LANGAN

1010 Maulest Chus at Culta 2200

- ----

T. 34E 04E 0000

1010	Market Street, Suite 3300 Philadelphia, PA 19103 1: 215.845.8900 P: 215.845.8901
To:	Francesco Cerrai – City of Philadelphia Department of Public Property
From:	John J.McElroy Jr., PhD, P.E. – LANGAN Tim Garrett, PLA, ASLA – LANGAN
Info:	Jayne Spector, PLA, LEED AP, ASLA – LANGAN
Date:	8 October 2019
Re:	Summary of Test Pit Exploration Miles Mack Playground Philadelphia, Pennsylvania LANGAN Project No.: 220104104

Dhiledelehie DA 10102

This memorandum presents the results of LANGAN's geotechnical engineering study for the existing retaining wall along the southern boundary of the basketball court at Miles Mack Playground in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The purpose of this study was to explore and evaluate the existing retaining wall in an effort to better understand the wall's construction and foundation, as well as to classify the wall's bearing and retained soils. This work was performed in accordance with LANGAN's ASR-2 dated 14 May 2019.

Subsurface Exploration

LANGAN attempted four test pits on 3 September 2019. Test pits TP-1 through TP-3 were located adjacent to the retaining wall, with two located at the top of the wall and one at the base of the wall. Test pit TP-4 was located on the west side of the basketball court playing surface. The test pits were completed by Uni-Tech with a Bobcat E-20 mini-excavator. All test pits were conducted under the full-time supervision of a LANGAN field engineer.

All but one test pit, TP-2, encountered a concrete slab immediately beneath the asphalt surface. The concrete slab at the three test pit locations could not be removed and were abandoned. At completion, test pit TP-2 was backfilled with excavated materials. All test pit surfaces were restored using cold-patch asphalt.

The test pit locations are shown on Figure 1. Test pit logs for all test pits are provided in Attachment A. A sketch of the footing observed in test pit TP-2, including construction material, elevations, depths and soil stratigraphy, are also included in Attachment A. Photographs documenting the test pits are provided in Attachment B. Descriptions of the observations obtained in each test pit are summarized below.

MEMO

<u>Test Pit TP-1</u>

Test pit TP-1 was performed on the high side of the retaining wall near the eastern limit of observed wall deflection. The test pit was performed at the location of a large surface crack that is suspected to be the result of settlement. The test pit surface consisted of two inches of asphalt pavement and was immediately underlain by a concrete slab. The concrete slab could not be removed and the thickness of the slab could not be determined. Photographs 5 and 6 in Attachment B depict test pit TP-1.

Test Pit TP-2

Test pit TP-2 was performed on the low side of the retaining wall at the point of the wall alignment where the most severe wall deflection was observed. The surface layer consisted of three inches of asphalt pavement and two inches of subbase stone. A layer of fill was encountered beneath the surficial layer extending to a depth of 1.75 feet and consisted of reddish brown medium to fine sand with varying amounts of silt, mica, slate, and brick. The fill was underlain by native decomposed mica schist rock consisting of brown, tan, orange-brown, reddish brown, black, and white fine sand with varying amounts of silt, gravel, and mica.

The below-grade portion of the wall beneath the upper brick wall consisted of three courses of concrete masonry unit (CMU) blocks above a single course of brick. The wall was observed bearing on a 12-inch-thick concrete footing. The upper brick wall itself extended below ground surface by a single course of brick before transitioning to the CMU blocks. No structural connection between the lower CMU block wall and the upper brick wall could be discerned. Photographs 1 through 4 in Attachment B depict test pit TP-2.

<u>Test Pit TP-3</u>

Test pit TP-3 was performed on the high side of the retaining wall on the west side of the wall alignment. The test pit was attempted at the location of a crack in the capstone on the wall. The test pit surface consisted of four inches of asphalt pavement and was immediately underlain by a concrete slab. The excavation contractor attempted to cut through the concrete slab with a demolition saw and discovered the concrete slab was at least 4.5 inches thick (full depth of the blade). The concrete slab could not be removed and the thickness of the slab could not be determined. Photograph 7 in Attachment B depicts test pit TP-3.



MEMO

Test Pit TP-4

Test pit TP-4 was performed in near the center of the westernmost basketball court at the location of a large north-to-south crack in the pavement. The test pit surface consisted of three inches of asphalt pavement and was immediately underlain by a concrete slab. The excavation contractor attempted to cut through the concrete slab with a demolition saw and discovered the concrete slab was at least 4.5 inches thick (full depth of the blade). The concrete slab could not be removed and the thickness of the slab could not be determined. A thin flexible membrane was encountered between the asphalt and the concrete slab on the western portion of the test pit, beneath the alignment of the large north-to-south crack. Photographs 8 and 9 in Attachment B depict test pit TP-4.

Evaluation and Recommendations

The movement/rotation of the wall appears to be localized to the western end of the wall alignment. We observed separation between the edge of the paved surface on the basketball court and the brick wall itself. Without knowing the condition of the backfill behind the wall, it is difficult to pinpoint the cause of the wall movement.

Due to the presence of the extensive concrete slab below the asphalt layer of the basketball courts (likely the former playing surface), it was not possible to determine the nature of the backfill materials behind the failing retaining wall nor if there was any type of drainage system behind the wall to relive hydrostatic pressure. We suspect the backfill soils are similar in nature to what was discovered in TP-2 and are more fine-grained and not very permeable. As such, it is our opinion that the retaining wall is tilting as a result of excess lateral earth and water pressures that are beyond the wall's design capacities. Also, the design and age of the wall seem to be a factor. The wall mortar is cracked throughout and the bond between mortar and bricks have broken loose and fallen out at several locations. There are also sections where the upper portion of the wall has laterally displaced several inches relative to the lower portion of the wall. These failures seem to indicate that the wall is unreinforced or just lightly reinforced causing the wall to fail and move.

As a temporary measure, we suggest installing weep holes in the wall to help relieve any buildup of hydrostatic pressure behind the wall. Four-inch diameter weep holes, placed four inches above the playground surface and at 20 feet maximum center-to-center spacing along the full length of the wall are recommended. A filter sock (3/8-inch gravel encased in filter fabric) should be placed within each weep hole in order to prevent soil mining of the wall backfill soil. The weep holes should be covered with a stainless steel mesh cover.





Another interim repair we suggest is to repair loose and missing mortar joints, replacing missing bricks, and sealing the joint between the wall and asphalt surface, and sealing the cracks in the concrete cap. We also recommend prohibiting vehicles from driving on the basketball court within 4 feet of the wall to prevent overloading the wall.

Ultimately, we recommend replacement of the existing retaining wall and replacement with a new wall system that has adequate structural capacity and has been designed for the loads and earth pressures. It should also have provisions for adequate drainage to eliminate hydrostatic pressures against the backside of the wall.

We believe that repairing the damaged and cracked asphalt of the basketball courts at the back side of the wall is prudent to reduce the water infiltration in the backfill materials thereby also reducing the possibility of excess hydrostatic pressure against the backside of the wall. We recommend the use of a geosynthetic paving fabric such as Mirafi MPG100 glass filament reinforced paving composite for this purpose. This product is intended to be used as reinforcement of asphalt, repairing longitudinal cracks, and full-width repair of asphalt surfaces.

Recommended Additional Exploration

We recommend that an additional subsurface exploration be performed on the high side of the retaining wall to determine the condition and composition of the wall backfill material. We recommend a series of six 10-foot deep standard penetration test (SPT) borings, four located on the west side of the basketball court where the wall was observed to be rotating and two on the east side of the basketball court beyond the control joint where the majority of the wall rotation was observed. Refer to Figure 2 for our recommended boring locations. We can provide a proposal for performing the borings and evaluating the results.

FIGURES



Filename: \\langan.com\data\PHL\Data1\220104104\Project Data\CAD\04\SheetFiles\Geotech\220104104-BL101-0101.dwg Date: 9/26/2019 Time: 19:58 User: jplotkin Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: ANSIB-BL



ATTACHMENT A

Test Pit Logs

ROJECT	Miles Mark Playaround			PROJECT NO. 220104104
OCATION	Philadelphia PA			ELEVATION AND DATUM
XCAVATION CO	NTRACTOR			DATE 913/19 COMPLETION DEPTH
XCAVATION EQ	UIPMENT Bobat FOO	1	-	OBSERVED WATER LEVEL DATA
ELEV.	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	DEPTH SCALE		REMARKS
	2" ASPHALT		-	Start at 10:45 AM
	-nu of test pit at d			Soncrete slab below asphalt thickness unknown
				Restored pavement with cold patch asphalt
		4		Stop at 12:00 PM
		5		
		6		
		7		
		8		
		12		
		-14-		

-	Langan
1	Engineering and Environmental Ser

1

neering	and	Enviro	onmer	ital	Ser	vices	Inc.

PROJECT	Miles Mark Planner				PROJECT NO_
LOCATION	Didital in myground			-	ELEVATION AND DATUM
EXCAVAT	Thiladelphia, PA			-	BATE CLUB CONTRACTOR
EVOAVAT	Uni-Tech			_	COMPLETION DEPTH
EXCAVATION	Bobcat E20 mini excavat	σY			OBSERVED WATER LEVEL DATA N/E
ELEV.	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	DEPTH SCALE	NO LOC	TYPE BId	REMARKS
	3" ASPHALT 2" Subbase STONE Brown, reddish brown m-F SAND, some Sile, trace mica, trace slate, trace brick (dry-moist) [FIL] Brown, ban, orange-brown, red-brown, black, &white Fine SAND, some silt, Some Fine glavel, trace mica (dry-moist) [DECOMPOSED MICASCHIST] End of test pit at 4'-0" End of test pit at 4'-0"	1			Stort at 11:05 AM Saweut through asphalt See attached sketch for foundation cross section Backfilled with excavated materie Restard pavement with cold patch asphalt. Stop at 12:00 PM

PROJECT	M.L. M. Pl			PROJECT NO.	
LOCATION	Miles Mack Mayground			2)	0104)04
EXCAVATION	Contractor			DATE	82.8
EXCAVATION	Uni-Tech			DATE 9/3/19	COMPLETION DEPTH
	Bobcat E20 mini exca	vator	_	OBSERVED WATER LEVEL DA	N/E
ELEV.	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	DEPTH SCALE	SAMPL DO TON	RE	MARKS
-	4" ASPHALT	- =		Start at 12:31	0 PM
		$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 $		Concrete Glab bi thickness > 4, Sawcut blad Restored pavement cold patch as Stop at 1:00 ph	elowi asphalt, 5" (depth of e) t with phalt 1

Langan Engineering and Environmental Services Inc.

LOG

OF	TEST	PIT	
			-

TP-4

SHEET 1 OF

-)

LOCATION	Philadelphia, PA		_/	ELEVATION AND DATUM
EXCAVATION	Uni-Tech		_	DATE 9/3/19 COMPLETION DEPTH 3"
	Bobcat E20 mini exco	vator	CANOL	OBSERVED WATER LEVEL DATA N/E
ELEV.	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	DEPTH SCALE	TYPE TYPE	REMARKS
	<u>3" ASPAALT</u> End of trot pit at 3"	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 $		start at 1915 PM Sowert through asphalt Concrete slob below asphalts, throkness >4.5" (depth of Sawert blode) Rubber membrane sandwiched between asphaltd consiele extending beyond west side of test pit (into large surface crack) Restored pavement with cold patch asphalt Stop at 1:30 PM





ATTACHMENT B

Test Pit Photos



Photo 1: Side of excavation on low side of wall. Brick and fill visible in upper 21 inches.





Photo 2: Three courses of CMU block below above-ground brick wall, on top of one course of brick, on top of concrete footing



PN: 220104104



Photo 3: Concrete footing, 12 inches thick and 12 inches protrusion from face of block wall





Photo 4: Top view of test pit on low side of wall



Photo 5: First test pit on high side of wall intended to be excavated at crack in asphalt



LANGAN



Photo 6: First test pit on high side of wall: 2 inches of asphalt underlain by concrete slab



Photo 7: Second test pit on high side of wall: 4 inches of asphalt underlain by a concrete slab. Sawcut concrete slab, thickness unknown (at least 4 inches depth of cut)



PN: 220104104



Photo 8: Third test pit on high side of wall



Photo 9: Rubber membrane sandwiched between asphalt (3 inches) and concrete, possible patch over preexisting crack in concrete (suspected location below crack shown in asphalt in previous photo)

PN: 220104104

