Architecture Structural Geotechnical



ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP EMPLOYEE OWNED Materials Testing Forensic Civil/Planning



PAVEMENT DESIGN REPORT

Bent Grass Residential Filing No. 2 El Paso County, Colorado

SF-19-014

PREPARED FOR:

Challenger Communities 8605 Explorer Drive, Suite 250 Colorado Springs, CO 80920

JOB NO. 173851

May 29, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,

Reviewed by,

RMG – Rocky Mountain Group

ú Z

Brian Griffith, E.I. Geotechnical Staff Engineer

Geoff Webster, P.E. Sr. Geotechnical Project Engineer

RMG – Rocky Mountain Group



TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION	.3
Location	.3
Existing Conditions	.3
Project Description	.3
FIELD INVESTIGATION AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS	.3
Drilling	.3
Subsurface Materials	.4
Groundwater	.4
LABORATORY TESTING	.4
Laboratory Testing	.4
PAVEMENT DESIGN	.4
Pavement Thickness	.6
Pavement Materials	.6
Soil Mitigation	.6
Subgrade Preparation	.6
Surface Drainage	.7
Subgrade Observations and Testing	.7
CLOSING	.7

FIGURES

Site Vicinity Map	1
Test Boring Location Plan	2
Recommended Pavement Sections	2.1
Explanation of Test Boring Logs	3
Test Boring Logs	
Summary of Laboratory Test Results	
Soil Classification Data	
Moisture-Density Relationship Curve	
California Bearing Ratio Test Results	
0	

APPENDIX A

1993 AASHTO Empirical Equation for Flexible Pavements

GENERAL SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Location

Bent Grass Meadows Residential Filing No. 2 is located northwest of the intersection of East Woodmen Road and Meridian Road in El Paso County, Colorado. The location of the site is shown on the Site Vicinity Map, Figure 1.

Existing Conditions

At the time of our field investigation, the proposed streets were close to grade and utility mains and services had been installed. Curb and gutter had not been installed.

Project Description

This Pavement Design Report was performed to determine the subsurface conditions present along the roadway alignments and to develop recommendations for the design and construction of the proposed flexible pavements.

The proposed streets included in this investigation are shown on Figure 2. Bent Grass Meadows Drive is classified as an Urban Non-Residential Collector roadway. This street has an 80-foot Right-of-Way, two 12-foot thru lanes, and a 12-foot median. The other streets are classified as Urban Local: Berwyn Loop, Lemon Grass Road, Avena Road, and Bossett Drive. These streets all have 50-foot Right-of Ways with two 15-foot travel lanes.

FIELD INVESTIGATION AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

Drilling

The subsurface conditions on the site were investigated by drilling seventeen (17) exploratory test borings. The approximate locations of the test borings are presented in the Test Boring Location Plan, Figure 2.

The test borings were advanced with a power-driven, continuous-flight auger drill rig to depths of about 5 to 10 feet below the existing ground surface. Samples were obtained in general accordance with ASTM D-3550 utilizing a 2¹/₂-inch OD modified California sampler. Representative bulk samples of subsurface materials were obtained from each boring at a depth of approximately 0 to 2 feet below the existing ground surface. An Explanation of Test Boring Logs is presented in Figure 3. The Test Boring Logs are presented in Figures 4 through 12.

Subsurface Materials

The subsurface materials encountered in the test borings consisted of well-graded silty sand. Combined bulk samples of the material classified as SW-SM, well-graded silty sand according to the Unified Classification System. For pavement design, the combined bulk soil samples classified in accordance with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (ASSHTO) classification system primarily as A-1-b soil with sporadic A-2-4 soil. This soil classification is considered "excellent to good" as subgrade material.

Groundwater

Groundwater was not encountered in the test borings at the time of drilling. Groundwater is not expected to affect the construction of the pavements. Fluctuations in groundwater and subsurface moisture conditions may occur due to variations in precipitation and other factors not readily apparent at this time. Development of the property and adjacent properties may also affect groundwater levels.

LABORATORY TESTING

Laboratory Testing

The moisture content for the recovered samples was obtained in the laboratory. Grain-size analysis and Atterberg Limits tests were performed on selected samples to classify the soil and to develop pertinent engineering properties. A Summary of Laboratory Test Results is presented in Figure 13. Soil Classification Data are presented in Figures 14 through 17. The soil proved to be non-plastic in laboratory testing, and therefore swell/consolidation testing was not performed.

As A-1-b soil is the predominant soil type across the development, a combined bulk sample of A-1-b soil was tested to determine the optimum moisture-density relationship in accordance with ASTM D1557 (Modified Proctor compaction test). California Bearing Ratio, CBR tests were performed at varying densities with moisture content near optimum. At 95% of the maximum Modified Proctor density, the CBR of the bulk sample was 13. The Moisture-Density Relation Curves are presented in Figure 18. The CBR Test Results are presented in Figures 19 and 20.

The developer intends to install a composite roadway section consisting of Hot Mix Asphalt over Aggregate Base Course (ABC). RMG performed a Mix Design for this composite section.

PAVEMENT DESIGN

The discussion presented below is based on the subsurface conditions encountered in the test borings, laboratory test results and the project characteristics previously described. If the subsurface conditions are different from those described in this report or the project characteristics change, RMG should be retained to review our recommendations and modify them, if necessary. The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report should be verified by RMG during construction.

The pavement design was performed using the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual, Appendix D. The pavement design parameters and design calculations are presented below.

Street Classification – Urban Non-Residential Collector

- 1) Bent Grass Meadows Drive ESAL = 821,000 (Table D-2) Serviceability Index = 2.0 (Table D-1) Reliability = 85% (Table D-1)
- 2) Strength coefficients (Table D-3) Asphalt (HMA): a₁ = 0.44 Aggregate Base Course (ABC): a₂ = 0.11
- 3) Subgrade $M_r = CBR \times 1500 = 13 \times 1500 = 19,500 \text{ psi}$
- 4) Structural number (SN) = 2.3 (1993 AASHTO Empirical Equation, Appendix A)
- 5) Composite asphalt/base course section Minimum HMA thickness = D_1 = 4 inches (Table D-2) ABC thickness = D_2 = {SN - ($D_1 \ge a_1$)} / a_2 = {2.3 - (4 ≥ 0.44)} / 0.11 = 4.9 inches Minimum ABC thickness = 8 inches (Table D-2) Use 4 inches HMA and 8 inches ABC: Check SN = (4 ≥ 0.44) + (8 ≥ 0.11) = 2.64 > 2.3 (Min. SN required) => OK

Street Classification – Urban Local

1) Berwyn Loop, Lemon Grass Road, Avena Road, Bossett Drive ESAL = 292,000 (Table D-2) Serviceability Index = 2.0 (Table D-1) Reliability = 80% (Table D-1)

- 2) Strength coefficients (Table D-3) Asphalt (HMA): a₁ = 0.44 Aggregate Base Course (ABC): a₂ = 0.11
- 3) Subgrade $M_r = CBR \times 1500 = 13 \times 1500 = 19,500 \text{ psi}$
- 4) Structural number (SN) = 1.85 (1993 AASHTO Empirical Equation, Appendix A)

5) Composite asphalt/base course section

Pavement Thickness

The recommended pavement sections are presented below and on Figure 2.1.

Bent Grass Meadows Drive	4" HMA	8" ABC
Berwyn Loop, Lemon Grass Road, Avena Road, Bossett Drive	3" HMA	8" ABC

Recommended Pavement Sections

Pavement Materials

Pavement materials should be selected, prepared, and placed in accordance with El Paso County specifications and the *Pikes Peak Region Asphalt Paving Specifications*. Tests should be performed in accordance with the applicable procedures presented in the specifications.

Soil Mitigation

The PDCM notes that mitigation measures may be required for expansive soils, shallow ground water, subgrade instability, etc. Based on the AASHTO classification of for the soils in the subdivision, the subgrade soils evaluated for this pavement design can be expected to be nonexpansive. Groundwater or wet and unstable soils were not encountered in the borings. Therefore, special mitigation measures do not appear to be necessary for subgrade preparation.

Subgrade Preparation

A composite section of HMA over ABC may be placed atop a 12-inch layer of prepared subgrade. Pavement areas should have topsoil, organic material, and debris removed, and be cleared and grubbed to minimum 24-inches. The upper 6 inches of exposed soil should be scarified and moisture conditioned to facilitate compaction (usually within 2 percent of the optimum moisture content) and compacted to firm and unyielding condition. Subgrade should then be brought to grade by installing clean soil in 8-inch loose lifts and compacted to 95 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by the Modified Proctor test (ASTM D-1557). The subgrade should then be proof-rolled with a heavy, pneumatic tired vehicle, and any areas that deform under wheel loads should be removed and replaced with clean

material and recompacted. Subgrade construction should continue until 12-inches of prepared subgrade has been placed.

Surface Drainage

Surface drainage is important for the satisfactory performance of pavement. Wetting of the subgrade soils or base course will cause a loss of strength which can result in pavement distress. Surface drainage should provide for efficient removal of storm-water runoff. Water should not pond on the pavement or at the edges of the pavement.

Subgrade Observations and Testing

The pavement thicknesses presented above assume pavement construction is completed in accordance with El Paso County specifications and the *Pikes Peak Region Asphalt Paving Specifications*. RMG should be present at the site during subgrade preparation, placement of fill, and construction of pavements to perform site observations and testing.

CLOSING

Our field exploration was conducted to provide geotechnical information for pavement thickness design. Variations in subsurface conditions not indicated by the borings may be encountered. This report has been prepared for **Challenger Communities** for application as an aid in the design of the proposed development in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practices. The analyses and recommendations in this report are based in part upon data obtained from exploratory borings and test pits, site observations and the information presented in referenced reports. The nature and extent of variations may not become evident until construction. If variations then become evident, RMG should be retained to re-evaluate the recommendations of this report, if necessary.

Our professional services were performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised, under similar circumstances, by geotechnical engineers practicing in this or similar localities. RMG Engineers does not warrant the work of regulatory agencies or other third parties supplying information which may have been used during the preparation of this report. No warranty, express or implied is made. Any contractor reviewing this report for bidding purposes must draw his own conclusions regarding site conditions and specific construction techniques to be used on this project.

This report is for the exclusive purpose of providing geotechnical information and pavement thickness design recommendations. The scope of services for this project does not include, either specifically or by implication, environmental assessment of the site or identification of contaminated or hazardous materials or conditions. Development of recommendations for the mitigation of environmentally related conditions, including but not limited to biological or toxicological issues, are beyond the scope of this report. If the Client desires investigation into the potential for such contamination or conditions, other studies should be undertaken.

If we can be of further assistance in discussing the contents of this report or analysis of the proposed development, from a geotechnical engineering point-of-view, please feel free to contact us.

FIGURES







SOILS DESCRIPTION



CLAYSTONE

FILL: SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY



SANDSTONE



SILTY SAND



SYMBOLS AND NOTES

ENGINEERS

Colorade Sorinas: (Compare Office) 2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway Colorado Spings, CO 80918 (719) 548-0600 SOUTHERN COLORADO, EDVICER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO



TEST BORING LOGS

FIGURE No. 3

DATE May/29/2020



















Test Boring No.	Depth	Water Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index	% Retained No.10 Sieve	% Retained No.40 Sieve	% Passing No. 200 Sieve	% Swell @ 100 psf	AASHTO Classification
1	2.0	10.0		NP	NP	5.3	35.0	15.9		A-2-4 (0)
1	4.0	4.8								
2	2.0	3.7		NP	NP	40.3	71.1	4.0		A-1-b (0)
2	4.0	3.8								
2	9.0	8.6								
3	2.0	7.3		NP	NP	18.7	56.9	14.6		A-1-b (0)
3	4.0	7.8								
4	2.0	11.9		NP	NP	18.7	50.4	20.1		A-1-b (0)
4	4.0	9.4								
5	2.0	4.6		NP	NP	35.6	73.5	4.9		A-1-b (0)
5	4.0	8.9								
5	9.0	15.7								
6	2.0	7.3		NP	NP	0.4	38.4	4.2		A-2-4 (0)
6	4.0	5.7								
6	9.0	10.0								
7	2.0	1.8		NP	NP	2.6	62.5	4.7		A-1-b (0)
7	4.0	3.2								
8	2.0	7.6		NP	NP	52.0	73.5	13.5		A-1-b (0)
8	4.0	8.8								
9	2.0	10.9		NP	NP	28.7	63.4	12.9		A-1-b (0)
9	4.0	7.5								
9	9.0	7.2								
10	2.0	6.3		NP	NP	21.9	60.5	16.8		A-1-b (0)
10	4.0	7.5								
11	2.0	8.7		NP	NP	29.8	65.5	16.1		A-1-b (0)
11	4.0	9.1								
12	2.0	7.9		NP	NP	27.9	59.0	16.9		A-1-b (0)
12	4.0	9.3								
13	2.0	8.1		NP	NP	19.4	64.4	14.7		A-1-b (0)
13	4.0	13.9								
14	2.0	1.6		NP	NP	50.0	80.6	5.0		A-1-a (0)
14	4.0	16.9								
14	9.0	16.2								
15	2.0	12.2		NP	NP	12.6	29.1	33.7		A-2-4 (0)
15	4.0	11.1								
16	2.0	5.5		NP	NP	38.6	65.4	16.8		A-1-b (0)
16	4.0	25.1								



\bigcap										
Test Bor No.	ing Depth	Water Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index	% Retained No.10 Sieve	% Retained No.40 Sieve	% Passing No. 200 Sieve	% Swell @ 100 psf	AASHTO Classification
17	2.0	2.9		NP	NP	17.0	32.0	17.7		A-2-4 (0)
17	4.0	3.6								
17	9.0	9.4								
	ROCKY M	10UNTAIN GROUP							$\mathbf{\Lambda}$	
Architectural Structural Forensics		CHITECTS MGG GINEERS Datas: Concort Office Math Blift Periory Autor Blift Periory Trib Sectory	Geotech Materials T Civil, Plan	nical festing nning	S LAB	UMM ORAT RES	ARY C ORY 1 ULTS)F TEST	JOB No. FIGURE PAGE 2 DATE	173851 No. 13 OF 2 May/29/2020











CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO TEST RESULTS

PROJECT:	Bent Grass F	iling No. 2			
JOB NUMBER:	173851			TEST DATE:	5/22/2020
AASHTO	A-1				
SAMPLE NUMBER:	CBR				
SAMPLE LOCATION:	Combinatior	n bulk sample	e from A-1 Te	est Borings	
SOIL DESCRIPTION:	Sand, Silty (S	SM)		-	
		15 blows/lift	25 blows/lift	45 blows/lift	
	Penetration	Load	Load	Load	
	(in)	(psi)	(psi)	(psi)	
	0.000	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	0.025	30.2	30.2	47.0	
	0.050	53.7	70.5	104.1	
	0.075	83.9	114.1	188.0	
	0.100	124.2	177.9	302.1	
	0.125	157.8	248.4	423.0	
	0.150	191.3	318.9	550.5	

221.6

255.1

376.0

476.7

557.3

0.175

0.200

0.300

0.400

0.500



382.7

439.8

641.2

758.7

812.4

668.0

765.4

1077.6

1289.1

1577.8

	15 blows/lift	25 blows/lift	45 blows/lift
Corrected	Corrected	Corrected	Corrected
Penetration	Load	Load	Load
(in)	(psi)	(psi)	(psi)
0.1	12.4	17.8	30.2
0.2	17.0	29.3	51.0



CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO TEST RESULTS

PROJECT:	Bent Grass F	iling No. 2		
JOB NUMBER:	173851			TEST DATE: 5/22/2020
AASHTO CLASSIFICATION:	A-1			
SAMPLE NUMBER:	CBR			
SAMPLE LOCATION:	Combination	n bulk sample	e from A-1 Te	est Borings
SOIL DESCRIPTION:	Sand, Silty (S	SM)		
	15 blows/lift	25 blows/lift	45 blows/lift	
Corrected California Bearing Ratio	12.4	17.8	30.2	
Dry Density (pcf)	112.8	117.1	119.4	
Percent Compaction	95	98	100	
Percent Moisture After Soaking	10.4	10.0	9.3	
Percent Expansion/Compression	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Surcharge Weight (lbs)	12.62	12.61	12.61	



California Bearing Ratio	13.0
Dry Density (pcf)	119.2
Percent Compaction	95.00%
Target Dry Density	113.2
Compaction Test Method	ASTM D-1557
Condition of sample	Soaked



Figure No. 20

APPENDIX A

1993 AASHTO Empirical Equation for Flexible Pavements

Equation Solver Variable Descriptions	and Typical Values Precautions			
Type in data in the grey boxes and click the c additional calculations, change the desired in Click on the text descriptions of the input or c	alculate button to see the output. To make put data and click the calculate button again. Dutput variables for more information.			
INPUT	OUTPUT			
1. Loading	1. Calculation Parameters			
Total Design ESALs (W ₁₈): 821000	Standard Normal Deviate (z _R): -1.037			
2. Reliability	∆PSI: 2.2			
Reliability Level in percent (R): 85 💌	Design Structural Number (SN): 2.245			
Combined Standard Error (S ₀): 0.44	2. Layer Depths (to the nearest 1/2 inch)			
3. Serviceability	Surface: 5.5			
Initial Serviceability Index (p _i): 4.2	Total SN based on layer depths: 2.42			
Terminal Serviceability Index (p _t): 2				
4. Layer Parameters Number of Base Layers: 0 ▼				
a m M _R Min. Depth	Comments			
Surface 0.44 1.0 N/A 0				
Subgrade N/A N/A 19500 N/A	Urban Non-residential Collector SN			
Calcu	llate			

1993 AASHTO Empirical Equation for Flexible Pavements

Equation Solver Variable Descriptions	and Typical Values Precautions			
Type in data in the grey boxes and click the c additional calculations, change the desired inp Click on the text descriptions of the input or c	alculate button to see the output. To make out data and click the calculate button again. output variables for more information.			
INPUT	OUTPUT			
1. Loading	1. Calculation Parameters			
Total Design ESALs (W ₁₈): 292000	Standard Normal Deviate (z _R): -0.841			
2. Reliability	∆ PSI: 2.2			
Reliability Level in percent (R): 80 💌	Design Structural Number (SN): 1.845			
Combined Standard Error (S ₀): 0.44	2. Layer Depths (to the nearest 1/2 inch)			
3. Serviceability	Surface: 4.5			
Initial Serviceability Index (p _i): 4.2	Total SN based on layer depths: 1.98			
Terminal Serviceability Index (pt): 2				
4. Layer Parameters Number of Base Layers: 0 ▼				
a m M _R Min. Depth	See Solution Details			
Surface 0.44 1.0 N/A 0	Comments			
Subgrade N/A N/A 19500 N/A	<u>Urban Local Roadway</u> SN			
Calcu	llate			