST
 KITCHEN CABINET
 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

REVISION SCHEDULE	
#	DATE

JOB NO. 219491
 DATE 2025.02.10
 DRAWN BR
 REVIEWED CHR

SHEET NAME: SITE LAYOUT PLAN

SHEET NO. **C3.0**

PERMIT DOCUMENTS HALF SCALE WHEN PRINTED AT THIS

SITE COORDINATES		
POINT #	NORTHING	EASTING
1	2839545.83	1873752.89
2	2839550.88	1873752.89
3	2839550.88	1873735.23
4	2839545.81	1873735.23

BUILDING GRID COORDINATES		
POINT #	NORTHING	EASTING
A1	2839542.13	1873839.43
A6	2839542.13	1873783.43
G1	2839434.13	1873839.43
G6	2839434.13	1873783.43

SIGN TABLE					
SIGN POST #	SIGN TYPE	NORTHING	EASTING	SIZE (IN)	DESCRIPTION
S1	R7-8 R7-8P	2839474.38	1873781.73	12x18 12x6	RESERVED PARKING FOR HANDICAPPED VAN ACCESSIBLE
S2	R7-8 R7-8P	2839454.97	1873781.73	12x18 12x6	RESERVED PARKING FOR HANDICAPPED VAN ACCESSIBLE


SIGNING & STRIPING GENERAL NOTES:

A. ALL SIGNAGE, STRIPING, AND OTHER TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES SHALL BE INSTALLED IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES (MUTCD).

B. AN ACCESS AISLE CAN BE SHARED BY 2 HANDICAP SPACES.

C. SIGN POSTS PER MASS 70-31.

NOTES:
 NO SURVEY WAS PERFORMED FOR LT4A.




NOTE: DRAWING PROVIDED BY R&M CONSULTANTS, INC. FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC.
TERRA FIRMA TESTING


FIGURE TITLE:
PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
 PROJECT NAME:
ACLT KITCHEN — MOUNTAIN VIEW
 PROJECT LOCATION:
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

PROJECT ID:
7289-25
 FIGURE NUMBER:
3

Rod Length Correction Factor, C_R




Overburden Correction Factor, C_N



Notes:


- Overburden correction factor is used only for cohesionless soils
- C_N is the ratio of the measured blow count to what the blow count would be at an overburden pressure of 1 ton/ft²
- σ'_{vo} is the effective overburden pressure at the point of measurement (ton/ft²)





NOTES:
 DRAWINGS NOT TO SCALE
 MINIMUM DEPTHS PROVIDED IN REPORT

* ENCLOSED HEATED SPACES MUST BE CONTINUOUSLY MAINTAINED AT/ABOVE 40°F



T_F = INSULATION THICKNESS UNDER ENTIRE FOUNDATION (INCHES)
 T_S = INSULATION THICKNESS UNDER FLOOR/SLAB ONLY (INCHES)
 T_E = INSULATION ALONG EXTERIOR OF FOUNDATION (INCHES)

*HEATED FOUNDATION TEMPERATURE MUST BE CONTINUOUSLY MAINTAINED AT/ABOVE 40°F

**FLOOR SYSTEM CAN BE STRUCTURAL (W/ CRAWLSPACE) OR SLAB-ON-GRADE

= RIGID BOARD INSULATION

DRAWING NOT TO SCALE



NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC.
TERRA FIRMA TESTING

FIGURE TITLE:
INSULATED SHALLOW FOUNDATION CONFIGURATIONS


PROJECT NAME:
ACL T KITCHEN — MOUNTAIN VIEW

PROJECT LOCATION:
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

PROJECT ID:
7289-25

FIGURE NUMBER:
6

$$\text{UPLIFT CAPACITY} = 0.8 \times (\text{EFFECTIVE SOIL WEIGHT} + \text{WEIGHT OF FOUNDATION})$$



 = FOOTING / STEM WALL

DRAWING NOT TO SCALE



NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC.
TERRA FIRMA TESTING

FIGURE TITLE:
FOOTING UPLIFT CAPACITY DIAGRAM


PROJECT NAME:
ACLT KITCHEN — MOUNTAIN VIEW

PROJECT LOCATION:
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA


PROJECT ID:
7289-25

FIGURE NUMBER:
7


ACTIVE PRESSURE CONDITION




AT-REST PRESSURE CONDITION



PASSIVE PRESSURE CONDITION



SEISMIC



NOTE: WALLS CAN BE EITHER FREE OR RESTRAINED AT THE TOP FOR THE PASSIVE PRESSURE CONDITION. EQUATIONS ARE ONLY VALID FOR UNITS OF t_{1-8} (PCF) AND $H-H_1$ (FT).

NOTE: SEISMIC LOADS ARE VALID FOR WALLS RETAINING LESS THAN 8 FEET VERTICAL OF EARTH. THE SEISMIC LOAD IS ADDED TO ACTIVE OR AT-REST CONDITIONS AND IS SUBTRACTED FROM PASSIVE CONDITIONS.



NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC.
TERRA FIRMA TESTING

FIGURE TITLE:
LATERAL RETAINING WALL PRESSURE SCHEMATICS

PROJECT NAME:
ACL KITCHEN — MOUNTAIN VIEW

PROJECT LOCATION:
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

PROJECT ID:
7289-25

FIGURE NUMBER:
8

LEVELING COURSE

SIEVE SIZE	% BY MASS PASSING
1"	100
3/4"	70-100
3/8"	50-80
#4	35-65
#8	20-50
#50	8-28
#200	2-6
0.02	0-3

TYPE II

SIEVE SIZE	% BY MASS PASSING
8"	100
3"	70-100
1-1/2"	55-100
3/4"	45-85
#4	20-60
#10	12-50
#40	4-30
#200	*2-6
0.02	0-3

*IN ADDITION TO THE GRADING LIMITS LISTED ABOVE, THE FRACTION OF MATERIAL PASSING THE #200 SIEVE SHALL NOT BE GREATER THAN FIFTEEN PERCENT (15 %) OF THAT FRACTION PASSING THE #4 SIEVE.

TYPE II - A

SIEVE SIZE	% BY MASS PASSING
3"	100
3/4"	50-100
#4	25-60
#10	15-50
#40	4-30
#200	*2-6
0.02	0-3

*IN ADDITION TO THE GRADING LIMITS LISTED ABOVE, THE FRACTION OF MATERIAL PASSING THE #200 SIEVE SHALL NOT BE GREATER THAN TWENTY PERCENT (20 %) OF THAT FRACTION PASSING THE #4 SIEVE.





APPENDIX A

GRAPHICAL EXPLORATION BOREHOLE LOGS



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

EXPLORATION B1

NGE-TFT PROJECT NAME: ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View **NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER:** 7289-25
PROJECT LOCATION: Anchorage, AK **EXPLORATION CONTRACTOR:** Discovery Drilling, Inc.
EXPLORATION EQUIPMENT: Truck-mounted CME 75 **EXPLORATION METHOD:** Hollow Stem Auger
SAMPLING METHOD: MPT w/ 340lb autohammer **LOGGED BY:** D. Light
DATE/TIME STARTED: 2/20/2025 @ 8:10:00 AM **DATE/TIME COMPLETED:** 2/20/2025 @ 10:05:00 AM
EXPLORATION LOCATION: N61.22438 / W149.81047 (See report Figure 2) **GROUND ELEVATION:** Not Known
▽ GROUNDWATER (ATD): N/E **▼ GROUNDWATER ():** N/E
EXPLORATION COMPLETION: Backfilled with cuttings **WEATHER CONDITIONS:** Mostly cloudy, 32°F

DEPTH (ft bgs)	GRAPHIC LOG	FROZEN SOILS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD SAMPLE ID	RECOVERY (in)	FIELD BLOWS	(N ₁) ₆₀	SAMPLE INT. COLLECT	LAB SAMPLE ID	LAB RESULTS	REMARKS/NOTES
0			ASPHALT									
			WELL GRADED SAND WITH SILT AND GRAVEL (SW-SM), brown, moist	▲	S1	16	15 25 16	N/A		S1	S1 MC = 5.8% 40.8% gravel, 48.4% sand, 10.8% silt P0.02 = 7.6% FC = PFS	Some fractures.
			WELL GRADED GRAVEL WITH SILT AND SAND (GW-GM), dense, brown, moist	▲	S2	17	6 34 38	N/A		S2		
5				▲	S3	16	4 19 18	49		S3	S2 MC = 2.4% 54.8% gravel, 39.8% sand, 5.4% silt	Fractures.
				▲	S4	16	10 18 17	38		S4		
10			POORLY GRADED SAND WITH GRAVEL (SP), dense, brown, moist	▲	S5	15	9 15 33	48		S5	S3 MC = 3.1% S4 MC = 2.1% S5 MC = 4.7% 27.5% gravel, 69.5% sand, 3.0% silt	Some fractures.
				▲	S6	15	6 16 16	30		S6	S6 MC = 3.5% 36.3% gravel, 59.9% sand, 3.8% silt	
15				▲	S7	16	8 18 16	32		S7	S7 MC = 5.8%	
20				▲	S8	15	10 16 19	29		S8	S8 MC = 3.7% 49.1% gravel, 46.2% sand, 4.7% silt	Fractures.
			WELL GRADED GRAVEL WITH SAND (GW), dense, brown, moist	▲	S9	17	8 19 21	29		S9	S9 MC = 2.8%	
25												
30												
Bottom of borehole at 31.5 ft bgs.												

Always refer to our complete geotechnical report for this project for a more detailed explanation of the subsurface conditions at the project site and how they may affect any existing and/or prospective project site development.



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

EXPLORATION B2

NGE-TFT PROJECT NAME: ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View **NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER:** 7289-25
PROJECT LOCATION: Anchorage, AK **EXPLORATION CONTRACTOR:** Discovery Drilling, Inc.
EXPLORATION EQUIPMENT: Truck-mounted CME 75 **EXPLORATION METHOD:** Hollow Stem Auger
SAMPLING METHOD: MPT w/ 340lb autohammer **LOGGED BY:** D. Light
DATE/TIME STARTED: 2/20/2025 @ 10:25:00 AM **DATE/TIME COMPLETED:** 2/20/2025 @ 12:35:00 PM
EXPLORATION LOCATION: N61.22430 / W149.81053 (See report Figure 2) **GROUND ELEVATION:** Not Known
▽ GROUNDWATER (ATD): N/E **▼ GROUNDWATER (I):** N/E
EXPLORATION COMPLETION: Backfilled with cuttings **WEATHER CONDITIONS:** Cloudy, 32°F

DEPTH (ft bgs)	GRAPHIC LOG	FROZEN SOILS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD SAMPLE ID	RECOVERY (in)	FIELD BLOWS	(N ₁) ₆₀	SAMPLE INT. COLLECT	LAB SAMPLE ID	LAB RESULTS	REMARKS/NOTES
0			ASPHALT		S1	18	28	N/A		S1	S1 MC = 7.2% 34.7% gravel, 46.5% sand, 18.8% silt P0.02 = 11.8% FC = F2	Some fractures.
			SILTY SAND WITH GRAVEL (SM), brown, moist		S2	18	7	N/A		S2		
							39					
							40					
5			WELL GRADED GRAVEL (GW), dense, brown, moist		S3	16	5	29		S3	S2 MC = 10.5% 21.0% gravel, 39.5% sand, 39.5% silt P0.02 = 26.7% FC = F3	Some fractures.
							8					
							14					
			POORLY GRADED GRAVEL WITH SAND (GP), dense, brown, moist		S4	14	8	36		S4		
							14					
							20					
10					S5	15	12	37		S5	S3 MC = 2.7%	
							16					
							21					
15					S6	16	12	40		S6	S4 MC = 2.4% 51.7% gravel, 44.9% sand, 3.4% silt	Some fractures.
							22					
							21					
20											S5 MC = 2.6%	
											S6 MC = 2.2%	
25					S7	17	8	25		S7	S7 MC = 3.3% 43.5% gravel, 52.3% sand, 4.2% silt	
			POORLY GRADED SAND WITH GRAVEL (SP), dense, brown, moist				14					
							16					
30					S8	17	12	42		S8	S8 MC = 2.3%	Some fractures.
							23					
							27					
					S9	16	15	35		S9	S9 MC = 2.3%	
							21					
							27					

Bottom of borehole at 31.5 ft bgs.



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

EXPLORATION B3

NGE-TFT PROJECT NAME: ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View **NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER:** 7289-25
PROJECT LOCATION: Anchorage, AK **EXPLORATION CONTRACTOR:** Discovery Drilling, Inc.
EXPLORATION EQUIPMENT: Truck-mounted CME 75 **EXPLORATION METHOD:** Hollow Stem Auger
SAMPLING METHOD: MPT w/ 340lb autohammer **LOGGED BY:** D. Light
DATE/TIME STARTED: 2/20/2025 @ 1:02:00 PM **DATE/TIME COMPLETED:** 2/20/2025 @ 2:15:00 PM
EXPLORATION LOCATION: N61.22446 / W149.81082 (See report Figure 2) **GROUND ELEVATION:** Not Known
▽ GROUNDWATER (ATD): N/E **▼ GROUNDWATER ():** N/E
EXPLORATION COMPLETION: Backfilled with cuttings **WEATHER CONDITIONS:** Clear, 38°F

DEPTH (ft bgs)	GRAPHIC LOG	FROZEN SOILS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD SAMPLE ID	RECOVERY (in)	FIELD BLOWS	(N ₁) ₆₀	SAMPLE INT. COLLECT	LAB SAMPLE ID	LAB RESULTS	REMARKS/NOTES
0			SILTY SAND WITH GRAVEL (SM) , brown, moist	XX	S1	17	22 11 11	N/A		S1	S1 MC = 20.2% 22.6% gravel, 37.2% sand, 40.2% silt	Some fractures.
				XX	S2	16	8 10 9	31		S2	S2 MC = 2.8%	
5			WELL GRADED GRAVEL WITH SILT AND SAND (GW-GM) , medium dense to dense, brown, moist	XX	S3	15	6 12 13	33		S3	S3 MC = 2.6% 50.8% gravel, 43.4% sand, 5.8% silt P0.02 = 3.8% FC = S1	
				XX	S4	14	8 10 12	24		S4	S4 MC = 1.8%	
10			WELL GRADED GRAVEL WITH SAND (GW) , dense, brown, moist	XX	S5	14	9 13 14	27		S5	S5 MC = 1.9% 59.2% gravel, 38.6% sand, 2.2% silt	
15				XX	S6	15	8 20 24	41		S6	S6 MC = 2.7%	
Bottom of borehole at 16.5 ft bgs.												



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

EXPLORATION B4

PAGE 1 OF 1

NGE-TFT PROJECT NAME: ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View **NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER:** 7289-25
PROJECT LOCATION: Anchorage, AK **EXPLORATION CONTRACTOR:** Discovery Drilling, Inc.
EXPLORATION EQUIPMENT: Truck-mounted CME 75 **EXPLORATION METHOD:** Hollow Stem Auger
SAMPLING METHOD: MPT w/ 340lb autohammer **LOGGED BY:** D. Light
DATE/TIME STARTED: 2/20/2025 @ 2:20:00 PM **DATE/TIME COMPLETED:** 2/20/2025 @ 4:30:00 PM
EXPLORATION LOCATION: N61.22441 / W149.81099 (See report Figure 2) **GROUND ELEVATION:** Not Known
▽ GROUNDWATER (ATD): N/E **▼ GROUNDWATER ():** N/E
EXPLORATION COMPLETION: See completion comments at end of log **WEATHER CONDITIONS:** Clear, 38°F

DEPTH (ft bgs)	GRAPHIC LOG	FROZEN SOILS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD SAMPLE ID	RECOVERY (in)	FIELD BLOWS	(N _{1,60})	SAMPLE INT. COLLECT	LAB SAMPLE ID	LAB RESULTS	REMARKS/NOTES	WELL DIAGRAM
0			ASPHALT										
			WELL GRADED GRAVEL WITH SILT AND SAND (GW-GM), dense, brown, moist										
5				X	S1	14	4 11 15	32		S1	S1 MC = 2.6% 53.0% gravel, 42.0% sand, 5.0% silt P0.02 = 3.0% FC = PFS		
10			WELL GRADED GRAVEL WITH SAND (GW), dense, gray, moist	X	S2	16	19 22 32	49		S2	S2 MC = 2.2% 60.0% gravel, 35.5% sand, 4.5% silt P0.02 = 2.7% FC = PFS	Some fractures.	
Bottom of borehole at 11.5 ft bgs. Set 1" PVC to BOH. Backfilled with cuttings from 1-11.5 ft bgs, bentonite chips from 0-1 ft bgs. Move 5' adjacent. Set 3" perc pipe to 5 ft bgs. Backfilled with cuttings.													

Always refer to our complete geotechnical report for this project for a more detailed explanation of the subsurface conditions at the project site and how they may affect any existing and/or prospective project site development.



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

EXPLORATION B5

NGE-TFT PROJECT NAME: ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View **NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER:** 7289-25
PROJECT LOCATION: Anchorage, AK **EXPLORATION CONTRACTOR:** Discovery Drilling, Inc.
EXPLORATION EQUIPMENT: Truck-mounted CME 75 **EXPLORATION METHOD:** Hollow Stem Auger
SAMPLING METHOD: MPT w/ 340lb autohammer **LOGGED BY:** D. Light
DATE/TIME STARTED: 2/20/2025 @ 4:50:00 PM **DATE/TIME COMPLETED:** 2/20/2025 @ 6:10:00 PM
EXPLORATION LOCATION: N61.22440 / W149.81122 (See report Figure 2) **GROUND ELEVATION:** Not Known
▽ GROUNDWATER (ATD): N/E **▼ GROUNDWATER ():** N/E
EXPLORATION COMPLETION: Backfilled with cuttings **WEATHER CONDITIONS:** Partly cloudy, 34°F

DEPTH (ft bgs)	GRAPHIC LOG	FROZEN SOILS	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD SAMPLE ID	RECOVERY (in)	FIELD BLOWS	(N ₁) ₆₀	SAMPLE INT. COLLECT	LAB SAMPLE ID	LAB RESULTS	REMARKS/NOTES
0			ASPHALT									
			SILTY SAND WITH GRAVEL (SM), brown, moist		S1	17	50	N/A		S1	41.7% gravel, 42.3% sand, 16.0% silt P0.02 = 10.5% FC = F2	
			WELL GRADED SAND (SW), dense, brown, moist		S2	17	2 13 21	N/A		S2		
5					S3	16	10 14 14	39		S3	S2 MC = 14.4% 19.8% gravel, 62.2% sand, 18.0% silt	Some fractures.
					S4	16	6 15 17	37		S4	P0.02 = 9.1% FC = F2	Some fractures.
10			POORLY GRADED GRAVEL WITH SAND (GP), dense, brown, moist		S5	17	13 27 29	55		S5	S3 MC = 2.2% S4 MC = 3.0% S5 MC = 2.7% 58.2% gravel, 38.9% sand, 2.9% silt	Lots of fractures.
15					S6	14	12 23	33		S6	S6 MC = 5.5%	
Bottom of borehole at 16.5 ft bgs.												



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

EXPLORATION LEGEND

CLIENT Spark Design, LLC

NGE-TFT PROJECT NAME ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View

NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER 7289-25

PROJECT LOCATION Anchorage, AK

LITHOLOGIC SYMBOLS (Unified Soil Classification System)



ASPHALT: Asphalt



GPS: Sandy Gravel



GW: USCS Well-graded Gravel



GW-GM: USCS Well-graded Gravel with Silt



GWS: USCS Well-graded Sandy Gravel



SM: USCS Silty Sand



SPG: Gravelly Sand



SW: USCS Well-graded Sand



SW-SM: USCS Well-graded Sand with Silt

SAMPLER SYMBOLS



Modified Penetration Test

WELL CONSTRUCTION SYMBOLS



Bentonite Seal



Slough Backfill

ABBREVIATIONS

LL - LIQUID LIMIT (%)
PI - PLASTIC INDEX (%)
MC - MOISTURE CONTENT (%)
DD - DRY DENSITY (PCF)
NP - NON PLASTIC
P200 - PERCENT PASSING NO. 200 SIEVE
P0.02- PERCENT PASSING 0.02mm SIEVE
PP - POCKET PENETROMETER (tons/ft²)
S/U - CASING STICK-UP

▽ Water Level at Time
Drilling, or as Shown

▼ Water Level After 24
Hours, or as Shown

TV - TORVANE
PID - PHOTOIONIZATION DETECTOR
UC - UNCONFINED COMPRESSION
ppm - PARTS PER MILLION
N/E - NOT ENCOUNTERED
N/R - NOT REPRESENTATIVE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE
I_{s(50)} - POINT LOAD INDEX
S_c - UNCONFINED COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

SOIL CLASSIFICATION CHART

CLIENT Spark Design, LLC

PROJECT NAME ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View

NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER 7289-25

PROJECT LOCATION Anchorage, AK

MAJOR DIVISIONS			SYMBOLS		TYPICAL DESCRIPTIONS	
			GRAPH	LETTER		
COARSE GRAINED SOILS	GRAVEL AND GRAVELLY SOILS	CLEAN GRAVELS		GW	WELL-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES	
		(LITTLE OR NO FINES)		GP	POORLY-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES	
		GRAVELS WITH FINES		GM	SILTY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - SILT MIXTURES	
	MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION RETAINED ON NO. 4 SIEVE	(APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		GC	CLAYEY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - CLAY MIXTURES	
		SAND AND SANDY SOILS	CLEAN SANDS		SW	WELL-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SANDS, LITTLE OR NO FINES
			(LITTLE OR NO FINES)		SP	POORLY-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SAND, LITTLE OR NO FINES
MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS LARGER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION PASSING ON NO. 4 SIEVE	SANDS WITH FINES		SM	SILTY SANDS, SAND - SILT MIXTURES	
		(APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		SC	CLAYEY SANDS, SAND - CLAY MIXTURES	
FINE GRAINED SOILS	SILTS AND CLAYS	LIQUID LIMIT LESS THAN 50		ML	INORGANIC SILTS AND VERY FINE SANDS, ROCK FLOUR, SILTY OR CLAYEY FINE SANDS OR CLAYEY SILTS WITH SLIGHT PLASTICITY	
				CL	INORGANIC CLAYS OF LOW TO MEDIUM PLASTICITY, GRAVELLY CLAYS, SANDY CLAYS, SILTY CLAYS, LEAN CLAYS	
				OL	ORGANIC SILTS AND ORGANIC SILTY CLAYS OF LOW PLASTICITY	
	MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS SMALLER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	SILTS AND CLAYS	LIQUID LIMIT GREATER THAN 50		MH	INORGANIC SILTS, MICACEOUS OR DIATOMACEOUS FINE SAND OR SILTY SOILS
					CH	INORGANIC CLAYS OF HIGH PLASTICITY
					OH	ORGANIC CLAYS OF MEDIUM TO HIGH PLASTICITY, ORGANIC SILTS
HIGHLY ORGANIC SOILS				PT	PEAT, HUMUS, SWAMP SOILS WITH HIGH ORGANIC CONTENTS	

NOTE: DUAL SYMBOLS ARE USED TO INDICATE BORDERLINE SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS. DIAGONAL LINES INDICATE UNKNOWN DEPTH OF SOIL TRANSITION.



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

EXPLORATION LOG KEY

CLIENT Spark Design, LLC

PROJECT NAME ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View

NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER 7289-25

PROJECT LOCATION Anchorage, AK

SAMPLER SYMBOLS



SPT w/ 140# Hammer
30" Drop and 2.0" O.D. Sampler



Modified SPT w/ 340# Hammer
30" Drop and 3.0 O.D. Sampler



Grab Sample



Shelby Tube Sample



Rock Core Sample



Direct Push Sample



No Recovery

N/E

Not Encountered

WELL SYMBOLS



1" Slotted Pipe
Backfilled with Silica Sand



1" PVC Pipe
Backfilled with Auger Cuttings



1" PVC Pipe
with Bentonite Seal



Capped Riser

COMPONENT DEFINITIONS

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

COMPONENT PROPORTIONS

DESCRIPTIVE TERMS	RANGE OF PROPORTION
Trace	1-5%
Few	5-10%
Little	10-20%
Some	20-35%
And	35-50%

MOISTURE CONTENT

DRY	Absence of moisture, dusty, dry to the touch
DAMP	Some perceptible moisture; below optimum
MOIST	No visible water; near optimum moisture content
WET	Visible free water, usually soil is below water table

RELATIVE DENSITY OR CONSISTENCY VERSUS SPT N-VALUE

COHESIONLESS SOILS			COHESIVE SOILS		
DENSITY	N (BLOWS/FT)	APPROXIMATE RELATIVE DENSITY (%)	CONSISTENCY	N (BLOWS/FT)	APPROXIMATE UNDRAINED SHEAR STRENGTH (PSF)
VERY LOOSE	0-4	0-15	VERY SOFT	0-1	< 250
LOOSE	5-10	15-35	SOFT	2-4	250-500
MEDIUM DENSE	11-25	35-65	MEDIUM STIFF	5-8	500-1000
DENSE	26-50	65-85	STIFF	9-15	1000-2000
VERY DENSE	> 50	85-100	VERY STIFF	16-30	2000-4000
			HARD	> 30	> 4000



Northern Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.
and Terra Firma Testing
11301 Olive Lane
Anchorage, AK 99515

EXPLORATION LOG KEY

CLIENT Spark Design, LLC

PROJECT NAME ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View

NGE-TFT PROJECT NUMBER 7289-25

PROJECT LOCATION Anchorage, AK

FROST DESIGN SOIL CLASSIFICATION

FROST GROUP (USACOE)	FROST GROUP (M.O.A.)	SOIL TYPE	% FINER THAN 0.02mm BY MASS	TYPICAL SOIL TYPES UNDER UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM
NFS*	NFS*	(A) GRAVELS CRUSHED STONE CRUSHED ROCK	0 - 1.5	GW, GP
		(B) SANDS	0 - 3	SW, SP
PFS*	NFS*	(A) GRAVELS CRUSHED STONE CRUSHED ROCK	1.5 - 3	GW, GP
	F2	(B) SANDS	3 - 10	SW, SP
S1	F1	GRAVELLY SOILS	3 - 6	GW, GP, GW-GM, GP-GM
S2	F2	SANDY SOILS	3 - 6	SW, SP, SW-SM, SP-SM
F1	F1	GRAVELLY SOILS	6 - 10	GM, GW-GM, GP-GM
F2	F2	(A) GRAVELLY SOILS	10 - 20	GM, GW-GM, GP-GM
		(B) SANDS	6 - 15	SM, SW-SM, SP-SM
F3	F3	(A) GRAVELLY SOILS	Over 20	GM, GC
		(B) SANDS, EXCEPT VERY FINE SILTY SANDS	Over 15	SM, SC
		(C) CLAYS, PI>12	-----	CL, CH
F4	F4	(A) ALL SILTS	-----	ML, MH
		(B) VERY FINE SILTY SANDS	Over 15	SM
		(C) CLAYS, PI<12	-----	CL, CL-ML
		(D) VARVED CLAYS AND OTHER FINE GRAINED, BANDED SEDIMENTS	-----	CL & ML; CL, ML, & SM; CL, CH, & ML; CL, CH, ML, & SM

*Non-frost susceptible

*Possibly frost susceptible, but requires lab testing to determine frost design soils classification.

ICE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

GROUP	ICE VISIBILITY	DESCRIPTION	SYMBOL
N	SEGREGATED ICE NOT VISIBLE BY EYE	POORLY BONDED OR FRIABLE	Nf
		WELL BONDED	Nb
		NO EXCESS ICE	Nbn
		EXCESS MICROSCOPIC ICE	Nbe
V	SEGREGATED ICE IS VISIBLE BY EYE AND IS ONE INCH OR LESS IN THICKNESS	INDIVIDUAL ICE CRYSTALS OR INCLUSIONS	Vx
		ICE COATINGS ON PARTICLES	Vc
		RANDOM OR IRREGULARLY ORIENTED ICE	Vr
		STRATIFIED OR DISTINCTLY ORIENTED ICE	Vs
		UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED ICE	Vu
ICE	ICE IS GREATER THAN ONE INCH IN THICKNESS	ICE WITH SOILS INCLUSIONS	ICE + Soil Type
		ICE WITHOUT SOILS INCLUSIONS	ICE



APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL REPORT DETAILS



APPENDIX B –

Additional Report Details & Considerations

1.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION ACTIVITIES

1.1 Subsurface Exploration

We conceived, coordinated, and directed a subsurface exploration program at the project site in an effort to characterize the subsurface conditions of the project site as they currently exist. We subcontracted Discover Drilling, Inc. (DDI) to provide the necessary geotechnical exploration services. A qualified representative from our office was present on-site during the entire exploration program to select the exploration locations, direct the exploration activities, log the geology of each exploration, and collect representative samples for further identification and laboratory analysis. Under our direction DDI advanced a total of five (5) soil borings at the project site on February 20, 2025 to depths ranging from approximately 11.5 to 31.5 feet below the existing ground surface (bgs) using conventional hollow-stem auger drilling and split-spoon sampling methods.

Under our direction, DDI performed a Modified Penetration Test (MPT) at regular intervals during the drilling of each borehole. A MPT can be used to assess the consistency of a soil interval and to collect representative soil samples. A MPT is performed by driving a 3.0-inch O.D. (2.4-inch I.D.) split-spoon sampler at least 18 inches past the bottom of the advancing augers with blows from a 340-lb drop-hammer, free-falling 30 inches onto an anvil attached to the top of the drill rod stem. Our field representative recorded the hammer blows required to drive the modified split-spoon sampler the entire length of each sample interval, or until sampler refusal was encountered. We have provided the field blow count data for each sample interval (in six-inch increments) on the graphical borehole logs contained in Appendix A of this report.

We corrected the field blow count data for all five (5) boreholes for standard confining pressure, drill rod length, and drop-hammer operation procedure to estimate a standard $(N_1)_{60}$ value for each sample interval. $(N_1)_{60}$ values are a measure of the relative density (compactness) and consistency (stiffness) of cohesionless or cohesive soils, respectively. Our estimate of the $(N_1)_{60}$ values is based on the drop-hammer blows required to drive the split-spoon sampler the final 12-inches of an 18-inch MPT. We have provided our estimated $(N_1)_{60}$ values for each sample interval on the graphical borehole logs contained in Appendix A of this report. The automatic drop-hammer that DDI used for this project is not standard, so we applied a correction factor of 1.1 to the $(N_1)_{60}$ values to account for the efficiency of the automatic drop-hammer used. We have provided a graphical plot

of the field blow count corrections that we used to correct for confining pressure and drill rod length in Figure 3 of this report.

Our field representative sealed each sample that they collected during our subsurface exploration program inside of an air-tight bag and/or container, to help preserve the moisture content of each sample, and then submitted each sample to our laboratory for further identification and analysis.

Once the exploration activities were complete, we directed DDI to backfill the annulus of each exploration with its respective drill cuttings and repair the asphalt pavement surface at each soil boring location using cold-patch asphalt mix.

We directed DDI to install one-inch diameter, open-ended PVC pipe from the ground surface down to the bottom of borehole four (4) in order to provide a conduit (i.e., monitoring wells) for future groundwater level monitoring. As per our instruction, DDI hand-slotted the bottom five (5) feet of the monitoring well casing prior to installation and then backfilled the annulus of each monitoring well borehole with drill cuttings up to a depth of approximately one foot bgs. DDI then backfilled the remaining portion of the monitoring well annulus with bentonite chips and subsequently hydrated the bentonite chips with clean water to form a seal against surface water infiltration. Construction diagrams for each groundwater monitoring well are presented on the graphical borehole logs contained in Appendix A of this report.

We directed DDI to install three-inch diameter, open-ended PVC pipe within 10 feet from the one-inch groundwater level monitoring well in order to provide a conduit (i.e., test well) for future infiltration testing. We then directed the DDI to backfill the annulus of each test well borehole with drill cuttings.

1.2 Groundwater Level Monitoring

We conducted groundwater level monitoring efforts at the project site on March 12, 2025 to help determine what the static groundwater level is and to help chart seasonal changes in the groundwater level across the project site. We used an electronic water level meter (with 0.01-foot increments) to measure the relative depth of the groundwater surface (below the existing ground surface) at each monitoring well location. A summary of the groundwater level measurements that we collected at the project site are presented on the graphical borehole logs contained in Appendix A of this report.

1.3 Infiltration Testing

We conducted infiltration testing at borehole four (4) on March 12, 2025. We conducted our infiltration testing in general conformance with the falling head percolation test procedure outlined in Table 3.9 of the EPA On-site Water Treatment & Disposal Systems Manual (as specified in Paragraph 9 of Section 9.2.1 of the 2009 Municipality of Anchorage Drainage Design Guidelines). Complete infiltration test data the test well is contained in Appendix C of this report.

2.0 LABORATORY TESTING

It is important to note that ASTM test method D-6913 requires that any soil sample specimen which is to be submitted for gradational analysis (by ASTM D-7928 or other methods) must satisfy a minimum mass requirement based on the maximum particle size of the sample specimen. Split-spoon sampling techniques (standard or modified), as well as other small-diameter soil sampling techniques (e.g., macro-core, etc.), typically recover anywhere from approximately 1 to 10 pounds of sample specimen. The amount of sample specimen recovered can be influenced by (amongst other variables) the soil gradation, soil density, sample interval, sampler tooling, and soil moisture content. As a result, samples of coarse-grained soils (with individual soil particles greater than approximately 0.75 inches in diameter) collected with small-diameter sampling methods (e.g., split-spoons, macro-core, etc.) may not meet the minimum mass requirement specified by Table 2 of ASTM D-6913. This may result in gradational and frost classification results which are not representative of the actual (i.e., in-situ) soil gradation and/or frost classification. The use of small-diameter sampling devices in coarse-grained soils (e.g., sand and gravel) can result in the collection of unrepresentative samples due to: the exclusion of oversized particles (larger than the opening of the sampler) from the sample; and the mechanical breakdown/degradation of coarse-grained particles by the sampling process (producing an unrepresentative increase in smaller-diameter particles in the sample). Both of these sampling biases can skew laboratory test results towards the fine-grained end of the gradational spectrum.

3.0 DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Frost Development and Protection

Frost Heave:

If the subgrade soils are allowed to freeze (for any amount of time), then soil ice can form in the subgrade and result in a phenomenon known as “frost heaving”. Frost heaving forces can generate significant uplift loads which can damage foundations or connecting members.

Burial Depths:

Perimeter and exterior shallow foundation footing burial depths will vary, based on whether or not the foundation subgrade will be allowed to freeze during winter months. Additionally, shallow foundations need to be buried sufficiently deep so as to resist any anticipated uplift/overturning forces (e.g. wind, seismic, frost jacking, etc.).

Frost heaving forces can damage shallow foundations. As such, footings need to be buried sufficiently deep and/or be adequately insulated so as to reduce the potential for freezing of the foundation subgrade and any associated frost heaving forces.

Insulation:

Artificial insulation can be used to decrease minimum burial depths for both heated and unheated foundations by helping to reduce the potential for freezing of foundation soils, as well as help increase heating efficiency.

Insulation may be placed beneath of interior floors/slabs. However, no insulation should be placed directly underneath of any perimeter footings, as this can promote freezing of the foundation soils by preventing adequate heat transfer from the interior of the structure to the foundation soils. Alternatively, insulation should be placed along the exterior of the footing/stem wall to prevent freezing (and associated frost heaving) of the foundation soils along the perimeter of the foundation.

In terms of insulating properties, one inch of rigid board insulation can be considered equivalent to one foot of NFS fill.

Cold Shallow Foundations

It is difficult to predict the depth of ground frost penetration and extent of ice lens formation at any given site. Therefore, we do not recommend the construction of cold shallow foundations. The formation of ice lenses in the foundation subgrade can damage overlying foundations due to differential movements in the foundation subgrade as a result of soil ice growth and/or subsequent thaw-related losses of soil bearing capacity (due to increased soil moisture contents).

Cold Deep Foundations

Deep foundation systems such as driven piling, helical piers, under-reamed concrete piers, or other deep foundation systems can serve as an alternative means of cold foundation support, as they can provide the uplift resistance needed to counteract any frost heaving/jacking forces (assuming proper embedment depths, footing sizes, etc. are achieved).

Frost heaving forces can damage connecting members of pile foundations and/or result in failures at connections between pile foundations. As such, connecting members need to be above grade with a sufficient air gap or be buried sufficiently deep and/or be adequately insulated so as to reduce the potential for freezing of the foundation subgrade and any associated frost heaving forces.

3.2 Modulus of Subgrade Reaction Calculations

For this project, the following equations can be used (with standard English units) to calculate the appropriate modulus of subgrade reaction for load footprints bearing onto recommended bearing materials (defined in the report):

$$k_{(B \times B)} = k_1 \left(\frac{B+1}{2B} \right)^2 \quad (1)$$

Where:

B = the load footprint width of a square load in feet

k_1 = the modulus of subgrade reaction for a 1-ft \times 1-ft rigid plate in pci

$k_{(B \times B)}$ = the modulus of subgrade reaction for a square load footprint of width B in pci

The following equation (2) can be used for a rectangular load having the dimensions $B \times L$ (in feet) with similar bearing soils as the square footprint loading equation above (1).

$$k_{(B \times L)} = \frac{k_{(B \times B)} \left(1 + 0.5 \frac{B}{L} \right)}{1.5} \quad (2)$$

Where:

$k_{(B \times B)}$ = the modulus of subgrade reaction for a $B \times B$ square load footprint

$k_{(B \times L)}$ = the modulus of subgrade reaction for $B \times L$ rectangular load footprint

B = the least horizontal dimension of a rectangular load footprint

L = the larger horizontal dimension of a rectangular load footprint

3.3 Lateral Earth Pressures

An active-earth pressure condition will prevail (under static loading) if a retaining wall is allowed to deflect or rotate a minimum of 0.001 times by the wall height. An at-rest pressure condition will prevail if a retaining wall is restrained at the top and cannot move at least 0.002 times the wall height. Lateral forces exerted by wind or seismic activity may be resisted by passive-earth pressures against the sides of the foundation footings, exterior walls (below grade), and grade beams. Therefore, interior footings should extend a minimum of 12 inches below the finished floor grade (assuming a continuously heated building is maintained during winter months) to help resist any lateral forces.

In order to prevent water accumulation against the outside of any foundation or retaining wall, the wall must have a perimeter drainage system connected to an outlet that will not freeze closed at any time of the year. The top of the drainage piping must be located below the top of the footing for the foundation and/or retaining wall. Backfill used against the wall (and extending a minimum of one foot beyond the wall) must be free-draining with less than three percent fines. The top one-foot of backfill against the outside of a foundation and/or retaining wall should consist of relatively impermeable (fine-grained) material and be tightly compacted such that surface water is directed away from the foundation and/or retaining wall. A permeable geotextile fabric may be useful to prevent mixing of the impermeable (fine-grained) overburden and underlying free-draining (coarse-grained) backfill. Furthermore, the finished surface should slope away from any foundation and/or retaining wall with a grade between 1 to 2 percent, such that surface water is directed away from the foundation and/or retaining wall.

Seismic loading on foundation and/or retaining walls generally increases the lateral pressures on the wall and decreases the passive resistance. For foundation systems where the building foundation is continuous, the differential lateral movement between the soil and foundation is very small, and as such, essentially no excess lateral loading on the foundation wall is experienced. Foundation walls with a differential in backfill heights of over six feet (basements, crawl spaces, etc.) will experience seismic lateral loading from the inertial effects of seismic waves passing through the foundation.

3.4 Pavement Sections

Construction of the pavement section for the proposed roads and parking areas will be guided (in part) by the amount of cut/fill needed to achieve the final grade. The composition, structure, and thickness of the pavement section will be further controlled by the frost susceptibility of, and overall potential for ice lens development within, the subgrade soils.

There are three primary factors that influence the potential for ice lens formation at a given site:

1. soil gradation (i.e., ability to draw up moisture through capillary tension);

2. the presence of sufficient volumes of water (surface water, pore water, or groundwater) near the freeze front to foster ice lens development; and
3. the rate and duration of freeze-front advancement due to air temperature and wind variations.

All three factors need to occur simultaneously in order for ice lenses to develop in the subgrade.

Materials:

As we discuss in the report, it is our experience that the “D-1” leveling course material currently available in Anchorage area may not be NFS following compaction, because the compaction with a vibratory compactor further increases the frost susceptibility of the leveling course by increasing the percentage of fine-grained material (due to degradation of the soil particles from the impact of the compaction equipment).

RAP has low frost susceptibility, making it a suitable alternative for D-1 as the leveling course material.

Type II-A materials can be used as a substitute for Type II materials, as Type II materials are becoming difficult to procure in the Anchorage area. However, no Type II materials should be placed within 12 inches of any pavement surfaces to help reduce the risk of pavement dimpling (from oversized particles contained within the Type II material).

4.0 CONSTRUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Warm Shallow Foundations

It is imperative that shallow building foundations for heated structures remain in a thawed state for the entire construction period; even when dealing with soils that have little to no frost susceptibility. Foundation soils that are allowed to freeze during the initial construction (before the building is enclosed and heated) may be compromised by the development of ice lenses. Upon thawing, which may take several weeks or months, potential differential settlements could distort the structure resulting in damaged foundations, cracked sheetrock, skewed door frames, and broken windows.

If construction extends into the winter months, temporary enclosures should be constructed which completely enclose warm foundations and heat should be applied to the enclosure to prevent freezing of the soils located beneath any warm foundation and/or floor slab.

5.0 THE OBSERVATIONAL METHOD

A comprehensive geoprofessional service (e.g., geotechnical, geological, civil, and/or environmental engineering, etc.) should consist of an interdependent, two-part process comprised of:

Part I - pre-construction site assessment, engineering, and design; and

Part II - continuous construction oversight and design support.

This process, commonly referred to in the geoprofessional industry as “The Observational Method”, was developed to reduce the costs required to complete a construction project, while simultaneously reducing the overall risk associated with the design and construction of the project.

In geotechnical engineering, Part I of the Observational Method (OM) begins with a geotechnical assessment of the site, which typically consists of some combination of literature research, site reconnaissance, subsurface exploration, laboratory testing, and geotechnical engineering. These efforts are usually documented in a formal report (e.g., such as this report) that summarizes the findings of the geotechnical assessment and presents provisional geotechnical engineering recommendations for design and construction. Geotechnical assessment reports (and the findings and recommendations contained within) are considered provisional due to the fact that their contents are typically based primarily on limited subsurface information for a site. Most conventional geotechnical exploration programs only physically characterize a very small percentage of a given site, as it is typically cost prohibitive to conduct extensive (i.e. high density/frequency) exploration programs. As an alternative, geoprofessionals use the subsurface information available for a site to extrapolate subsurface conditions between exploration locations and develop appropriate provisional recommendations based on the inferred site conditions. As a result, the geoprofessional of record cannot be certain that the provisional recommendations will be wholly applicable to the site, as subsurface conditions other than those identified during the geotechnical assessment may exist at the site which could present obstacles and/or increased risk to the proposed design and construction.

Part II of the OM is employed by geoprofessionals to help reduce the risk associated with unidentified and/or unexpected subsurface conditions. Geoprofessionals accomplish Part II of the OM by providing construction oversight (e.g., construction observation, inspection, and testing). Part II of the OM is a valuable service, as the geoprofessional of record is available if unexpected conditions are encountered during the construction process (e.g., during excavation, fill placement, etc.) to make timely assessments of the unexpected conditions and modify their design and construction recommendations accordingly; thus reducing considerable cost resulting from potential construction delays and reducing the risk of future problems resulting from inappropriate design and construction practices.

Oftentimes, a client may be persuaded to use an alternative geoprofessional firm to conduct Part II of the OM for a given project; as some geoprofessional firms offer the same services at discounted prices in order to help them obtain the overall construction materials engineering and testing (CoMET) commission. The geoprofessional industry as a whole recommends against this practice. An alternative geoprofessional firm cannot provide the same level of service as the geoprofessional of record. The geoprofessional of record has (amongst other things) a unique familiarity with the project including; an intimate understanding of the subsurface conditions, the proposed design, and the client's unique concerns and needs, as well as other factors that could impact the successful completion of a construction project. An alternative geoprofessional firm is not aware of the inferences made and the judgment applied by the geoprofessional of record in developing the provisional recommendations, and may overlook opportunities to provide extra value during Part II of the geoprofessional service.

Clients that prevent the geoprofessional of record from performing a complete service can be held solely liable for any complications stemming from engineering omissions as a result of unidentified conditions. The geoprofessional of record may not be liable for any resulting complications that occur, as the geoprofessional of record was not able to complete their services. Furthermore, the replacement geoprofessional firm may also be found to have no liability for the same reasons.

We are available at any time to discuss the OM in more detail, or to provide you with an estimate for any additional construction observation and testing services required.



APPENDIX C

INFILTRATION TEST DATA



Infiltration/Percolation Test Form

Project Name/No.: ACLT KITCHEN - MOUNTAIN VIEW / 7289-25


Legal Description: Lot 3 W3 S2, block 1 of the Mountain view Subd., Anchorage, Alaska – 0.15 acres

Date Test Performed: 3/12/2025



Test Performed For: SPARK DESIGN, LLC

Date of Excavation: 12/4/24

Exploration I.D.: B2



Site Plan



Was GW Observed ATD? No GW Monitoring Depth N/E bgs
 If yes, at what depth? N/A bgs Date of Measurement 3/12/25

Reading No.	Date	Gross Time Start/Stop (HH:MM)	Net Time (Minutes)	Depth to Water Start/Stop (feet BTOC)		Net Drop (inches)
1	3/12/25	1040/1049	9	5.35	5.85	6
2	3/12/25	1050/1058	8	5.35	5.85	6
3	3/12/25	1100/1108	8	5.35	5.85	6
4	3/12/25	1110/1119	9	5.35	5.85	6
5	3/12/25	1120/1129	9	5.35	5.85	6
6	3/12/25	1130/1139	9	5.35	5.85	6

Final Percolation Rate: 1.5 (minutes/inch) Perc Hole/Casing Diam: 3 in
 Test Run between: 4.6 ft and 4.1 ft BGS Casing S/U: 0.8 ft

Comments: Groundwater seeped away in less than 30 minutes during the initial reading, readings taken every 10 min.

Performed By: Jacob Stephens, EIT I, Daniel J. Light, P.E. certify that this test was performed in accordance with all state and municipal guidelines in effect on this date. Date: 3/14/2024



APPENDIX D

LABORATORY TEST RESULTS




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B1
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S1 / 0.2 - 1.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Well-graded sand w/ silt and gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK/SCT
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	40.8	USCS	SW-SM
% SAND	48.4	USACOE FC	PFS
% SILT/CLAY	10.8	% PASS. 0.02 mm	7.6
% MOIST. CONTENT	5.6	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C_u)		79.9	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C_c)		1.5	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	-27	
12.70	1/2"	79	
9.50	3/8"	75	
4.75	#4	59	
2.00	#10	46	
0.85	#20	35	
0.43	#40	23	
0.25	#60	16	
0.15	#100	13	
0.075	#200	10.8	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1	0.0487	9.1
2	0.0347	8.6
5	0.0222	7.8
8	0.0176	7.2
15	0.0130	6.5
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B1
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S2 / 3 - 4'
DESCRIPTION:	Well-graded gravel w/ silt and sand
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	54.8	USCS	GW-GM
% SAND	39.8	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	5.4	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	2.4	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C_u)		45.1	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C_c)		1.6	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	82	
12.70	1/2"	66	
9.50	3/8"	61	
4.75	#4	45	
2.00	#10	32	
0.85	#20	23	
0.43	#40	16	
0.25	#60	11	
0.15	#100	8	
0.075	#200	5.4	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B1
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S5 / 10.5 - 11.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Poorly-graded sand w/ gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	27.5	USCS	SP
% SAND	69.5	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	3.0	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	4.7	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C_u)		9.0	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C_c)		0.4	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	94	
12.70	1/2"	88	
9.50	3/8"	84	
4.75	#4	72	
2.00	#10	61	
0.85	#20	52	
0.43	#40	36	
0.25	#60	13	
0.15	#100	6	
0.075	#200	3.0	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B1
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S6 / 15 - 16.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Poorly-graded sand w/ gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	36.3	USCS	SP
% SAND	59.9	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	3.8	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	3.5	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C_u)		15.2	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C_c)		0.4	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	89	
12.70	1/2"	81	
9.50	3/8"	76	
4.75	#4	64	
2.00	#10	53	
0.85	#20	40	
0.43	#40	22	
0.25	#60	10	
0.15	#100	6	
0.075	#200	3.8	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B1
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S8 / 25 - 26.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Well-graded gravel w/ sand
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	49.1	USCS	GW
% SAND	46.2	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	4.7	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	3.7	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C_u)		28.7	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C_c)		1.2	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"	100	
38.10	1.5"	95	
19.00	3/4"	89	
12.70	1/2"	78	
9.50	3/8"	71	
4.75	#4	51	
2.00	#10	35	
0.85	#20	26	
0.43	#40	17	
0.25	#60	10	
0.15	#100	7	
0.075	#200	4.7	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B2
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S1 / 0.2 - 1.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Silty sand w/ gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK/SCT
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	34.7	USCS	SM
% SAND	46.5	USACOE FC	F2
% SILT/CLAY	18.8	% PASS. 0.02 mm	11.8
% MOIST. CONTENT	7.2	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		263.6	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		2.5	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	93	
12.70	1/2"	85	
9.50	3/8"	80	
4.75	#4	65	
2.00	#10	51	
0.85	#20	42	
0.43	#40	33	
0.25	#60	26	
0.15	#100	22	
0.075	#200	18.8	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1	0.0458	14.3
2	0.0328	13.5
5	0.0212	12.0
8	0.0170	11.0
15	0.0127	9.5
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B2
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S2 / 2.5 - 4'
DESCRIPTION:	Silty sand w/ gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK/SCT
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt


% GRAVEL	21.0	USCS	SM
% SAND	39.5	USACOE FC	F3
% SILT/CLAY	39.5	% PASS. 0.02 mm	26.7
% MOIST. CONTENT	10.5	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		UNKNOWN	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		UNKNOWN	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	94	
12.70	1/2"	90	
9.50	3/8"	85	
4.75	#4	79	
2.00	#10	72	
0.85	#20	67	
0.43	#40	61	
0.25	#60	55	
0.15	#100	48	
0.075	#200	39.5	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1	0.0416	34.6
2	0.0304	30.8
5	0.0200	26.0
8	0.0160	24.0
15	0.0121	20.6
30		
60		
250		
1440		

HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B2
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S4 / 7.5 - 9'
DESCRIPTION:	Poorly-graded gravel w/ sand
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	51.7	USCS	GP
% SAND	44.9	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	3.4	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	2.4	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		23.9	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		0.9	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	81	
12.70	1/2"	71	
9.50	3/8"	63	
4.75	#4	48	
2.00	#10	34	
0.85	#20	21	
0.43	#40	12	
0.25	#60	7	
0.15	#100	5	
0.075	#200	3.4	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B2
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S7 / 20 - 21.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Poorly-graded sand w/ gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	43.5	USCS	SP
% SAND	52.3	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	4.2	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	3.3	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C_u)		24.3	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C_g)		0.4	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT


SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	94	
12.70	1/2"	80	
9.50	3/8"	72	
4.75	#4	57	
2.00	#10	42	
0.85	#20	33	
0.43	#40	22	
0.25	#60	10	
0.15	#100	6	
0.075	#200	4.2	

COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B3
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S1 / 0 - 1.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Silty sand w/ gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	22.6	USCS	SM
% SAND	37.2	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	40.2	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	20.2	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		UNKNOWN	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		UNKNOWN	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT


SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	90	
12.70	1/2"	86	
9.50	3/8"	83	
4.75	#4	77	
2.00	#10	72	
0.85	#20	68	
0.43	#40	61	
0.25	#60	55	
0.15	#100	47	
0.075	#200	40.2	

COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B3
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S3 / 5 - 6.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Well-graded gravel w/ silt and sand
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK/SCT
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	50.8	USCS	GW-GM
% SAND	43.4	USACOE FC	S1
% SILT/CLAY	5.8	% PASS. 0.02 mm	3.8
% MOIST. CONTENT	2.6	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		33.1	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		1.5	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	81	
12.70	1/2"	70	
9.50	3/8"	63	
4.75	#4	49	
2.00	#10	32	
0.85	#20	21	
0.43	#40	14	
0.25	#60	10	
0.15	#100	8	
0.075	#200	5.8	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1	0.0497	4.9
2	0.0355	4.4
5	0.0226	3.9
8	0.0179	3.7
15	0.0132	3.3
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B3
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S5 / 10 - 11.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Well-graded gravel w/ sand
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	59.2	USCS	GW
% SAND	38.6	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	2.2	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	1.9	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		16.3	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		2.0	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	87	
12.70	1/2"	73	
9.50	3/8"	65	
4.75	#4	41	
2.00	#10	23	
0.85	#20	15	
0.43	#40	8	
0.25	#60	5	
0.15	#100	3	
0.075	#200	2.2	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B4
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S1 / 0.2 - 1.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Silty sand w/ gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK/SCT
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	41.7	USCS	SM
% SAND	42.3	USACOE FC	F2
% SILT/CLAY	16.0	% PASS. 0.02 mm	10.5
% MOIST. CONTENT	6.1	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		306.1	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		3.7	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	88	
12.70	1/2"	77	
9.50	3/8"	72	
4.75	#4	58	
2.00	#10	44	
0.85	#20	35	
0.43	#40	27	
0.25	#60	22	
0.15	#100	19	
0.075	#200	16.0	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1	0.0453	13.2
2	0.0324	12.9
5	0.0210	10.8
8	0.0170	9.9
15	0.0126	8.8
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B4
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S2 / 2.5 - 3.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Silty sand w/ gravel
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK/SCT
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	19.8	USCS	SM
% SAND	62.2	USACOE FC	F2
% SILT/CLAY	18.0	% PASS. 0.02 mm	9.1
% MOIST. CONTENT	14.4	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		29.9	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		1.8	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	99	
19.00	3/4"	91	
12.70	1/2"	88	
9.50	3/8"	86	
4.75	#4	80	
2.00	#10	72	
0.85	#20	63	
0.43	#40	54	
0.25	#60	42	
0.15	#100	26	
0.075	#200	18.0	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1	0.0491	14.3
2	0.0351	12.4
5	0.0226	9.8
8	0.0181	8.5
15	0.0135	6.9
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	B4
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S5 / 10 - 11.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Poorly-graded gravel w/ sand
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	58.2	USCS	GP
% SAND	38.9	USACOE FC	N/A
% SILT/CLAY	2.9	% PASS. 0.02 mm	N/A
% MOIST. CONTENT	2.7	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C_u)		30.3	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C_c)		1.0	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"	100	
38.10	1.5"	95	
19.00	3/4"	76	
12.70	1/2"	62	
9.50	3/8"	56	
4.75	#4	42	
2.00	#10	30	
0.85	#20	20	
0.43	#40	11	
0.25	#60	7	
0.15	#100	4	
0.075	#200	2.9	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1		
2		
5		
8		
15		
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	MW
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S1 / 5 - 6.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Well-graded gravel w/ silt and sand
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK/SCT
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	53.0	USCS	GW-GM
% SAND	42.0	USACOE FC	PFS
% SILT/CLAY	5.0	% PASS. 0.02 mm	3.0
% MOIST. CONTENT	2.6	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C_u)		35.1	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C_c)		1.2	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"		
38.10	1.5"	100	
19.00	3/4"	86	
12.70	1/2"	69	
9.50	3/8"	62	
4.75	#4	47	
2.00	#10	33	
0.85	#20	24	
0.43	#40	16	
0.25	#60	10	
0.15	#100	7	
0.075	#200	5.0	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1	0.0512	3.7
2	0.0362	3.4
5	0.0232	3.1
8	0.0183	2.9
15	0.0135	2.6
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com




NORTHERN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING, INC. / TERRA FIRMA TESTING

Laboratory Testing Geotechnical Engineering Instrumentation Construction Monitoring Services Thermal Analysis

PROJECT CLIENT:	Spark Design, LLC
PROJECT NAME:	ACLT Kitchen - Mountain View
PROJECT NO.:	7289-25
SAMPLE LOC.:	MW
NUMBER/ DEPTH:	S2 / 10 - 11.5'
DESCRIPTION:	Well-graded gravel w/ sand
DATE RECEIVED:	2/21/2025
TESTED BY:	AK/SCT
REVIEWED BY:	Andrew Fortt

% GRAVEL	60.0	USCS	GW
% SAND	35.5	USACOE FC	PFS
% SILT/CLAY	4.5	% PASS. 0.02 mm	2.7
% MOIST. CONTENT	2.2	% PASS. 0.002 mm	N/A
UNIFORMITY COEFFICIENT (C _u)		36.7	
COEFFICIENT OF GRADATION (C _c)		1.9	
ASTM D1557 (uncorrected)		N/A	
ASTM D4718 (corrected)		N/A	
OPTIMUM MOIST. CONTENT. (corrected)		N/A	

PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS ASTM D6913 / D422 / C136



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	


SIEVE ANALYSIS RESULT

SIEVE SIZE (mm)	SIEVE SIZE (U.S.)	TOTAL % PASSING	SPECIFICATION (% PASSING)
152.40	6"		
76.20	3"	100	
38.10	1.5"	84	
19.00	3/4"	73	
12.70	1/2"	62	
9.50	3/8"	54	
4.75	#4	40	
2.00	#10	26	
0.85	#20	18	
0.43	#40	12	
0.25	#60	8	
0.15	#100	6	
0.075	#200	4.5	

HYDROMETER RESULT

ELAPSED TIME (MIN)	DIAMETER (mm)	TOTAL % PASSING
0		
1	0.0502	3.8
2	0.0358	3.4
5	0.0229	3.0
8	0.0181	2.7
15	0.0134	2.5
30		
60		
250		
1440		

MOISTURE-DENSITY RELATIONSHIP ASTM D1557



HYDRAULIC COND. (ASTM D2434)	N/A
DEGRADATION (ATM T-313)	N/A
PLASTICITY INDEX ASTM 4318	N/A

The testing services reported herein have been performed to recognized industry standards, unless otherwise noted. No other warranty is made. Should engineering interpretation or opinion be required, NGE-TFT will provide upon written request.

11301 Olive Lane · Anchorage, Alaska 99515 · Phone: 907-344-5934 · Fax: 907-344-5993 · www.nge-tft.com



APPENDIX E



ASCE 7 SEISMIC HAZARD REPORT

ASCE Hazards Report

Address:
No Address at This Location

Standard: ASCE/SEI 7-22
Risk Category: II
Soil Class: D - Stiff Soil

Latitude: 61.224391
Longitude: -149.81082
Elevation: 165.8792749045933 ft
(NAVD 88)







Site Soil Class: D - Stiff Soil

Results:

PGA _M :	0.53	T _L :	16
S _{MS} :	1.62	S _s :	1.5
S _{M1} :	1.86	S ₁ :	0.65
S _{DS} :	1.08	V _{S30} :	260
S _{D1} :	1.24		

Seismic Design Category: D



MCE_R Vertical Response Spectrum

Vertical ground motion data has not yet been made available by USGS.

Design Vertical Response Spectrum

Vertical ground motion data has not yet been made available by USGS.



Data Accessed: Thu Mar 13 2025

Date Source:

USGS Seismic Design Maps based on ASCE/SEI 7-22 and ASCE/SEI 7-22 Table 1.5-2. Additional data for site-specific ground motion procedures in accordance with ASCE/SEI 7-22 Ch. 21 are available from USGS.

The ASCE Hazard Tool is provided for your convenience, for informational purposes only, and is provided “as is” and without warranties of any kind. The location data included herein has been obtained from information developed, produced, and maintained by third party providers; or has been extrapolated from maps incorporated in the ASCE standard. While ASCE has made every effort to use data obtained from reliable sources or methodologies, ASCE does not make any representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness, reliability, currency, or quality of any data provided herein. Any third-party links provided by this Tool should not be construed as an endorsement, affiliation, relationship, or sponsorship of such third-party content by or from ASCE.

ASCE does not intend, nor should anyone interpret, the results provided by this Tool to replace the sound judgment of a competent professional, having knowledge and experience in the appropriate field(s) of practice, nor to substitute for the standard of care required of such professionals in interpreting and applying the contents of this Tool or the ASCE standard.

In using this Tool, you expressly assume all risks associated with your use. Under no circumstances shall ASCE or its officers, directors, employees, members, affiliates, or agents be liable to you or any other person for any direct, indirect, special, incidental, or consequential damages arising from or related to your use of, or reliance on, the Tool or any information obtained therein. To the fullest extent permitted by law, you agree to release and hold harmless ASCE from any and all liability of any nature arising out of or resulting from any use of data provided by the ASCE Hazard Tool.