Appendix B

Phase 2 Site Plans

 \mathbf{r}

E:\Shared\Documents\985\Engineering\Grading\985Gr-sht CG01-Res.dwg, 9/29/2014 7:09:08 AM

E:\Shared\Documents\985\Engineering\Grading\985Gr-sht CG02-Res.dwg, 9/29/2014 7:13:27 AM

Appendix C

Oak Tree Study

 $\overline{}$

OAK TREE REPORT

SUBJECT

Agoura Equestrian Estates Tentative Tract Map No. 72316 Agoura Hills

PREPARED FOR Equine Estates, LLC 11911 San Vicente Blvd., Ste. 375 Los Angeles, CA 90049

PREPARED BY

L. NEWMAN DESIGN GROUP, INC. ASLA, California State License #2464 ISA Certified Arborist WE-6820A 31300 Via Colinas, Suite 104 Westlake Village, CA 91362-4579 E-Mail: *lndg@lndg.net* Ph.: (818) 991-5056 Fx.: (818) 991-3478

Date: July 17, 2013 Revision Date: August 18, 2014 LNDG Project No.: 200-463

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

This Document is owned by and is the Sole and Exclusive Property of L. NEWMAN DESIGN GROUP, INC. All Information Contained in this Document is for Use on the Specified Project and shall not be Used/Copied without the Expressed Written Permission of L. NEWMAN DESIGN GROUP, INC.

Agoura Equestrian Estates LNDG Project No. 200-463 Page 2

PROJECT LOCATION

The subject project is a proposed residential development located northeast of the Chesebro Road/Palo Comado Canyon Road intersection in the City of Agoura Hills.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this report is to qualify the present condition of the site's oak trees and to discuss the potential encroachments to them and the effect on the health of the trees. This involved:

- 1. Determining the general condition of the protected oak trees (see **SUMMARY OF FIELD OBSERVATIONS SHEETS**);
- 2. Ascertaining the impacts that will occur due to the proposed development (see grading plan/**OAK TREE LOCATION MAP**);
- 3. Providing guidance to minimize any encroachments of the saved oak trees.

METHOD OF STUDY

Qualifying the oak trees was accomplished by the use of our standard visual survey as completed by **L. NEWMAN DESIGN GROUP, INC.** (**LNDG**) in July of 2013. In the course of fieldwork, we performed the following tasks:

- 1. Oak trees near the proposed development were tagged with numbered, metal tags. These tags are affixed to the sides of the trees and correspond to the numbers on the **OAK TREE LOCATION MAP.** There are additional trees that fall within 250 feet of the property boundary that are not impacted by the development and, therefore, were not tagged.
- 2. Live tree trunks were measured at 3½' above mean natural grade and, if they measured at least 2 inches in diameter, were assessed for health and aesthetic quality. Trees included are within the project boundaries (right of way) or are within 50 feet of the right of way;
- 3. Driplines (the outermost edge of the tree's canopy) were field measured at the eight compass directions equidistant around the circumference of the tree. Most of the trees were land surveyed by and placed on a topographic map/street improvement plan (scale: $1" = 40'$) prepared by HMK Engineering, Inc. Refer to the **OAK TREE LOCATION MAP** included herein for the oak tree locations.

OAK SPECIES

There were 39 oak trees tagged, as noted above, within the developed area. The 39 oak trees referenced in this report consist of 7 *Quercus agrifolia* (coast live oak) and 32 *Quercus lobata* (valley oaks). There are approximately an additional 80 trees that were not tagged or assessed that are outside the proposed development or outside the property boundary and within 250 feet of the boundary. The majority of the additional oaks are *Quercus lobata*.

OAK TREE ORDINANCE

Oak trees of the genus *Quercus* within the City of Agoura Hills are protected by law. City Council Resolution #374 makes the cutting, moving and/or removal of an oak tree without a permit a misdemeanor.

The major thrust of the oak tree policy approved by the Agoura Hills City Council is to establish a theoretical protected zone in regard to the aerial portion of an oak tree. It is felt by the City that this protected zone shall be

Agoura Equestrian Estates

LNDG Project No. 200-463 Page 3

defined as follows: "Using the dripline as a point of reference, the "Protected Zone" shall commence at a point 5' outside the dripline and extend inward to the trunk of the tree. In no case shall the "Protected Zone" trace a circumference less than 15' from the trunk of the oak tree."

RESULTS of STUDY

1. **Physiological Condition of the Oaks**

The trees are generally in good condition. The physiological condition of each tree is detailed in the **SUMMARY of FIELD OBSERVATIONS** contained within this report. All recommendations made on our field forms relate only to the specific dates of our fieldwork.

2. **Summary of Data/Plan Review**

- A. The development that is proposed consists of a new road and cul-e-sac, flood control devices, i.e. rock-lined drainage swales, storm drains, and infiltration basins, and an equestrian trail. Grading for building pads is not a part of this land development project at this time. Of the 39 oak trees inventoried for this project, five oak trees (#28- #32) will be encroached in a minor way as described below:
- B. There is one proposed encroachment by the proposed storm drain line of oak tree #28 which is north of Chesebro Road. The encroachment, as shown on the plan, will occur where the underground storm drain pipes join to empty into the existing creek. The line is shown 2 feet inside the protected zone, 15 feet from the trunk. The actual excavation for the line will be closer, approximately 12 feet from the trunk. Care should be taken to limit construction activity to the side opposite the oak tree. If possible, the pipe location will be re-aligned away from the protected zone but it shall not be re-aligned closer to the tree without City approval. This will be a minor encroachment and no pruning shall be required.
- C. Oak trees #29, #30, #31, and #32 will be slightly encroached by the proposed, graded, drainage swale (and/or the construction activity to build it) east of trees #29-#31 and east of tree #32 at the perimeter of their driplines. Construction activity must be limited and kept close to the area of work between the trees and the swale. The edge of the swale will be approximately 35 feet from the trunks of trees #29 and #30, 22 feet from the trunk of tree #31 and 10 feet from tree #32. These will be a minor encroachments and no pruning shall be required.
- D. The proposed equestrian trail along the western property boundary will encroach trees #29, #30 and #31 by the 8-foot wide trail itself and by the proposed rail fence. Tree #29 is west of the existing masonry wall. Trees #30 and #31 are west of the existing chainlink fence. The trail will consist of 6-inch deep, compacted decomposed granite with redwood header on each side of the trail. The fence posts will be installed 8 feet on center along both sides of the trail from the property line to approximately 8 feet away. The three oak trees are just on the other side of the fence or wall. The excavation for the equestrian trail and posts will be done by hand ensuring no damage will be done to significant roots (roots 2 inches or larger) and preserving roots in place. The post holes shall be excavated without severing significant roots and post hole locations shall be altered to avoid pruning them unless approved by the arborist. This will be a minor encroachment if the work is done to minimize root damage and to avoid compacting the soil in the protected zones of the trees.

Agoura Equestrian Estates

LNDG Project No. 200-463 Page 4

- E. The proposed new equestrian trail from the beginning of the new road, where it will intersect Chesebro Road, to where the new trail will join the existing equestrian trail between trees #4 and #5, 150 feet away, will be aligned so that it will not impact any protected oak trees. The new trail for this 150 foot length shall be a cleared pathway to join the existing dirt trail and will not cause any impact to the oak trees although it will pass through the protected zone of oak tree #1. This encroachment will be insignificant because a trail will not be constructed within the protected zone of tree #1
- F. No oaks are proposed to be removed and no pruning will be required.

3. **Mitigation Recommendations**

- A. All trees to be saved in place shall be protected with a chain link fence outside of the protected zone or at the limit of the approved excavation or construction. No construction activity shall take place within the protected zones of any oak tree other than tree #29 if the encroachment cannot be eliminated as described above.
- B. Any City approved work within the protected zones of the saved oak trees, if any, including branch removals, shall be under the direct inspection/observation of an arborist.
- C. Copies of the oak tree report, the oak tree permit, and the City approved site plan, as well as landscape and irrigation plans, shall be kept on site during all site construction.

OAK TREE PRESERVATION PROGRAM

As development occurs around the saved oak trees, they will become dependent upon the future residents for their care and preservation. All construction activities shall follow our established **PRESERVATION PROGRAM**. This program was developed to control the impacts to each tree and to protect them from any unnecessary and unscheduled damage.

Consideration of disease and pest control will play a major role in such a program and for the most part will be long range. The best protection against any problem is to build up the tree's natural defenses and to avoid wounding whenever possible. The proper mitigation measures will encourage vigorous growth within the trees, so that their compartmentalization can effectively control disease.

All oak tree mitigation techniques shall be inspected/observed on-site by the City arborist. The City shall be notified 48 hours prior to any work that is planned within the protected zone of any oak tree. The following list of recommendations (**PRESERVATION PROGRAM**), if followed, should insure that the saved trees will remain valuable assets to the community:

1. **Tree Protection**

A. Before any site construction commences, some specified trees shall be protected with a minimum 5' high chain link fence. Fencing shall be installed to minimize damage that might occur due to equipment storage, debris dumping, parking, etc. within the oak tree protected zones. This fence shall remain during all phases of construction and shall not be moved or removed without the approval of the City of Agoura Hills Planning & Community Development Department (Planning Dept.).

LNDG Project No. 200-463 Page 5

- B. Fence posts shall be no closer than 15' from any oak tree trunk as well as being no closer than 15' on-center within any dripline. Digging the fence postholes shall not cause the severing of any oak tree roots larger than 2 inches.
- C. Signs of a minimum size of 2'x2' shall be installed on the fence equidistant around each tree. On a grove of trees, sign shall be spaced 50' apart. The signs must read:

WARNING **- THIS FENCE SHALL NOT BE REMOVED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION FROM THE CITY OF AGOURA HILLS PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**.

D. Any brush clearance within the dripline areas shall be completed by handwork only.

2. **Pruning and Dead Wood Removal (not anticipated)**

A. A certified arborist shall perform all pruning cuts according to the International Society of Arborists' Best Management Practices: Tree Pruning and according to ANSI A300 pruning standard. Work shall be performed in accordance with the ANSI Z133.1 safety standard.

3. **Water & Fertilization**

- A. Watering should not be done during the months of June, July, and August unless the root system has been compromised by damage done to some of the roots. If recommended by an arborist, water should be applied no more than once or twice a week and allowed to drain thoroughly before more water is applied.
- B. Fertilization of these native oak trees is not ordinarily recommended and should not be done unless approved by the City arborist.

4. **Diseases and Pests**

- A. Prior to construction, the vigor of the saved trees shall be assessed. Any trees in a weakened condition shall be treated, as deemed necessary by the City arborist to invigorate them.
- B. During all phases of construction, the health of the trees shall be monitored for signs of disease. These problems, if determined to exist, shall be addressed in order to remedy them.

5. **Grading Within the Protected Zone**

Exploratory trenching shall be done by hand or with great care by digging equipment under the observation of the consulting arborist for all trees proposed to be encroached by this project. This shall be done in order to minimize the damage to the root system by digging and to allow the proper pruning of the roots that are found. If any roots 2 inches or larger are encountered, they shall be saved (except in a grading cut situation) and covered with a layer of plastic cloth until backfilled.

6. **Other Considerations**

A. Do not nail grade stakes or attach anything to a tree that causes damages to the tree.

- $B.$ Do not install any planting, irrigation, or utilities within 15' of any native oak tree trunk unless approved by the Planning Dept.
- C. Do not apply chemical herbicides within 100' of any native oak tree dripline.
- D. Dust accumulation onto the tree's foliage from construction shall be hosed off periodically during construction under the recommendation of the consulting arborist.
- E. A certification letter is required by the Planning Dept. upon completion of all work to the oak trees. This letter shall be submitted within five (5) working days of project completion.

NOTICE of DISCLAIMER:

This report represents the independent opinion of the signatory consultant (L. NEWMAN DESIGN GROUP, INC.). The tree(s) discussed herein was/were generally reviewed for physical, biological function and aesthetic conditions. This examination was conducted in accordance with presently accepted industry procedures, which are a ground-plane macro-visual observation only. No extensive microbiological, soil-root excavations, upper crown examination nor internal tree investigations were conducted. Therefore, the reporting herein reflects the overall visual appearance of the tree(s) on the date reviewed and no warranty is implied as to the potential failure, health or demise of any part or of whole of any tree described in the report. Records may not remain accurate after our inspection due to unknown causes of changeable deterioration of the reviewed site.

Respectfully submitted,

L. NEWMAN DESIGN GROUP, INC. ASLA, California State License #2464

John Oblinger OAK TREE CONSULTANT Certified Arborist WE-6820A

OAK TREE PHOTOGRAPHS

OAK TREES 1, 2 &3 - FACING WEST

OAK TREE 4 - FACING EAST

OAK TREE 5 - FACING WEST

OAK TREE 6 - FACING WEST

OAK TREE 7 - FACING NORTH

OAK TREE 8-10 - FACING EAST

OAK TREE 11, 14-18 - FACING SOUTHEAST

OAK TREE 12 - FACING EAST

OAK TREE 13 - FACING WEST

OAK TREE 19 - FACING WEST

OAK TREE 20-23 - FACING EAST

OAK TREE 24 - FACING SOUTHEAST

OAK TREE 25 - FACING NORTH

OAK TREE 26 - FACING NORTH

OAK TREE 27 - FACING NORTH

OAK TREE 28 - FACING NORTH

OAK TREE 29 - FACING NORTH

OAK TREE 30 - FACING SOUTH

OAK TREE 31 - FACING SOUTH

OAK TREE 32 - FACING SOUTH

OAK TREE 33-34 - FACING SOUTH

OAK TREE 35 - FACING EAST

OAK TREE 36-37 - FACING WEST

OAK TREE 38-39 - FACING SOUTH

INSPECTION NOTICE

The following information was observed on the date(s) indicated herein, and should only be considered true at the time of field inspection.

DRIPLINE MEASUREMENTS

INSPECTION NOTICE

The following information was observed on the date(s) indicated herein, and should only be considered true at the time of field inspection.

DRIPLINE MEASUREMENTS

DRIPLINE MEASUREMENTS

DRIPLINE MEASUREMENTS

DRIPLINE MEASUREMENTS

DEFINITIONS

SUMMARY of FIELD OBSERVATIONS DEFINITIONS

INTRODUCTION

Familiarity with the following definitions is necessary to the basic understanding of the tree ordinance, this tree report, and of the procedures used to evaluate the trees and the site conditions. There are numerous diseases and insects that frequently attack trees. A long discourse in plant pathology or entomology is not a prerequisite to develop a basic understanding of the effects of disease and insects upon living plant tissue but a basic knowledge of disease and insects should include an understanding of the following definitions:

EQRM

- 1. Tree Number - each protected tree in the field has been assigned a number that corresponds to a tree location on the "Tree Location Map".
- $2.$ Species - is the type of tree that is being evaluated.
- 3. Number of Trunks - as measured in accordance to the ordinance existing at the time of evaluation.
- Diameter of Trunks as measured at 41/2' above mean natural grade. $\mathbf{4}$
- 5. Tree Height - is the approximate height of each numbered, evaluated tree.
- 6. Leaning - is the direction the tree is inclined from the natural vertical position.

PHYSICAL CONDITION

- Trunk Cavity/Damage A Cavity is a hollow area in the trunk, usually due to wood decay. Damage is a 1. damaged area on the trunk, usually due to an external force onto the tree.
- $2.$ Exposed Roots - roots exposed near tree; e.g. in creek bed.
- 3. **Exfoliating Bark - the flaking off of bark from trunk, branches and/or twigs.**
- Water Pocket pockets formed at branch crotches that can hold water and possibly weaken the tree's 4. structure (possible hazard).
- 5. **Exudation - the issuance or expelling of liquid, usually from wounds.**
- 6. Fruiting Bodies - are the external signs (i.e. mushrooms, conks) of internal wood decay.
- Insect/Mite Damage is some form of damage to the parts of the tree caused by insects or mites (i.e. scale, $\overline{7}$. caterpillars, weevils, borers, mites, etc.).
- Galls/Oak Pit Scale Galls are abnormal growth (tumors) on the tree, which may be caused by insects, 8. mites, bacteria, etc. Oak Pit Scale has a severe weakening effect on the twigs, sometimes resulting in their death. When the scale settles on the twig, a swelling of the twig tissue occurs so that the insect, in effect, is in a pit, hence, the name.
- Fire Damage each tree is rated on the amount of bum it has received. These are: 9.

Percent of Tree Burned Category

 $0\% - 25\%$ Slight (S) Moderate (M) 26% - 75% Heavy (H) 76% - 100% Complete (C) Burned to the ground

DEFINITIONS

General Trees

Page 2 of 3

- A check mark only, indicates a sign of past fire damage: А.
- The trees with slight damage have an excellent chance of recovering to their original form. Trees with moderate **B.** damage have a good chance of recovery with alterations in form. Heavy percentage of burn on trees will significantly alter their form and lower their probability of survival to half:
- Ċ. The "complete" category is for those trees that burned to the ground.
- $10.$ Mainstem Dieback - death of healthy mainstems from the growing tip back.
- Branch Cavities hollow areas in the trunk or limbs in the upper tree, usually due to the decay of wood. $11₁$
- $12.$ Weak Crotches - poorly formed branch attachments.
- $13.$ Twig/Branch Dieback - death of unhealthy twigs from the growing tip back.
- Exocormic Growth excessive growth along main limbs, rather than on twigs. $14.$
- $15.$ Thin Foliage - defoliation and twig dieback throughout the canopy.
- 16. Vigor - is the capacity of a tree for growth and survival. Below are the ratings:

Good (G) - New tip growth; good leaf color; relatively smooth bark free from cracks/decay; Moderate (M) - Some new tip growth; medium leaf color; some dead wood; thinning crown; Poor (P) - No new tip growth; poor leaf color; abnormal bark; much dead wood; heavily thinned crown. A vigorous tree will more easily ward off disease and/or insect attacks, and should recover from impacts more quickly than a weak tree.

- $17.$ Terrain - refers to the topography of the land where the tree is found.
- Potential Hazard any tree may be more or less a hazard to people depending on its location and/or health. 18.

RATINGS

- The Health of the trees was visually determined from a macroscopic inspection of signs and symptoms of $1.$ disease. The following describes our system:
	- Outstanding A healthy and vigorous tree characteristic of its species and free of any visible signs of A. disease or pest infestation:
	- Above Average A healthy and vigorous tree. However, there are minor visible signs of disease and **B.** pest infestation:
	- C. Average - Although healthy in overall appearance, there is a normal amount of disease and/or pest infestation:
	- Below Average/Poor* This tree is characterized by exhibiting a greater degree of disease and/or D. pest infestation or structural instability than normal and appears to be in a state of decline. This tree also exhibits extensive signs of dieback;
	- Dead* This tree exhibits no signs of life whatsoever at the time of field evaluation. Ε. A tree rating of "D" and lower is in a low stage of vigor and naturally a meaningful level of recovery is
doubtful. Removal should be considered if it is within the proposed project development.
- The Aesthetic/Conformity quality of the trees was visually determined from an overall inspection of 2. appearance. The following describes our system:
	- Outstanding The tree is visually symmetrical, having the ideal form & appearance for the species; А.
	- Average The tree, though non-symmetrical, has an appealing form for the species with very little В. dieback of foliage or twigs/branches;
	- Below Average The tree is non-symmetrical for the species with an unappealing form and/or has C. much dieback of foliage and twigs/branches;

DEFINITIONS General Trees Page 3 of 3

D. Poor - The tree has few positive characteristics and may detract from the beauty of the landscape.

TREATMENT

- Remove Dead Wood if noticeable dead wood in the canopy makes tree unattractive, it can be removed. $1.$
- $2.$ Remove Wire, etc. - if anything has been physically attached to the tree, it should be removed.
- $3¹$ Insect/Disease Treatment - see TREE PRESERVATION PROGRAM within this report for explanation.
- $4¹$ Cable/Brace - can extend the time the tree remains healthy, attractive and hazard free;
- 5. None - no treatment is recommended.
- 6. Remove Tree - if the tree can't be saved through any type of treatment, it should be removed.

REMARKS (Some other terms that may be used)

- $1.$ Basal Growth - is leaf growth generating from around base of trunk.
- $2.$ Exposed Buttress Roots - when soil is absent at the base of the tree.
- $3₁$ Heart Rot - is decomposition of heartwood (the central portion of a twig/branch/trunk).
- Powdery Mildew are leaves that are covered by a white powdery growth generally when new growth $4.$ becomes wet for long periods of time; leaves may be distorted, stunted and drop prematurely.
- Cankers are rough swellings with depressed centers resulting in death of tissue that later cracks open and 5. exposes the wood underneath in twigs, branches, and/or trunks.
- 6. Chlorotic Leaves - leaf veins remain normally green, but the tissue between veins becomes yellow, which is usually caused by nutrient deficiencies.
- $7₁$ Mottling - are leaves that have a variegated pattern of green and yellow.
- 8. Defoliation - is a premature leaf drop.
- 9. Bark Beetle Frass - are wood fragments mixed in the insect's excrement.
- Witches Broom is an abnormal growth cluster of twigs that may be caused by pruning, insects, mites, $10.$ fungus, etc.
- Mistletoe is a leafy evergreen perennial parasite with dark green leathery leaves. $11.$
- Crowded is a tree within the canopy of an adjacent tree or canopy. $12.$
- Shading Out is the defoliation and twig dieback inside the canopy due to the lack of sunlight. $13.$

G:\HortDept\Reports\Support Data\Definitions\Definitions - General Trees.doc

OAK TREE LOCATION MAP

Memo

As requested, we reviewed the following materials submitted with respect to the subject entitlement request:

 Oak Tree Report prepared by L. Newman Design Group, Inc. dated July 17, 2013, revised August 18, 2014 and received by the City of Agoura Hills September 19, 2014

Following are our comments with respect to the oak trees for the subject entitlement request:

Oak Trees

The subject property, consisting of approximately 69 acres, is located within an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County adjacent to the City of Agoura Hills, northeast of the Ventura Freeway Palo Comado Interchange. As part of an annexation and development agreement project the current entitlement request seeks permission to subdivide the two undeveloped lots into 15 residential lots and two open-space lots. The site is currently zoned 'light agricultural'. Proposed zoning is 'residential very low' for the 20 acres that would be subdivided into single-family residential lots. The applicant proposes to donate the remaining 49 acres to a public entity, to be named at a later date, to be designated 'open space deed restricted'. The request also seeks permission to construct a private road, equestrian trails, and drainage facilities. Development of the residences is not part of the currently proposed project. As each residence is proposed, an oak tree report will be necessary to determine potential impacts to individual oak trees within the residential lot.

There are a total of approximately 119 coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and valley oak trees (*Q*. *lobata*) on or adjacent to the site. Thirty-nine coast live oak and valley oak trees are located within 50 feet of the proposed development. Fourteen of these oak trees are located on the property and the remaining 25 oak trees are located on the adjacent properties.

No oak trees would be removed to accommodate the road, equestrian trails, and drainage facilities. One hundred fourteen of the existing oak trees would be retained with no direct impacts.

Construction of the private road, equestrian trails, and drainage facilities as proposed would encroach within the protected zones of five oak trees located within 50 feet of the proposed development. Construction of the drainage swale near the westerly property line would result in encroachment within the edge of the protected zone of Oak Tree 29, and within the protected zone but outside the dripline of Oak Tree 32. Construction of a new storm drain would encroach within the protected zone but outside the dripline of Oak Tree 28. Impacts to these three trees should be minor and as long as the work is performed carefully the trees should not experience any long term impacts. The proposed equestrian trail and the fence to run along its easterly side will encroach within the driplines of Oak Trees 29, 30, and 31 which are located off-site on the properties to the west. Impacts to these three trees should be

minor to moderate but as long as the work is performed carefully the trees should not experience any long term impacts.

Following are our comments and recommended conditions of approval with respect to the oak trees for the subject entitlement request:

Oak Trees

- 1. The applicant is permitted to encroach within the protected zones of Oak Trees 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32 in order to complete the approved site development program.
- 2. No activities are permitted within the protected zone of the remaining 114 oak trees. They shall be preserved in place with no direct impacts.
- 3. All excavation within the protected zones of Oak Trees 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32 shall be performed using hand tools only under the direct observation of the applicant's oak tree consultant.
- 4. The applicant shall comply with all mitigation measures recommended in the above Revised Oak Tree Report.
- 5. The applicant shall provide forty-eight (48) hour notice prior to the start of any approved work within the protected zone of any oak tree.
- 6. The project shall be subject to periodic inspections by the City of Agoura Hills Landscape and Oak Tree Consultant. The number and timing of the inspections shall be determined by the Director of Planning and Community Development and the City Landscape and Oak Tree Consultant to ensure compliance by the applicant.
- 7. No planting or irrigation is permitted within the protected zone of an existing oak tree without approval from the City of Agoura Hills Landscape and Oak Tree Consultant.
- 8. Prior to the start of any mobilization or construction activities on the site, Oak Trees shall be fenced at the edge of the protected zone in strict accordance with Article IX, Appendix A, Section V.C.1.1 of the City of Agoura Hills Oak Tree Preservation and Protection Guidelines. The City Oak Tree Consultant shall approve the fencing location subsequent to installation and prior to the start of any mobilization or work on the site.
- 9. No vehicles, equipment, materials, spoil or other items shall be used or placed within the protected zone of any oak tree at any time, except as specifically required to complete the approved work.
- 10. No pruning of live wood shall be permitted unless specifically authorized by the City Oak Tree Consultant. Any authorized pruning shall be performed by a qualified arborist under the direct observation of the applicant's oak tree consultant. All pruning operations shall be consistent with ANSI A300 Standards – Part 1 Pruning and the most recent edition of the International Society of Arboriculture Best Management Practices for Tree Pruning.
- 11. Upon completion of construction, each existing oak tree shall be mulched throughout the dripline with three inches (3") of approved organic mulch as needed to supplement natural leaf litter where encroachment has occurred.
- 12. Within ten (10) calendar days of the completion of work and prior to removal of the protective fencing, the applicant shall contact the City Oak Tree Consultant to perform a final inspection. The applicant shall proceed with any remedial measures the City Oak Tree Consultant deems necessary to protect or preserve the health of the subject oak trees at that time.

Appendix D

Floral Compendium Faunal Compendium

 $\overline{}$

Floral Compendium

Faunal Compendium

Appendix E

Geotechnical Evaluation

 $\overline{}$

Geotechnical Site Evaluation Proposed Agoura Equestrian Estates East of Chesebro Road and North of US 101 Agoura Hills, California

prepared for

Fortune Realty LLC 5423 Village Road, Suite 200 Long Beach, CA 90808

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attachments:

Applied Earth Sciences 3595 Old Conejo Road Geotechnical Engineers Engineering Geologists

DSA Accepted Testing Laboratory

DSA Accepted Testing Laboratory DSA Accepted Testing Laboratory 805 375-9262

Special Inspection and Materials Testing 805 375-9262 Special Inspection and Materials Testing

July 24, 2013

805 375-9263 fax

Fortune Realty LLC Work Order: 2232-0-FR-100 5423 Village Road, Suite 200 Long Beach, CA 90808

Attention: Mr. Benjamin Efraim

Subject: **Geotechnical Site Evaluation, Proposed Agoura Equestrian Estates, East of Chesebro Road and North of US 101, Agoura Hills, California.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to our proposal dated March 22, 2013 (Proposal Number: 5699-10) addressed to Fortune Realty LLC we are providing herein a site evaluation of the property east of Chesebro Road and north of US 101 in Agoura Hills, California. Property development addressed in this report consists of large equestrian style residential lots as shown on Plate 1 based on the grading plan prepared by HMK Engineering, Inc. This map serves as the base map for our Geotechnical Map (Plate 1) showing the site, proposed development, and approximate points of prior subsurface exploration.

This evaluation and report were prepared as a stand alone document to address the current proposed residential development of the site and supersedes the referenced geotechnical reports addressing the site and previous proposed developments. Our prior evaluation report and responses to reviews of the County of Los Angeles are listed following the text of this report under References. Based on our site evaluation, the property is suitable for the proposed residential construction from a geotechnical standpoint provided recommendations presented herein are implemented in the project design and construction. Descriptions of the site and geologic units along with our conclusions and recommendations are presented within the text of this report.

Remedial grading will be necessary to prepare the site for the proposed development. Remedial grading will consist of the stabilization of a landslide, removal of the upper soils within the lower portions of the property, and undercutting the bedrock areas to provide a minimal thickness of engineered compacted fill below the proposed residential buildings. Setback of the buildings from the ascending slopes will be needed per the City of Agoura Hills Building Code. Detail grading and site preparation recommendations are presented later in the text of this report.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The property will be developed for fifteen equestrian style residential lots as shown on Plate 1. Conventional cut and fill grading will be used to construct the building pads and access drives within the valley floor. The building pads will be raised above the valley floor as shown on Plate 1 and no major cut slopes are planned into the hillsides. Access to the lots will be via a private road from Cheseboro Road. The drive off Cheseboro Road is also anticipated to carry standard utilities including public domestic sewer. Cut and fill slopes shown on Plate 1 are shallow in gradient at roughly 5(horizontal):1(vertical) at maximum heights of roughly 12 and 5 feet, respectively.

No architectural plans have been reviewed for this site evaluation. However, the homes are anticipated to be of wood with limited steel framing supported on conventional foundations with concrete slabs on grade. Structural loads should be relatively light with column loads of less than 10 kips and continuous foundation loads of roughly 1 kip per linear foot.

3. SCOPE OF SERVICES

The purpose of this scope of services was to evaluate our previously acquired subsurface and laboratory data and perform analyses to provide geotechnical recommendation for design and construction of the proposed residential development. Our scope of services outlined below was performed under the supervision of a State registered geotechnical engineer and certified engineering geologist.

3.1 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Regional geologic maps and prior geotechnical reports for the site in our files (see attached reference list) were reviewed for this site evaluation. Additional pertinent geologic and geotechnical literature in our files was researched to assist characterization of the site.

3.2 GEOLOGIC MAPPING

Previously detailed geologic mapping of existing surficial exposures on and adjacent the site was performed by this firm. As part of this evaluation a geologist from our office visited the site to evaluate if readily observable changes have occurred to the property since our prior reports were prepared. The previously acquired data was utilized in the current site evaluation.

3.3 SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION AND SAMPLING

For our prior evaluation of the site a detailed program of subsurface exploration was performed within the property. The program consisted of fifteen bucket auger borings excavated to depths ranging from 21 feet (borings B-1 through B-7) to 63.5 feet (B-13) below the ground surface. The borings were excavated by a subcontractor supplied and operated, truck mounted bucket auger drilling rig. Bulk and relatively undisturbed drive samples were obtained from each bucket auger boring for geotechnical laboratory testing. Where safety permitted, the borings were entered by a geologist for detailed "down-hole" logging. Logs of these exploratory excavations are presented in Appendix A along with the exploratory borings by Applied Earth Sciences (1998).

3.4 LABORATORY TESTING

A program of laboratory testing was performed previously by this firm to evaluate the geotechnical properties of the samples obtained during the referenced drilling operations. Testing included expansion potential, shear strength, in-situ moisture content and dry density, consolidation potential, and compaction characteristics (see Appendix B). The prior laboratory testing was supplement for this evaluation with collection of samples for corrosion testing. The samples were submitted to an independent corrosion engineer for testing and report preparation. The completed corrosion report is presented in Appendix B.

3.5 GEOLOGIC AND GEOTECHNICAL ANALYSES

Geologic data from archival research, geologic mapping, and subsurface exploration is presented on the Geotechnical Map (Plate 1) along with Geotechnical Cross Sections (Plate 2) to illustrate geologic structure and relationships between geologic structure, geologic units, and proposed grades. In addition, select cross sections were evaluated for slope stability with the results presented in Appendix C. Rough grading requirements were evaluated including remedial grading (i.e., stability fills or buttresses),

removal depths, and shrinkage and subsidence. Foundation recommendations were prepared based upon subsurface information and laboratory test results. Preliminary recommendations for structural sections (pavements) are also presented herein.

3.6 REPORT

This report was prepared to summarize our geotechnical evaluation of the proposed residential site development. This summary includes geologic setting, description of geologic units, geologic structure, ground water conditions, seismicity, and summary of earth material properties. The report includes logs of subsurface exploration, geotechnical map, geologic cross sections, laboratory test methods and results, stability analyses, and design and construction recommendations.

4. SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site is northeast of the intersection of Chesebro Road and the Ventura Freeway (101) within Agoura Hills (Figure 1). The site is in a relatively level alluvial valley (on the eastern side of Palo Comado Canyon) surrounded by ascending hills on the north, east, and south. Existing slope gradients range from nearly level in the alluvial valley floor to locally as steep as 2(h):1(v) on the surrounding hillsides. Drainage of the property is accomplished generally by sheet and rill flow off the hillsides to incised ravines that outlet onto the valley floor and sheet flow to the northwest where a creek is located on the western side of Chesebro Road. Total relief of the property is roughly 230 feet.

Vegetation on the site consists of seasonal weeds and grasses with some native scrub and oak trees on the hillside areas.

5. SITE GEOLOGY

5.1 LITHOLOGY

Two Miocene-age sedimentary bedrock formations underlie the property. These units have been referred to the middle Miocene Calabasas Formation and middle to upper Miocene Modelo Formation. Surficial deposits on-site include topsoil/colluvial soils, Quaternary to Recent age alluvial deposits and landslide debris. These units are described below with detailed exploration excavation specific descriptions presented on the logs of Borings (Appendix A). The interpreted areal distribution and structural relationships of these units (except for topsoil/colluvium) are shown on the attached Geotechnical Map (Plate 1) and Cross Sections (Plate 2).

5.1.1 Calabasas Formation

Representing the oldest rock unit exposed on-site, the Calabasas Formation underlies the southern half of the property. While natural exposures are rare because of its residual soil mantle, as encountered in Borings B-2, B-3, B-4, B-6, B-12, B-13, B-14, and B-15, the on-site Calabasas Formation consists of claystone and clayey siltstone interbedded with silty fine-grained sandstone. Colors vary from light olive brown, dark brown, yellowish brown and gray for the silt/claystones and yellowish-brown, olive to brownish yellow and light gray for the sandstone. The bedrock unit is generally thinly bedded, weathered, and fractured (ellipsoidal fractures) with scattered calcium carbonate filled fractures and iron staining. At depth the Calabasas Formation becomes less weathered, indurated, and unoxidized light and dark gray in color.

Structurally, the Calabasas bedrock is inclined to the north-northeast at moderate to steep angles (28 to 78 degrees). This overall structure is consistent with regional geologic maps (Yerkes et al. 1993, Dibblee 1992) that indicate bedding is generally inclined to the northeast at moderate angles (30 to 45 degrees). Variations in bedding orientation and inclinations were noted particularly in Borings B-13 and B14 where local zones of tight chevron folding were observed in the subsurface, and at limited ridge/ranch road cut exposures.

5.1.2 Modelo Formation

Overlying the Calabasas Formation and in slight angular unconformity, the Modelo Formation underlies the hillside terrain of the northeastern portion of the site. Similar to the Calabasas Formation on site, natural exposures are few due to residual soil development. As encountered in Borings B-5, B-8, B-9, B-10, B-11, and at limited ridge/ranch road cut exposures, the Modelo Formation consists of interbedded clayey siltstone, claystone, and fine-grained sandstone. Diatomaceous siltstone commonly with fossil fish scales and occasional interbeds of siliceous fissile shale were also encountered in outcrop and in the exploratory borings. Colors vary from light yellowish to olive brown and gray to dark gray for the silt/claystone and pale yellow to light gray for the sandstone. Generally thinly bedded to fissile, the Modelo Formation is slightly weathered and fractured. Fractures often have gypsum infillings and iron oxide staining.

Structurally, the bedding is inclined to the north at moderate to steep angles (25 to 53 degrees). Tight folding was not observed within the Modelo Formation on-site. Regional maps (Yerkes, et al., 1993, Dibblee, 1992) indicate the Modelo Formation in this area is inclined to the northeast at moderate angles (25-32 degrees).

5.1.3 Alluvium

Alluvial soils were encountered in the main valley area of the property in borings B-1 through B-7, B-12, and B-15. The thickness of these soils ranges from at least 21 feet (B-1) to 6 feet (B-15). As observed in the borings, the alluvium generally consists of very dark grayish brown to light olive brown to yellowish brown silty clay with various amounts of sand in a very stiff to hard and moist condition. Scattered cobbles and gravel composed of siltstone were noted as were scattered carbonate veinlets. Based on laboratory data, the alluvium is not subject to significant consolidation and when wetted under load, expansion occurs rather than hydrocollapse.

5.1.4 Residual Soil

Residual soil typically mantles the bedrock and alluvial soils on the site and generally consists of light olive brown slightly sandy clay to clayey sand in a hard and moist condition. The thickness of this material varies from 1 to 4.5 feet.

5.1.5 Artificial Fill

Man made fills exist supporting Palo Comado/Driver Road and locally are associated with existing dirt roads on site. While not encountered in the exploratory borings, the fills are anticipated to be composed of soils locally derived from bedrock and alluvium.

5.2 LANDSLIDES

A rotational landslide was encountered in the area of boring B-10. Interpreted to be a relatively shallow failure, 10-15 feet thick, the failure surface was encountered at 11 feet below the ground surface in B-10 and is comprised of gray plastic clay inclined at 5 degrees to the southwest. Truncated beds were observed just above the slide plane with scattered fractures filled with gypsum. No other landslides were encountered during this evaluation. Although suspected features have been delineated by others, these features were drilled and no evidence of a landslide was encountered.

5.3 GROUNDWATER

Groundwater was encountered as minor seepage in boring B-6 at 19.5 ft, B-8 at 26 ft, B-9 at 25 ft, B-10 from 20 to 29 ft, B-11 below 36.5 ft, B-12 at 18 and heavy flow below 25 ft, B-13 below 28 ft, B-14 at 27 ft, and B-15 below 12 ft deep.

5.4 FAULTING AND SEISMICITY

Agoura Hills and surrounding area are in a seismically active region prone to occasional damaging earthquakes. The destructive power of earthquakes can be grouped into fault-rupture, ground shaking

(strong motion), and secondary effects of ground shaking such as tsunami, liquefaction, settlement, landslides, etc. The hazard of fault-rupture is generally thought to be associated with a relatively narrow zone along well defined pre-existing active or potentially active faults. No doubt there are and will be exceptions to this, because it is not possible to predict the precise location of a new fault where none existed before (CDMG, 1975). No active or potentially active faults are known to cross the site and the site is not currently within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as defined by the State Geologist (Bryant and Hart, 2007). The potential for ground rupture due to faulting onsite during the lifetime of the project is considered remote.

Nevertheless, the property will be subject to strong ground motion from occasional earthquakes in the region. Significant earthquakes have occurred within a 40 mile radius of the site within the last 3 decades. The 1994 Northridge earthquake produced strong ground motion at the site with peak horizontal acceleration between 20 and 40 percent of gravity (0.2g to 0.4g) [Chang, et al., 1994]. Therefore, it is likely significant earthquakes will occur in the region within the life of the proposed project.

Based on the latest United States Geological Survey (USGS) interactive web application, *2008 Interactive Deaggregations* <https://geohazards.usgs.gov/deaggint/2008/>, probabilistic seismic hazard analyses (PSHA) predict the Design Basis Earthquake peak ground acceleration will be on the order of 0.40g for the soft rock (Vs=475 m/sec) conditions of the site (Lat. 34.145°N, Long. 118.735°W). The Design Basis Ground Motion is defined as having a 10% chance of being exceeded in 50 years is based on probabilistic analyses. The mean magnitude from this PSHA is 6.76 (Mw) with a mean distance of 18.9 km from the property with a modal magnitude of 7.02 (Mw) and a modal distance of 13.5 km from the property.

Secondary effects of strong ground motion include tsunami, seiche, liquefaction, seismic settlement, landslides, etc. Tsunami (seismic sea wave) and seiche (standing wave) are effects not inherent to the site given its inland location and lack of large bodies of water proximal to the site. The potential for earthquake induced landslides is discussed in the slope stability section and Appendix C of this report.

5.5 LIQUEFACTION

Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon were saturated soils with low cohesion lose strength when severely shaken and develop excess pore pressures. Due to the excess pore pressures the soils react more as a liquid than a soil and during shaking or after the shaking subsides settlement or lateral movement can occur. The potential for liquefaction is currently of most concern in the upper 50 feet of the subsurface profile.

The area of proposed residential construction is underlain by either bedrock at the surface or at a shallow depth within the alluvial valley. For example in borings B-2, -3, -4, and -6 bedrock was encountered at depths of 19, 18, 14.5, and 9 feet (Gorian, 1999). Also, in borings B-1, -2, and -3 bedrock was encountered at depths of 16, 13.5, and 14.5 feet, respectively (AES, 1998). Groundwater was not encountered within the alluvial soils above the bedrock and the alluvium is predominately well consolidated clay at depth as described in the boring logs (see Appendix A). Therefore, the area of proposed residential construction is not considered to be potentially susceptible to liquefaction.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 6.1 GENERAL

The site was evaluated from a geotechnical perspective for the proposed residential development as described herein and may be developed as proposed provided geotechnical recommendations presented in the forthcoming sections of this report are followed and incorporated in the design and construction of the project. If the proposed development or site conditions change, the following recommendations may require revision.

6.2 GEOTECHNICAL SEISMIC DESIGN

Active faults identified by the State are not present onsite nor is the site within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Nevertheless, the site is within a seismically active region prone to occasional damaging earthquakes.

Seismic ground motion parameters were evaluated using a simplified code based approach and ground motion procedures for seismic design. The simplified code based approach follows the procedures in the 2010 California Building Code (CBC) based on ASCE/SEI 7-05 Section 11.4. The 2010 CBC is based on the 2009 IBC which references the Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures (ASCE/SEI 7-05) as indicated under Effective use of the IBC/CBC on page ix of the 2010 CBC. In addition, the seismic parameters based on ASCE/SEI 7-10 are proved which will be included in the upcoming CBC.

Seismic ground motion values are initially determined based on site class B (rock) conditions. The values are adjusted to obtain the maximum considered earthquake (MCE) spectral acceleration values for the site based on its site class of D. The seismic design parameters for the site's coordinates (latitude 34.1465° North and longitude 118.7359° West) were obtained from the USGS web based spectral acceleration response maps and calculator:

<http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/designmaps/grdmotion.php>

Seismic Parameters based on ASCE/SEI 7-05

Seismic Parameters based on ASCE/SEI 7-10

The purpose of the building code earthquake provisions is primarily to safeguard against major structural failures and loss of life, not to limit damage nor maintain function. Therefore, values provided in the building code should be considered minimum design values and should be used with the understanding site acceleration could be higher than addressed by code based parameters. Cracking of walls and possible structural damage should be anticipated in a significant seismic event.

6.3 SLOPE STABILITY

The proposed project is within the valley floor surrounded by hillside. Shallow cuts and fills are proposed for the site development as shown on Plate 1 and no cuts are planned for the adjacent hillsides. However, stability of the natural hillside area was evaluated as indicated in Appendix C. The only hillside area needing remediation is the landslide illustrated in cross section C-C'. This area will require a shear key/buttress to provide stabilization of the relatively shallow feature. Our analysis indicates the native slopes and remediated slopes (where necessary) have static and pseudo static factors of safety in excess of 1.5 and 1.1 respectively. A complete discussion of our analyses regarding slope stability is presented in Appendix C.

6.4 SITE PREPARATION AND GRADING

6.4.1 General

Site preparation and grading recommendations presented below are for preparation of the development area for support of residential structures and related site improvements. All aspects of grading including site preparation, grading, and fill placement should be per the City of Agoura Hills Building Code. Fill placement and bottom preparation for fill placement, backfill placement, utility trench backfill, and subgrade should be observed (and tested when appropriate) by this firm during construction.

6.4.2 Vegetation / Debris Removal

Vegetation or construction debris within the areas of construction should be removed prior to the grading operations.

6.4.3 Soil Removal (building pad over-excavation)

The upper soil zone overlying the entire site is highly weathered and desiccated to a depth of approximately 3 feet. These upper soils should be removed and recompacted in all development areas including structures, hardscape, paving, and areas supporting engineered fill.

To reduce the potential for differential settlement due to variable supporting soil conditions, soil removals should be performed to establish nearly uniform supporting soil conditions for each structure. Additional removals should be made such that building pads have a maximum variable fill thickness of 5 feet including the removal of the upper 3 feet of weathered, desiccated soils. That is the depth of fill should not vary by more than 5 feet across an individual building pad (structure envelope).

In addition, the building area (structure envelope) should be undercut to allow a minimum of 5 feet of compacted fill below the bottom of the footings. The removal area should extend to a minimum of five feet beyond the building pad or the removal should slope down past the toe at the same gradient as the fill slope above or a maximum of 10 feet, whichever is less.

After the removals are completed as addressed above, the exposed soil/bedrock should be observed by this office to evaluate if additional removals are needed. If critically expansive material is encountered in the subgrade, the undercut may need to be deepened to 8 feet or more below the bottom of proposed footings. Existence or absence of critically expansive material should be evaluated during grading by this office. Fill soils should not be placed until the geotechnical observation of removal areas is completed.

6.4.4 Bedrock Undercutting

To reduce problems later with landscaping and excavation for buried utilities and footings, bedrock cut areas should be over excavated (undercut) and capped with engineered compacted fill. Overexcavation

should extend below the anticipated depths of footing bottoms and utility trenches, whichever is deeper. The undercut zone should extend a minimum of 5 feet beyond the building area. The excavated rock may be reused as fill providing it is mixed and blended and does not contain rocks over 8 inches in maximum dimension. Consideration should be given to over excavating possible pool areas.

6.4.5 Transition Pads

Removals are recommended where transitions between contrasting materials (bedrock/alluvium, alluvium/engineered compacted fill, or bedrock/engineered compacted fill) cross the foot print of settlement sensitive structures. For transition pads which incorporate both cut and fill materials, the cut portions within building areas and 5 feet beyond the building perimeters should be undercut at least 5 feet below the bottom of the footings, and capped with engineered compacted fill. The purpose of the undercut is to reduce the potential for significant differential settlement or uplift between these contrasting materials.

6.4.6 Preparation of Fill Areas

After removals are performed as addressed above, areas to receive fill should be processed before placing fill. Processing should consist of surface scarification to a depth of 6 to 8 inches, moisture conditioning to slightly over the optimum moisture content, and compaction to a minimum of 90% of the maximum dry density (90% relative compaction).

6.4.7 Keying and Benching

Fills placed on ground sloping steeper than 5(horizontal):1(vertical) should be keyed and benched (horizontal benches) into firm competent native materials (after all required removals are made). All keyways should be a minimum of 15 feet wide and cut a minimum depth of 2 feet at the toe into firm competent inplace bedrock. Keyways should be tilted into the slope and should be at least 3 feet deep at the heel (measured from below the slope toe elevation). The keyways and benching should be observed by this firm before placing fill. Horizontal benches should be a minimum of 5 feet wide, i.e., a minimum 5 feet of competent material. The vertical portion of the bench in competent soils should not exceed 5 feet.

6.4.8 Fill Placement

On-site materials obtained from excavations may be used as fill soils. Fill soils should be free of deleterious materials including trash, debris, organic matter, and rocks larger than 6 inches*.* Fill soils should be placed in thin uniform lifts, brought to slightly over the optimum moisture content, and compacted to a minimum of 90% relative compaction. The need for import fill is not anticipated.

6.4.9 Relative Compaction

Relative compaction is the ratio of the in place dry soil weight to the maximum dry soil weight as determined per ASTM test method D1557. Optimum moisture content and maximum dry density should be determined per ASTM D 1557.

6.4.10 Temporary Excavations

Temporary slopes should conform to the requirements of CAL/OSHA. Surcharge loads should be setback a distance at least equal to the depth of the cut or trench from the tops of temporary excavations.

6.4.11 Utility Trenches

Utility trench backfill within slopes, building, parking, and drive areas should be compacted to a minimum of 90% relative compaction.

6.4.12 Slab Areas

The upper 6 inches of slab subgrade soils should be re-compacted before placing sand subbase, if soils were disturbed during footing construction or utility installation.

6.4.13 Shrinkage and Subsidence

Shrinkage is considered to be the volume loss of soils from cut to fill. Subsidence is considered to account for densification of the upper subgrade soils over the site, and densification of the underlying soils (below the zone of in-place recompaction). Based upon available data, and using previous experience on similar projects, the preliminary estimated shrinkage and subsidence factors for the various site materials are presented below. Values presented for shrinkage and subsidence are estimates only.

***** Assuming an average relative compaction of 93%.

If a more accurate determination of estimated shrinkage amount is critical for the balance of cut and fill quantities, values can be reevaluated during the early stages of site grading.

6.5 MANUFACTURED SLOPE CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

6.5.1 General

Cut and fill slopes are generally at a shallow gradient of 5 (horizontal):1(vertical). However, if necessary slopes may be constructed at a maximum gradient of 2(horizontal):1(vertical). All cut slopes and retaining wall backcuts should be observed by an engineering geologist from this office. All manufactured slopes will require maintenance as discussed below.

6.5.2 Cut Slopes

Cut slopes may be constructed at a maximum gradient of $2(h):1(v)$. Other than in the landslide area (Boring B-10), no adverse geologic conditions are anticipated. Nevertheless, all cut slopes or backcuts for retaining walls should be observed by an engineering geologist from our office for the presence of adverse geologic conditions. Where topsoil is present at the top of a cut slope, the top of the slope should be "laid back" or rounded.

6.5.3 Fill Slopes

Fill slopes may be constructed at a maximum gradient of 2(h):1(v). Fill slopes should be keyed and benched into firm in-place soil or bedrock. Fill slope keyways should be a minimum of 15 feet wide and cut to a minimum depth of 2 feet at the toe into competent in-place materials. The keyway should be tilted into the slope and should be at least 3 feet deep at the heel (measured from below the slope toe elevation). The keyway should be observed by a representative of this office prior to placing any fill.

Where possible, the outer slope faces should be overfilled and trimmed back to provide for firm, wellcompacted surfaces. It may be necessary to sheepfoot and/or grid roll the slopes if they are not overfilled and trimmed. Slope faces should be tested and reworked as necessary to achieve the required 90 percent relative compaction.

Depending on the conditions encountered during keying and benching operations, fill slopes should be constructed with a backdrain consisting of a 24 inch square section of rock (1/2"-3/4") wrapped in filter cloth. A perforated 4 inch diameter PVC schedule 40 pipe should be installed at the base of the gravel material with non-perforated outlet pipes. The outlets should be roughly 12 inches above the toe of slope or tied into the storm drain system. The outlets at the surface should be protected with a concrete monument and the ends covered with a slotted cap to prevent rodent entry.

6.5.4 Shear Key / Buttress Fill Slope Construction

A shear key/buttress fill should be constructed to support the existing landslide illustrated in cross section C-C'. The buttress should be a minimum of 30 feet wide perpendicular to the movement of the slide as shown on cross section C-C'. The depth of the buttress fill should extend to a minimum of 3 feet below the slide plan into firm in place bedrock. The bottom of the fill may be benched providing the benches are tilted into the hillside. The bottom of the buttress should be observed by any engineering geologist from this office. The surface of the buttress may be regraded to the original surface grades. All other construction of the buttress including construction of the backdrain should be per the recommendations presented in the Fill Slopes section. Keyway size and location for buttress fills based on stability analyses (to remediate the existing landslide) are presented in Appendix C.

The shear key/buttress is intended to support the area above the shear key/buttress and does not provide remediation of the area below the shear key/buttress. Therefore, if construction is proposed within the area of the landslide additional removal and recompaction of the landslide will be necessary. This area is not suitable for the support of structures unless further geotechnical/geological evaluations and additional removal and recompaction of the landslide are performed. An alternate to the construction of a shear key/buttress is to completely remove the landslide mass and replace that mass with engineered compacted fill with appropriate drainage structures.

6.5.5 Slope Maintenance

Slopes will require maintenance to reduce the risk of erosion and degradation with time due to natural or man-made conditions. Future performance of the slopes will depend on the control of burrowing animals and maintenance of brow ditches, drainage structures, and slope vegetation as discussed below.

Graded or exposed natural slopes should be maintained with dense, deep rooting (minimum $2\pm$ feet deep), drought resistant ground cover and shrubs or trees. A reliable irrigation system should be installed on the slopes where necessary, adjusted so over watering does not occur, and periodically checked for leakage. Care should be taken to maintain a uniform, near optimum moisture content in the slopes, and to avoid over drying, or excess irrigation. Excess watering of slopes should be avoided to reduce the risk of erosion and surficial failures. Slopes should not be watered before forecasted rain.

All drainage structures (including those at the surface such as V-ditches and buried) should be kept in good condition and clean the entire length to the outlet. Final grading of the site should provide positive drainage away from slopes, and water should not be allowed to pond or gather in a slope area. Burrowing animals, particularly ground squirrels, can destroy slopes; therefore, where present, immediate measures should be taken to evict them.

6.6 SOIL EXPANSIVENESS

Expansion tests were performed on two samples of soil representative of the materials which will be placed for future compacted fill. Based on these test results, the soils at the site should be classified as moderately expansive. Preliminary foundation design should be in the 51-90 expansion range. However, expansion tests should be performed at the finish grade materials at the conclusion of grading for each building pad area.

Expansive soils contain clay particles that change in volume (shrink or swell) due to a change in the soil moisture content. The amount of volume change depends upon the soil swell potential, availability of water, and soil restraining pressure. Swelling occurs when clay soils become wet due to excessive water. Excessive water can be caused by poor surface drainage, over-irrigation of lawns and planters, and sprinkler or plumbing leaks.

Swelling clay soils can cause distress to residential construction (generally as uplift). Construction on expansive soil has an inherent risk that should be acknowledged and understood by the developer and property owner. The geotechnical recommendations presented herein are intended to reduce the potential for expansive soil action. However, these recommendations are not intended, nor designed to provide complete and full mitigation of expansive soil conditions. Additional recommendations can be provided to upon request to further reduce the risk of expansive soil movement. Soil movement can be

roughly 1 to 2 inches depending upon the conditions incurred as described herein. Therefore, the following should be maintained within the property:

- a) Positive drainage should be consistently provided and maintained away from all structures. Drainage should not be changed creating an adverse drainage condition.
- b) Landscape watering should be held to a minimum. Sprinkler systems should be maintained and plumbing leaks should be immediately repaired so that subgrade soils underlying or adjacent the structures do not become saturated. Trees should be spaced so that roots will not extend under foundations or slabs.
- c) Water should not be allowed to pond or accumulate around pool decking allowing water migration into the subgrade. Pool hardware fittings should be adequately water tight, and caulking should be maintained between hardscape joints, and interfaces between hardscape and adjoining house.
- d) Information regarding care and maintenance of improvements on expansive soils should be passed on to future owners of the property.

6.7 CONVENTIONAL FOUNDATION DESIGN

6.7.1 General

Shallow foundations in the form of spread and continuous footings may be used for the support of the proposed buildings provided remedial grading is performed as addressed above. As mentioned earlier, for preliminary foundation design, the finish grade materials are assumed to have a moderate expansion potential in the 51-90 expansion index range. However, the expansion potential of the building envelope should be determined at the completion of rough grading.

6.7.2 Design Data

Conventional foundations embedded into engineered compacted fill may be designed to impose a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 2,000 pounds per square foot (psf). The bearing pressure may be increased by one third for temporary loading.

Reinforcement should be a minimum of two #4 bars in the top and bottom (total of 4 bars). Vertical reinforcement of #4 bars should be installed at 24 inch centers. The vertical steel should extend to the bottom footing reinforcement and extended a minimum of 36 inches into the slab.

Footings should have a minimum depth 24 inches for soils in the 51-90 expansion range and 30 inches for soils in the 91-130 expansion range. Embedment should be measured below the lowest adjacent interior or exterior grade. Footing embedment for raised wood floors should be measured below the interior grade if it is lower than the exterior, this could result in footings of roughly 5 feet deep measured from the exterior. Footings behind retaining walls should be embedded below a 2(h):1(v) line extending up from the base of the wall or the wall should be designed to support the footing surcharge. The minimum footing width should be 18 inches.

Soil disturbed near the footings should be replaced with compacted engineered fill. A representative of this office should observe the placement of any fill intended for structural support.

The footing embedments provided above are considered the minimum acceptable embedments for the soil expansion range. Generally, foundation depth is increased with an increased potential for soil expansion (greater soil expansion index value). Therefore, footing embedment that is deeper than the recommended minimum may provide additional reduction in the potential for foundation distress due to expansive soil movement. Recommendations for deeper foundation embedment can be provided at the owner's request. The above recommendations for foundation design should be considered the minimum standard for geotechnical concerns only and the design should be supplemented with the appropriate structural design.

6.7.3 Lateral Resistance

Lateral forces exerted by retained soil or compacted fill may be resisted by passive soil pressure and friction. To develop full passive earth pressure, footings should meet the required footing to slope setback. Passive soil pressure may be taken as an equivalent fluid having a density of 250 pounds per cubic foot (pcf). Friction between the bottom of the footings and soil may be taken as 0.4. The values may be combined with no reduction. The above values are ultimate values with no factors of safety applied.

6.7.4 Settlement

Static settlement of the footings as recommended above should be minimal, less than 1 inch in a 30 foot span, depending upon the foundation loading and size. Settlements are anticipated to occur rapidly as the foundations are loaded. No long-term settlement is anticipated for properly constructed foundations embedded in the recommended bearing material. However, expansive soils movement could occur as previously discussed herein.

Minor wall cracking could occur within the structure associated with expansion and contraction of the structural wood members due to thermal or moisture changes. In addition, minor wall or slab cracking may be associated with settlement or expansive soil movement. All structures settle during construction and some minor settlement of the structures on site can occur after construction during the life of the project. However, additional settlement/soil movement could occur if the soils become saturated due to excessive water infiltration generally caused by excessive irrigation, poor drainage, etc.

6.7.5 Footings on or Near Slopes

Deepened footings or setbacks should be used for all buildings and accessory structures sensitive to differential movement. In general, minimum setbacks are provided in Chapter 18 of the California Building Code or a minimum of 5 feet, whichever provides the greater setback. Setback requirements pertain to slopes having a gradient over 3(horizontal):1(vertical).

6.7.6 Footing Excavations

Footings should be cut square and level and cleaned of loose soils. Soil excavated from the footing trenches (including utility trenches) should not be spread over areas of construction or slopes, unless properly placed and compacted. A representative of this office should observe the footing excavations before placing reinforcing steel. Soils silted into the footing excavations during the premoistening operations should be removed to the required depth before casting the concrete. The footings should be cast as soon as possible to avoid deep desiccation of the footing subsoil.

6.7.7 Premoistening

Conventional footing and slab on-grade subgrade soils should be moistened to a minimum of 3% over the optimum moisture content to a minimum depth of 18 inches for soils in the 51-90 soil expansion range and 24 inches for soils in the 91-130 soil expansion range. The above moisture should be obtained and maintained at least a suggested 2 days prior to casting the concrete. A representative of this office should observe the subgrade soil premoistening prior to casting the concrete. Soils silted into the footing excavations during the premoistening operations should be removed prior to placing concrete.

6.7.8 Conventional Slab-On-Grade Design

Lightly loaded slabs-on-grade within the building interior should be a minimum of 4 inches thick. Reinforcement should consist of a minimum of No. 3 bars at 18 inches on center in both directions or per the structural engineer's design. The slab should be tied to the foundations per the structural engineer's design. Conventional slabs on-grade should be underlain by a minimum of 6 inch thick aggregate layer or as required by code. The subgrade should be processed prior to sand/gravel placement if the subgrade has been disturbed during construction.

6.7.9 Moisture Vapor Retarder Layer

An appropriate moisture vapor retarder layer should be installed and maintained below slabs on grade. The intent of the moisture vapor retarder layer is to reduce moisture vapor transmission through a slab.

Ten-mil plastic sheeting may be used as a minimum moisture vapor retarder layer below the slab. The retarder should be installed with the edges overlapped at least 12 inches.

Where necessary per site conditions, code requirements, or if desired, heavier moisture vapor retarder layers should be used. Perforations through the moisture vapor retarder such as at pipes, conduits, columns, grade beams, and wall footing penetrations should be sealed. Proper construction practices should be followed during construction of the slab on-grade. Repair and seal tears or punctures in the moisture barrier resulting from the construction process prior to concrete placement.

Minimizing shrinkage cracks in the slab-on-grade can further minimize moisture vapor emissions. A properly cured slab utilizing low-slump concrete will reduce the risk of shrinkage cracks in the slab as described herein.

The concrete contractor should be made aware of the moisture vapor retarder and required to protect the layer. Perforations made in the layer by the concrete contractor should be properly sealed prior to concrete placement. In addition, for concrete placed directly on top of the layer, the concrete contractor should make any necessary changes in the concrete placement and curing. Placing the concrete directly on top of the moisture vapor retarder layer allows the layer to be observed for damage directly prior to concrete placement.

The grade of the project should be kept as high as practical and the interior slabs should be maintained as high as practical above the exterior grades. Drainage should be maintained away from the structures. Provide proper drainage and elevation of ground adjacent the slab (that is the ground surface should be at least 6 inches below the wall plate or per Code requirements). In addition, the landscaping should not be over watered resulting in excess moisture below the slab

6.7.10 Flooring

Tile flooring can crack, reflecting cracks in the concrete slab below the tile. Therefore, the slab designer should consider this in the design of concrete slabs on-grade where tile will be placed. The tile installer should use installation methods that reduce possible tile cracking. A vinyl crack isolation membrane (approved by the Tile Council of America/Ceramic Tile Institute) is recommended between tile and concrete slabs on grade.

Slabs on grade should be tested for moisture content prior to the selection of the flooring and adhesives. Moisture in the slabs should not exceed the flooring manufacturer's specifications. Regardless, site conditions can change and therefore sealing of the concrete surface should be considered per the manufacturer's specifications.

6.7.11 Concrete Placement and Cracking

Minor cracking of concrete slabs is common and is generally the result of concrete shrinkage continuing after construction. Concrete shrinks as it cures resulting in shrinkage tension within the concrete mass. Since concrete is weak in tension, development of tension results in cracks within the concrete. Therefore, concrete should be placed using procedures to minimize cracking within the slab. Shrinkage cracks can become excessive if water is added to the concrete above the allowable limit and proper finishing and curing practices are not followed. Concrete mixing, placement, finishing, and curing should be performed per the current American Concrete Institute Guide for Concrete Floor and Slab Construction (ACI 302.1R). Concrete slump during concrete placement should not exceed the design slump specified by the structural engineer. Concrete slabs on grade should be provided with tooled crack control joints at 10-15 foot centers or as specified by the structural engineer.

6.8 RETAINING WALL DESIGN

6.8.1 Foundations

The foundation design recommendations including bearing and lateral pressures presented above may be used for retaining wall design.

6.8.2 Active Pressures

Retaining walls should be designed to resist an active pressure exerted by compacted backfill or retained soil. Retaining walls that may yield at the top should be designed for an equivalent fluid pressure equal to 45 and 60 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) for a level backfill and 2(horizontal:1(vertical) sloping backfill, respectively.

The above active pressures are not designed to resist expansion of the backfill. Therefore, if water is allowed to saturate backfill or backcut materials consisting of clayey soils, the expansion pressure could exceed the active pressures provided. Furthermore, the above active pressures are not designed to accommodate any adverse geologic conditions such as unsupported bedding or joint sets. Should such conditions be encountered additional evaluation would be required. Retaining wall backcuts should be observed by the project geotechnical consultant to evaluate backcut conditions.

Footings behind retaining walls should be embedded below a 2(horizontal):1(vertical) line extending up from the base of the wall or the wall should be designed to support the footing surcharge.

A surcharge has not been included in the recommended lateral earth pressures. The above lateral pressures are ultimate values with no factor of safety included. Walls should be designed for an appropriate factor of safety as determined by the structural engineer.

Aerial surcharge may be treated as additional height of backfill where one foot of additional height is assumed for each 125 psf of aerial surcharge. Light vehicle wheel loads may be taken as 300 psf of additional surcharge. Where surcharge conditions from adjacent foundations are identified, we can provide a pressure distribution of the surcharge for retaining wall design.

6.8.3 Lateral Seismic Pressure

A lateral seismic pressure is not required where the retaining wall is less than 6 feet in height. Walls greater than 6 feet to 8 feet high should be designed using a seismic pressure per the County of Los Angeles Building Code Manuel 1807.2 Article 1 (dated 10-25-12).

6.8.4 Wall Free Board

Retaining walls supporting ascending slopes should be provided with appropriate free board and drainage swales per the civil engineer's design. Commonly the free board is one foot high.

6.8.5 Retaining Wall Drainage and Backfill

Retaining walls should be provided with a drainage system behind the wall consisting of a continuous minimum 1 foot wide section of No. 4 rock (pea gravel or equivalent) wrapped in filter cloth. A composite drain board may be used in lieu of an aggregate drain. The drain material should extend from the base of the wall to the top of the wall or to within 2 feet of the top of wall for interior and exterior walls, respectively. The material should be drained by a perforated 4 inch diameter pipe (3/8 inch perforations, perforations down) or weep holes (where applicable in landscaped areas). The invert of the drainpipe should be at least 6 inches below the top of any adjacent slabs-on-grade. Surface drainage systems and the

retaining wall backdrain should not share a common outlet pipe such that water could flow back to the backdrains. Outlet pipe locations should be surveyed and recorded.

Retaining walls should be waterproofed to resist moisture infiltration through the wall. The upper 2 feet of exterior wall backfill should consist of compacted native soils. In addition, if possible the backfill below the 2 foot thick cap should be low in expansion if possible.

Retaining wall backfill should be compacted to a minimum of 90% of the maximum soil density using light equipment. The retaining wall backfill should be benched into the backcut where the backcut is shallower than $3/4(h)$: $1(v)$.

6.9 SWIMMING POOL

6.9.1 General

Swimming pool design should be per the following design recommendations. These geotechnical recommendations are preliminary and should be reviewed and revised as necessary when the locations are known and prior to finalizing the pool plans. Risks associated with pool construction, such as pool or deck movement, cannot be completely eliminated, especially if proper construction practices, drainage, maintenance of landscaping, pool plumbing and pool equipment are not provided. This office should observe all geotechnical aspects of pool construction addressed herein.

Highly expansive soils and soils with variable densities may be encountered in the pool bottom or walls. The existence of critically expansive and variable density soils should be evaluated by an engineering geologist from this office. Therefore, the excavation should be observed by this office prior to completing the excavation or the placement of any steel or forms.

6.9.2 Pool Excavation

All aspects of grading for the pool including site preparation, excavation, and fill placement should be per the City of Agoura Hills Building Code except where more restrictive requirements are presented herein. Soil/bedrock exposed in the pool excavation should be kept moist until the concrete is placed. The concrete should be cast as soon as possible after excavation to avoid desiccation of the subgrade material. Completion of the pool excavation and construction should be performed so the excavation is open for a maximum of two weeks.

A layback of the pool wall may be necessary if adverse bedrock is exposed in the pool walls. Therefore, the pool excavation should be observed by a geologist from this office. It may be necessary to undercut the pool if the pool excavation crosses a daylight line. In addition, this office should observe the excavation prior to placing structural steel. Soil excavated from the pool area should not be spread over any areas of construction and slopes or used for support of structures or slabs unless properly placed and compacted.

6.9.3 Pool Walls

The minimum pool wall design should be per the City of Agoura Hills standards for a highly expansive soil condition. In addition, the pool walls should be designed as self-supported retaining walls. Pool walls should be designed to resist an at-rest earth pressure equivalent to a fluid having a density of 60 pounds per cubic foot for level backfill.

The owner should be cautioned to keep the soils near and beneath the pool and hardscape at uniform and constant moisture content. Previously discussed differential movement could occur if the expansive soils become excessively wet and/or dry. Constant soil moisture content should be maintained to reduce the potential for expansive soil movements.
A vertical pool excavation near a foundation or structure should not extend below a 2(h):1(v) line extending down from the structure at the ground surface at the ground level. Pool walls supporting loads imposed by an adjacent structure should be designed by a structural engineer. Foundations below a $2(h):1(v)$ line extending up from the base of the pool wall should not impose loads on the pool.

The spa and infinity edge structures should not be cantilevered off the main pool structure due to the possible effects of soil expansion. The foundation of the pool should be setback from a descending slope as outlined in the foundation section of this report.

6.9.4 Swimming Pool Plumbing

Pool and water feature piping should be flexible and able to accommodate the possibility of movement. Leaks in the plumbing or drainage system should be repaired at once.

6.9.5 Concrete Deck

Decking and hardscape surrounding the swimming pool should be constructed on engineered compacted fill or firm native material. All exterior concrete slabs-on-grade and walkways should be designed as described in Exterior Slabs and Walkways section of this report. Loose excavated soil from the swimming pool area or elsewhere, should not be used underneath the deck unless properly moisture conditioned and compacted as described above. Joints between adjoining sections of pool decking and between the pool decking and the pool walls should be caulked. Periodic inspection by the owner and subsequent recaulking, if necessary, are maintenance procedures to prevent water from migrating into the supporting subgrade. Drainage should be collected at area drains to convey water to paved drainage surfaces. Drainage water should not be disposed of on any of the adjacent descending slopes.

6.10 EXTERIOR SLABS AND WALKWAYS

Exterior concrete slabs-on-grade and walkways should be a minimum of 4 inches thick and underlain by a minimum of 4 inches of sand. Driveway and motor court slabs should be a minimum 5 inches thick and underlain by 6 inches of compacted base material. Exterior slabs should be reinforced with a minimum of #3 bars on 24 inch centers in each direction. All slabs should have crack control joints (full depth joints) at intervals of 10 to 15 feet. Sidewalks may consist of unreinforced concrete provided the walks are provided with crack control joints spaced at a distance equal to the panel width. Recommendations for concrete placement are included herein under Concrete Placement and Cracking.

Concrete subgrade soils should be properly placed and compacted for the support of the concrete flatwork. Driveway subgrade soils should be prepared and compacted according to recommendations herein. Prior to placing concrete, subgrade soils should be premoistened to a minimum of 3% over the optimum moisture content for a minimum depth of 24 inches. Proper premoistening can reduce the risk of slab subgrade expansion, if used in addition to other preventive measures. Where critical, the subgrade soil premoistening should be observed by this office prior to placing the concrete.

Exterior slabs can experience differential uplift caused by non-uniform expansion of the subgrade soils due to varied migration of water beneath the slab. Differential uplift can occur at the corner, edge, or center of slab. Therefore, planter areas should be graded so that water drains positively away from the hardscape and not below the hardscape. A reinforced deepened perimeter edge should be considered on all slabs to minimize non-uniform moisture migration and water infiltration into the sand layer under the slab. The perimeter edge should extend a minimum of 12 inches below the bottom of the slab and have a width of 8 inches. A deeper edge would further reduce the risk of deep water migration into the slab subsoils. Where a slab or walkway is adjacent a descending slope (within 2 feet) the slope side edge should be equipped with a minimum 24 inch deep, 12 inch wide perimeter edge reinforced with at least 1 - #4 bar in the top and bottom.

Concrete shrinkage cracks will become excessive if water is added to the concrete above the allowable limit, and proper finishing and curing practices are not followed. Finishing and curing should be performed per the Portland Cement Association Guidelines. The concrete slump should not exceed 6 inches unless otherwise specified by the structural engineer.

6.11 PRELIMINARY PAVEMENT DESIGN

Based on an estimated R Value of 15 for existing upper soils at the site and an assumed Traffic Index of 5, 3 inches of asphaltic concrete over 8 inches of aggregate base should be used for preliminary design of drive areas. The final structural sections should be confirmed at the conclusion of grading. The upper 6 inches of subgrade, and the base materials should be compacted to at least 90% and 95% of the maximum dry density, respectively.

Planter areas should be graded so excess water drains onto and not beneath the adjacent AC pavement and curbs. Concrete curbs near the top of descending slopes should be embedded so the bottom of the curb has a setback of 5 feet to the slope face.

6.12 SITE DRAINAGE

Positive drainage should be provided away from structures and hardscape during and after construction per the grading plan or applicable building codes. Water should not be allowed to gather or pond against foundations. In addition, planters near a structure should be constructed so that irrigation water will not saturate footing and slab subgrade soils. Landscape planting and trees should be located to avoid roots extending beneath foundations and slabs. Irrigation lines and landscape watering should be kept away from building lines wherever possible. Irrigation lines and sprinklers should be placed so that water is not sprayed on the footings or saturates the soil adjacent the footings. Landscape watering should be held to a minimum; however, landscaped areas should be maintained in a uniformly moist condition and not allowed to dry out or became saturated. Planters adjacent to a structure should be constructed so that irrigation water does not saturate the soil underlying the footings and slabs.

6.13 GUTTERS AND DOWNSPOUTS

Gutters and downspouts should be installed to collect roof water that might otherwise infiltrate the soils adjacent structures. The downspouts should be drained into collector pipes to carry water away from the structures or other positive drainage should be provided.

6.14 PLAN REVIEW

As the development process continues and detailed grading and/or foundation plans and specifications are developed, they should be reviewed by Gorian and Associates, Inc. Additional geotechnical recommendations may be warranted at that time.

6.15 SECTION 111

It is the opinion of this office that if the project is constructed in accordance with our recommendations and properly maintained, the proposed structures will be safe against hazard from landslide, settlement, or slippage, and that the proposed building or grading construction will have no adverse effect on the geologic stability of property outside of the building site. The nature and extent of tests conducted for purposes of this declaration are, in the opinion of the undersigned, in conformance with generally accepted practice in the area. Test findings and statements of professional opinion do not constitute a guarantee or warranty, express or implied.

7. CLOSURE

This report was prepared under the direction of a registered geotechnical engineer and certified engineering geologist. No warranty, express or implied, is made as to conclusions and professional advice included in this report. Gorian and Associates, Inc. disclaim responsibility and liability for problems that may occur if recommendations presented herein are not followed.

This report was prepared for Fortune Realty LLC and design consultants solely for design and construction of the project described herein. It may not contain sufficient information for other uses or the purposes of other parties. These recommendations should not be extrapolated to other areas or used for other facilities without consulting Gorian and Associates, Inc. Grading and foundation work at the site should be performed per the current City of Agoura Hills Building Code. Due to possible subsurface variations, this office should observe all aspects of field construction addressed in this report.

The scope of the services provided by Gorian and Associates, Inc. and its staff, excludes responsibility and/or liability for work conducted by others. Such work includes, but is not limited to, means and methods of work performance, quality control of the work, superintendence, sequencing of construction and safety in, on, or about the jobsite.

Recommendations herein are based on interpretations of the subsurface conditions concluded from information gained from subsurface explorations and a surficial site reconnaissance. The interpretations may differ from actual subsurface conditions, which can vary horizontally and vertically across the site. Therefore, persons using this report for bidding or construction purposes should perform such independent evaluations, as they deem necessary.

oOo

We appreciate the opportunity to submit this geotechnical report. If you have any questions concerning this report or require additional information, please do not hesitate to give us a call.

Respectfully,

Gorian and Associates, Inc.

By: Jerome J. Blunck, GE151 **Principal Geotechnical Engineer**

William F. Cavan, Jr **CEG** $1/161$ Principal Engineering Geologist

REFERENCES

- Applied Earth Sciences, February 4, 1998, Preliminary geotechnical investigation, proposed Heschel West Liberty Canyon Project on east side of Chesebro Road, Agoura Hills (County of Los Angeles), California. unpublished consultant's report. Work Order: 97-559-02.
- Bryant, W.A. and E.W. Hart, 2007, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California. California Geological Survey Special Publication 42 (rev. 2007 Interim Revision).
- California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) [now California Geological Survey (CGS)], 1975, Guidelines for Evaluating the Hazard of Surface Rupture. California Division of Mines and Geology Note Number 49.
- California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) [now California Geological Survey (CGS)], 1995, Supplement No. 1 to Special Publication 42 (1994 edition).
- California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) [now California Geological Survey (CGS)], 1998, Seismic Hazard Zones, Calabasas Quadrangle Los Angeles County, California. Official map released February 1, 1998. viewed at

http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/quad/CALABASAS/maps/ozn_calab.pdf

- California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) [now California Geological Survey (CGS)], 1997, Revised 2006, *Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the Calabasas 7.5-minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California.* CDMG Seismic Hazard Zone Report 006. last revised 1/13/06. viewed at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/quad/CALABASAS/reports/calab_eval.pdf
- California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) [now California Geological Survey (CGS)], 2000, Digital Images of Official Maps of Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones of California, Southern Region. CD-ROM, Division of Mines and Geology CD 2000-003.
- California Geological Survey (CGS), 2008, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California. California Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 117A.
- Cao, T., Bryant, W.A., Rowshandel, B., Brannum, D., and Willis, C.J., June 2003, The Revised 2002 California Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Maps.
- Chang, S.W., Bray, J.D., and Seed, R.B., 1994, Ground Motions and Local Site Effects. in Stewart, J.P., Bray, J.D., Seed, R.B. and Sitar, N. eds., Preliminary Report on the Principal Geotechnical Aspects of the January 17, 1994 Northridge Earthquake, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California at Berkeley, Report No. UBC/EERC-94/08.
- Dibblee, T.W., Jr., 1992, Geologic map of the Calabasas quadrangles, Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, California. Dibblee Foundation Map #DF-37, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Gorian and Associates, Inc., May 13, 1999, Preliminary geologic and geotechnical evaluation of the proposed Heschel School West, located east of Chesebro Road and north of US 101, Agoura, Los Angeles County, California. Work Order: 2232-0-10, Log Number: 19439.
- Gorian and Associates, Inc., April 12, 2001, Geotechnical plan review, proposed school development, located east of Chesebro Road and north of US 101, Agoura, Los Angeles County, California. Work Order: 2232-0-0-11, Log Number: 20974.
- Gorian and Associates, Inc., July 23, 2001, Geotechnical response to geologic and soils engineering review sheets (dated 5/10/01 and 5/21/01, respectively), proposed school development, 27600 Canwood Street, Calabasas Area, County of Los Angeles, California. Work Order: 2232-0-0-11, Log Number: 21099.
- Gorian and Associates, Inc., February 4, 2002, Geotechnical evaluation of proposed access drive grading, Heschel West School site, Canwood Street at Palo Comado Canyon Road, Agoura Hills, California. Work Order: 2232-0-0-11, Log Number: 21591.
- Gorian and Associates, Inc., July 19, 2004, Geotechnical plan review, proposed school development, east of Chesebro Road and north of US 101, Agoura Area, County of Los Angeles, California. Work Order: 2232-0-0-11, Log Number: 23260.
- Hart, E.W. and Bryant, W.A., 1997. Fault rupture hazard zones in California, California Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 (reviewed).
- McGuire, R.K. and W.J. Arabasz, 1990, An introduction to probabilistic seismic hazard analysis in Ward, S.H. ed., Geotechnical and environmental geophysics. 1:333-353.
- Petersen, M.D., Bryant., W.A., Cramer, C.H., Cao, T., Reicle, M.S. , Frankel, A.D., Lienkaemper, J.J., McCrory, P.A., and Schwartz, D.P., 1996, Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for the state of California. California Division of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 96-08; U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 96-706.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS) interactive web application, 2008 Interactive Deaggregations. [<https://geohazards.usgs.gov/deaggint/2008/>](https://geohazards.usgs.gov/deaggint/2008/)
- United States Geological Survey (USGS) interactive web application, Earthquake Hazards Program, US Seismic Design Maps and Tools for Engineers, US Seismic Design Maps. http://geohazards.usgs.gov/designmaps/us/application.php
- Weber, F.H. 1984, Geology of the Calabasas-Agoura-eastern Thousand Oaks area, Los Angeles and Ventura counties, California, California Division of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 84-1 LA.
- Weber, F.H., Jr., Cleveland, G.B., Kahle, J.E., Kiessling, E.W., Miller, R.V. Mills, M.F., and Morton, D.M. 1973. Geology and mineral resources study of southern Ventura County, California: California Division of Mines and Geology Preliminary Report 14.
- Weber, F.H., Jr., and Kiessling, E.W., 1975, General Features of Seismic Hazards of Ventura County, California: California Division of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 76-5 LA (in press as a special report).
- Yerkes, R.F., and Showalter, P.K., 1993, Preliminary geologic map of the Calabasas 7.5 minute quadrangle, southern California, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 93-205, 11 p.
- Yerkes, R.F. and R.H. Campbell, 1979, Stratigraphic Nomenclature of the Central Santa Monica Mountains, Los Angeles County California. U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin 1457-E
- Ziony, J.E., Wentworth, C.M., Buchanan-Banks, J.M. and H.C. Wagner, 1974, Preliminary map showing recency of faulting in coastal Southern California. U.S. Geological Survey Map MR-585.
- Ziony, J.E., and L.M. Jones, 1989, Map showing late Quaternary faults and 1978-84 seismicity of the Los Angeles region, California. U.S. Geologic Survey Map MF-1964.

APPENDIX A

LOGS OF SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL - AGOURA HILLS

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

كالمساحد للمسال

Ground Elevation: 927+

 $\overline{\mathsf{T}}$

 \top

f

Location:

┯

 $\overline{}$

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

LEGEND:

-
- B Bulk Sample
D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)
MC Moisture Content (%)
N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"
PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-
- %Sand-%Silt-%Clay SMC
	-
	- le
	-

ation Test

USC - Unified Soil Classification System

Work Order: 2232-0-10

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-1

Logged By: CHD Date Observed: 2-16-99

Gorian and Associates, Inc.

T

٦

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

hard). Scattered siltstone fragments.

DESCRIPTION

ALLUVIUM: Very dark grayish brown slightly sandy silty clay (moist,

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-2

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL - AGOURA HILLS

lulв sl

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 941±

SYM

lusc

icL

D

٠1

MC

 13.3

DD

98.9

Location:

- B Bulk Sample
D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)
-

actual conditions encountered.

-
-
- MC Moisture Content (%)
NC Moisture Content (%)
PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
- SMC
	-
	-
- %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
-
- SMC 3Sand-4Sitt-4Gtay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

Work Order: 2232-0-10

REMARKS

At 1* 2/12"

Logged By: CHD Date Observed: 2-16-99

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-3

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\cdot} }$

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL - AGOURA HILLS

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 949.5±

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP Location: __

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD Date Observed: 2-16-99

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

LEGEND:

-
- B Bulk Sample

D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

D In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC Moisture Content (%)

N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-
-
-
-
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-4

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 964±

Location: SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Logged By: CHD Date Observed: 2-16-99

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a actual conditions encountered.

LEGEND:

-
-
-
-
-
- B

B Bulk Sample

D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC Moisture Content (%)

N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
- -
	-
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-5

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 961±

Location: SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Date Observed: 2-16-99

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a actual conditions encountered.

LEGEND:

-
-
-
-
- -
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

 \bar{z}

Few cobbles.

cobbles. (Moist, hard).

DESCRIPTION

<u>ALLUVIUM:</u> Very dark grayish brown silty clay (moist to wet, hard).

Dark grayish brown silty clay, some sand. Scattered gravel to

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-6

 \sim

At 1! 2/12"

At 3' 3/12"

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 958±

SYM

D

-1

-2

-3

4

-5 -6 -7 -8

-9 -10 -11 -12 -13 -14 -15 -16 -17 -18 -19 -20 -21 -22 ∣ כר! **USC**

CL

CL

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP $Location:$ ___

DD

96.5

MC

19.9

actual conditions encountered.

LEGEND:

- B Bulk Sample
- D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)
-
-
- MC Moisture Content (%)
NC Moisture Content (%)
PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

Date Observed: 2-16-99 **REMARKS**

 $U|B|S$

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-7

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 946+

Location:

 $\ddot{}$

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a actual conditions encountered.

LEGEND:

c:\DOCS/LOGS/2232

- B Bulk Sample

D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC Moisture Content (%)

N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-
-
-

 \bar{z}

-
-
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Date Observed: 2-16-99

÷.

 $F = 11000$

٦

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Scattered siltstone fragements.

DESCRIPTION

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-8

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 975±

USC

 CL

Ð

-1

 -2

-3

SYM

Location:

MC

DD

lulals

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

Downhole logged to 21%'

LEGEND:

c:\DOCS/LOGS/2232

- B Bulk Sample
D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)
MC Moisture Content (%)
N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"
PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-

actual conditions encountered.

-
- %Sand-%Silt-%Clay SMC
-
- SMC Sand-saile-science
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

Date Observed: 2-17-99

REMARKS

°NE

 $0/12$ "

MODELO FORMATION: Gray claystone interbedded with pale yellow

fine-grained sandstone (damp, hard) and light olive brown clayey

<u>RESIDUAL SOIL:</u> Light olive brown silty clay (moist, hard).

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

RESIDUAL SOIL: Light olive brown silty clay with scattered shale

Work Order: 2232-0-10

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-9

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

 $|U|B|S|$

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

MC

Location: _

fragments.

DD

Ground Elevation: 994±

|usc| SYM

 CL

D

DESCRIPTION

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a actual conditions encountered.
LEGEND:

B - Bulk Sample
D - Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD - In Place Dry Density (pcf)
NC - Moisture Content (%)
N - SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP - Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)

-
-

SMC - %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT - Standard Penetration Test
SYM - Graphic Symbol
U - Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC - Unified Soil Classification System

Logged By: CHD

Date Observed: 2-17-99

REMARKS

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

DESCRIPTION

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-10

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

 $|{\sf uscl}$ sym $|{\sf uls}|$ s $|{\sf nc}|$ dd

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Location: _

Ground Elevation: 1004±

∦D

SYI
U

- Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
- Unified Soil Classification System

USC

- %Sand-%Silt-%Clay - Standard Penetration Test

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

B - Bulk Sample

B - Bulk Sample

D - Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft

DD - In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC - Moisture Content (%)

N - SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP - Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)

REMARKS

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-10 (page 2) Work Order: 2232-0-10

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 1004±

Location: SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Logged By: CHD

Date Observed: 2-17-99

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

LEGEND:

B - Bulk Sample

B - Bepth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

DD - In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC - Moisture Content (%)

N - SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP - Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)

-
-
-
-

-
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

DESCRIPTION

RESIDUAL SOIL: Light olive brown silty clay (wet, hard).

Work Order: 2232-0-10

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-11

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

MC

 $|U|B|S|$

Ground Elevation: 1018+

|usc| SYM

 CL

D

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may different other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

-
-
-
-
-
- B Bulk Sample

B Bulk Sample

D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC Moisture Content (%)

N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
- -
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System

DD

Location:

Logged By: CHD

Date Observed: 2-18-99

REMARKS

At 1! 2/12"

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-11 (page 2) Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

Date Observed: 2-18-99

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Location: _

Ground Elevation: 1018±

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a actual conditions encountered.

LEGEND:

-
- B Bulk Sample
D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)
MC Moisture Content (%)
N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"
PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-
-
-
- -
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System

c:\DOCS/LOGS/2232

 $|U|B|S|$

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

MC

Ground Elevation: 962+

SYM

USC

CL

lcL

D

 -1

-2

 -3

-4

-5

-6

7

8

Location:

DD

 19.5 102.7

22.5 104.7

veinlets.

moist).

(Hard, damp).

SUB-SURFACE DATA

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

DESCRIPTION

ALLUVIUM: Brown silty clay (hard, moist). Scattered carbonate

Light olive brown silty clay with siltstone fragements (hard,

<u>CALABASAS FORMATION:</u> Olive yellow silty fine-grained sandstone

interbedded with light olive brown to light olive gray clayey

siltstone to claystone. Slightly weathered. Fractured.

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a actual conditions and may cha
LEGEND:

 $\, {\bf B} \,$

 -27

- Bulk Sample
- Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft) D

D - Depth Betow urband (pcf)

DD - In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC - Moisture Content (%)

N - SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP - Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)

-
- -

Dark gray clayey siltstone to claystone (hard, damp).

SMC - %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT - Standard Penetration Test
SYM - Graphic Symbol
U - Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC - Unified Soil Classification System

Work Order: 2232-0-10

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-12

Logged By: CHD

Date Observed: 2-18-99

REMARKS

At 2' 4/12"

At 5' 5/12"

Attitude on Bedding at 7'

N43°W/40°NE

 $1¹$

At 9'

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-12 (page 2)

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 962+

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

 \bar{z}

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

LEGEND:

-
- B Bulk Sample
D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)
MC Moisture Content (%)
N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"
-
-
-
- PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
-

 \bar{z}

c:\DOCS/LOGS/2232

actual conditions encountered.

SUB-SURFACE DATA

DESCRIPTION

RESIDUAL SOIL: Brown silty clay (hard, moist). Scattered siltstone

×

fragments.

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-13

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

|u|в|s

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

MC

Ground Elevation: 1029±

SYM

USC

 CL

D

-1

Location: SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

DD

LEGEND:

SMC - %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT - Standard Penetration Test
SYM - Graphic Symbol
U - Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC - Unified Soil Classification System

Gorian and Associates, Inc.

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

Date Observed: 2-19-99

REMARKS

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-13 (page 2) Work Order: 2232-0-10

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 1029+

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP Location:

Logged By: CHD

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

LEGEND:

-
- B Bulk Sample

B Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC Moisture Content (%)

N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-
-
-
- -
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-13 (page 3)

Logged By: CHD

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim \sim

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

LEGEND:

-
- B Bulk Sample

D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC Moisture Content (%)

N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-
-
-
- -
-
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Scattered carbonate filled fractures.

Scattered siltstone framents.

DESCRIPTION

RESIDUAL SOIL: Light olive brown silty clay (hard, moist).

CALABASAS FORMATION: Brownish yellow clayey siltstone and light

At 9'; highly contorted non-continuous Betonite clay seam (%").

olive brown claystone. Slightly weathered. Fractured, yet tight.

Logged By: CHD

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-14

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

MC

27.4

Location:

DD

99.4

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

UBS

Ground Elevation: 1007±

SYM

USC

CL

 \mathbf{D}

-1

 \overline{c}

-3 -4

-5

-6 $\overline{7}$

-8

-9

 -10

 -11

 -12 -13 -14

 -15 -16 -17

-18

-19

-20

-21

 -22 -23 -74

 -25

 -26

 -27 -28

LEGEND:

- Bulk Sample
- Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft) \overline{B} Ð

 \mathbf{H}

- Graphic Symbol
- Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
- Unified Soil Classification System **USC**

- %Sand-%Silt-%Clay **SMC** S/SPT - Standard Penetration Test

SYM

actual conditions encountered.

- In Place Dry Density (pct) DD

MC - Moisture Content (%)
N - SPT Blows From 6" to 18"
PP - Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)

Date Observed: 2-19-99/2-22-99

REMARKS

At 5! 5/12"

Attitude on Bedding at 8'

N39°W/36°NE At 91

 \mathcal{Y}_h

 11_k

 10^{1} 6/12"

 $15! 5/12"$

201 6/12"

25 ' 8/12"

Gorian and Associates, Inc.

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-14 (page 2)

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 1007+

Date Observed: 2-19-99/2-22-99

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

LEGEND:

- B Bulk Sample

D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC Moisture Content (%)

N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
-
-

SMC - %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT - Standard Penetration Test
SYM - Graphic Symbol
U - Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC - Unified Soil Classification System

EXCAVATION NUMBER: $B-14$ (page 3)

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

 $6 - \frac{1}{2}$ Floughtons 1007+

 1002

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Date Observed: 2-19-99/2-22-99

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ
at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a actual conditions encountered.

LEGEND:

-
-
-
-
- B Bulk Sample
D Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)
MC Moisture Content (%)
N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"
PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
- -
	-
- SMC %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT Standard Penetration Test
SYM Graphic Symbol
U Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC Unified Soil Classification System
	-

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

(hard, moist). Trace sand.

DESCRIPTION

ALLUVIUM: Brown silty clay with scattered gravel of sandstone

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-15

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS

 $|u|$ $s|s|$

Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

MC

Ground Elevation: 936±

SYM

USC

СL

D

-1

Location: _

DĐ

LEGEND:

actual conditions encountered.

-
-
-
- B Bulk Sample

B Bepth Below Ground Elevation (ft)

DD In Place Dry Density (pcf)

MC Moisture Content (%)

N SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)
- %Sand-%Silt-%Clay **SMC** S/S
- **SYM**
- Ũ.
- **USC**
- Graphic Symbol
- Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
- Unified Soil Classification System

Work Order: 2232-0-10 Logged By: CHD

Date Observed: 2-22-99

REMARKS

and the state

Work Order: 2232-0-10

Logged By: CHD

Gorian and Associates, Inc.

EXCAVATION NUMBER: B-15 (page 2)

Project: HESCHEL WEST SCHOOL -AGOURA HILLS Method of Excavation: 24" Diameter Bucket Auger

Ground Elevation: 936± Location: REMARKS $|U|B|S$ DESCRIPTION D lusc SYM **MC** DD At 28'; becoming interbedded with light gray silty fine- to coarse- -28 grained sandstone. -29 At 30'; becoming very indurated. Light gray fine-grained sandstone. -30 Core barrel used. -31 Total depth 30%' (Practical Refusal) -32 No caving Minor seepage below 12' Downholed to 25' -33

This log applies only at the location of this excavation and at the time of excavating. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locations and may change at this location with the passage of time. The data presented are a

LEGEND:

B - Bulk Sample
D - Depth Below Ground Elevation (ft)
DD - In Place Dry Density (pcf)
MC - Moisture Content (%)
N - SPT Blows From 6" to 18"

PP - Pocket Penetrometer Values (TSF)

SMC - %Sand-%Silt-%Clay
S/SPT - Standard Penetration Test
SYM - Graphic Symbol
U - Relatively Undisturbed Drive Sample
USC - Unified Soil Classification System

SEE GEOTECHNICAL MAP

Date Observed: 2-18-99

AVATED: 1/17/98

 $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$

LOG OF BORING

JOB NAME: Mr. David Minas

JOB No. 97-559-02

 $\ddot{}$

APPLIED EARTH SCIENCES GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS FIGURE NO: $1-1$

LE EXCAVATED: 1/17/98

GROUND ELEVATION: +

 α

LOG OF BORING

JOB NAME: Mr. David Minas

JOB No. 97-559-02

APPLIED EARTH SCIENCES GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS FIGURE NO: $1-2$

DATE EXCAVATED: 1/17/98

LOG OF BORING

JOB NAME: Mr. David Minas

JOB No. 97-559-02

FIGURE NO: 1-3

 $\ddot{}$

DATE EXCAVATED: 1/17/98

GROUND ELEVATION: +

LOG OF BORING

 \mathbf{r}

 $\ddot{}$

JOB NAME: Mr. David Minas

JOB No. 97-559-02

APPLIED EARTH SCIENCES GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS FIGURE NO: $1-4$

DATE EXCAVATED: 1/17/98

GROUND ELEVATION: +

LOG OF BORING

JOB NAME: Mr. David Minas

JOB No. 97-559-02

APPLIED EARTH SCIENCES GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$

FIGURE NO: 1-5

DATE EXCAVATED: 1/17/98

GROUND ELEVATION: +

LOG OF BORING

JOB NAME: Mr. David Minas

JOB No. 97-559-02

APPLIED EARTH SCIENCES GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS FIGURE NO: 1-6

l,

DATE EXCAVATED: 1/17/98

 \bar{z}

GROUND ELEVATION: \pm

LOG OF BORING

 \overline{a}

JOB NAME: Mr. David Minas

JOB No. 97-559-02

FIGURE NO: 1-7
APPENDIX B

LABORATORY TESTING

General

The results of our prior laboratory test results on selected relatively undisturbed and bulk samples are presented below. Tests were performed to evaluate the physical and engineering properties of the encountered earth materials, including field moisture and density, compaction characteristics. expansion potential, shear strength, and consolidation potential. In addition, to the prior testing four samples of the on site materials were submitted to an independent corrosion engineer to evaluate the corrosion potential of concrete and metal in contact with the on site soils.

Field Density and Moisture Tests

In situ dry density and moisture content were determined from the relatively undisturbed samples obtained during drilling operations. The test results and a detailed description of the soils encountered are shown on the attached logs of subsurface data, Appendix A.

Maximum Density-Optimum Moisture

Maximum density/optimum moisture tests (compaction characteristics) were performed on selected samples of the encountered materials. The tests were performed in general accordance with ASTM test method D 1557. The results are as follows:

Soil Expansion Tests

Samples of the encountered soils were tested for expansiveness in general accordance with ASTM test method D4829. The results are as follows:

Direct Shear Tests

Direct shear tests were performed on relatively undisturbed and remolded samples of the soil encountered from the borings. The sample sets were saturated prior to being sheared under axial loads ranging from 920 to 3,680 psf at a rate of 0.05 inches per minute. The ultimate shear strength results are attached as graphic summaries.

Load-Consolidation Tests

Load-consolidation tests were conducted on seven relatively undisturbed soil samples. Test loads were added in increments to a maximum of 8,000 psf or 9,400 psf. Water was added at an axial load of 1,000 psf or 1,175 psf to study the effect of moisture infiltration on potential foundation behavior. The results are attached as graphic summaries.

Soil Corrosion

 $\sim 10^{-11}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \bar{z}

The potential for corrosion of concrete and metals in contact with the on site soil was evaluated by an independent corrosion engineer. The results of that evaluation are presented in this appendix.

 \mathcal{A}

 $\sim 10^7$

Explanation: B-9 $@$ 12' = Sample taken from boring 9 at 12 feet in depth. SHEARFORM#1003

Explanation: B-9 $@$ 12' = Sample taken from boring 9 at 12 feet in depth. SHEARFORM #1003

Explanation: B-9 $@$ 12' = Sample taken from boring 9 at 12 feet in depth. SHEARFORM#1003

Results of Direct Shear Test

Explanation: B-9 $@$ 12' = Sample taken from boring 9 at 12 feet in depth.

Results of Direct Shear Test

Explanation: B-9 $@$ 12' = Sample taken from boring 9 at 12 feet in depth.

Work Order No.: 2232 - 0 - 10

Rebound

Load Consolidation Results

Work Order No.: 2232-0-10

Rebound

Work Order No.: 2232-0-10

Work Order No.: 2232 - 0 - 10

CONSOLIDATION #1002

Work Order No.: 2232 - 0 - 10

Rebound

Work Order No.: 2232-0-10

Rebound

Work Order No.: 2232-0-10

2160 Winifred Street Mail: P.O. Box 115 Simi Valley, CA 93062

April 21, 1999 Date:

APR 26 1999

Gorian Associates, Inc. Attention: Randy Wendt 766 Lakefield Road Suite A Westlake Village, CA 91361

Job No.: 1599028

Subject:

Soil Chemistry Analysis for Gorian Job # 2232-1-10 - 4 Samples

Dear Mr. Wendt:

Soil Chemistry Analysis for the above referenced samples are provided below.

NOTE: SAMPLES WERE ANALYZED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING METHODS.

1. MINIMUM RESISTIVITY DETERMINED BY SOIL BOX METHOD, (PER ASTM G-57)

2. PH MEASURED BY POTENTIOMETRIC METHOD USING STANDARD ELECTRODES. (PER CAL TRANS. #643)

3. CHLORIDE AND SULFATE WERE ANALYZED IN ACCORDANCE WITH EPA METHODS FOR CHEMICAL ANALYSIS FOR WATER AND WASTE, NO. 300 EPA-600/4-79-020. CONCENTRATION BY WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL.

Comments:

- \mathcal{I} . Type II modified Portland Cement is recommended for concrete products.
- $\overline{2}$ Soils are corrosive to uncoated ferrous metals.

 $\overline{3}$. Copper pipe should be encased with a minimum of 3" of sand.

Hot and cold water copper pipes require special procedures when installed under concrete $\overline{4}$. floor slabs. Electrical isolation from structural concrete such as footing and steel reinforcing wire or bars in the floor slab should be maintained to prevent future corrosion. We recommend overhead plumbing as the most effective method of preventing corrosion.

Please call if you have any questions.

Very truly yours, ConCeCo Engineering, Inc.

RJC:ch

112 Bunker Court Folsom, CA 95630 (fax) 916.983.1838 (ph) 916.849.6420 Kerri@AtlanticCorrosionEngineers.com corrprincess@ardennet.com www.AtlanticCorrosionEngineers.com

July 1, 2013

Gorian and Associates, Inc. Attention: Sheryl N. Shatz Thousand Oaks, CA 91320

Atlantic Job No.: 2013-013

Subject: Soil Chemistry Analysis for Gorian Job # Soil Chemistry Analysis for Gorian Job #2232-FR-0-100

Fortune Realty, Agoura Equestrian Estates, 4 Samples (C-1, C-2, C-3 and C-4)

 $1.$

MINIMUM RESISTIVITY DETERMINED BY SOIL BOX METHOD, (PER ASTM G-57)
PH MEASURED BY POTENTIOMETRIC METHOD USING STANDARD ELECTRODES. (PER CAL TRANS. #643)
CHLORIDE AND SULFATE WERE ANALYZED IN ACCORDANCE WITH EPA METHODS FOR $\frac{2}{3}$

 $\frac{4}{5}$

APPENDIX C

SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES

Geotechnical sections have been prepared, using geologic data, through natural slopes within and adiacent proposed development areas. A discussion of each of the analyze sections, results of the analyses, and proposed remedial grading solutions as necessary are presented below.

Our analyses considered postulated planar and rotational type failures within the natural and graded slopes. The material strengths for the bedrock were developed using information from our laboratory direct shear testing of both undisturbed and remolded samples.

The undisturbed samples were saturated and sheared to develop cross-bedding strengths. Bulk samples were remolded to field densities, saturated, precut along the plane to be sheared, and sheared repeatedly to develop residual along-bedding strengths. The strengths used in our slope stability analyses are provided below:

The strengths used in our analyses are based upon the materials encountered in our subsurface exploration. Both static analyses and pseudostatic analyses were completed using the ultimate strengths.

Planar failures were evaluated utilizing Janbu's method. This method divides the postulated failure mass into a series of slices. Interslice forces are not taken into account. The analyses utilized anisotropic soil parameters as previously discussed. Numerous trial surfaces were analyzed for each section. Slope stability is commonly stated in terms of calculated factor of safety. The surfaces analyzed are presented graphically. The ten trial surfaces with the lowest factors of safety are presented graphically and listed in our computer output files. Stability results are listed below and analyses are shown on the attached calculation sheets.

The generally accepted lower limit for factor of safety is 1.5 and 1.1 for static and pseudostatic conditions, respectively. Where calculated factors of safety are less than the accepted lower limit, remedial measures were analyzed.

Section A-A'

This section is oriented approximately north-south and includes a portion of the east-west ridge along the south side of the property. A rotational analysis was conducted for this section. The results of the analyses indicate that the critical factor of safety is greater than 1.5 and 1.1 for static and pseudostatic conditions, respectively.

Section C-C'

The slide plane, as observed in boring B-10, is shallow and dips at a low angle $(\sim5^{\circ})$. In the analyses, the slide was limited to a thickness of approximately 10 feet based on the subsurface data and geomorphic expression of the slope face.

This section portravs the slope in the direction of the landslide movement and represents the worst case scenario. The landslide was modeled as both a shallow planner and rotational failure. All materials above the slide plane were assumed to have the weakened residual clay strength (400 psf and 8°). A buttress is recommended with a minimum width of 30 feet. Construction recommendations are contained in the report text. Because the buttress will be constructed with drainage measures in place, the stability analyses were completed by assuming zero pore pressures in the buttress fill. The location of the buttress should be substantially as shown on Cross Section C and should extend laterally across the width of the landslide. Analyses of the slope following the proposed remedial measures indicate the factors of safety are above the minimum required.

WO 2232-0-FR-100 Section A-A'

GSTABL7

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a'.OUT Page 1 *** GSTABL7 $\pi \star \pi$ ** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. ** ** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.005, Sept. 2006 ** (All Rights Reserved-Unauthorized Use Prohibited) SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS SYSTEM Modified Bishop, Simplified Janbu, or GLE Method of Slices. (Includes Spencer & Morgenstern-Price Type Analysis) Including Pier/Pile, Reinforcement, Soil Nail, Tieback, Nonlinear Undrained Shear Strength, Curved Phi Envelope, Anisotropic Soil, Fiber-Reinforced Soil, Boundary Loads, Water Surfaces, Pseudo-Static & Newmark Earthquake, and Applied Forces. Analysis Run Date: $7/23/2013$ Time of Run: 03:47PM Run By: Gorian and Associates, Inc. Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\Sect Input Data Filename: A-A' dat Output Filename: Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\Sect $\texttt{A-A}^{\texttt{+}}$. OUT Unit System: English Plotted Output Filename: Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\Sect $\mathtt{A}\text{-}\mathtt{A}^{\intercal}$. \mathtt{PLT} PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: WO 2232-0-FR-100 Section A-A' BOUNDARY COORDINATES 14 Top Boundaries 15 Total Boundaries Soil Type Y-Left X-Right Y-Right Boundary X-Left No. (fE) (f_t) (ft) (E_t) Below Bnd 0.00 934.00 32.00 935.00 $\mathbf{1}$ $\mathbf{1}$ 62.00 937.00 \overline{a} 32.00 935.00 $\mathbf 1$ 62.00 937.00 75.00 940.00 \overline{a} 3 75.00 940.00 92.00 944.00 \overline{a} $\overline{4}$ $\overline{5}$ 92.00 944.00 139.00 960.00 $\overline{2}$ 6 139.00 960.00 166.00 970.00 2 $\overline{7}$ 166.00 970.00 201.00 981.00 $\overline{2}$ 981.00 8 201.00 208.00 984.00 $\overline{2}$ $\overline{9}$ 984.00 231.00 988.00 $\overline{2}$ 208.00 10 988.00 249.00 993.00 $\overline{2}$ 231.00 1000.00 \overline{a} 11 249.00 993.00 275.00 $12²$ 275.00 1000.00 290.00 1005.00 $\overline{2}$ \overline{a} 13 290.00 1005.00 304.00 1005.00 14 304.00 1005.00 343.00 1003.00 $\mathbf 2$ 937.00 15 0.00 62.00 $\overline{2}$ 921.00 User Specified Y-Origin = $800.00(ft)$ Default X-Plus Value = 0.00 (ft) Default Y-Plus Value = 0.00 (ft) ISOTROPIC SOIL PARAMETERS 2 Type(s) of Soil Soil Total Saturated Cohesion Friction Pore Pressure Piez. Type Unit Wt. Unit Wt. Intercept Angle Pressure Constant Surface $No. (pcf)$ (pcf) (psf) (deg) Param. (psf) No. 200.0 30.0 $0.00 -$ 120.0 120.0 125.0 Ω $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{2}$ 120.0 120.0 400.0 36.0 0.00 125.0 \circ ANISOTROPIC STRENGTH PARAMETERS 1 soil type (s) Soil Type 2 Is Anisotropic Number Of Direction Ranges Specified = 3 Direction Counterclockwise Cohesion Friction Range Direction Limit Intercept Angle No. (deq) (psf) (deq) 36.00 400.00 $\mathbf{1}$ 39.0 \overline{a} 52.0 400.00 8.00 3 400.00 36.00 90.0 ANISOTROPIC SOIL NOTES: (1) An input value of 0.01 for C and/or Phi will cause Aniso

C and/or Phi to be ignored in that range. (2) An input value of 0.02 for Phi will set both Phi and C equal to zero, with no water weight in the tension crack. An input value of 0.03 for Phi will set both Phi and (3) C equal to zero, with water weight in the tension crack. A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified. 5000 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated. 100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 50 Points Equally Spaced Along The Ground Surface Between $X = 50.00 (ft)$
and $X = 100.00 (ft)$ Each Surface Terminates Between $X = 220.00 (ft)$ and $X = 300.00(ft)$ Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation At Which A Surface Extends Is $Y = 0.00$ (ft) 10.00(ft) Line Segments Define Each Trial Failure Surface. Following Are Displayed The Ten Most Critical Of The Trial Failure Surfaces Evaluated. They Are Ordered - Most Critical First. * * Safety Factors Are Calculated By The Modified Bishop Method * * Total Number of Trial Surfaces Attempted = 5000 Number of Trial Surfaces With Valid $\overline{FS} = 5000$ Statistical Data On All Valid FS Values: FS Max = 4.984 FS Min = 2.922 FS Ave = 3.517 Standard Deviation = 0.381 Coefficient of Variation = 10.83 % Failure Surface Specified By 18 Coordinate Points Point $X-Surf$ Y-Surf (f_t) No. (ft) \perp 73.469 939.647 \overline{a} 83.044 936.762 92.808 934.603 $\mathbf{3}$ $\overline{4}$ 102.707 933.181 5 112.684 932.504 ϵ 932.577 122.684 $7\overline{ }$ 132.650 933.398 8 934.963 142.527 152.258 -9 937.263 940.286 10 161.791 11 171.070 944.015 $12[°]$ 180.043 948.427 13 188.661 953.500 196.875 959.203 1.4 15 204.639 965.506 211.909 972.372 16 17 218.644 979.764 18 224.158 986.810 Circle Center At $X = 116.716$; $Y = 1065.783$; and Radius = 133.344 Factor of Safety 2.922 *** *** 23 slices Individual data on the Water Water Tie Tie Earthquake Force Force Force Force Force Surcharge Hor Ver Slice Width Norm Tan **Load** Weight Top Bot No. (f_t) (lbs) (lbs) (lbs) $(1bs)$ (lbs) (ls) $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ $\mathbf{1}$ 1.5 74.8 0.0 199.8 $0.$ $\overline{}$ 0. 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1050.2 0 . 0.0 0.0 0.0 \mathcal{D} $8 \ . \ 0$ 2869.3 $0.$ 9.0 7710.2 0.0 1146.5 $0.$ $0.$ 0.0 0.0 0.0 \mathbf{B} $\ensuremath{\textbf{0}}$. $\ensuremath{\textbf{8}}$ 0.1 916.3 0.0 103.5 $0.$ 0.0 0.0 0.0 $\overline{4}$ 9.9 0.0 5 14334.6 0.0 10.0 19755.3 0.0 0.0 6 $\overline{7}$ 24243.0 0.0 0.0 10.0 8 10.0 27691.9 0.0 0.0 19064.4 0.0 0.0 9 6.4 7.0 3.5 10990.1 0.0 0.0 31525.5 0.0 0.0 $11\,$ 9.7 31914.8 0.0 0.0

 0.0

 0.0

 12

 13

 9.5

 4.2

14188.5


```
Y: \2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a'.OUT Page 4
    5
              107.572
                             931.163
    6
              117.572
                             931.056
    \overline{7}127.554
                             931.641
    ^{\rm 8}137.473
                             932.918
    -9
              147.278
                             934.878
                             937.514
   10156.925
              166.365
                             940.813
   1112175.554
                             944.758
   13184.448
                             949.330
   14\,193.002
                             954.508
   15
              201.178
                             960.267
              208.934
                             966.579
   1617216.235
                             973.413
   18
              223.044
                             980.737
   79228.571
                             987.578
                         114.125 ; Y = 1075.170 ; and Radius =
Circle Center At X =144.155
       Factor of Safety
             2.935 ***
       ***Failure Surface Specified By 20 Coordinate Points
  Point
              X-Surf
                            Y-Surf
   No.
               (Et)(f<sub>td</sub>)68.367
                             938.469
    \mathcal{L}\overline{a}77.806
                             935.165
    \overline{3}87.460
                             932.558
    \overline{4}97.278
                             930.661
    5
              107.209
                             929.486
    6
              117.199
                             929.037
    \overline{7}127.195
                             929.318
    8
                             930.327
              137.144
    9
              146.993
                             932.058
              156.690
   1\,0934.503
   11166.182
                             937.648
   12
              175.420
                             941.476
   13184.354
                             945.968
   14
              192.938
                             951.100
   15
              201.124
                             956.843
   16
              208.869
                             963.168
   17216.133
                             970.041
   18\,222.877
                             977.425
              229.065
                             985.281
   19
   20
              230.889
                             987.981
Circle Center At X =118.342 ; Y = 1065.923 ; and Radius =
                                                                        136.901
       Factor of Safety
              2.940 ***
      \star\star\starFailure Surface Specified By 17 Coordinate Points
                            Y-SurfPoint
              X-Surf
               (f_t)(f_t)No.
    \mathbf{1}83.673
                             942.041
                             938.966
    \overline{a}93.189
    3
              102.928
                             936.697
                             935.250
    \bf{4}112.823
    5
              122.804
                             934.636
    \epsilon132.802
                             934.859
    \overline{7}142.745
                             935.917
    ^{\rm 8}152.566
                             937.803
    \ddot{q}940.504
              162.195
   10171.563
                             944.000
   11180.607
                             948.267
                             953.276
   12189.262
   13197.469
                             958.991
   14\,205.168
                             965.372
                             972.374
   15212.307
   16
              218.835
                             979.949
   17
              223.763
                             986.741
Circle Center At X =125.143; Y = 1054.095; and Radius =
                                                                        119.482
       Factor of Safety
      \star\star\star2.944
                       \star\star\star
```


 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a'.OUT Page 6 212.400 975.534 16 17 219.036 983.015 221.590 986.364 18 Circle Center At $X = 114.705$; $Y = 1068.619$; and Radius = 134.872 Factor of Safety 2.946 *** $***$ Failure Surface Specified By 19 Coordinate Points Point $X-Surf$ Y-Surf \bar{z} No. (ft) (f_t) $\mathbf{1}$ 71.429 939.176 2 81.041 936.419 $\mathbf{3}$ 90.821 934.333 100.722 932.928 $\overline{4}$ $5\overline{5}$ 110.696 932.211 ϵ 120.696 932.186 $\overline{7}$ 130.674 932.852 $\mathbf{8}$ 934.206 140.582 9 150.372 936.242 938.951 10 159.999 11 169.414 942.318 12 178.575 946.328 13 950.963 187.437 14 195.956 956.198 15 204.094 962.011 16 211.810 968.372 975.251 17 219.067 18 225.832 982.616 19 229.991 987.824 Circle Center At X = 116.063 ; Y = 1076.652 ; and Radius = 144.541 Factor of Safety *** 2.949 *** **** END OF GSTABL7 OUTPUT ****

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a' ps.OUT Page 1 *** GSTABL7 *** ** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. ** ** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.005, Sept. 2006 ** (All Rights Reserved-Unauthorized Use Prohibited) SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS SYSTEM Modified Bishop, Simplified Janbu, or GLE Method of Slices. (Includes Spencer & Morgenstern-Price Type Analysis) Including Pier/Pile, Reinforcement, Soil Nail, Tieback, Nonlinear Undrained Shear Strength, Curved Phi Envelope, Anisotropic Soil, Fiber-Reinforced Soil, Boundary Loads, Water Surfaces, Pseudo-Static & Newmark Earthquake, and Applied Forces. $7/24/2013$ Analysis Run Date: Time of Run: $11:17AM$ Run By: Gorian and Associates, Inc. Input Data Filename: Y: \2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a' ps.dat Y: \2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect Output Filename: a-a' ps.OUT Unit System: English Plotted Output Filename: Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a' ps.PLT PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: WO 2232-0-FR-100 Section A-A' pseudo-static BOUNDARY COORDINATES 14 Top Boundaries 15 Total Boundaries Boundary $X-T \in F$ Y-Left X-Right Y-Right Soil Type (fE) Below Bnd No. (ft) (f_t) (f_{tt}) 934.00 32.00 $1\,$ 0.00 935.00 $\mathbf{1}$ 32.00 935.00 62.00 937.00 \mathcal{D} \mathbf{I} 937.00 75.00 3 62.00 940.00 $\overline{2}$ $4\overline{ }$ 75.00 940.00 92.00 944.00 $\overline{2}$ 92.00 944.00 139.00 960.00 $\overline{2}$ 5 166.00 ϵ 139.00 960.00 970.00 $\overline{2}$ $\overline{7}$ 201.00 $\overline{2}$ 166.00 970.00 981.00 981.00 984.00 \mathbf{a} 201.00 208.00 $\overline{2}$ \mathbf{Q} 208.00 984.00 231.00 988.00 \overline{z} 993.00 988.00 $10\,$ 231.00 249.00 \overline{a} 993.00 71 249.00 275.00 1000.00 -2 12 275.00 1000.00 290.00 1005.00 2 13 290.00 1005.00 304.00 1005.00 2 1005.00 304.00 343.00 1003.00 $\overline{2}$ 14 15 0.00 921.00 62.00 937.00 $\overline{2}$ User Specified Y-Origin $=$ 850.00(ft) Default X-Plus Value = 0.00 (ft) Default Y-Plus Value = 0.00 (ft) ISOTROPIC SOIL PARAMETERS 2 Type(s) of Soil Soil Total Saturated Cohesion Friction Pore Pressure Piez. Type Unit Wt. Unit Wt. Intercept Angle Pressure Constant Surface \mathbb{N} o. (pcf) (pcf) (psf) (deg) Param. (psf) NO. 120.0 120.0 200.0 30.0 $0.00 125.0$ $\overline{0}$ $\mathbf{1}$ 120.0 400.0 36.0 0.00 125.0 $\overline{2}$ 120.0 Ω ANISOTROPIC STRENGTH PARAMETERS 1 soil type(s) Soil Type 2 Is Anisotropic Number Of Direction Ranges Specified = 3 Direction Counterclockwise Cohesion Friction Range Direction Limit Intercept Angle No. (deq) (psf) (deg) 400.00 36.00 39.0 $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{2}$ 52.0 400.00 8.00 3 90.0 400.00 36.00 ANISOTROPIC SOIL NOTES: (1) An input value of 0.01 for C and/or Phi will cause Aniso

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a' ps.OUT Page 2

C and/or Phi to be ignored in that range.

(2) An input value of 0.02 for Phi will set both Phi and C equal to zero, with no water weight in the tension crack. (3) An input value of 0.03 for Phi will set both Phi and C equal to zero, with water weight in the tension crack. Specified Peak Ground Acceleration Coefficient $(A) = 0.400(g)$ Specified Horizontal Earthquake Coefficient (kh) = $0.150(q)$ Specified Vertical Earthquake Coefficient $(kv) = 0.000(q)$ Specified Seismic Pore-Pressure Factor = 0.000 A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified. 5000 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated. 100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 50 Points Equally Spaced Along The Ground Surface Between $X = 50.00$ (ft) and $X = 100.00 (ft)$ Each Surface Terminates Between $X = 220.00(ft)$
and $X = 300.00(ft)$ Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation At Which A Surface Extends Is $Y = 0.00$ (ft) 10.00(ft) Line Seqments Define Each Trial Failure Surface. Following Are Displayed The Ten Most Critical Of The Trial Failure Surfaces Evaluated. They Are Ordered - Most Critical First. * * Safety Factors Are Calculated By The Modified Bishop Method * * Total Number of Trial Surfaces Attempted = 5000 Number of Trial Surfaces With Valid FS = 5000 Statistical Data On All Valid FS Values: FS Max = 3.362 FS Min = 1.969 FS Ave = 2.329 Standard Deviation = 0.264 Coefficient of Variation = 11.34 $%$ Failure Surface Specified By 19 Coordinate Points Y-Surf X-Surf Point No. (f_t) (f_f) 68.367 938.469 $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{2}$ 77.955 935.626 933.454 $\overline{3}$ 87.716 $\overline{4}$ 97.604 931.964 5 107.572 931.163 6 117.572 931.056 $\overline{7}$ 127.554 931.641 8 137.473 932.918 9 147.278 934.878 10 156.925 937.514 11 166.365 940.813 175.554 944.758 12 13 184.448 949.330 14 193.002 954.508 201.178 15 960.267 16 208.934 966.579 17 216.235 973.413 223.044 980.737 1.8 19 228.571 987.578 Circle Center At X = 114.125 ; Y = 1075.170 ; and Radius = 144.155 Factor of Safety $***$ 1.969 *** Individual data on the 24 slices Water Water Tie Tie Earthquake Force Force Force Surcharge Force Force Slice Width Weight Bot Tan Ver Load Top Norm Hor (lbs) (tt) $(\exists bs)$ $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ No. (lbs) (lbs) $(1bs)$ 208.8 $\overline{}$ 0. $\overline{0}$. 6.6 1392.0 0.0 864.8 0.0 0.0 $\mathbf{1}$ \overline{a} 3.0 0.0 385.2 $0.$ $0.$ 227.8 0.0 1518.7 0.0 $0.1283.3$ 0.0 1250.0 3 9.8 8555.0 $0.$ 0.0 0.0 4.3 0.0 $\mathbf{0}$. 0.1 799.3 \overline{A} 5328.4 541.6 0.0 0.0 5 5.6 8451.8 0.0 0.0 ϵ 10.0 19187.0 0.0 0.0 $\overline{7}$ 0.0 10.0 23871.0 $0₀$

 0.0

 0.0

 R

 10.0

27619.7

 $\overline{3}$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a' ps.OUT Paqe 5 15 198.956 961.575 16 206.666 967.943 17 213.921 974.825 $18\,$ 220.688 982.188 19 224.421 986.856 Circle Center At $X =$ 110.007; $Y = 1077.114$; and Radius = 145.812 Factor of Safety $***$ $1,977$ *** Failure Surface Specified By 28 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf No. (EE) (f_t) 936.948 61.224 $\mathbf 1$ $\overline{2}$ 70.881 934.349 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 80.640 932.168 $\overline{4}$ 90.484 930.408 $\overline{5}$ 100.395 929.074 6 110.353 928.166 $\overline{7}$ 927.688 120.342 130.342 927.639 8 $\overline{9}$ 140.334 928.020 10 150.302 928.831 11 160.225 930.070 12 170.085 931.734 13 179.865 933.820 14 189.546 936.325 15 199.111 939.244 16 208.541 942.571 946.301 17 217.819 18 226.929 950.426 19 235.853 954.939 20 959.831 244.574 21 253.077 965.094 22 261.346 970.718 23 976.692 269.365 277.121 24 983.005 25 284.597 989.646 26 291.781 996.602 27 298.660 1003.861 28 299.650 1005.000 Circle Center At $X = 126.471$; $Y = 1160.050$; and Radius = 232.446 Factor of Safety $\star \star \star$ 1.978 *** Failure Surface Specified By 21 Coordinate Points X-Surf Point Y-Surf No. (f_t) (ft) $\mathbf{1}$ 61.224 936.948 70.752 933.909 $\overline{2}$ 3 80.460 931.513 4 90.307 929.769 5 928.686 100.248 6 110.239 928.268 $\overline{7}$ 120.236 928.517 8 929.433 130.194 $\overline{9}$ 140.069 931.011 10 149.817 933.243 11 159.393 936.121 12 168.757 939.632 13 177.866 943.758 14 948.484 186.679 15 195.157 953.786 16 203.263 959.642 1.7 210.961 966.026 18 972.909 218.215 19 224.994 980.260 231.268 988.047 20 231.292 988.081 21 Circle Center At X = 111.502 ; Y = 1078.120 ; and Radius = 149.857

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect a-a' ps.OUT Page 6

*** GSTABL7 *** ** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. ** ** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.005, Sept. 2006 ** (All Rights Reserved-Unauthorized Use Prohibited) SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS SYSTEM Modified Bishop, Simplified Janbu, or GLE Method of Slices. (Includes Spencer & Morgenstern-Price Type Analysis) Including Pier/Pile, Reinforcement, Soil Nail, Tieback, Nonlinear Undrained Shear Strength, Curved Phi Envelope, Anisotropic Soil, Fiber-Reinforced Soil, Boundary Loads, Water Surfaces, Pseudo-Static & Newmark Earthquake, and Applied Forces. 7/24/2013 Analysis Run Date: Time of Run: 10:29AM Run By: Gorian and Associates, Inc. Input Data Filename: v:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c'.dat y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect Output Filename: $\text{c-c}\space$. OUT English Unit System: Plotted Output Filename: y: \2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect $c-c$ '.PLT PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: WO 2232-0-FR-100 Section C-C' BOUNDARY COORDINATES

y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c'.OUT Page 4 $***$ $***$ 2.219 Failure Surface Specified By 10 Coordinate Points Point $X-Surf$ Y-Surf No. (fth) (ft) $\mathbf{1}$ 111.750 998.955 $\overline{2}$ 111.986 998.749 $\overline{3}$ 123.976 998.258 989.786 $\sqrt{4}$ 132.475 $\overline{5}$ 408.905 1077.590 6 417.351 1086.114 $\overline{7}$ 425.189 1095.201 \mathbf{a} 432.175 1104.958 9 1116.474 435.551 10 438.587 1120.724 Factor of Safety $***$ 2.219 $\overline{***}$ Failure Surface Specified By 10 Coordinate Points $X-Surf$ Y-Surf Point No. (f_U) (f_t) $\mathbf{1}$ 111.750 998.955 \overline{c} 111.986 998.749 123.976 998.258 3 $\overline{4}$ 132.475 989.786 5 408.905 1077.590 ϵ 417.351 1086.114 $\overline{7}$ 425.189 1095.201 R 432.175 1104.958 9 435.551 1116.474 10 438.587 1120.724 Factor of Safety $\star\star\star$ 2.219 *** Failure Surface Specified By 10 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf $(f_t(t))$ (f_t) $No.$ $\mathbf{1}$ 111.750 998.955 998.749 \mathcal{P} 111.986 $\overline{3}$ 123.976 998.258 $\overline{4}$ 132.475 989.786 5 408.905 1077.590 6 1086.114 417.351 $\overline{7}$ 425.189 1095.201 8 432.175 1104.958 435.551 9 1116.474 10 438.587 1120.724 Factor of Safety $2,219$ *** $***$ Failure Surface Specified By 10 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf $(f[†])$ (f_t) No. 111.750 998.955 $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{2}$ 111.986 998.749 3 123.976 998.258 $\overline{4}$ 132.475 989.786 5 408.905 1077.590 ϵ 417.351 1086.114 $\overline{7}$ 425.189 1095.201 8 432.175 1104.958 \mathbf{Q} 435.551 1116.474 1120.724 10 438.587 Factor of Safety 2.219 *** $***$ Failure Surface Specified By 10 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf (f_t) (ft) No. 111.750 998.955 $\mathbf{1}$ 998.749 \overline{c} 111.986 \mathfrak{Z} 123.976 998.258

 $\overline{}$

y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c'.OUT Page 5 $\overline{4}$ 132.475 989.786 408.905 1077.590 -5 417.351 1086.114 6 $\overline{7}$ 425.189 1095.201 8 432.175 1104.958 $\overline{9}$ 435.551 1116.474 10 438.587 1120.724 Factor of Safety $****$ 2.219 *** Failure Surface Specified By 10 Coordinate Points $X-Surf$ $Y-Surf$ Point No. (ft) (f_t) $\mathbf{1}$ 111.750 998.955 $\overline{2}$ 111.986 998.749 $\mathbf{3}$ 123.976 998.258 $\overline{4}$ 132.475 989.786 5 1077.590 408.905 6 417.351 1086.114 $\overline{7}$ 425.189 1095.201 432.175 8 1104.958 $\ddot{9}$ 435.551 1116.474 438.587 1120.724 10 Factor of Safety 2.219 *** $\star\star\star$ Failure Surface Specified By 10 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf (f^t) (ft) No. $\mathbf{1}$ 111.750 998.955 $\overline{2}$ 111.986 998.749 $\overline{3}$ 123.976 998.258 $\overline{4}$ 132.475 989.786 1077.590 5 408.905 6 417.351 1086.114 $\overline{7}$ 425.189 1095.201 $\, 8$ 432.175 1104.958 \mathbf{Q} 1116.474 435.551 10 438.587 1120.724 Factor of Safety 2.219 *** $***$ Failure Surface Specified By 10 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf (f_t) No. (f_t) 998.955 $\mathbf{1}$ 111.750 \overline{c} 111.986 998.749 998.258 3 123.976 989.786 \overline{A} 132.475 5 408.905 1077.590 $\sqrt{6}$ 417.351 1086.114 $\overline{7}$ 425.189 1095.201 8 432.175 1104.958 \mathbf{Q} 435.551 1116.474 $10\,$ 438.587 1120.724 Factor of Safety 2.219 *** $***$ **** END OF GSTABL7 OUTPUT ****

GSTABL7

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' ps.OUT Page 1 *** GSTABL7 *** ** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. ** ** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.005, Sept. 2006 ** (All Rights Reserved-Unauthorized Use Prohibited) SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS SYSTEM Modified Bishop, Simplified Janbu, or GLE Method of Slices. (Includes Spencer & Morgenstern-Price Type Analysis) Including Pier/Pile, Reinforcement, Soil Nail, Tieback, Nonlinear Undrained Shear Strength, Curved Phi Envelope, Anisotropic Soil, Fiber-Reinforced Soil, Boundary Loads, Water Surfaces, Pseudo-Static & Newmark Earthquake, and Applied Forces. Analysis Run Date: $7/24/2013$ Time of Run: 11:02AM Run By: Gorian and Associates, Inc. Y: \2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect Input Data Filename: $c-c$ ps.dat Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect Output Filename: c-c' ps.OUT Unit System: English Plotted Output Filename: Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect $c-c$ ps. PLT PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: WO 2232-0-FR-100 Section C-C' pseudo-static BOUNDARY COORDINATES Boundaries 16 Top 31 Total Boundaries X-Right Y-Right Soil Type Y-Left Boundary X-Left (f_t) (f_t) (ft) Below Bnd $NO₋$ $(f+1)$ $0\,$. $0\,0$ 978.00 6.00 978.00 \mathcal{R} $\mathbf{1}$ 34.00 985.00 978.00 $\overline{3}$ \mathcal{D} 6.00 $\overline{3}$ 34.00 985.00 70.00 992.00 $\overline{2}$ 70.00 992.00 84.00 994.00 $\overline{2}$ $\overline{4}$ 1004.00 994.00 140.00 $\mathbf{1}$ 5 84.00 1004.00 229.00 1030.00 2 140.00 6 $\overline{7}$ 1030.00 268.00 1045.00 $\boldsymbol{2}$ 229.00 302.00 1058.00 $\overline{2}$ 1045.00 8 268.00 302.00 1058.00 $\overline{9}$ 328.00 1072.00 2 359.00 1084.00 \overline{a} 10 328.00 1072.00 $11\,$ 359.00 1084.00 380.00 1095.00 2 415.00 1109.00 2 12 380.00 1095.00 422.00 1111.00 $\overline{\mathbf{4}}$ 13 415.00 1109.00 480.00 1145.00 $\overline{4}$ 14 422.00 1111.00 1145.00 505.00 1150.00 $\overline{4}$ 15 480.00 1150.00 1150.00 656.00 16 505.00 $\overline{4}$ \overline{a} 17 127.00 990.00 140.00 1004.00 2 84.00 994.00 93.00 985.00 18 $\overline{3}$ 19 34.00 985.00 45.00 981.00 20 45.00 981.00 60.00 980.00 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 980.00 973.00 60.00 $\overline{4}$ 0.00 21 22 60.00 980.00 93.00 985.00 $\overline{4}$ 23 93.00 985.00 123.00 983.00 $\bf 4$ 127.00 990.00 983.00 $\overline{4}$ 24 123.00 25 127.00 990.00 159.00 996.00 $\overline{4}$ 996.00 180.00 1002.00 $\overline{4}$ 26 159.00 1002.00 259.00 1030.00 $\overline{4}$ 27 180.00 1030.00 323.00 1058.00 $\overline{4}$ 28 259.00 29 1058.00 373.00 1082.00 $\bf{4}$ 323.00 1098.00 400.00 $\overline{4}$ 30 373.00 1082.00 1098.00 415.00 1109.00 \overline{a} 31 400.00 User Specified Y-Origin $=$ 850.00(ft) Default X-Plus Value = 0.00 (ft) Default Y-Plus Value = 0.00 (ft) ISOTROPIC SOIL PARAMETERS 4 Type (s) of Soil Soil Total Saturated Cohesion Friction Pore Pressure Piez.

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' ps.OUT Paqe 2 Type Unit Wt. Unit Wt. Intercept Angle Pressure Constant Surface (pcf) (psf) (deg) Param. (psf) N_O . $No.$ (pcf) 30.0 0.00 0.0 Ω 120.0 120.0 400.0 $\mathbf{1}$ 120.0 120.0 400.0 8.0 0.00 125.0 Ω \hat{z} 200.0 $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$ 1200 120.0 30.0 0.00 125.0 \circ 125.0 120.0 120.0 400.0 36.0 0.00Ω \overline{A} Specified Peak Ground Acceleration Coefficient $(A) = 0.400(q)$ Specified Horizontal Earthquake Coefficient (kh) = $0.150(q)$ Specified Vertical Earthquake Coefficient (kv) = $0.000(q)$ Specified Seismic Pore-Pressure Factor = 0.000 A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random Technique For Generating Sliding Block Surfaces, Has Been Specified. 5000 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated. 2 Boxes Specified For Generation Of Central Block Base Length Of Line Segments For Active And Passive Portions Of Sliding Block Is 15.0 X-Left Y-Left X-Right Y-Right Height **Box** (ft) No. (Et) (ft) (ft) (f_t) 30.00 965.00 175.00 990.00 17.00 $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{2}$ 350.00 1050.00 450.00 1095.00 20.00 Following Are Displayed The Ten Most Critical Of The Trial Failure Surfaces Evaluated. They Are Ordered - Most Critical First. * * Safety Factors Are Calculated By The Simplified Janbu Method * * Total Number of Trial Surfaces Attempted = 5000 Number of Trial Surfaces With Valid FS = 5000 Statistical Data On All Valid FS Values: FS Max = 2.258 FS Min = 1.441 FS Ave = 1.838 Standard Deviation = 0.151 Coefficient of Variation = 8.21 $%$ Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points X-Surf Y-Surf Point No. (ft) (f_t) $1\,$ 133.440 1002.829 1001.294 \overline{a} 135.774 3 148.866 993.972 $\overline{4}$ 436.420 1086.354 5 443.676 1099.482 6 454.149 1110.220 $\overline{7}$ 1121.237 464.329 \mathbf{R} 470.297 1134.998 9 474.207 1141.604 Factor of Safety 1.441 *** $***$ Individual data on the 25 slices Water Water Tie Tie Earthquake Force Force Force **Force** Force Surcharge Slice Width **Bot** Norm Tan Hor Ver Load Weight Top $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ (lbs) No. (f_{tt}) $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ (lbs) $\overline{0}$. 0.0 41.0 0.0 $\mathbf{1}$ 2.3 273.3 0.0 0.0 $0.$ $0.$ 48.1 0.0 0.0 \mathcal{D} 1.1 320.4 0.0 0.0 219.0 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 3.1 1459.8 0.0 443.7 $0.$ $0.$ 0.0 0.0 $0.$ $0.1372.7$ 8.7 9151.4 0.0 1245.3 0.0 0.0 $\overline{4}$ 24.5 $0.$ 0.1 $\ensuremath{\text{o}}$. $\ensuremath{\text{2}}$ 257.1 0.0 38.6 0.0 0.0 5 ϵ 1.0 1441.9 0.0 125.2 $0.$ $0.$ 216.3 0.0 0.0 $\overline{7}$ 79.2 108667.2 $0.0 10395.9$ 0.1 $0.16300.1$ 0.0 0.0 $0.2014.6$ 10.5 13430.7 0.0 1384.0 $0₋$ 0.0 0.0 8 $0.4051.5$ 9 19.5 27010.1 0.0 2554.7 $\overline{0}$. 0.0 0.0 0.0 1181.6
0.0 4463.9 $0.2020.0$ 10 9.0 13466.4 $0.$ 0.0 0.0 $0.$ $0.8441.0$ 0.0 0.0 11 34.0 56273.3 $\begin{array}{cccc} 0\centerdot 0 & 44\mathtt{0.5.7} \\ 0\centerdot 0 & 2757.1 & 0 \\ 0\centerdot 0 & 656.5 & 0 \\ 0\centerdot 0 & 4070.1 & 0 \\ 0\centerdot 0 & 1838.1 & 0 \\ 0\centerdot 0 & 919.0 & 0 \\ 0\centerdot 0 & 2625.8 & 0 \\ 0\centerdot 0 & 1969.4 & 0 \\ \end{array}.$ 12 21.0 43120.9 $0.$ 6468.1 0.0 0.0 $0.1794.1$ 13 5.0 11961.0 0.0 0.0 $0.11996.1$ 0.0 0.0 79974.1 14 31.0 15 14.0 40213.4 $0.6032.0$ 0.0 0.0 7.0 21893.1 $0.3284.0$ 0.0 0.0 16 17 66143.0 $0.9921.4$ 0.0 $0₀$ 20.0 $0.7813.1$ 18 15.0 52087.3 0.0 0.0

Y: \2232 Heschel West School \2232-0-FR engineering calcs \sect c-c' ps. OUT Page 3 19 7.0 24698.9 0.0 919.0 $0.$ $0.3704.8$ 0.0 0.0 $0.8095.3$ 20 14.4 53968.6 0.0 1893.2 $\mathbf{0}$. 0.0 ${\bf 0}$. ${\bf 0}$ $0.0 1875.0$
0.0 1875.0
0.0 1875.0 $0. 3743.5$
0. 4133.3 $0.$ 21 7.3 24956.7 0.0 0.0 22 10.5 27555.1 $0.$ 0.0 0.0 $0.3133.7$ $0.$ 23 10.2 20891.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 1875.0 $0.$ $0.1014.7$ 0.0 0.0 24 6.0 6765.0 0.0 959.5 25 3.9 1011.9 $0.$ $0. 151.8$ 0.0 0.0 Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points Point $X-Surf$ $Y-Surf$ $(f(t))$ No. (f_t) $\mathbf{1}$ 133.440 1002.829 135.774 1001.294 $\overline{2}$ $\overline{3}$ 148.866 993.972 436.420 1086.354 $\overline{4}$ 1099.482 $5¹$ 443.676 6 454.149 1110.220 $\overline{7}$ 464.329 1121.237 \mathbf{R} 470.297 1134.998 474.207 1141.604 9 Factor of Safety 1.441 *** $***$ Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points $Y-\bar{S}urt$ Point X-Surf No. (ft) (f_t) 133.440 $\mathbf{1}$ 1002.829 135.774 1001.294 2 3 148.866 993.972 1086.354 $\overline{4}$ 436.420 $\overline{5}$ 443.676 1099.482 $\mathbf 6$ 454.149 1110.220 $+10.297$
474.207 1134.998
474.207 1141 1121.237 $\overline{7}$ 464.329 8 9 Factor of Safety 1.441 *** $* * *$ Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points X-Surf Y-Surf Point No. (E_t) (ft) $\mathbf{1}$ 133.440 1002.829 1001.294 $\overline{2}$ 135.774 $\overline{3}$ 148.866 993.972 1086.354 $\bf 4$ 436.420 5 443.676 1099.482 6 454.149 1110.220 $\overline{7}$ 464.329 1121.237 1134.998 \mathbf{R} 470.297 474.207 1141.604 9 Factor of Safety 1.441 *** $* + +$ Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points $X-Surf$ Y-Surf Point (ft) No. (ft) 1002.829 133.440 $\mathbf{1}$ 1002.022 1001.294 202.972 $\overline{2}$ 135.774 3 148.866 993.972 1086.354 $\overline{4}$ 436.420 5 443.676 1099.482 6 454.149 1110.220 $\overline{7}$ 1121.237 464.329 \mathbf{g} 470.297 1134.998 474.207 1141.604 \mathbf{Q} Factor of Safety 1.441 *** $\star\star\star$ Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf No. \langle f t \rangle (ft) 133.440 1002.829 $\mathbf{1}$

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' ps.OUT Page 4 \mathcal{D} 135.774 1001.294 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 148.866 993.972 4 436.420 1086.354 $\overline{5}$ 443.676 1099.482 ϵ 454.149 1110.220 464.329 1121.237 $\overline{7}$ \mathbf{a} 470.297 1134.998 474.207 1141,604 $\mathbf Q$ Factor of Safety $***$ 1.441 *** Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf No. (ft) (ft) $\mathbf{1}$ 133.440 1002.829 135.774 $2 -$ 1001.294 $\mathbf{3}$ 148.866 993.972 $\overline{4}$ 436.420 1086.354 $\overline{5}$ 443.676 1099.482 ϵ 454.149 1110.220 $\overline{7}$ 464.329 1121.237 470.297 1134.998 8 474.207 1141.604 \mathbf{Q} Factor of Safety \boldsymbol{x} \boldsymbol{x} \boldsymbol{x} 1.441 *** Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points $Y-Surf$ Point X-Surf (f_t) (tt) NO. $\mathbf{1}$ 133.440 1002.829 2 135.774 1001.294 148.866 993.972 $\mathbf{3}$ 1086.354 $\overline{4}$ 436.420 5 443.676 1099.482 6 454.149 1110.220 $\overline{7}$ 464.329 1121.237 8 470.297 1134.998 474.207 1141.604 \mathbf{Q} Factor of Safety 1.441 *** *** Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points $Y-Surf$ Point X-Surf No. (ft) (f_t) $\mathbf{1}$ 133.440 1002.829 1001.294 $\overline{2}$ 135.774 $\mathbf{3}$ 148.866 993.972 1086.354 $\bf{4}$ 436.420 $\overline{5}$ 443.676 1099.482 454.149 1110.220 6 $\overline{7}$ 464.329 1121.237 8 470.297 1134.998 1141.604 \mathbf{Q} 474.207 Factor of Safety 1.441 *** \star \star \star Failure Surface Specified By 9 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf No. (f_t) (f_t) 1002.829 $\mathbf{1}$ 133.440 $\mathbf{2}$ 135.774 1001.294 $\mathbf{3}$ 148.866 993.972 $\overline{\mathbf{4}}$ 436.420 1086.354 5 443.676 1099.482 ϵ 1110.220 454.149 $\overline{7}$ 464.329 1121.237 $^{\rm 8}$ 470.297 1134.998 9 474.207 1141.604 Factor of Safety 1.441 *** $***$ **** END OF GSTABL7 OUTPUT ****

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ.OUT Paqe 1 *** GSTABL7 *** ** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. ** ** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.005, Sept. 2006 ** (All Rights Reserved-Unauthorized Use Prohibited) SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS SYSTEM Modified Bishop, Simplified Janbu, or GLE Method of Slices. (Includes Spencer & Morgenstern-Price Type Analysis) Including Pier/Pile, Reinforcement, Soil Nail, Tieback, Nonlinear Undrained Shear Strength, Curved Phi Envelope, Anisotropic Soil, Fiber-Reinforced Soil, Boundary Loads, Water Surfaces, Pseudo-Static & Newmark Earthquake, and Applied Forces. $7/24/2013$ Analysis Run Date: Time of Run: $10:35$ AM Run By: Gorian and Associates, Inc. Y: \2232 Heschel West School \2232-0-FR engineering calcs \sect Input Data Filename: c-c' circ.dat Output Filename: Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ.OUT English Unit System: Plotted Output Filename: Y: \2232 Heschel West School \2232-0-FR engineering calcs \sect c-c' circ.PLT PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: WO 2232-0-FR-100 Section C-C' circular search BOUNDARY COORDINATES 16 Top Boundaries 31 Total Boundaries Y-Left X-Right Y-Right Soil Type Boundary X-Left (E_L) (ft) (ft) Below Bnd (ft) N_{Ω} . 978.00 6.00 978.00 $\mathbf{1}$ 0.00 3 985.00 \mathbf{B} \overline{a} 6.00 978.00 34.00 70.00 992.00 $\overline{2}$ 34.00 985.00 3. 84.00 994.00 2 70.00 992.00 $\overline{4}$ 140.00
229.00 $\overline{5}$ 84.00 994.00 1004.00 $\mathbf{1}$ 1030.00 140.00 1004.00 -2 ϵ 1030.00 $\overline{7}$ 229.00 268.00 1045.00 \overline{a} 2 8 268.00 1045.00 302.00 1058.00 1058.00 $\overline{2}$ 1072.00 Q 302.00 328.00 $\overline{2}$ $10₁$ 328.00 1072.00 359.00 1084.00 ² 359.00 1084.00 380.00 1095.00 11 1109.00 $\overline{2}$ 380.00 1095.00 415.00 12 1109.00 415.00 13 422.00 1111.00 $\bf{4}$ 422.00 1111.00 480.00 1145.00 $\bf{4}$ 14 1145.00 505.00 1150.00 $\overline{4}$ $15\,$ 480.00 505.00 1150.00 656.00 1150.00 $\overline{4}$ 16 990.00 140.00 1004.00 $\overline{2}$ 17 127.00 985.00 $\overline{2}$ 18 84.00 994.00 93.00 45.00 $7Q$ 34.00 985.00 981.00 $\overline{3}$ 60.00 980.00 3 20 45.00 981.00 973.00 980.00 21 0.00 60.00 $\overline{4}$ 93.00 985.00 980.00 $\overline{4}$ 22° 60.00 985.00 123.00 983.00 23 93.00 $\overline{4}$ 990.00 24 123.00 983.00 127.00 $\overline{4}$ 990.00 159.00 996.00 $\overline{4}$ 25 127.00 1002.00 26 159.00 996.00 180.00 $\overline{4}$ 27 180.00 1002.00 259.00 1030.00 $\overline{4}$ 1058.00 1030.00 323.00 $\overline{4}$ 28 259.00 29 323.00 1058.00 373.00 1082.00 $\overline{4}$ 30 373.00 1082.00 400.00 1098.00 $\overline{4}$ 415.00 400.00 1109.00 $\overline{\mathbf{4}}$ 1098.00 31 850.00 (ft) User Specified Y-Origin $=$ Default X-Plus Value = 0.00 (ft) Default Y-Plus Value = 0.00 (ft) ISOTROPIC SOIL PARAMETERS 4 Type (s) of Soil Soil Total Saturated Cohesion Friction Pore Pressure Piez.

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ.OUT Page 2 Type Unit Wt. Unit Wt. Intercept Angle Pressure Constant Surface (deq) Param. (psf) $No. (pcf)$ $(**pc** f)$ (psf) No. Ω 30.0 0.00 0.0 $\mathbf{1}$ 120.0 120.0 400.0 120.0 120.0 400.0 8.0 0.00 125.0 $\overline{0}$ \mathcal{L} \mathbf{r} 120.0 120.0 200.0 30.0 0.00 125.0 Ω 120.0 120.0 400.0 36.0 0.00 125.0 Ω $\overline{4}$ A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified. 5000 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated. 100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 50 Points Equally Spaced Along The Ground Surface Between $X = 80.00 (ft)$ and $X = 200.00$ (ft) $X = 280.00(ft)$ Each Surface Terminates Between and $X = 430.00(ft)$ Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation At Which A Surface Extends Is $Y = 0.00$ (ft) 10.00 (ft) Line Seqments Define Each Trial Failure Surface. Following Are Displayed The Ten Most Critical Of The Trial Failure Surfaces Evaluated. They Are Ordered - Most Critical First. * * Safety Factors Are Calculated By The Modified Bishop Method * * Total Number of Trial Surfaces Attempted = 5000 Number of Trial Surfaces With Valid FS = 5000 Statistical Data On All Valid FS Values: FS Max = 6.416 FS Min = 1.731 FS Ave = 3.162 Standard Deviation = 0.582 Coefficient of Variation = 18.41 % Failure Surface Specified By 29 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf \langle ft) (ft) No. $\mathbf{1}$ 158.367 1009.366 $\mathbf{2}$ 168.242 1010.943 178.090 1012.679 \mathcal{F} 187.910 1014.572 $\overline{4}$ 5 197.697 1016.623 ϵ 207.450 1018.830 $\sim 10^{-1}$ $\overline{7}$ 217.167 1021.194 8 226.844 1023.714 1026.388 \mathbf{Q} 236.480 246.072 10 1029.217 11 255.617 1032.199 12 265.112 1035.334 274.557 1038.621 13 14 283.947 1042.059 15 293.281 1045.648 302.556 1049.386 16 17 311.770 1053.272 $18\,$ 320.921 1057.305 19 330.005 1061.485 20 339.022 1065.810 21 347.967 1070.279 22 356.840 1074.892 23 365.638 1079.646 374.358 1084.540 24 1089.574 25 382.999 26 391.557 1094.746 27 400.032 1100.055 1105.499 28 408.420 29 411.615 1107.646 Circle Center At $X =$ 65.025 ; $Y = 1625.433$; and Radius = 623.098 Factor of Safety $\star\star\star$ 1.731 $* * *$ Individual data on the 34 slices Tie Tie Earthquake Water Water Force Force Force Force Force Surcharge Slice Width Weight Norm Tan Hor ver Load Top Bot $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ (lbs) $(1bs)$ No. (f_{td}) (lbs) (lbs) 774.6 $\overline{}$ 0. $\mathbf{1}$ 9.9 0.0 1250.0 $\overline{0}$. 0.0 0.0 0.0

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ.OUT Page 4 173.174 1011.357 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 182.986 1013.288 $\overline{4}$ 5 192.768 1015.364 202.518 1017.587 ϵ 7 212.233 1019.954 $^{\rm 8}$ 221.913 1022.466 1025.122 $\ddot{9}$ 231.554 10 241.154 1027.921 11 250.711 1030.863 12 260.224 1033.948 13 269.689 1037.173 $1\,4$ 279.106 1040.539 15 288.471 1044.046 16 297.783 1047.691 17 307.039 1051.475 18 316.238 1055.396 19 325.378 1059.454 20 334.456 1063.648 21 343.471 1067.976 1072.439 22 352.420 23 361.301 1077.034 24 370.114 1081.761 25 378.854 1086.619 26 387.522 1091.607 27 396.114 1096.723 28 404.629 1101.967 29 413.064 1107.337 30 416.049 1109.300 48.624 ; $Y = 1670.311$; and Radius = Circle Center At $X =$ 670.623 Factor of Safety $* * *$ 1.746 *** Failure Surface Specified By 25 Coordinate Points $X-Surf$ $Y-Surf$ Point $_{\rm No.}$ (ft) (f_t) $\mathbf{1}$ 155.918 1008.650 $\overline{2}$ 165.865 1009.685 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 175.784 1010.951 $\overline{4}$ 185.671 1012.450 5 195.521 1014.180 ϵ 205.327 1016.139 $\overline{7}$ 215.084 1018.328 8 224.788 1020.745 9 234.432 1023.388 10 244.012 1026.256 253.522 1029.347 11 12 262.957 1032.660 13 272.312 1036.194 1039.945 281.582 14 15 290.762 1043.912 16 299.846 1048.093 17 308.829 1052.485 18 317.708 1057.087 19 326.476 1061.895 1066.907 20 335.129 343.663 1072.120 21 22 352.072 1077.532 360.352 23 1083.139 2.4 368.499 1088.938 368.665 1089.063 25 116.715 ; $Y = 1434.020$; and Radius = 427.173 Circle Center At $X =$ Factor of Safety $\star\star\star$ 1.748 $* * *$ Failure Surface Specified By 23 Coordinate Points X-Surf $\verb|Y-Surf|$ Point No. (ft) (ft) 1007.935 ${\bf 1}$ 153.469 $\overline{2}$ 163.433 1008.785

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ.OUT Page 5 1009.893 173.372 \mathbf{z} $\overline{4}$ 183.278 1011.259 5 193.146 1012.881 1014.758 202.968 6 $\overline{7}$ 212.738 1016.890 $\bf{8}$ 222.449 1019.274 1021.910 -9 232.096 10 241.671 1024.795 251.167 1027.927 11 260.580 12 1031.304 13 269.901 1034.925 14 279.126 1038.786 15 288.247 1042.885 16 297.259 1047.220 1051.786 $17\,$ 306.155 $18\,$ 314.930 1056.582 19 323.578 1061.604 1066.849 20 332.092 21 340.468 1072.312 1077.991 22 348.699 23 354.610 1082.300 125.691 ; $Y = 1392.399$; and Radius = Circle Center At $X =$ 385.467 Factor of Safety $***$ $\star\star\star$ 1.748 Failure Surface Specified By 21 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf NO. $(f₁)$ (fE) $\mathbf 1$ 200.000 1021.528 209.915 1022.829 2 $\overline{3}$ 219.790 1024.402 $\,4$ 229.619 1026.246 1028.360 5 239.393 1030.742 6 249.105 $\overline{7}$ 258.748 1033.391 8 268.314 1036.304 $\overline{9}$ 277.797 1039.479 10 287.188 1042.914 11 296.482 1046.606 305.670 1050.553 12 13 314.746 1054.751 14 323.703 1059.197 1063.888 15 332.535 16 341.234 1068.820 $17\,$ 349.794 1073.990 1079.394 18 358.208 19 366.471 1085.027 20 374.575 1090.885 21 379.841 1094.917 Circle Center At $X =$ 157.709 ; $Y = 1382.362$; and Radius = 363.304 Factor of Safety 1.751 *** $****$ Failure Surface Specified By 30 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf $Y-Surf$ No. (ft) (ft) 146.122 1005.789 $\mathbf{1}$ \overline{a} 156.006 1007.308 1008.982 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 165.865 $\overline{4}$ 175.697 1010.811 5 185.498 1012.793 6 1014.929 195.267 $\overline{7}$ 205.002 1017.218 8 1019.660 214.699 \mathbf{Q} 224.357 1022.253 10 233.973 1024.997 1027.891 11 243.545 12 253.071 1030.936 13 262.547 1034.129

Y: \2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ.OUT Page 6 14 271.972 1037.471 15 281.344 1040.959 290.660 1044.595 16 299.917 1048.376 17 18 \sim 309.114 1052.302 19 318.249 1056.371 20 327.319 1060.583 1064.937 21 336.321 22 345.254 1069.432 23 354.115 1074.066 1078.838 24 362.903 25 371.615 1083.748 26 1088.794 380.249 27 388.802 1093.974 28 397.273 1099.288 29 405.660 1104.734 30 407.610 1106.044 Circle Center At $X =$ 54.243 ; $Y = 1636.566$; and Radius = 637.434 Factor of Safety $* * *$ 1.762 $* * *$ Failure Surface Specified By 26 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf $No.$ (ft) (f_t) 155.918 1008.650 $\mathbf{1}$ 1009.866 \overline{a} 165.844 1011.288 \mathcal{R} 175.743 $\overline{4}$ 185.609 1012.915 $5\overline{2}$ 195.440 1014.746 1016.782 6 205.231 7 214.977 1019.020 8 224.675 1021.460 1024.101 q 234.320 10 243.908 1026.942 $1\,1$ 253.435 1029.982 12 262.896 1033.219 13 272.289 1036.651 14 281.608 1040.278 15 290.850 1044.097 16 300.010 1048.108 17 309.085 1052.308 1056.696 18 318.071 19 326.964 1061.270 $20\,$ 335.760 1066.027 21 344.456 1070.966 1076.084 22 353.046 23 361.529 1081.380 24 369.900 1086.850 25 1092.494 378.155 1096.511 26 383.777 102.430 ; $Y = 1486.764$; and Radius = 481.096 Circle Center At $X =$ Factor of Safety $* * *$ $* * *$ 1.766 Failure Surface Specified By 19 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf Y-Surf No. (f_t) (f_t) $\mathbf 1$ 192.653 1019.382 $\overline{2}$ 202.621 1020.179 3 212.554 1021.334 $\bf{4}$ 222.439 1022.845 $\overline{5}$ 232.264 1024.712 ϵ 242.014 1026.930 7 251.679 1029.498 8 261.245 1032.412 9 270.700 1035.668 10 280.032 1039.262 289.229 1043.189 11 12 298.278 1047.445

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{$

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ ps.0UT Page 1 *** GSTABL7 *** ** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. ** ** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.005, Sept. 2006 ** (All Rights Reserved-Unauthorized Use Prohibited) SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS SYSTEM Modified Bishop, Simplified Janbu, or GLE Method of Slices. (Includes Spencer & Morgenstern-Price Type Analysis) Including Pier/Pile, Reinforcement, Soil Nail, Tieback, Nonlinear Undrained Shear Strength, Curved Phi Envelope, Anisotropic Soil, Fiber-Reinforced Soil, Boundary Loads, Water Surfaces, Pseudo-Static & Newmark Earthquake, and Applied Forces. Analysis Run Date: $7/24/2013$ $10:54AM$ Time of Run: Run By: Gorian and Associates, Inc. Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect Input Data Filename: c-c' circ ps.dat Output Filename: Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ ps.00T Unit System: English Plotted Output Filename: Y: \2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ ps.PLT PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: WO 2232-0-FR-100 Section C-C' circ search pseudo-static BOUNDARY COORDINATES 16 Top Boundaries 31 Total Boundaries X-Left Y-Left X-Right Y-Right Soil Type Boundary $(f\bar{t})$ (f_t) Below Bnd No. $(f⁺)$ (ft) 978.00 6.00 $\mathbf{1}$ 0.00 978.00 $\overline{3}$ 2 6.00 978.00 34.00 985.00 \mathcal{R} 70.00 992.00 ² 985.00 $\mathbf{3}$ 34.00 84.00 $\overline{4}$ 70.00 992.00 994.00 $\overline{2}$ 5 84.00 994.00 140.00 1004.00 $\mathbf{1}$ 140.00 1004.00 229.00 1030.00 \mathcal{D} $6 \overline{6}$ 1030.00 $\overline{7}$ 229.00 268.00 1045.00 $\overline{2}$ 8 268.00 1045.00 302.00 1058.00 2 1058.00 $\overline{2}$ Q 302.00 328.00 1072.00 $10[°]$ 328.00 1072.00 359.00 1084.00 2 359.00 1084.00 380.00 1095.00 $\overline{2}$ 11 2 415.00 $12[°]$ 380.00 1095.00 1109.00 1109.00 $13¹$ 415.00 422.00 1111.00 $\overline{4}$ 14 422.00 1111.00 480.00 1145.00 $\pmb{\mathcal{L}}$ 1145.00 505.00 1150.00 15 480.00 $\overline{4}$ 16 505.00 1150.00 656.00 1150.00 $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ 127.00 990.00 140.00 1004.00 $\overline{2}$ $17₁$ 994.00 93.00 985.00 $\overline{2}$ 18 84.00 19 34.00 985.00 45.00 981.00 3 45.00 981.00 60.00 980.00 $\overline{3}$ 20 60.00 980.00 21 0.00 973.00 $\overline{4}$ 980.00 93.00 985.00 22 60.00 \overline{A} 23 93.00 985.00 123.00 983.00 $\overline{4}$ 990.00 983.00 127.00 $\overline{4}$ 24 123.00 25 127.00 990.00 159.00 996.00 \overline{A} 996.00 180.00 1002.00 26 159.00 $\overline{4}$ 259.00 1030.00 27 180.00 1002.00 $\overline{4}$ 1030.00 28 259.00 323.00 1058.00 Δ 1058.00 373.00 1082.00 29 323.00 4 30 373.00 1082.00 400.00 1098.00 \overline{a} 1098.00 415.00 1109.00 $\overline{4}$ 400.00 31 User Specified Y-Origin $=$ 850.00(ft) Default X-Plus Value = $0.00(ft)$ Default Y-Plus Value = $0.00(ft)$ ISOTROPIC SOIL PARAMETERS 4 Type(s) of Soil Soil Total Saturated Cohesion Friction Pore Pressure Piez.

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ ps.0UT Page 2 Type Unit Wt. Unit Wt. Intercept Angle Pressure Constant Surface $No.$ (pcf) (pcf) (psf) (deq) Param. (psf) $No.$ 0.00 0.0 Ω $\mathbf{1}$ 120.0 120.0 400.0 30.0 400.0 8.0 0.00 125.0 Ω \mathcal{P} 120.0 120.0 200.0 120.0 30.0 0.00 125.0 $\mathbf 0$ \mathcal{B} 120.0 0.00 $\overline{4}$ 120.0 120.0 400.0 36.0 125.0 Ω Specified Peak Ground Acceleration Coefficient $(A) = 0.400(g)$ Specified Horizontal Earthquake Coefficient (kh) = $0.150(q)$ Specified Vertical Earthquake Coefficient (kv) = $0.000(q)$ Specified Seismic Pore-Pressure Factor = 0.000 A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified. 5000 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated. 50 Points Equally Spaced 100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of Along The Ground Surface Between $X = 80.00 (ft)$ and $X = 200.00(ft)$ Each Surface Terminates Between $X = 280.00(ft)$ $X = 430.00(ft)$ and Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation At Which A Surface Extends Is $Y =$ $0.00(f_t)$ 10.00(ft) Line Segments Define Each Trial Failure Surface. Following Are Displayed The Ten Most Critical Of The Trial Failure Surfaces Evaluated. They Are Ordered - Most Critical First. * * Safety Factors Are Calculated By The Modified Bishop Method * * Total Number of Trial Surfaces Attempted = 5000 Number of Trial Surfaces With Valid FS = 5000 Statistical Data On All Valid FS Values: FS Max = 4.472 FS Min = 1.216 FS Ave = 2.171 0.386 Coefficient of Variation = Standard Deviation = $17.76%$ Failure Surface Specified By 23 Coordinate Points $X-Surf$ Y-Surf Point (f_t) $No.$ (f_t) 1005.789 146.122 $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{2}$ 156.099 1006.467 3 166.054 1007.420 175.978 1008.648 4 5 185.865 1010.148 ϵ 195.707 1011.921 $\overline{7}$ 205.496 1013.965 $\overline{8}$ 215.224 1016.278 9 224.886 1018.858 10 1021.704 234.472 243.977 1024.813 11 253.392 1028.183 12 13 262.710 1031.811 271.925 1035.695 14 1039.832 15 281.029 16 290.016 1044.218 17 298.878 1048.851 1053.726 18 307.610 19 316.203 1058.840 20 324.652 1064.189 1069.769 21 332.950 22 341.092 1075.576 23 345.137 1078.634 126.519 ; $Y = 1367.797$; and Radius = 362.539 Circle Center At $X =$ Factor of Safety $***$ 1.216 Individual data on the 26 slices Earthquake Tie Water Water Tie Force Force Surcharge Force Force Force Tan Ver Load Slice Width Weight Top Bot Norm Hor (lbs) (lbs) (f_t) (lbs) $(1bs)$ $(1bs)$ (lbs) $(\lfloor bs \rfloor)$ (lbs) No. 0.0 0.0 1250.0 $\begin{array}{ccc} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{array}$. 200.8 0.0 1338.6 $\mathbf{1}$ 10.0 $0.$ $0.$ 575.8 0.0 0.0 \overline{c} 3838.7 0.0 1250.0 10.0 0 . 898.0 0.0 0.0 $\mathbf{3}$ 9.9 5986.5 0.0 1250.0 $0.$

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ ps.0UT Page 4 13 272.312 1036.194 14 281.582 1039.945 15 290.762 1043.912 299.846 1048.093 16 1052.485 17 308.829 317.708 1057.087 18 19 326.476 1061.895 1066.907 20 335.129 343.663 1072.120 21 22 352.072 1077.532 23 360.352 1083.139 24 368.499 1088.938 25 368.665 1089.063 116.715 ; $Y = 1434.020$; and Radius = 427.173 Circle Center At $X =$ Factor of Safety $***$ 1.242 $***$ Failure Surface Specified By 29 Coordinate Points X-Surf $Y-Surf$ Point No. (f_t) (f_t) 1009.366 $1\,$ 158.367 1010.943 $\overline{2}$ 168.242 3 178.090 1012.679 $\boldsymbol{4}$ 187.910 1014.572 5 1016.623 197.697 6 207.450 1018.830 $\overline{7}$ 217.167 1021.194 8 226.844 1023.714 9 236.480 1026.388 10 246.072 1029.217 1032.199 11 255.617 12 265.112 1035.334 13 274.557 1038.621 1042.059 14 283.947 293.281 1045.648 1.5 16 302.556 1049.386 311.770 1053.272 17 18 320.921 1057.305 19 330.005 1061.485 1065.810 20 339.022 347.967 1070.279 21 22 356.840 1074.892 23 365.638 1079.646 374.358 1084.540 24 25 382.999 1089.574 1094.746 391.557 26 27 400.032 1100.055 408.420 1105.499 28 29 411.615 1107.646 623.098 65.025 ; $Y = 1625.433$; and Radius = Circle Center At $X =$ Factor of Safety 1.250 *** $***$ Failure Surface Specified By 30 Coordinate Points Point X-Surf $Y-Surf$ No. (f_t) (f_t) 153.469 1007.935 $\overline{1}$ 1009.572 $\overline{2}$ 163.334 1011.357 3 173.174 182.986 1013.288 $\overline{4}$ 192.768 1015.364 5 6 202.518 1017.587 1019.954 $\overline{7}$ 212.233 8 221.913 1022.466 $\overline{9}$ 231.554 1025.122 1027.921 10 241.154 1030.863 11 250.711 $12\,$ 260.224 1033.948 1037.173 13 269.689

Y:\2232 Heschel West School\2232-0-FR engineering calcs\sect c-c' circ ps.OUT Page 5 14 279.106 1040.539 15 288.471 1044.046 297.783 1047.691 16 1051.475 17 307.039 1055.396 18 316.238 1059.454 19 325.378 20 334.456 1063.648 21 343.471 1067.976 352.420 1072.439 22 23 361.301 1077.034 24 370.114 1081.761 1086.619 378.854 25 26 387.522 1091.607 27 396.114 1096.723 1101.967 28 404.629 1107.337 29 413.064 30 416.049 1109.300 48.624 ; $Y = 1670.311$; and Radius = 670.623 Circle Center At $X =$ Factor of Safety $***$ 1.259 Failure Surface Specified By 26 Coordinate Points X-Surf Y-Surf Point (f_t) (f_t) No. 1008.650 $\mathbf{1}$ 155.918 165.844 2 1009.866 $\mathbf{3}$ 175.743 1011.288 1012.915 $\bf 4$ 185.609 $\overline{5}$ 195.440 1014.746 6 205.231 1016.782 1019.020 $\overline{7}$ 214.977 8 224.675 1021.460 $\overline{9}$ 234.320 1024.101 10 243.908 1026.942 253.435 1029.982 11 12 262.896 1033.219 1036.651 13 272.289 281.608 1040.278 14 290.850 1044.097 15 16 300.010 1048.108 309.085 1052.308 17 1056.696 18 318.071 19 326.964 1061.270 335.760 1066.027 20 21 344.456 1070.966 22 353.046 1076.084 361.529 1081.380 23 369.900 1086.850 24 25 378.155 1092.494 1096.511 26 383.777 102.430 ; $Y = 1486.764$; and Radius = 481.096 Circle Center At $X =$ Factor of Safety 1.262 *** $\star\star\star$ Failure Surface Specified By 30 Coordinate Points X-Surf $Y-Surf$ Point (f_t) No. (ft) 1005.789 $\mathbf{1}$ 146.122 $\mathfrak{2}% _{T}=\mathfrak{2}_{T}\!\left(a,b\right) ,\ \mathfrak{2}_{T}=\mathfrak{2}_{T}\!\left(a,b\right) ,$ 156.006 1007.308 1008.982 3 165.865 1010.811 $\overline{4}$ 175.697 5 185.498 1012.793 1014.929 6 195.267 $\overline{7}$ 205.002 1017.218 $\, 8$ 214.699 1019.660 1022.253 $\,9$ 224.357 1024.997 10 233.973 243.545 1027.891 $1\,1$ 1030.936 12 253.071

Page 6

