



**Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas**

InTEC Project No. S251271-R1
September 26, 2025



1922 Dry Creek Way, Suite 101
San Antonio, Texas 78259

Integrated Testing and Engineering Company of San Antonio, L.P.

12028 Radium, San Antonio, Texas 78216—Phone: (210) 525 9033—Fax: (210) 525 9032—www.InTEC-SA.com



Integrated Testing and Engineering Company of San Antonio, L.P.
Geotechnical & Environmental Engineering • Construction Services • Geologic Assessment

September 26, 2025

Lennar Homes

1922 Dry Creek Way, Suite 101
San Antonio, Texas 78259

Attention: **Mr. Richard Mott, P.E.**

Email: richard.mott@lennar.com

Re: Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis

Proposed New Streets

Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B

San Antonio, Texas

InTEC Project No. S251271-R1

Ladies & Gentlemen:

Integrated Testing and Engineering Company of San Antonio (InTEC) has completed a **subsurface exploration and pavement thickness evaluation report** at the above referenced project site. The results of the exploration are presented in this report.

We appreciate and wish to thank you for the opportunity to be of service to you on this project. If we can be of additional assistance during the foundations explorations, and materials testing-quality control phase of construction, please call us.

Sincerely,

InTEC of San Antonio

Murali Subramaniam, Ph. D., P.E.
Vice President



09/26/2025

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The soil conditions at the location of the **proposed new streets at Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B in San Antonio, Texas** were obtained from **excavating 15 test pits to a depth of 6 to 10 feet**. Laboratory tests were performed on selected specimens to evaluate the engineering characteristics of various soil strata encountered in the test pits.

- The subsurface soils at the test pit locations primarily consist of brown clays, tan clays, tan calcareous clays, and marl with caliche and gravel.
- The results of our exploration, laboratory testing, and engineering evaluation indicate that the underlying soils consist predominantly of **moderately plastic to highly plastic clays**, with significant potential for shrink-swell behavior due to changes in moisture content.
- **Estimated potential vertical rise (PVR)** using TxDOT Test Method TEX-124-E ranges from **2 to 4 ½ inches** at the current site grades. These values are based on standard modeling assumptions and **should not be interpreted as exact predictions of future movement**.
- The proposed pavements at this site may be supported by flexible pavement sections.
- **Cut and fill information is not available for our review at this time.** Based on the soils encountered in the test pits, Clay or Calcareous Clay / Marl subgrades are anticipated.
- At the time of construction, if the final street subgrade consists of material other than encountered in our test pits, the recommendations may have to be revised.
- As requested, pavement section recommendations for Local Type streets are presented.
- Ground water was not encountered in the test pits at the time of excavation.
- The performance of the recommended pavement sections depends on **proper drainage, moisture control, construction practices**, and long-term **post-construction maintenance**. Shrink Swell related movements should be anticipated due to natural variability in subsurface conditions and soil behavior.

This summary is intended for general guidance only. **Detailed descriptions, analysis, assumptions, and recommendations** are included in the full report and should be reviewed in their entirety. The contents of this report are based on **site conditions at the time of exploration**, and **any deviation from those conditions may require reevaluation** by the geotechnical engineer.

Summary Table A – Input Parameters used in Asphalt Pavement Section Calculation

	Local Type A (no bus traffic)	Local Type A (with bus traffic)	Local B
ESAL	100,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Reliability Level	R-70	R-70	R-90
Initial and Terminal Serviceability	4.2 and 2.0	4.2 and 2.0	4.2 and 2.0
Standard Deviation	0.45	0.45	0.45
Service Life	20 years	20 years	20 years
If heavy truck traffic is anticipated, please contact InTEC with anticipated traffic data for revised recommendations.			

Summary Table B – Minimum Flexible Pavement Recommendations – CBR = 2.0

Street Classification	Asphaltic Concrete			Aggregate Base, Inches	Geogrid	Treated Subgrade, Inches	Structural Number
	Type D, inches	Type C, inches	Type B, inches				
Local Type A (no bus traffic)	3.00	-	-	11.50	No	6" LT	2.93
	3.00	-	-	9.50	Yes	6" LT	2.93
	2.00	-	-	14.50	No	6" LT	2.91
	2.00	-	-	12.00	Yes	6" LT	2.92
	2.00	-	6.00	-	No	6" LT	2.92
Local Type A (with bus traffic)	3.00	-	-	19.50	No	6" LT	4.05
	3.00	-	-	16.50	Yes	6" LT	4.12
	3.00	-	8.50	-	No	6" LT	4.21
Local Type B	2.00	2.00	-	23.00	No	6" LT	4.98
	2.00	2.00	-	19.00	Yes	6" LT	4.99
	4.00	-	9.50	-	No	6" LT	4.99

Design Notes:

- The results of our laboratory testing and engineering evaluation indicate that the underlying shallow clays are **moderately plastic to highly plastic in character**. Potential vertical movement on the order of **2 to 4 ½ inches** is estimated at existing grade elevation.
- Clay or Calcareous Clay / Marl subgrades are anticipated. Pavement section recommendations are based on clay subgrade, with a Design CBR value of 2.0.
- Input parameters are shown in Table No. 3 (Summary Table A). Please call us to provide pavement recommendations, if needed, for different input values.

Subgrade Notes (*):

- Cut and fill data are not available at this time.
- Fill used to raise the grade in clay areas:
 - approved fill material free should have a minimum CBR value of 2.0 and a maximum Plasticity Index value of 45 (on site material). Lime application rates should be re-evaluated and tested for sulfate content prior to use of the fill material.
 - The fill material should be approved by the geotechnical engineer, free of deleterious material, and the gravel size should not exceed 3 inches in size. The material should be placed and compacted as per applicable city / county guidelines.
 - The subgrade, prior to placement of fill, should be proof rolled to identify weak areas. Any identified weak areas should be recompacted.
- Fill used to raise the grade in calcareous clay / marl areas:
 - Existing clays should be removed to marl / limestone stratum prior to placement of fill.

- approved fill material free should have a minimum CBR value of 5.0 and a maximum Plasticity Index value of 20.
- Based on the thickness of the clays encountered in the test pits, we anticipate the final pavement subgrade Plasticity Index value to be either less than or equal to 20 or greater than 20.
- **If the subgrade Plasticity Index values are less than or equal to 20, as per City of San Antonio or Bexar County requirements, subgrade TREATMENT is not needed.**
- Subgrade should be **TREATED** using lime or cement. Lime application rates are presented here. Please contact InTEC for cement application rates.
 - Treated to a depth of 6 inches using 6 percent lime content.
 - The subgrade soils should be tested for soil sulfate content prior to lime application. If the soil sulfate content is higher than 3000 ppm, an alternate procedure will be needed.
 - Lime application rate of **32 lbs per sq yard for 6-inch depth** of treatment is recommended.
 - Cement may be used in lieu of lime. Cement application rate should be determined at the time of construction.

General Notes:

- Input parameters are shown in Table No. 3 (Summary Table A). Please call us to provide pavement recommendations, if needed, for different input values. If repetitive truck or heavy truck traffic is anticipated, please contact us for revised pavement recommendations.
- Pavement section recommendations are based on a subgrade CBR value of 2.0. The pavement recommendations are not based on the shrink / swell characteristics of the underlying soils. The pavement can experience cracking and deformation due to shrinkage and swelling characteristics of the soils as described in the *Vertical Movements* section of this report. Use of geogrid helps reduce shrink / swell related pavement distress.
- Significant pavement distress has been observed during construction phase with the combination of construction traffic and irrigation water / rain water getting underneath the asphalt.
- If water is allowed to get underneath the asphalt / concrete or if moisture content of the base or subgrade changes significantly, then pavement distress will occur. Moisture penetration underneath the asphalt pavement surface should be reduced. One of the following methods should be used:
 - Deeper curbs; such as curbs extending a minimum of 3 inches into subgrade.
 - Compacted clays backfilled against the curbs.
- In addition, water should not be allowed to get underneath the pavement section at the time of home construction.

Geogrid:

- One layer of geogrid, Tensar Triax TX130 or better, installed on top of treated subgrade as per manufacturer's guidelines.

Subgrade Verification:

- The final pavement subgrade should be verified and delineated as needed for different subgrade conditions by InTEC.

Summary Table C – Summary of Pavement Materials

Pavement Section	Material	Stabilization or Treatment	Thickness
Subgrade	Clays	Treatment - Sulfate content should be tested prior to treatment	As recommended in pavement options (6 inches)
Base	TxDOT Item 247 A1-2	-	As recommended in pavement options (maximum of 6 inches per lift)
Asphalt	Type B, C, D	-	As recommended in pavement options
Geogrid	Tensar Triax TX130	One layer	As per manufacturer's recommendations

See report for more details

Summary Table D – Applicable procedures and minimum density and moisture percentages

All applicable city or county guidelines should be used. The following City of San Antonio Standard Specifications for Construction, June 2008, may be followed if specific guidelines are not available. Some of the relevant procedures are shown below.

Pavement Material	Procedure *	Density and Moisture Control
Subgrade fill (maximum 6 inch thick lifts)	Item 107	As per construction specifications
Treated Subgrade (6 inch thick lift)	Item 108- lime	As per construction specifications
Aggregate Base TxDOT Item 247 A1-2 (maximum 6 inch thick lift)	Item 200	As per construction specifications
Asphalt HMAC Type B, C, D	Item 205, 206	As per construction specifications
Geogrid	Manufacturer's Guidelines	-

(*) City of San Antonio Standard Specifications for Construction, June 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	10
General	10
Purpose and Scope of Services	10
Project Description	11
SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION	12
Scope	12
Excavating and Sampling	12
Water Level Measurements	12
Field Logs	12
Presentation of the Data	13
LABORATORY TESTING PROGRAM	14
Purpose	14
Laboratory Tests	14
Presentation of the Data	14
GENERAL SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS	15
Soil Stratigraphy	15
Ground Water Observations	15
PAVEMENTS ON EXPANSIVE SOIL	17
General	17
Evaluation of the Shrink-Swell Potential of the Soils	17
The Mechanism of Swelling	17
Initial Moisture Condition and Moisture Variation	17
Man Made Conditions That Can Be Altered	18
Summation	21
DESIGN ENGINEERING ANALYSIS	22
Pavement Design Considerations	22
Vertical Movements	22
PAVEMENT GUIDELINES	24
General	24
Pavement Design	24
“Alligator” Type Cracks	25
Longitudinal Cracks	25
Periodic Maintenance	26
Pavement Sections	26
Subgrade Preparation	29
Deeper Fill	29
Base Course	30
Asphaltic Concrete	30
Perimeter Drainage	30
CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES	31
Construction Monitoring	31
Site Preparation	31
Proof Rolling	31
Compaction	31
Select Fill	32

General Fill.....	32
General Fill Compaction	32
Ground Water.....	33
Drainage.....	33
Temporary Drainage Measures	33
Construction Slopes.....	34
Time of Construction	34
Control Testing and Field Observation	34
DRAINAGE AND MAINTENANCE	35
LIMITATIONS	37

INTRODUCTION

General

This report presents the results of our **subsurface exploration and pavement thickness evaluation** for the **proposed new streets at Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B in San Antonio, Texas**. This project was authorized by **Mr. Richard Mott, P.E.**

Purpose and Scope of Services

The purpose of our subsurface investigation was to evaluate the site's subsurface and ground water conditions and provide pavement thickness recommendations for the planning and development phases of the project. Our scope of services includes the following:

- 1) excavating and sampling of 15 test pits – to depths of 6 to 10 feet;
- 2) evaluation of the in-place conditions of the subsurface soils through field penetration tests;
- 3) observing the ground water conditions during drilling operations;
- 4) performing laboratory tests such as Atterberg limits, California Bearing Ratio (C.B.R.), Lime Series, and Moisture content tests;
- 5) review and evaluation of the field and laboratory test programs during their execution with modifications of these programs, when necessary, to adjust to subsurface conditions revealed by them;
- 6) compilation, generalization and analyses of the field and laboratory data in relation to the project requirements;
- 7) estimate of potential vertical movements;
- 8) preparation of pavement guidelines;
- 9) preparation of a written geotechnical engineering report for use by the members of the design team in their preparation of construction, contract, and specifications documents.

The Scope of Services **did not include slope stability or any environmental assessment** for the presence or absence of wetlands or hazardous or toxic materials in the soil, surface water, groundwater, or air, on or below or around this site. Any statements in this report or on the Test Pit Logs regarding odors, colors or unusual or suspicious items or conditions are strictly for the information of the client.

Project Description

The proposed project involves the development of the new streets at Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B in San Antonio, Texas.

- The proposed pavement areas are anticipated to include Local type streets.
- Cut and fill information are not available for our use at this time.
- Clay or Calcareous Clay / Marl subgrades are anticipated.
- Review of the geologic map indicates the site is located within Kpg, Pecan Gap Chalk, and Kknm, Navarro Group and Marlbrook Marl, formations. The Bexar County Karst Map indicates the site is located within “Karst Zone 3” (areas that probably do not contain listed invertebrate karst species).

SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

Scope

The field exploration to determine the engineering characteristics of the subsurface materials included a reconnaissance of the project site, excavating the test pits, and obtaining bulk samples.

Fifteen test pits were excavated at the approximate locations shown on the Test Pit Location Plan, Plate 1, included in the Illustration section of this report. These test pits were **excavated to depths of 6 to 10 feet below the presently existing ground surface**. Test pit locations were selected by the project geotechnical engineer and established in the field by the drilling crew using normal taping procedures. Test pits were excavated to recover samples from different depths.

Excavating and Sampling

The test pits were performed with a mini-excavator. Test Pit samples of the subsurface materials were obtained and the samples were identified according to test pit number and depth, encased in polyethylene plastic wrapping to protect against moisture loss, and transported to our laboratory in special containers.

Water Level Measurements

Ground water was not encountered in the test pits at the time of excavation. In relatively pervious soils, such as sandy soils, the indicated elevations are considered reliable ground water levels. In relatively impervious soils, the accurate determination of the ground water elevation may not be possible even after several days of observation. Seasonal variations, temperature and recent rainfall conditions may influence the levels of the ground water table and volumes of water will depend on the permeability of the soils.

Field Logs

A field log was prepared for each test pit. Each log contained information concerning the sampling method, samples attempted and recovered, indications of the presence of various materials such as silt, clay, gravel or sand and observations of ground water. It also contained an interpretation of subsurface conditions between samples. **Therefore, these logs included both factual and interpretive information.**

Presentation of the Data

The final logs represent our interpretation of **the contents of the field logs for the purpose delineated by our client**. The final logs are included on **Plates 2 thru 16** included in the Illustration section. A key to classification terms and symbols used on the logs is presented on **Plate 17**.

LABORATORY TESTING PROGRAM

Purpose

In addition to the field exploration, a supplemental laboratory testing program was conducted to determine additional **pertinent engineering characteristics** of the subsurface materials necessary in evaluating the soil parameters.

Laboratory Tests

All phases of the laboratory testing program were performed in **general accordance with the indicated applicable** ASTM Specifications as indicated in Table No. 1.

Table No. 1 – Laboratory Testing Procedures

Laboratory Test	Applicable Test Standard
Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit and Plasticity Index of the Soils	ASTM D 4318
Moisture Content	ASTM D 2216
California Bearing Ratio	ASTM D 1883
pH	ASTM D 6276

In the laboratory, each sample **was observed and classified by a geotechnical engineer**. As a part of this classification procedure, the natural water contents of selected specimens were determined. Liquid and plastic limit tests were performed on representative specimens to determine the plasticity characteristics of the different soil strata encountered.

Presentation of the Data

In summary, the tests presented were conducted in the laboratory to evaluate the engineering characteristics of the subsurface materials. The results of all these tests are presented on appropriate Test Pit Logs. These laboratory test results were used to classify the soils encountered generally according to the Unified Soil Classification System (ASTM D 2487).

GENERAL SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

Soil Stratigraphy

The soils underlying the site may be grouped into **two generalized strata** with similar physical and engineering properties. The lines designating the interface between soil strata on the logs represent approximate boundaries. Transition between materials may be gradual. The soil stratigraphy information at the test pit locations are presented in **Test Pit Logs, Plates 2 thru 16**. The soil conditions in between test pits may vary across the site. We should be called upon at the time of construction to verify the soil conditions between our test pits.

The engineering characteristics of the underlying soils, based the results of the laboratory tests performed in selected samples, are summarized and presented in the following paragraphs.

Fill was encountered to an approximate depth of 1.5-ft in Test Pit TP-4. Fill depths are likely to vary across the site.

The underlying dark brown to brown clays, dark brown clays, tan and gray clays, tan silty clays, tan gravelly clays, and light tan calcareous clays to marl are moderately plastic to highly plastic with tested liquid limit values varying from 27 to 67 and plasticity index values ranging from 15 to 45.

The above description is of a generalized nature to highlight the major soil stratification features and soil characteristics. The Test Pit Logs should be consulted for specific information at each test pit location.

Soil stratigraphy may vary between test pit locations. If deviations from the noted subsurface conditions are encountered during construction, they should be brought to the attention of InTEC. We may revise the recommendations after evaluating the significance of the changed conditions.

Ground Water Observations

Ground water was not encountered in the test pits at the time of excavation. Short term field observations generally do not provide accurate ground water levels. The contractor should check the subsurface water conditions prior to any excavation activities. The low permeability of the soils would require several days or longer for ground water to enter and stabilize in the test pit holes. Ground water levels will fluctuate with seasonal climatic variations and changes in the land use.

It is not unusual to encounter shallow groundwater during or after periods of rainfall. The surface water tends to percolate down through the surface until it encounters a relatively impervious layer.

PAVEMENTS ON EXPANSIVE SOIL

General

There are many plastic clays that swell considerably when water is added to them and then shrink with the loss of water. Pavements constructed on these clays are subjected to large uplifting forces caused by the swelling.

In the characterization of a pavement site, two major factors that contribute to potential shrink-swell problems must be considered. Problems can arise if a) the soil has expansive and shrinkage properties and b) the environmental conditions that cause moisture changes to occur in the soil.

Evaluation of the Shrink-Swell Potential of the Soils

Subsurface sampling, laboratory testing and data analyses are used in the evaluation of the shrink-swell potential of the soils under the pavements.

The Mechanism of Swelling

The mechanism of swelling in expansive clays is complex and is influenced by a number of factors. Basically, expansion is a result of changes in the soil-water system that disturbs the internal stress equilibrium. Clay particles in general have negative electrical charges on their surfaces and positively charged ends. The negative charges are balanced by actions in the soil water and give rise to an electrical interparticle force field. In addition, adsorptive forces exist between the clay crystals and water molecules, and Van Der Waals surface forces exist between particles. Thus, there exists an internal electro-chemical force system that must be in equilibrium with the externally applied stresses and capillary tension in the soil water. If the soil water chemistry is changed either by changing the amount of water or the chemical composition, the interparticle force field will change. If the change in internal forces is not balanced by a corresponding change in the state of stress, the particle spacing will change so as to adjust the interparticle forces until equilibrium is reached. This change in particle spacing manifests itself as a shrinkage or swelling.

Initial Moisture Condition and Moisture Variation

Volume change in an expansive soil mass is the result of increases or decreases in water content. The initial moisture content influences the swell and shrink potential relative to possible limits, or ranges, in moisture content. Moisture content alone is useless as an indicator or predictor of shrink-swell potential. The

relationship of moisture content to limiting moisture contents such as the plastic limit and liquid limit must be known.

If the moisture content is below or near plastic limit, the soils have high potential to swell. It has been reported that expansive soils with liquidity index* in the range of 0.20 to 0.40 will tend to experience little additional swell.

The availability of water to an expansive soil profile is influenced by many environmental and manmade factors. Generally, the upper few feet of the profile are subjected to the widest ranges of moisture variation, and are least restrained against movement by overburden. This upper stratum of the profile is referred to as the active zone. Moisture variation in the active zone of a natural soil profile is affected by climatic cycles at the surface, and fluctuating groundwater levels at the lower moisture boundary. The surficial boundary moisture conditions are changed significantly simply by placing a barrier such as a building floor slab or pavement between the soil and atmospheric environment. Other obvious and direct causes of moisture variation result from altered drainage conditions or man-made sources of water, such as irrigation or leaky plumbing. The latter factors are difficult to quantify and incorporate into the analysis, but should be controlled to the extent possible for each situation. For example, proper drainage and attention to landscaping are simple means of minimizing moisture fluctuations near structures, and should always be taken into consideration.

Man Made Conditions That Can Be Altered

There are a number of factors that can influence whether a soil might shrink or swell and the magnitude of this movement. For the most part, either the owner or the designer has some control over whether the factor will be avoided altogether or if not avoided, the degree to which the factor will be allowed to influence the shrink-swell process.

Antecedent Rainfall Ratio This is a measure of the local climate and is defined as the total monthly rainfall for the month of and the month prior to laying the pavement divided by twice the average monthly rate measured for the period. The intent of this ratio is to give a relative measure of ground moisture conditions at the time the pavement is placed. Thus, if a pavement is placed at the end of a wet period, the pavement should be expected to experience some loss of support around the perimeter as the wet soils begin to dry out and shrink. The opposite effect could be

* LIQUIDITY INDEX = (NATURAL WATER CONTENT - PLASTIC LIMIT) / (LIQUID LIMIT - PLASTIC LIMIT)

anticipated if the pavement is placed at the end of an extended dry period; as the wet season occurs, uplift around the perimeter may occur as the soil at the edge of the slab pavement in moisture content.

Age of Pavement The length of time since the pavement was cast provides an indication of the type of swelling of the soil profile that can be expected to be found beneath the pavement.

Drainage This provides a measure of the slope of the ground surface with respect to available free surface water that may accumulate around the pavement. Most builders are aware of the importance of sloping the final grade of the soil away from the pavement so that rain water is not allowed to collect and pond against or adjacent to the pavement. If water were allowed to accumulate next to the pavement, it would provide an available source of free water to the expansive soil underlying the pavement. Similarly, surface water drainage patterns or swales must not be altered so that runoff is allowed to collect next to the pavement.

Pre-Construction Vegetation Large amount of vegetation existing on a site before construction may have desiccated the site to some degree, especially where large trees grew before clearing. Constructing over a desiccated soil can produce some dramatic instances of heave and associated structural distress and damage as it wets up.

Post-Construction Vegetation **The type, amount, and location of vegetation that has been allowed to grow since construction can cause localized desiccation. Planting trees or large shrubs near a building can result in loss of foundation support as the tree or shrub removes water from the soil and dries it out.** Conversely, the opposite effect can occur if flowerbeds or shrubs are planted next to the foundation and these beds are kept well-watered or flooded. This practice can result in swelling of the soil around the perimeter where the soil is kept wet.

Site Grading, Lot Slopes, and Earthwork Effects In addition to the environmental and man-made factors described above, the grading and earthwork operations performed during site development can significantly influence the potential for shrink-swell movement at any given lot.

Cut and Fill Conditions During site development, many residential lots are brought to design grade through cut and fill operations. Fill soils, if not properly compacted at the time of placement, may experience post-construction volume changes due to wetting, drying, or consolidation. When fill

soils overlay natural undisturbed expansive clays, the combination of differing material types and histories can create non-uniform movement potential across the building pad. Transition zones, where cut and fill areas meet within the foundation footprint, are particularly sensitive and may result in localized differential movement under changing moisture conditions.

Lot Slopes and Surface Water Drainage The slope of the lot also plays a role in the long-term performance of foundations on expansive soils. Sloped lots may result in preferential surface water runoff toward one side of the structure, increasing the risk of moisture accumulation and differential heave if drainage is not properly controlled. Additionally, on sloped sites underlain by expansive soils, lateral soil movement may occur over time due to creep and shrink-swell cycles. This movement is typically oriented downslope and may contribute to gradual lateral displacement of light foundation systems unless proper design measures are incorporated.

As with other moisture-related factors, careful attention to site grading, uniform pad preparation, and positive drainage away from structures are critical elements in mitigating the effects of expansive soils. Special consideration should be given to areas of deep fill, slope transitions, or where cut/fill differentials exist within the foundation footprint.

Utilities Underneath the Pavement The utilities such as sewer, water, electricity, gas, and communication lines are often installed underneath the streets. The sewer utility construction, for example, typically involves trenching to the desired depth, installing gravel a gravel bed underneath the sewer main, installing primary backfill (gravel), and placing back the secondary backfill (generally excavated soils). The secondary backfill material is compacted in lifts. In addition, sewer service lines run laterally from each house (for a typical subdivision, approximately every 50-ft). These trenches with gravel and onsite material backfill are conducive to carrying water. In addition, the sewer service lines can carry water from behind the curb. Occasionally, the sewer line may be encased in concrete which will cause ponding of any travelling water within the sewer trenches. Any water travelling within these trenches can cause expansive clays to swell. If the backfill is not adequately compacted or if excessive water is flowing in these trenches, the trench backfill can potentially settle.

Summation

It is beyond the scope of this investigation to do more than point out that the above factors have a definite influence on the amount and type of swell to which a pavement is subjected during its useful life. The design engineer must be aware of these factors as he develops his design and make adjustments as necessary according to the results of special measurements or from his engineering experience and judgment.

DESIGN ENGINEERING ANALYSIS

Pavement Design Considerations

Review of the test pits and test data indicates that the following factors will affect the pavement design and construction at this site:

- 1) The site is underlain by moderately plastic to highly plastic clays. Structures supported on or within these soils will be subjected to potential vertical movements on the order of **2 to 4 ½ inches**.
- 2) The strengths of the underlying soils are adequate to support the proposed new streets.
- 3) Based on the stratigraphy observed at this site, the final street subgrade is anticipated to be in the Clay or Calcareous Clay / Marl strata. The final street subgrade should be verified by InTEC at the time of construction.
- 4) Ground water was not encountered in the test pits at the time of excavation.

Vertical Movements

The potential vertical rise (PVR) for slab-on grade construction at the location of the structures had been estimated using Texas Department of Transportation Procedure TXDOT-124-E. This method utilizes the liquid limits, plasticity indices, and in-situ moisture contents for soils in the seasonally active zone, estimated to be about twelve to fifteen feet at the project site.

The estimated PVR value provided is based on the proposed floor system applying a sustained surcharge load of approximately 1.0 lb. per square inch on the subgrade materials. **Potential vertical movement on the order of 2 to 4 ½ inches was estimated at the existing grade elevation.**

The PVR values are based on the current site grades. If cut and fill operations in excess of 6 inches are performed, the PVR values could change significantly. Higher PVR values than the above-mentioned values will occur in areas where water is allowed to pond for extended periods.

If proper drainage is not maintained (allowing subgrade moisture content to change significantly) and / or if the pavement is underlain by utility trenches and the utilities leak (a) potential vertical movements will be

much greater than 2 to 3 times the anticipated vertical movements will be realized and (b) the subgrade strength may be significantly lowered.

If the finish grade elevation is higher than the existing grade, compacted select fill should be used to raise the grade level. Any select fill should be placed and compacted as recommended under *Select Fill* in the “Construction Guidelines” section of this report. Each lift should be compacted and tested by InTEC to verify Compaction Compliance.

If the clays underlying the compacted / treated subgrade soils is moisture conditioned to a thickness of 18 inches, potential vertical movement on the order of 3 inches is estimated.

It should be noted that expansive clay does not shrink/swell without changes in moisture content, and thus good site design is very important to minimize movements. Coping with problems of shrink/swell due to expansive clays is a “fact of life” in the Texas region of south western U.S.A.

PAVEMENT GUIDELINES

General

Pavement area at this unit is expected to include Local type streets. The following recommendations are presented as a guideline for pavement design and construction. These recommendations are based on a) our previous experience with subgrade soils like those encountered at this site, b) pavement sections which have proved to be successful under similar design conditions, c) final pavement grades will provide adequate drainage for the pavement areas and that water will not be allowed to enter the pavement system by either edge penetration adjacent to landscape areas or penetration from the surface due to surface ponding, or inadequate maintenance of pavement joints, or surface cracks that may develop.

Pavement Design

Pavement designs provide an adequate thickness of structural sections over a particular subgrade (in order to reduce the wheel load to a distributed level so that the subgrade can support load). The support characteristics of the subgrade are based on strength characteristics of the subgrade soils and not on the shrinkage and swelling characteristics of the clays. Therefore, the pavement sections may be adequate from a structural stand point, may still experience cracking and deformation due to shrinkage and swelling characteristics of the soils. In addition, if the proposed new pavements are used to carry temporary construction traffic, then heavier sections may be needed. Please contact InTEC to discuss options.

It is very important to minimize moisture changes in the subgrade to lower the shrinkage and swell movements of the subgrade clays. The pavement and adjacent areas should be well drained. Proper maintenance should be performed by sealing the cracks as soon as they develop to prevent further water penetrations and damage. In our experience,

- (a) majority of the pavement distress observed over the years were caused by changes in moisture content of the underlying subgrade and / or excessive moisture in the base section,
- (b) pavements with a grade of one percent or more have performed better than the pavements with allowable minimum grade,

- (c) pavements with no underground utilities have performed better than pavements with underground utilities and the associated laterals,
- (d) pavements that are at a higher-grade elevation than the surrounding lots have performed better, and
- (e) any design effort that minimizes moisture penetration into the pavement layers have performed better.

“Alligator” Type Cracks

A layer of aggregate base is typically used underneath the concrete curbs around the pavement areas. This layer of aggregate base underneath the concrete curb is conducive to the infiltration of surface water into the pavement areas. Water infiltration into the subgrade and / or base layer can result in “alligator type” cracks especially when accompanied by construction traffic. Increased moisture content of the pavement sections will significantly impact its support characteristics. Moisture penetration into pavement layers can be reduced by (a) penetrating the concrete curbs at least three inches into the native clays soils, (b) installing French Drains on the outside of the curbs, or (c) installing a moisture barrier such as a trench filled with bentonite or flowable fill. Alligator type cracks are also caused by weak / soft pockets within the pavement layers. Thoroughly proof rolling the subgrade and base layers will help identify the soft spots and densify as needed.

Longitudinal Cracks

Asphalt pavements in highly expansive soil conditions, such as the soils encountered at this site, can develop longitudinal cracks along the pavement edges. The longitudinal cracking typically occurs about 1 to 4 feet inside of the pavement edges and they run parallel to the pavement edge. Longitudinal or reflective cracks may also be observed over utility trenches. The longitudinal cracks are generally caused by differential drying and shrinkage of the underlying expansive clays. The moisture content change of the underlying subgrade clays can be reduced by installing moisture barriers. Vertical moisture barriers along the edge of the pavement or horizontal moisture barriers such as paved sidewalks or geogrid will help control the development of the longitudinal cracks.

Periodic Maintenance

The pavements constructed on clay subgrades such as the one encountered at this site will be subjected to shrink / swell related movements. Hence, proper maintenance should be performed by sealing the cracks as soon as they develop to prevent further water penetrations and damage.

Pavement Sections

Local type residential streets may be designed with flexible pavements. The final finish street subgrade is expected to be in the Clay or Calcareous Clay / Marl subgrade areas. Minimum flexible pavement sections for the anticipated subgrades are presented in Table No. 2 in the following page. The project geotechnical engineer should delineate the streets for different subgrades at the time of construction. Input parameters used in the pavement section calculations are presented in Table No. 3.

- If pavement design for parameters other than those shown in Table No. 3 is needed or if repetitive / heavy truck traffic is anticipated, please contact us for additional pavement section recommendations.
- The recommended pavement sections are based on the subgrade soil support characteristics.
- The pavement sections are not based on shrink / swell characteristics of the subgrade soils.
- The subgrade soil support characteristics will be significantly affected by changes in moisture content.

The cut and fill information is not available at this time. The final street subgrade should be verified by InTEC at the time of construction.

Table No. 2 – Minimum Flexible Pavement Recommendations – CBR = 2.0

Street Classification	Asphaltic Concrete			Aggregate Base, Inches	Geogrid	Treated Subgrade, Inches	Structural Number
	Type D, inches	Type C, inches	Type B, inches				
Local Type A (no bus traffic)	3.00	-	-	11.50	No	6" LT	2.93
	3.00	-	-	9.50	Yes	6" LT	2.93
	2.00	-	-	14.50	No	6" LT	2.91
	2.00	-	-	12.00	Yes	6" LT	2.92
	2.00	-	6.00	-	No	6" LT	2.92
Local Type A (with bus traffic)	3.00	-	-	19.50	No	6" LT	4.05
	3.00	-	-	16.50	Yes	6" LT	4.12
	3.00	-	8.50	-	No	6" LT	4.21
Local Type B	2.00	2.00	-	23.00	No	6" LT	4.98
	2.00	2.00	-	19.00	Yes	6" LT	4.99
	4.00	-	9.50	-	No	6" LT	4.99

Design Notes:

- The results of our laboratory testing and engineering evaluation indicate that the underlying shallow clays are **moderately plastic to highly plastic in character**. Potential vertical movement on the order of **2 to 4 ½ inches** is estimated at existing grade elevation.
- Clay or Calcareous Clay / Marl subgrades are anticipated. Pavement section recommendations are based on clay subgrade, with a Design CBR value of 2.0.
- Input parameters are shown in Table No. 3 (Summary Table A). Please call us to provide pavement recommendations, if needed, for different input values.

Subgrade Notes (*):

- Cut and fill data are not available at this time.
- Fill used to raise the grade in clay areas:
 - approved fill material free should have a minimum CBR value of 2.0 and a maximum Plasticity Index value of 45 (on site material). Lime application rates should be re-evaluated and tested for sulfate content prior to use of the fill material.
 - The fill material should be approved by the geotechnical engineer, free of deleterious material, and the gravel size should not exceed 3 inches in size. The material should be placed and compacted as per applicable city / county guidelines.
 - The subgrade, prior to placement of fill, should be proof rolled to identify weak areas. Any identified weak areas should be recompacted.
- Fill used to raise the grade in calcareous clay / marl areas:
 - Existing clays should be removed to marl / limestone stratum prior to placement of fill.

- approved fill material free should have a minimum CBR value of 5.0 and a maximum Plasticity Index value of 20.
- Based on the thickness of the clays encountered in the test pits, we anticipate the final pavement subgrade Plasticity Index value to be either less than or equal to 20 or greater than 20.
- **If the subgrade Plasticity Index values are less than or equal to 20, as per City of San Antonio or Bexar County requirements, subgrade TREATMENT is not needed.**
- Subgrade should be **TREATED** using lime or cement. Lime application rates are presented here. Please contact InTEC for cement application rates.
 - Treated to a depth of 6 inches using 6 percent lime content.
 - The subgrade soils should be tested for soil sulfate content prior to lime application. If the soil sulfate content is higher than 3000 ppm, an alternate procedure will be needed.
 - Lime application rate of **32 lbs per sq yard for 6-inch depth** of treatment is recommended.
 - Cement may be used in lieu of lime. Cement application rate should be determined at the time of construction.

General Notes:

- Input parameters are shown in Table No. 3 (Summary Table A). Please call us to provide pavement recommendations, if needed, for different input values. If repetitive truck or heavy truck traffic is anticipated, please contact us for revised pavement recommendations.
- Pavement section recommendations are based on a subgrade CBR value of 2.0. The pavement recommendations are not based on the shrink / swell characteristics of the underlying soils. The pavement can experience cracking and deformation due to shrinkage and swelling characteristics of the soils as described in the *Vertical Movements* section of this report. Use of geogrid helps reduce shrink / swell related pavement distress.
- Significant pavement distress has been observed during construction phase with the combination of construction traffic and irrigation water / rain water getting underneath the asphalt.
- If water is allowed to get underneath the asphalt / concrete or if moisture content of the base or subgrade changes significantly, then pavement distress will occur. Moisture penetration underneath the asphalt pavement surface should be reduced. One of the following methods should be used:
 - Deeper curbs; such as curbs extending a minimum of 3 inches into subgrade.
 - Compacted clays backfilled against the curbs.
- In addition, water should not be allowed to get underneath the pavement section at the time of home construction.

Geogrid:

- One layer of geogrid, Tensar Triax TX130 or better, installed on top of treated subgrade as per manufacturer's guidelines.

Subgrade Verification:

- The final pavement subgrade should be verified and delineated as needed for different subgrade conditions by InTEC.

Table No. 3 – Input Parameters used in Asphalt Pavement Section Calculation

	Local Type A (no bus traffic)	Local Type A (with bus traffic)	Local B
ESAL	100,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Reliability Level	R-70	R-70	R-90
Initial and Terminal Serviceability	4.2 and 2.0	4.2 and 2.0	4.2 and 2.0
Standard Deviation	0.45	0.45	0.45
Service Life	20 years	20 years	20 years
If heavy truck traffic is anticipated, please contact InTEC with anticipated traffic data for revised recommendations.			

Subgrade Preparation

It is important that any existing pavement and organic and compressible soils are removed and the exposed subgrade is properly prepared prior to pavement installation. The subgrade should be prepared as described in the applicable city / county Guidelines. Base course material should be placed immediately upon completion of the subgrade compaction operation to prevent drying of the soils due to exposure.

The finish grade elevation of the subgrade should be such that water drains downward freely towards a drainage area. At the drainage area, 3x5 rock may be provided at the subgrade level and the collected water at the drainage area should be taken out (such as into the existing concrete drainage channel). If any voids in the subgrade should be filled in with the same subgrade material and compacted in lifts.

The approved fill material should be placed in 8-inch lifts (6 inches compacted) and compacted as recommended in the Site Preparation section of the Construction Guidelines presented in this report.

Deeper Fill

If the fill depth exceeds 4 feet, the potential subgrade settlement should be considered. The fill material should have the minimum design CBR value. The fills should be placed in 6-inch thick lifts and compacted to a minimum of 98 percent of the maximum dry density at a minimum moisture content of optimum moisture content (Tex 114E). If the fill depths exceed 10-ft, each lift should be compacted to a minimum of

100 percent of the maximum dry density at a moisture content between optimum minus 2 and optimum plus 2 percent of the optimum moisture content (Tex 114E). In areas where culvert crossing are planned, above recommendations should be followed in backfilling around the culvert. Please contact InTEC with the cut and fill information to evaluate the effect of proposed cut and fill on the recommendations and to provide fill material and compaction recommendations.

Base Course

Based on the survey of available materials in the area, a base course of crushed limestone aggregate or gravel appears to be the most practical material for asphalt pavement project. The base course should conform to Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation Standard Specification, Item 247, Type A, Grade 1-2. The aggregate base course should be installed as per applicable city / county Guidelines.

At a minimum the base course should be brought to near optimum moisture conditions and compacted in lifts to at least 95 percent of maximum dry density as determined by test method TxDOT 113E.

Asphaltic Concrete

The asphaltic concrete surface course should conform to City of San Antonio Standard Construction Guidelines, 2008. The asphaltic concrete should be installed as per applicable city / county Guidelines.

Perimeter Drainage

It is important that proper perimeter drainage be provided so that infiltration of surface water from compacted areas surrounding the pavement is minimized, or if this is not possible, curbs should extend through the base and into the subgrade. A crack sealant compatible to both asphalt and concrete should be installed at the concrete-asphalt interfaces.

Wherever there are drastic grade changes in the pavement area (such as from 3 to 4 percent grade to 1 to 2 percent grade) 3 x 5 inch gravel subgrade with a subsurface drain system (such as Akwadrain® on the sides of the pavement) and outlet should be considered. This aspect will provide for a better drainage system in this area. Please contact InTEC for drainage recommendations.

CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES

Construction Monitoring

InTEC, as the Geotechnical Engineer of Record, should be actively involved in monitoring earthwork and foundation construction. Proper performance of foundation systems depends not only on design but also on quality construction practices. Contact InTEC prior to construction to incorporate foundation and earthwork monitoring into the project's quality control plan.

Site Preparation

Site preparation will consist of removal of the organic material, preparation of the subgrade, and Remove organic materials, vegetation, and loose soils to a depth of at least 6 inches in areas where floor slabs or pavements are planned. Subgrade should be approved by InTEC and proof rolled. Recompect to at least 95% of maximum dry density (ASTM D698) within -1% to $+3\%$ of optimum moisture content. Exposed subgrade should be kept moist and approved before fill placement.

Old underground utilities beneath proposed structures should be removed or sealed. Backfill should be compacted in 6-inch lifts to 95% of maximum dry density within the specified moisture range.

If cut/fill operations occur beneath the building pad, fill thickness should be uniform to reduce differential movement. Voids from tree or structure removal must be compacted per recommendations.

Proof Rolling

Use a 25-ton pneumatic roller with 10 passes and tire pressures per manufacturer specs to achieve 90 psi ground contact pressure. InTEC must observe proof rolling. Weak zones should be removed and replaced with select fill. Retest areas that do not meet density.

Maintain positive drainage throughout construction to avoid ponding or construction delays.

Compaction

Site grading plan is not available for review at this time. If any low areas or disturbed areas encountered during construction should be appropriately prepared and compacted. Any deleterious or wet materials should be removed and wasted. The fill placement in the low areas should not be in a "bowl shape". The

sides of the fill area should be “squared up” and the excavated bottom should be proof rolled as described in *Proof Rolling* section of this report. On site material, with no deleterious material, may be used to raise the grade. After proof rolling operation, the fill should be placed in 6-inch lifts and compacted to a minimum of **95 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D 698 test method within optimum and three percent above optimum moisture content**. Each lift should be tested by InTEC for compaction compliance and approved before placement of the subsequent lifts. The exposed subgrade should not be allowed to dry out prior to placing structural fill. It is recommended that any given lot does not straddle filled areas and natural areas to help lower differential movement of the structures.

Select Fill

Use crushed limestone with LL < 40, PI = 5–20, and <30% passing No. 200 sieve. Max particle size: 3 inches. Place in 6-inch compacted lifts and compact to 95% of ASTM D 698 dry density within $\pm 2\%$ of optimum moisture. Each lift must be tested and approved by InTEC.

General Fill

General fill materials may consist of clean on-site material, select fill materials, or any clean imported fill material. The purpose of a general fill is to provide soils with good compaction characteristics that will provide uniform support for any non-habitable structures that are not movement sensitive. The general fill material should be free of any deleterious material, construction debris, organic material, and should not have gravels larger than 6 inches in maximum dimension. The top two feet of fill material used underneath pavement areas should not have gravels larger than 3 inches in maximum dimension.

It should be understood that the use of the general fill may result in greater than anticipated potential vertical movements and differential movements. If the greater potential vertical movements or differential soil movements cannot be tolerated, then select fill material should be used and should conform to the Select Fill recommendations.

General Fill Compaction

The general fill materials should be placed in lifts not to exceed 8 inches thick and compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by test method ASTM D 698 at a moisture content within 3 percent of the optimum water content. Each lift should be compacted and tested by a

representative of a geotechnical laboratory to verify compaction compliance and approved before placement of the subsequent lifts.

The general fill compaction requirements can also be discussed and determined in consultation with the owner prior to construction.

Ground Water

In any areas where significant cuts (2-ft or more) are made to establish final grades for pavement, attention should be given to possible seasonal water seepage that could occur through natural cracks and fissures in the newly exposed stratigraphy. Subsurface drains may be required to intercept seasonal groundwater seepage. The need for these or other dewatering devices on should be carefully addressed during construction. Our office could be contacted to visually inspect final pads to evaluate the need for such drains.

The ground water seepage may happen several years after construction if the rainfall rate or drainage changes within the project site or outside the project site. If seepage run off occurs towards the pavement areas an engineer should be called on to evaluate its effect and provision of French Drains at this location.

Drainage

Ground water seepage was not encountered in the test pits at the time of excavation. However, minor ground water seepage may be encountered within the pavement areas and grading excavations at the time of construction, especially after periods of heavy precipitation. **Small quantities of seepage may be handled by conventional sump and pump methods of dewatering.**

Temporary Drainage Measures

Temporary drainage provisions should be established, as necessary, to minimize water runoff into the construction areas. If standing water does accumulate, it should be removed by pumping as soon as possible.

Adequate protection against sloughing of soils should be provided for workers and inspectors entering the excavations. This protection should meet O.S.H.A. and other applicable building codes.

Construction Slopes

- Temporary Slopes: 1H:1V in Stratum I and II clays.
- Fill Slopes: 1H:1V, compacted in 3–5 ft lifts.
- Permanent Slopes: Max 3H:1V. Use 5H:1V where pedestrian access is expected.

Time of Construction

If the pavement is installed during or after an extended dry period, the subgrade may experience greater movement around the edges when the soil moisture content increases, such as due to rain or irrigation. Similarly, a pavement installed during or after a wet period may experience greater movement around the edges during the subsequent drying of the soils.

Control Testing and Field Observation

Subgrade preparation and base and asphalt placement should be monitored by the project geotechnical engineer or his representative of InTEC. As a guideline, at least one in-place density test should be **performed for every 100 lineal feet (or as per respective city and county requirements, whichever requires more frequent testing) of street of compacted surface lift.** However, a minimum of three density tests should be performed by InTEC on the subgrade or subsequent lifts of compaction. Any areas not meeting the required compaction should be re-compacted and retested until compliance is met.

DRAINAGE AND MAINTENANCE

Proper drainage and long-term moisture management are **critical** to the performance of the proposed structures and pavements, particularly due to the presence of **expansive soils** at the site. Seasonal or localized changes in moisture content can lead to **unpredictable slab and foundation movements**, especially if water is allowed to collect near building perimeters or utility corridors.

◆ Roof Drainage & Plumbing

- All roof drainage must be directed **at least 10 feet away** from the foundation using gutters, downspouts, and splash blocks or extensions.
- If positive surface slope cannot be provided, closed pipe systems discharging to a storm sewer are preferred.
- Plumbing leaks, especially beneath the slab or within utility trenches, must be identified and repaired **immediately** to prevent localized swelling and loss of support.

◆ Lot Grading & Flatwork

- Final grading should slope away from the structure at a **minimum of 5%** for the first 10 feet.
- Pavements, sidewalks, and patios within this zone should follow the same slope guideline and be designed to **accommodate post-construction movement**, especially in fill areas or expansive clay zones.
- Joints between slabs and structures should be **sealed and inspected regularly**. Water should not be allowed to pond in planters, depressions, or along unsealed joints.

◆ Landscaping & Vegetation

- **Large trees and deep-rooted plants** should not be planted within a horizontal distance equal to their mature height from the foundation.
- Planters adjacent to the structure should be self-contained and designed to prevent moisture infiltration to foundation soils.

- Irrigation systems and sprinkler mains should be located a **minimum of 5 feet** away from buildings, and designed to prevent overwatering near foundations.

◆ **Utility Trenches**

- Trenches for utilities often include granular bedding, which can act as **conduits for water** to reach the building pad.
- All trenches must be properly compacted and should include **cut-off collars or clay plugs** where lines cross building footprints to prevent subsurface water migration.

◆ **Long-Term Maintenance and Considerations**

- The **PVR (Potential Vertical Rise)** values estimated in this report assume that all drainage systems are installed and maintained properly. Failure to do so may result in **actual movements 2–3 times greater** than those predicted.
- During **extended dry periods**, observe the perimeter of the structure. If soil is pulling away from the foundation, **controlled watering** should be applied to avoid sudden moisture shifts when rain returns.
- Any future modifications to drainage, site grading, landscaping, or nearby construction should be carefully evaluated for impact on foundation performance.

LIMITATIONS

The analyses and recommendations submitted in this report are based upon the data obtained from **15 test pits excavated at the site**. This report may not reflect the exact variations of the soil conditions across the site. The pavement recommendations presented in the report should be reviewed and confirmed based on the proposed cut and fill and observation at the time of construction.

The data and interpretations presented are professional opinions, not exact representations of all subsurface conditions. These recommendations are **confirmation-dependent** and should be reviewed by InTEC during construction to validate assumed conditions.

This report is **not intended to inform means, methods, or construction logistics** such as equipment selection, cost estimation, or contractor scheduling. If the report is used for bidding or other unintended purposes, it is done **solely at the contractor's risk**.

Revisions may be required if:

- the proposed structure or grading is changed;
- drainage or site use is altered;
- significant cut and fill activities are performed; or
- excessive time has passed since the field exploration.

The geotechnical engineer affirms that the findings and advice herein are consistent with the standard of care for geotechnical engineers practicing in this region. However, **no other warranties, express or implied, are provided**.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of **Lennar Homes** for pavement thickness evaluation for the **proposed new streets at Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B in San Antonio, Texas**.


Illustration Section

Description	Plate No.
Vicinity Map	Plate 1A
Aerial Map	Plate 1B
Topographic Map	Plate 1C
Geologic Map	Plate 1D
Soil Map	Plates 1E-1 & 1E-2
Bexar County Karst Map	Plate 1F
Approximate Test Pit Locations	Plate 1G
Test Pit Photos	Plates 1H-1 thru 1H-4
Test Pit Logs	Plates 2—16
Keys to Classifications and Symbols	Plate 17
Calculations	Plates 18—26
Information on Geotechnical Report	Appendix

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025




Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Vicinity Map

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025




Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Aerial Map—Approximate Location

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025




Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Topographic Map—Approximate Location

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025



Kpg—Pecan Gap Chalk

chalk and chalky marl, more calcareous westward, very light yellow to yellowish brown, weathers to form moderately deep soil, seldom exposed; *Exogyra ponderosa* common; thickness 100-400 feet, thins westward to eastern Medina County where it is overlain by Anacacho Limestone, beyond this point included with Austin Chalk

Kknm—Navarro Group and Marlbrook Marl


Navarro Group and Marlbrook Marl ("upper Taylor marl") undivided, Kknm. Upper part—marl, clay, sandstone, and siltstone; marl and clay, glauconitic, contain concretions of limonite and siderite; sandstone, fine grained, and siltstone, yellow brown, contain concretions of hard bluish-gray siliceous limestone 2 to 10 feet in diameter; sandstone beds have little lateral continuity and become more abundant westward; thickness up to 580 feet. Lower part—clay, dominantly montmorillonitic, unctuous, greenish gray to brownish gray; weathers to a very thick, black, clayey soil; thickness 400± feet. Total thickness 980± feet

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Geologic Map—Approximate Location

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025



Bexar County, Texas

Map unit symbol and soil name	Pct. of map unit	Hydrologic group	Depth	USDA texture	Classification		Pct Fragments		Percentage passing sieve number—				Liquid limit	Plasticity index
					Unified	AASHTO	>10 inches	3-10 inches	4	10	40	200		
			<i>In</i>				<i>L-R-H</i>	<i>L-R-H</i>	<i>L-R-H</i>	<i>L-R-H</i>	<i>L-R-H</i>	<i>L-R-H</i>	<i>L-R-H</i>	<i>L-R-H</i>
BsC—Whitewright-Austin complex, 1 to 5 percent slopes														
Whitewright	65	D	0-6	Clay loam	CH, CL	A-6, A-7-6	0- 0- 0	0- 3- 5	95-98-100	90-95-100	80-90-100	60-79- 98	34-43 -52	15-24-32
			6-15	Silty clay, silty clay loam, clay loam, gravelly clay loam	CH, CL	A-6, A-7-6	0- 0- 0	0- 3- 5	85-93-100	80-90-100	70-85-100	60-79- 98	34-43 -52	15-24-32
			15-20	Bedrock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Austin	35	C	0-28	Silty clay	CH, CL	A-7-6	0- 0- 0	0- 3- 5	95-98-100	90-95-100	80-90-100	75-86- 96	45-57 -69	25-35-44
			28-42	Silty clay, clay, silty clay loam	CH, CL	A-6, A-7-6	0- 0- 0	0- 3- 5	95-98-100	90-95-100	80-90-100	75-86- 96	35-50 -65	16-28-40
			42-72	Bedrock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—


Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Soil Map—Approximate Location

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025

Bexar County, Texas														
Map unit symbol and soil name	Pct. of map unit	Hydrologic group	Depth	USDA texture	Classification		Pct Fragments		Percentage passing sieve number—				Liquid limit	Plasticity index
					Unified	AASHTO	>10 inches	3-10 inches	4	10	40	200		
			In				L-R-H	L-R-H	L-R-H	L-R-H	L-R-H	L-R-H	L-R-H	L-R-H
HgD—Rock outcrop-Olmos complex, 5 to 25 percent slopes														
Rock outcrop	80	D	0-80	Bedrock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Olmos	15	D	0-13	Very cobbly loam	SC, CL, GC	A-2-6, A-6	0-0-0	21-26-35	61-72-89	52-65-86	44-58-81	32-43-62	32-35-36	13-15-16
			13-14	Cemented material	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
			14-26	Cemented material	—	A-2-4, A-2-6, A-4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
			26-80	Cemented material	—	A-2-4, A-2-6, A-4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
HsB—Houston Black clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes														
Houston black	80	D	0-6	Clay	CH	A-7-6	0-0-0	0-0-0	96-98-100	92-96-100	81-92-100	71-81-90	63-70-76	34-44-49
			6-70	Clay, silty clay	CH	A-7-6	0-0-0	0-0-0	98-98-100	96-96-100	85-92-100	74-81-90	58-70-76	38-44-49
			70-80	Clay, silty clay	CH	A-7-6	0-0-0	0-0-0	94-96-100	86-92-100	74-88-100	65-78-95	61-71-75	37-45-50
HuC—Houston Black gravelly clay, 3 to 5 percent slopes														
Houston black	90	D	0-13	Gravelly clay	CH, GC	A-7-6	0-0-0	0-3-4	65-69-77	46-57-74	41-55-74	35-48-67	63-70-76	38-44-49
			13-63	Clay	CH	A-7-6	0-0-0	0-0-0	98-98-99	96-96-98	85-92-98	74-81-89	63-70-71	38-44-49
			63-86	Clay	CH	A-7-6	0-0-0	0-0-0	95-96-99	88-93-98	75-89-98	66-79-93	61-71-75	37-45-50
LvB—Lewisville silty clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes														
Lewisville	85	C	0-15	Silty clay	CH	A-7-6	0-0-0	0-0-0	94-96-100	94-96-100	91-95-100	87-90-100	52-52-59	28-29-34
			15-38	Silty clay, clay loam, silty clay loam	CH, CL	A-6, A-7-6	0-0-0	0-0-0	95-96-100	95-96-100	83-95-100	76-88-100	39-49-57	18-26-32
			38-69	Silty clay, clay loam, silty clay loam	CH, CL	A-6, A-7-6	0-0-0	0-0-0	81-89-100	81-89-100	71-88-100	65-82-100	39-50-59	18-27-34
TaB—Eckrant cobbly clay, 1 to 8 percent slopes														
Eckrant	85	D	0-4	Cobbly clay	CH, CL	A-7-6	0-3-15	28-34-55	75-92-100	74-92-100	68-88-100	60-78-93	45-60-70	25-32-40
			4-11	Extremely cobbly silty clay, very cobbly silty clay, extremely cobbly clay, very cobbly clay, very stony clay	CH, CL, GC	A-2-7, A-7-6	0-14-22	28-36-67	33-72-82	30-70-81	27-67-81	24-60-77	45-60-70	25-32-40
			11-80	Bedrock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TaC—Eckrant very cobbly clay, 5 to 15 percent slopes														
Eckrant	90	D	0-4	Very cobbly clay	CH, GC	A-7-6	0-3-12	9-23-45	49-59-80	46-58-79	43-55-79	37-48-79	49-60-70	25-31-42
			4-12	Very cobbly clay, very cobbly clay loam, cobbly clay, extremely cobbly silty clay	CH, CL, GC	A-2-7, A-7-6	0-2-21	27-46-63	21-50-83	18-48-82	15-46-82	13-41-82	45-61-70	23-32-43
			12-30	Bedrock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis Proposed New Streets Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B San Antonio, Texas						Soil Map—Continued								
						InTEC Project Number: S251271					Date: 08/29/2025			




1	• Karst Zone 1 - Areas known to contain listed invertebrate karst species
2	• Karst Zone 2 - Areas having a high probability of containing suitable habitat for listed invertebrate karst species
3	• Karst Zone 3 - Areas that probably do not contain listed invertebrate karst species
4	• Karst Zone 4 - Areas which require further research but are generally equivalent to Zone 3, although they may include sections which could be classified as Zone 2 or Zone 5 as more information becomes available
5	• Karst Zone 5 - Areas which do not contain listed invertebrate karst species

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Bexar County Karst Map

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025



Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Approximate Test Pit Locations

InTEC Project Number:
S251271


Date:
08/29/2025



TP-1



TP-2



TP-3



TP-4

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Test Pit Photos

InTEC Project Number:
S251271


Date:
08/29/2025



TP-5



TP-6



TP-7



TP-8

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis Proposed New Streets Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B San Antonio, Texas	Test Pit Photos	
	InTEC Project Number: S251271	Date: 08/29/2025



TP-9



TP-10



TP-11



TP-12

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Test Pit Photos

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025




TP-13



TP-14



TP-15



Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Test Pit Photos

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes										PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-1																											
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - •																																				
0																																															
		TP	Dark Brown Clay -with Gravel						41	24	•																																				
		TP	Tan Silty Clay -with Caliche and Gravel -with Calcareous Clay Seams						55	37	•																																				
5		TP																																													
		TP																																													
		TP																																													
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample								•																																				
15																																															
20																																															
25																																															
30																																															
35																																															
Notes:												Ground Water Observed: No												Completion Depth (ft): 10																							
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer												S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample												HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample												Plate: 2											

PROJECT NO: S251271

DATE: 09/11/2025

CLIENT: Lennar Homes



TEST PIT NO. TP-2

DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20 40 60 80			
0														
		TP	Dark Brown Clay -with Gravel						60	40	</			

Notes:

Ground Water Observed: No

Completion Depth (ft): 8

**S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF
by Hand Penetrometer**

S.S. - Split Spoon Sample
S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample

HA - Hand Auger
AU - Auger Sample

Plate: 3

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B

LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas

CLIENT: Lennar Homes

PROJECT NO: S251271

DATE: 09/11/2025



TEST PIT NO. TP-3

DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX		
0												
		TP	Dark Brown to Brown Clay								Plastic Limit Moisture Content % - 20 40 60 80 — — — — Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - 20 40 60 80	
		TP										
5		TP								64		42
		TP	Tan and Gray Clay -with Caliche									
			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample									
10												
15												
20												
25												
30												
35												

Notes:

Ground Water Observed: No

Completion Depth (ft): 8

S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF
by Hand Penetrometer

S.S. - Split Spoon Sample
S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample


HA - Hand Auger
AU - Auger Sample

Plate: 4

PROJECT NO: S251271

DATE: 09/11/2025

Plate: 5

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes										PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-5																											
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20 40 60 80																																				
0		TP	Dark Brown to Brown Clay								51	29																																			
		TP																																													
5		TP																																													
		TP	Tan and Gray Clay -with Caliche																																												
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample																																												
15																																															
20																																															
25																																															
30																																															
35																																															
Notes:												Ground Water Observed: No												Completion Depth (ft): 8																							
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer												S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample												HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample												Plate: 6											

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B

LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas

CLIENT: Lennar Homes

PROJECT NO: S251271

DATE: 09/11/2025



TEST PIT NO. TP-6

DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	
0											
		TP	Dark Brown to Brown Clay								
		TP									
5		TP							67	45	
		TP	Tan and Gray Clay -with Caliche								
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample								
15											
20											
25											
30											
35											

Notes:

Ground Water Observed: No

Completion Depth (ft): 8


S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF
by Hand Penetrometer

S.S. - Split Spoon Sample
S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample


HA - Hand Auger
AU - Auger Sample

Plate: 7

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes										PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-7																					
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20 40 60 80																														
0																																									
		TP	Dark Brown to Brown Clay																																						
		TP							54	31																															
5		TP																																							
		TP	Tan and Gray Clay -with Caliche																																						
			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample																																						
10																																									
15																																									
20																																									
25																																									
30																																									
35																																									
Notes:												Ground Water Observed: No										Completion Depth (ft): 8																			
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer												S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample										HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample										Plate: 8									

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes										PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-8																											
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX																																					
0											Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20 40 60 80																																				
		TP	Dark Brown to Brown Clay								60	39																																			
		TP																																													
5		TP																																													
		TP	Tan and Gray Clay -with Caliche																																												
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample																																												
15																																															
20																																															
25																																															
30																																															
35																																															
Notes:												Ground Water Observed: No												Completion Depth (ft): 8																							
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer												S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample												HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample												Plate: 9											

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes										PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-9																			
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit — Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20406080																												
0		TP	Dark Brown Clay																																				
TP		Light Tan Calcareous Clay to Marl -with Caliche																																					
TP																																							
5			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample																																				
10																																							
15																																							
20																																							
25																																							
30																																							
35																																							
Notes:										Ground Water Observed: No										Completion Depth (ft): 6																			
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer										S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample										HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample										Plate: 10									

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes										PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-10																					
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20 40 60 80																														
0		TP	Dark Brown Clay						27	15																															
TP		Light Tan Calcareous Clay to Marl -with Caliche																																							
TP																																									
5			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample																																						
10																																									
15																																									
20																																									
25																																									
30																																									
35																																									
Notes:												Ground Water Observed: No										Completion Depth (ft): 6																			
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer												S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample										HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample										Plate: 11									

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B

LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas

CLIENT: Lennar Homes

PROJECT NO: S251271

DATE: 09/11/2025



TEST PIT NO. TP-11

DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit — Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - •			
											20	40	60	80
0														
		TP	Dark Brown Clay											
		TP	Tan Silty Clay -with Marl Seams											
5		TP								35	20			
		TP												
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample											
15														
20														
25														
30														
35														

Notes:

Ground Water Observed: No


Completion Depth (ft): 8


S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF
by Hand Penetrometer

S.S. - Split Spoon Sample
S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample

HA - Hand Auger
AU - Auger Sample

Plate: 12

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes										PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-12																			
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - •																												
0											20 40 60 80																												
		TP	Dark Brown Clay								57	38																											
		TP																																					
5		TP																																					
		TP	Tan and Gray Clay -with Caliche																																				
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample																																				
15																																							
20																																							
25																																							
30																																							
35																																							
Notes:										Ground Water Observed: No										Completion Depth (ft): 8																			
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer										S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample										HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample										Plate: 13									

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-13							
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20 40 60 80						
0																	
		TP	Dark Brown Clay								57	34					
		TP															
5		TP															
		TP	Tan and Gray Clay -with Caliche														
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample														
15																	
20																	
25																	
30																	
35																	
Notes:										Ground Water Observed: No				Completion Depth (ft): 8			
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer				S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample				HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample				Plate: 14					

PROJECT: Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B LOCATION: San Antonio, Texas CLIENT: Lennar Homes										PROJECT NO: S251271 DATE: 09/11/2025										 TEST PIT NO. TP-14																					
DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20 40 60 80																														
0																																									
		TP	Dark Brown Clay																																						
		TP							57	37																															
5		TP																																							
		TP	Tan and Gray Clay -with Caliche																																						
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample																																						
15																																									
20																																									
25																																									
30																																									
35																																									
Notes:												Ground Water Observed: No										Completion Depth (ft): 8																			
S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF by Hand Penetrometer												S.S. - Split Spoon Sample S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample										HA - Hand Auger AU - Auger Sample										Plate: 15									


PROJECT NO: S251271

DATE: 09/11/2025

CLIENT: Lennar Homes



TEST PIT NO. TP-15

DEPTH (feet)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	SOIL DESCRIPTION	% MINUS 200 SIEVE	UNIT DRY WT IN PCF	S.S. BY P.P	BLOWS PER FOOT	SHEAR STRENGTH TSF	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTICITY INDEX	Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Moisture Content % - • 20 40 60 80
0											
		TP	Dark Brown Clay						47	27	
		TP									
5		TP	Tan Gravelly Clay -with Calich								
		TP									
10			Mini-Excavator Refusal TP = Test Pit Sample								
15											
20											
25											
30											
35											

Notes:

Ground Water Observed: No

Completion Depth (ft): 8

**S.S by P.P - Shear Strength in TSF
by Hand Penetrometer**

S.S. - Split Spoon Sample
S.T. - Shelby Tube Sample

HA - Hand Auger
AU - Auger Sample

Plate: 16

KEY TO CLASSIFICATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<u>Soil Fractions</u>		<u>Soil or Rock Types</u> (Shown in symbols column) (Predominate Soil Types Shown Heavy)		
<u>Component</u>	<u>Size Range</u>			
Boulders	Greater than 12"			
Cobbles	3" - 12"			
Gravel	3" - #4 (4.76mm)			
Coarse	3" - 3/4"			
Fine	3/4" - #4			
Sand	#4 - #200 (0.074mm)			
Coarse	#4 - #10 (2.00mm)			
Medium	#10 - #40 (0.42mm)			
Fine	#40 - #200 (0.074mm)			
Silt and Clay	Less than #200			
		Limestone	Sandy Clay	Gravel

TERMS DESCRIBING SOIL CONSISTENCY

<u>Description</u> (Cohesive <u>Soils</u>)	<u>Unconfined</u> <u>Compression</u> <u>TSF</u>	<u>Blows/Ft.</u> <u>Std. Penetration</u> <u>Test</u>	<u>Description</u> (Cohesionless <u>Soils</u>)	<u>Blows/Ft.</u> <u>Std. Penetration</u> <u>Tests</u>
Very Soft	0.25	<2	Very Loose	0 - 4
Soft	0.25 - 0.50	2 - 4	Loose	4 - 10
Firm	0.50 - 1.00	4 - 8	Medium Dense	10 - 30
Stiff	1.00 - 2.00	8 - 15	Dense	30 - 50
Very Stiff	2.00 - 4.00	15 - 30	Very Dense	50
Hard	>4.00	>30		

SOIL STRUCTURE

Calcareous	Containing deposits of calcium carbonate; generally nodular.
Slickenside	Having inclined planes of weakness that are slick and glossy in appearance.
Laminated	Composed of thin layers of varying color and texture.
Fissured	Containing shrinkage cracks frequently filled with fine sand or silt. Usually more or less vertical.
Interbedded	Composed of alternate layers of different soil types.
Jointed	Consisting of hair cracks that fall apart as soon as the confining pressure is removed.
Varved	Consisting of alternate thin layers of sand, silt or clay formed by variations in sedimentations during the various seasons of the year, of often exhibiting contrasting colors when partially dried. Each layer is generally less than 1/2" in thickness.
Stratified	Composed of, or arranged in layers (usually 1 inch or more)
Well-graded	Having a wide range of grain sizes and substantial amount of all intermediate particle sizes.
Poorly or Gap-graded	Having a range of sizes with some intermediate sizes missing.
Uniformly-graded	Predominantly of one grain size.

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B
San Antonio, Texas

InTEC Project Number:
S251271

Date:
08/29/2025

Calculations

CBR = 2.0

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis

Tensar.
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.440	1.200
Aggregate base (NX750)	6 in	0.300	1.800
Structural number (SN)			3.000

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.440	1.320
Aggregate base	11.5 in	0.140	1.610
Structural number (SN)			2.930

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
100,000	3,000 psi	70%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar+ (2.20.0)
© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar+ software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar+ software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar+ software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar+ software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar+ software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar+ software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type A (without Bus Traffic)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis


Tensar
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Stabilized
132,800 ESALs



Unstabilized
108,700 ESALs

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.400	1.200
Aggregate base (NX750)	6 in	0.300	1.800
Structural number (SN)			3.000

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	2 in	0.440	0.880
Aggregate base	14.5 in	0.140	2.030
Structural number (SN)			2.910

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
100,000	3,000 psi	70%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar+ (2.20.6)

© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar+ software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar+ software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar+ software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar+ software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar+ software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar+ software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type A (without Bus Traffic)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis


Tensar
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	INTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
100,000	3,000 psi	70%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar® (2.20.6)

© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar® software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar® software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar® software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar® software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar® software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar® software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Geogrid option calculated with adjusted structural coefficient value (0.17)

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type A (without Bus Traffic)

INTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis


Tensar.
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
100,000	3,000 psi	70%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar+ (2.20.0).
© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar+ software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar+ software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar+ software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar+ software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar+ software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar+ software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Geogrid option calculated with adjusted structural coefficient value (0.17)

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type A (without Bus Traffic)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis

Tensar
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Total HMA thickness should be within the same range on both pavement sections for accurate comparison: 2-3 in | 3-6 in | 6-14 in

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.400	1.200
Aggregate base (NX750)	6 in	0.300	1.800
Structural number (SN)			3.000

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	2 in	0.440	0.880
HMA layer 2	6 in	0.340	2.040
Structural number (SN)			2.920

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
100,000	3,000 psi	70%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar+ (2.00.0)

© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar+ software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar+ software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar+ software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar+ software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar+ software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar+ software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type A (without Bus Traffic)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis


Tensar.
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Stabilized
1,003,000 ESALs



Unstabilized
1,013,500 ESALs

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.400	1.200
Aggregate base (NX750)	12 in	0.237	2.844
Structural number (SN)			4.044

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.440	1.320
HMA layer 2	2 in	0.140	0.280
Aggregate base	17.5 in	0.140	2.450
Structural number (SN)			4.050

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
1,000,000	3,000 psi	70%	0.45	Initial	Terminal
				4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar® (2.0.0.0)

© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar® software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar® software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar® software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar® software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar® software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar® software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type A (with Bus Traffic)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis


Tensar
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
1,000,000	3,000 psi	70%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar+ (2.20.6)

© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar+ software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar+ software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar+ software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar+ software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar+ software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar+ software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Geogrid option calculated with adjusted structural coefficient value

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type A (with Bus Traffic)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis

Tensar.
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Total HMA thickness should be within the same range on both pavement sections for accurate comparison: 2-3 in | 3-6 in | 6-14 in

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.400	1.200
Aggregate base (NX750)	12 in	0.237	2.844
Structural number (SN)			4.044

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.440	1.320
HMA layer 2	8.5 in	0.340	2.890
Structural number (SN)			4.210

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
1,000,000	3,000 psi	70%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar+ (2.20.6)
© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report
You undertake to only use the Tensar+ software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar+ software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar+ software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar+ software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar+ software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar+ software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type A (with Bus Traffic)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis

Tensar
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Total HMA thickness should be within the same range on both pavement sections for accurate comparison: 2-3 in | 3-6 in | 6-14 in

	Thickness	Coeff	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.400	1.200
Aggregate base (NX750)	18 in	0.210	3.780
Structural number (SN)			4.980

	Thickness	Coeff	SN
HMA layer 1	4 in	0.440	1.760
HMA layer 2	6 in	0.140	0.840
Aggregate base	17 in	0.140	2.380
Structural number (SN)			4.980

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
2,000,000	3,000 psi	90%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar® (2.20.6)

© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar® software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar® software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar® software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar® software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar® software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar® software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type B

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis

Tensar
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Total HMA thickness should be within the same range on both pavement sections for accurate comparison: 2-3 in | 3-6 in | 6-14 in

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.400	1.200
Aggregate base (NX750)	18 in	0.210	3.780
Structural number (SN)			4.980

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	4 in	0.440	1.760
HMA layer 2	6 in	0.170	1.020
Aggregate base	13 in	0.170	2.210
Structural number (SN)			4.990

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
2,000,000	3,000 psi	90%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar® (2.20.6)
© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar® software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar® software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar® software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar® software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar® software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar® software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Geogrid option calculated with adjusted structural coefficient value

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type B

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis


Tensar
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Total HMA thickness should be within the same range on both pavement sections for accurate comparison: 2-3 in | 3-6 in | 6-14 in

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.400	1.200
Aggregate base (NX750)	18 in	0.210	2.780
Structural number (SN)			4.980

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	4 in	0.440	1.760
HMA layer 2	6 in	0.210	1.260
Aggregate base	11.5 in	0.170	1.955
Structural number (SN)			4.975

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
2,000,000	3,000 psi	90%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar+ (2.20.0)
© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar+ software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar+ software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar+ software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar+ software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar+ software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar+ software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

6" CTB

Cement Treated Base

Geogrid option calculated with adjusted
structural coefficient value

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type B

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Asphalt Pavement Design Analysis

Tensar
A Division of CMC

Design		Reference	
Project		Location	
Customer		Designer	Murali Subramaniam
Company	InTEC	Date	September 26, 2025

Method of analysis

The calculation method used to create this Tensar software output is the design method for flexible pavements given in the AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures 1993. The enhancement of performance due to the inclusion of Tensar geogrids in the stabilised layer is derived empirically from full scale pavement tests and trafficking trials carried out by independent authorities.

Results



Total HMA thickness should be within the same range on both pavement sections for accurate comparison: 2-3 in | 3-6 in | 6-14 in

	Thickness	Coeff.	SN		Thickness	Coeff.	SN
HMA layer 1	3 in	0.400	1.200	HMA layer 1	4 in	0.440	1.760
Aggregate base (NX750)	18 in	0.210	5.780	HMA layer 2	9.5 in	0.340	3.230
Structural number (SN)			4.969	Structural number (SN)			4.990

Parameters

Project Information

Target ESALs	Subgrade resilient modulus	Reliability	Standard deviation	Serviceability	
				Initial	Terminal
2,000,000	3,000 psi	90%	0.45	4.2	2

This report was prepared using Tensar+ (2.20.6)

© 2021-2025 Tensar International Corporation. All rights reserved. Tensar is a registered trademark.

Limitations of this Report

You undertake to only use the Tensar+ software tool and its output solely to evaluate the application of Tensar geogrids, and strictly according to the Terms of Use. The suitability of the software output and Tensar International's geogrids for any project is the sole responsibility of you, and your employees, contractors or other third parties who access the Tensar+ software tool and its output ("Your Associates"). The Tensar+ software output is merely illustrative and is not a detailed design. You will ensure that you and Your Associates have undergone all necessary training through Tensar International and/or have the necessary expertise and experience to use the Tensar+ software tool and its output correctly and safely. Copyright in the Tensar+ software output belongs to Tensar International. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written permission of Tensar International except to Your Associates provided it is only disclosed for the purpose of evaluating the commercial application for the use of Tensar International's geogrids, and you are fully liable for Your Associates' acts or omissions. The Tensar+ software output does not form the whole or any part of a contract.

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Local Type B

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1


Date:
09/25/2025

InTEC of San Antonio

ASTM D-1883 California Bearing Ratio Test Report



Load Penetration Curve



CBR Results

Results	A	B	C	D	Average
0.1 in Pen.	2.4				
0.2 in Pen.	3.3				
Moisture (%)	19.20				
Density (pcf)	101.40				
Final Moisture (%)	27.60				
Final Density (pcf)	89.10				

Project Number	S251271		Sample Location	
Project Name	Tres Laurels, 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B		Specimen A	Vicinity of TP-3
Date	9/19/2025			
Client	Lennar Homes		Specimen C	
			Specimen D	
Job Ref.			Liquid Limit:	62.0
Sample Num.			Plastic Limit:	20.0
Remarks	Dark Brown Clay			

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

CBR Test Results (Clay)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1


Date:
09/25/2025

InTEC of San Antonio

ASTM D-1883 California Bearing Ratio Test Report



Load Penetration Curve



CBR Results

Results	A	B	C	D	Average
0.1 in Pen.	5.7				
0.2 in Pen.	8.3				
Moisture (%)	11.40				
Density (pcf)	120.70				
Final Moisture (%)	18.20				
Final Density (pcf)	101.60				


Project Number	S251271	Sample Location	
Project Name	Tres Laurels, 1B, 4B, 5A, 5B	Specimen A	Vicinity of TP-10
Date	9/17/2025		
Client	Lennar Homes	Specimen C	
		Specimen D	
Job Ref.		Liquid Limit:	31.0
Sample Num.		Plastic Limit:	14.0
Remarks	Tan Calcareous Clay, Marl, Caliche		

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

CBR Test Results (Marl)

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025



Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

Lime Series

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Appendix

Subsurface Exploration and Pavement Analysis
Proposed New Streets
Tres Laurels, Units 1B, 4B, 5A, & 5B
San Antonio, Texas

InTEC Project Number:
S251271-R1

Date:
09/25/2025

Important Information about This Geotechnical-Engineering Report

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

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

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

Understand the Geotechnical-Engineering Services Provided for this Report

Geotechnical-engineering services typically include the planning, collection, interpretation, and analysis of exploratory data from widely spaced borings and/or test pits. Field data are combined with results from laboratory tests of soil and rock samples obtained from field exploration (if applicable), observations made during site reconnaissance, and historical information to form one or more models of the expected subsurface conditions beneath the site. Local geology and alterations of the site surface and subsurface by previous and proposed construction are also important considerations. Geotechnical engineers apply their engineering training, experience, and judgment to adapt the requirements of the prospective project to the subsurface model(s). Estimates are made of the subsurface conditions that will likely be exposed during construction as well as the expected performance of foundations and other structures being planned and/or affected by construction activities.

The culmination of these geotechnical-engineering services is typically a geotechnical-engineering report providing the data obtained, a discussion of the subsurface model(s), the engineering and geologic engineering assessments and analyses made, and the recommendations developed to satisfy the given requirements of the project. These reports may be titled investigations, explorations, studies, assessments, or evaluations. Regardless of the title used, the geotechnical-engineering report is an engineering interpretation of the subsurface conditions within the context of the project and does not represent a close examination, systematic inquiry, or thorough investigation of all site and subsurface conditions.

Geotechnical-Engineering Services are Performed for Specific Purposes, Persons, and Projects, and At Specific Times

Geotechnical engineers structure their services to meet the specific needs, goals, and risk management preferences of their clients. A geotechnical-engineering study conducted for a given civil engineer

will not likely meet the needs of a civil-works constructor or even a different civil engineer. Because each geotechnical-engineering study is unique, each geotechnical-engineering report is unique, prepared *solely* for the client.

Likewise, geotechnical-engineering services are performed for a specific project and purpose. For example, it is unlikely that a geotechnical-engineering study for a refrigerated warehouse will be the same as one prepared for a parking garage; and a few borings drilled during a preliminary study to evaluate site feasibility will not be adequate to develop geotechnical design recommendations for the project.

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

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

Note, too, the reliability of a geotechnical-engineering report can be affected by the passage of time, because of factors like changed subsurface conditions; new or modified codes, standards, or regulations; or new techniques or tools. *If you are the least bit uncertain about the continued reliability of this report, contact your geotechnical engineer before applying the recommendations in it. A minor amount of additional testing or analysis after the passage of time – if any is required at all – could prevent major problems.*

Read this Report in Full

Costly problems have occurred because those relying on a geotechnical-engineering report did not read the report in its entirety. Do not rely on an executive summary. Do not read selective elements only. *Read and refer to the report in full.*

You Need to Inform Your Geotechnical Engineer About Change

Your geotechnical engineer considered unique, project-specific factors when developing the scope of study behind this report and developing the confirmation-dependent recommendations the report conveys. Typical changes that could erode the reliability of this report include those that affect:

- the site's size or shape;
- the elevation, configuration, location, orientation, function or weight of the proposed structure and the desired performance criteria;
- the composition of the design team; or
- project ownership.

As a general rule, *always* inform your geotechnical engineer of project or site changes – even minor ones – and request an assessment of their impact. *The geotechnical engineer who prepared this report cannot accept*

responsibility or liability for problems that arise because the geotechnical engineer was not informed about developments the engineer otherwise would have considered.

Most of the “Findings” Related in This Report Are Professional Opinions

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

This Report’s Recommendations Are Confirmation-Dependent

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

This Report Could Be Misinterpreted

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

- confer with other design-team members;
- help develop specifications;
- review pertinent elements of other design professionals’ plans and specifications; and
- be available whenever geotechnical-engineering guidance is needed.

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

Give Constructors a Complete Report and Guidance

Some owners and design professionals mistakenly believe they can shift unanticipated-subsurface-conditions liability to constructors by limiting the information they provide for bid preparation. To help prevent the costly, contentious problems this practice has caused, include the complete geotechnical-engineering report, along with any attachments or appendices, with your contract documents, *but be certain to note*

conspicuously that you’ve included the material for information purposes only. To avoid misunderstanding, you may also want to note that “informational purposes” means constructors have no right to rely on the interpretations, opinions, conclusions, or recommendations in the report. Be certain that constructors know they may learn about specific project requirements, including options selected from the report, *only* from the design drawings and specifications. Remind constructors that they may perform their own studies if they want to, and *be sure to allow enough time* to permit them to do so. Only then might you be in a position to give constructors the information available to you, while requiring them to at least share some of the financial responsibilities stemming from unanticipated conditions. Conducting prebid and preconstruction conferences can also be valuable in this respect.

Read Responsibility Provisions Closely

Some client representatives, design professionals, and constructors do not realize that geotechnical engineering is far less exact than other engineering disciplines. This happens in part because soil and rock on project sites are typically heterogeneous and not manufactured materials with well-defined engineering properties like steel and concrete. That lack of understanding has nurtured unrealistic expectations that have resulted in disappointments, delays, cost overruns, claims, and disputes. To confront that risk, geotechnical engineers commonly include explanatory provisions in their reports. Sometimes labeled “limitations,” many of these provisions indicate where geotechnical engineers’ responsibilities begin and end, to help others recognize their own responsibilities and risks. *Read these provisions closely.* Ask questions. Your geotechnical engineer should respond fully and frankly.

Geoenvironmental Concerns Are Not Covered

The personnel, equipment, and techniques used to perform an environmental study – e.g., a “phase-one” or “phase-two” environmental site assessment – differ significantly from those used to perform a geotechnical-engineering study. For that reason, a geotechnical-engineering report does not usually provide environmental findings, conclusions, or recommendations; e.g., about the likelihood of encountering underground storage tanks or regulated contaminants. *Unanticipated subsurface environmental problems have led to project failures.* If you have not obtained your own environmental information about the project site, ask your geotechnical consultant for a recommendation on how to find environmental risk-management guidance.

Obtain Professional Assistance to Deal with Moisture Infiltration and Mold

While your geotechnical engineer may have addressed groundwater, water infiltration, or similar issues in this report, the engineer’s services were not designed, conducted, or intended to prevent migration of moisture – including water vapor – from the soil through building slabs and walls and into the building interior, where it can cause mold growth and material-performance deficiencies. Accordingly, *proper implementation of the geotechnical engineer’s recommendations will not of itself be sufficient to prevent moisture infiltration.* Confront the risk of moisture infiltration by including building-envelope or mold specialists on the design team. *Geotechnical engineers are not building-envelope or mold specialists.*



GEOPROFESSIONAL
BUSINESS
ASSOCIATION

Telephone: 301/565-2733

e-mail: info@geoprofessional.org www.geoprofessional.org