

June 5, 2017

Mr. Tim Morgan c/o Vista Tassajara HOA 563 Leisure Street Livermore, CA 94551

Re: Geotechnical Engineering Report for Hillview Drive Slope Repair Vista Tassajara, Danville, California *SFB Project No.: 768-1*

Mr. Morgan:

In accordance with the request of the Vista Tassajara Homeowners Association, Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. (SFB) has performed a geotechnical investigation and prepared plans and specifications for the repair of a portion of the hillside located above the Hillview Drive cul-de-sac in Danville, California, as shown on the attached Site Plan and Engineering Geology Map, **Figure 1**. This report presents the results of our field investigation, laboratory tests, and slope stability analyses of the proposed slope repair plans. The purpose of this report is to support the Grading and Drainage Plans prepared by SFB for the repair of the hillslope.

It is our understanding that a landslide occurred on the hillside above the southern terminus (culde-sac) of Hillside Drive during the winter of 2016/2017. As shown on the attached **Figure 1**, the landslide exists within open space land managed by the Vista Tassajara HOA. The toe of the landslide is located at the base of the slope and has negatively impacted the private lot and residence at 95 Hillview Drive, and has the potential for negatively impacting the private lot and residence at 92 Hillview Drive and Hillview Drive itself. The landslide has detrimentally damaged surface drainage (and possibly subsurface drainage) facilities on the slope. The damaged hillside requires repair otherwise additional landslide movement will occur in the future that can affect private lots, Hillview Drive, and non-subdivision property located to the east.

### **1.0 Previous Grading During Original Subdivision Development**

As part of our work, we reviewed the following available documents and plans related to the original Vista Tassajara Subdivision 6736 development:

1600 Willow Pass Court • Concord, CA 94520 • Tel 925.688.1001 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 815, Concord, CA 94522-0815 *Serving Northern and Central California, Sacramento, and Central Valley Regions* www.sfandb.com

### **Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey Engineering Company, Inc.** Page 2 of 9

- *Geotechnical Investigation Report*, prepared by Berlogar Geotechnical Consultants (BGC) and dated 2/8/88;
- *Grading Plans*, prepared by PRW and Associates and dated 2/17/88;
- *As-Built Subdrain Location Plan*, prepared by BGC and dated 10/12/88; and
- *Soil Engineering Services During Mass Grading*, a report prepared by BGC and dated 11/8/88.

It is our understanding the original mass grading of the subdivision was performed in June through September 1988. The landslide site and vicinity are located within a previously mapped landslide area (Slide 23) that, according to BGC, extended to depths of about 25 to 45 feet below original grades as shown on Plate 4 (Section A) of BGC's subdivision geotechnical investigation report. According to BGC, most of Slide 23 was removed during mass grading except for specific upslope portions that extended beyond the subdivision boundary that were left in place but buttressed with engineered fill. According to previous BGC field compaction test results at the Slide 23 area, fills (that were placed after the landslide was removed) were placed at optimum moisture content or higher and compacted to not less than 90 percent relative compaction per ASTM D1557. Subdrains were reportedly installed in the landslide repair area. The subdrain locations (but not elevations) are recorded on an as-built subdrain location plan prepared by BGC.

### **2.0 Existing Surface and Subsurface Conditions**

SFB performed reconnaissance and geologic mapping of the site and surrounding area on February 22, April 5 and 19, and May 2, 2017. In addition, a topographic survey of the area was performed by Meridian Associates, Inc., in April 2017. At the time of our investigation, several landslides were observed at the site and encompassed an area of about 380 feet wide and 220 feet long in lateral extent (as shown on **Figure 1**). The deeper landslides generally exhibited rotational movement. Head scarps of about 5 to 15 feet high were located at the southeastern boundary of the landslides. Slide debris up to about 5 to 10 feet in thickness had accumulated at the base of the hillslope. The bottoms of the landslides were estimated to be at depths of about 15 to 25 feet below existing ground surface. Some of the soil debris had been removed and stockpiled in adjacent areas.

Subsurface exploration was performed by SFB using a track-mounted drill rig equipped with 6 inch diameter, continuous flight, solid stem auger. On April 19, 2017, three exploratory borings were drilled to depths of about 26-1/2 to 36 feet below existing ground surface. Soil samples were retrieved from the borings for geological and engineering evaluations and laboratory testing. Prior to the site development, four exploratory borings (B-8 through B-10) were

### **Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey Engineering Company, Inc.** Page 3 of 9

*Hillview Drive Slope Repair, 768-1.001 June 5, 2017*

previously performed by BGC in December 1987 to depths of about 27-1/2 feet to 57 feet at the landslide site and vicinity.

The approximate locations of SFB's borings and the previous borings by BGC are shown on **Figure 1**. The logs of SFB's borings and details regarding SFB's field investigation are included in **Appendix A.** The results of SFB's laboratory tests are discussed in **Appendix B**. Logs of the previous boring by BGC are provided in **Appendix C** for reference.

It should be noted that changes in the surface and subsurface conditions can occur over time as a result of either natural processes or human activity and may affect the validity of the conclusions and recommendations in this report. Our attached boring logs and related information depict location specific subsurface conditions encountered during our field investigation. The approximate locations of our borings were determined by using the results of the topographic survey and landmark references and should be considered accurate only to the degree implied by the method used.

Boring SFB-1, located in the central portion of the western slide, generally encountered stiff to very stiff clayey fill materials to a depth of about 35 feet where siltstone bedrock was encountered. It is estimated that the landslide extended to a depth of about 22 feet in this area (an elevation of about 767 feet). Groundwater was encountered on the surface of the bedrock. The boring extended to a depth of about 36 feet.

Boring SFB-2, located at the base of the western slide, encountered soft and saturated landslide debris to a depth of about 7 feet. Water was seeping in the boring at this depth. Below the landslide debris, stiff clayey fill materials were encountered to the maximum depth explored in this boring of 26-1/2 feet.

Boring SFB-3, located between the eastern and western slides, encountered firm and wet clayey fills within the upper 3 feet of the boring, and very stiff to hard clayey fills to the maximum depth explored in this boring of 26-1/2 feet. Water was seeping into the boring within the upper 6 feet.

Based on the results of our laboratory testing, the clayey fills have a high to very high plasticity and high to critical expansion potential. The laboratory testing on retrieved fill samples also indicate the in-situ fills not located within the landslide deposit area have moisture contents varying from 20 to 30 percent at the time of our sample retrieval. The dry densities of the retrieved in-situ fill soil samples generally ranged from 91 to 107 pounds per cubic foot (pcf), with an average of about 97 pcf. We performed two laboratory compaction curves on samples of the in-situ fill soils which resulted in a maximum dry density ranging from 113 to 114 pcf (per

### **Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey Engineering Company, Inc.** Page 4 of 9 *Hillview Drive Slope Repair, 768-1.001 June 5, 2017*

ASTM D1557) at optimum moisture contents of 14 to 16 percent. Within the landslide deposit area (the area where the landslide debris extended up and over the previously existing ground surface) located in the lower reaches of the slope, our laboratory testing indicates that the weak landslide debris was saturated at the time of our investigation (water contents ranging from 39 to 40 percent) with dry densities ranging from 77 to 81 pcf.

The attached Cross-Sections A-A' and B-B' (attached as **Figures 2 and 3**) show our interpretations of the estimated possible landslide planes and associated subsurface conditions based on the results of our field explorations and mapping. The locations of the sections are shown on **Figure 1**.

### **3.0 Engineering Properties of Subsurface Materials**

Engineering properties of the proposed engineered fills ("Rebuilt Fill"), existing clayey fills to remain beyond the upper and lower limits of the repair area ("Existing Fill"), and siltstone and claystone rock ("Bedrock") were derived from the field and laboratory testing results and typical engineering correlations.

To evaluate the long-term strength of the existing fill materials and the proposed engineered fill, onsite fill material samples were retrieved and remolded to an approximate dry density of about 98 pcf, similar to the average dry density properties of the existing fill materials within the hillslope, and approximately 5 percent above optimum moisture content as determined by ASTM Method D1557 for laboratory consolidated drained direct shear testing (ASTM D3080). The remolded direct shear test results indicate the "Existing Fill" has an effective cohesion of 250 psf (pounds per square foot) and an effective friction angle of 26 degrees. For comparison, drained fully softened peak (ASTM D7608) torsional shear testing was also performed on remolded fill material samples. The torsional shear test results indicate the onsite fill materials have fully softened peak internal friction angles ranging from about 21 to 25 degrees. According to Stark et al.  $(2005)^1$  $(2005)^1$ , the drained fully softened shear strength condition corresponds to the condition where the clayey fill has absorbed as much water as possible, has reached equilibrium at the site, and has not undergone shearing (landsliding) in the past.

As part of our shear strength assessment, we performed a back-calculation along the failure surface to determine the internal angle of friction at the time of failure. Details regarding the back-calculation are provided in Section 4.0 below. Based on the results of the shear strength laboratory testing and the back-calculation results, it is our opinion that assigning a friction angle of 26 degrees to the "Existing Fill" materials is appropriate. It is also our opinion that assigning

<span id="page-3-0"></span> $\frac{1}{1}$ <sup>1</sup>Stark, Choi & McCone, *Drained Shear Strength Parameters for Analysis of Landslides*, Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering (ASCE), Vol. 131, No. 5, May 1, 2005.

### **Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey Engineering Company, Inc.** Page 5 of 9 *Hillview Drive Slope Repair, 768-1.001*

*June 5, 2017*

a friction angle of 26 degrees to the "Rebuilt Fill" for long-term strength is appropriate and also conservative since the proposed hillside repair will include substantial surface and subsurface drainage.

The laboratory testing results are attached as **Appendix B** for reference. The table below summarizes the soil and rock engineering properties used in our analyses.



### **4.0 Slope Stability Analyses of Existing Conditions and Proposed Slope Repair**

SFB performed slope stability analyses using the two dimensional, limit equilibrium computer program, GSLOPE (Mitre Software, 1999). The procedures presented in the Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC) publication, *Recommended Procedures for Implementation of DMG Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Landslide Hazards in California*, were followed during our analyses. For the major earthquake loading condition, a seismic coefficient (k) of 0.25 was applied in our pseudo-static analyses for the purpose of screening. This coefficient was determined based on a design-basis maximum ground acceleration of  $0.69g$  (per the [2](#page-4-0)016 USGS Unified Hazard Tool<sup>2</sup> using a 10% probability of being exceeded in a 50-year period; a 475-year return period with a stiff soil site condition), a causative magnitude 6.9 earthquake located at 11.9 kilometers away, and a threshold displacement of 15 centimeters (approximately 6 inches). As stated in the SCEC publication, the threshold displacements provide an index of slope performance. The 15 centimeters (6 inches) value distinguishes conditions in which small to moderate displacements are likely from conditions in which large displacements are likely.

The representative Cross-Section  $A - A'$  (**Figure 2**) was used in our slope stability analyses to back-calculate the frictional resistance at the time of hillslope failure along the three possible

<span id="page-4-0"></span> $\frac{1}{2}$ Dynamic: Conterminous U.S. 2014 v4.1.0; https://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/interactive/

### **Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey Engineering Company, Inc.** Page 6 of 9

*Hillview Drive Slope Repair, 768-1.001 June 5, 2017*

slide planes and to evaluate the possible repair schemes. An estimated groundwater level at 5 feet below existing ground surface was used for the existing fill layer. The hillside friction angle was back-calculated to achieve a factor of safety of 0.99 against sliding under static condition. Our back-calculations results indicate the existing hillslope fill materials along potential slide planes had a friction angle of about 25 to 26 degrees at the time of slope failure, which corresponds well with the remolded laboratory shear strength properties. This back-calculated frictional resistance also corresponds well with the upper bound, fully softened peak strength.

Our recommended slope repair which includes removal of the existing landslide debris, installation of subdrains, and keying and benching of proposed compacted, engineered fills is shown on the attached **Figures 4 and 5**. The representative Cross-Section a - a' (**Figure 5**) was used for our slope stability analyses of the proposed slope repair grading. The table below summarizes the most critical results of our slope stability analyses of the proposed slope repair grading along Section a - a' under both static and pseudo-static conditions. The cross-section profiles, soil and rock engineering properties used in the analyses, and the detailed results of the analyses are presented on the computer program printouts in the attached **Appendix D**.



The results of our slope stability analyses indicate that the factor of safety against sliding under static conditions after the proposed slope repair is completed is greater than the generally acceptable value of 1.5 for the most critical potential slide plane. For the major earthquake loading condition, a factor of safety against sliding of 0.96 was calculated, which is very close to 1.0 (in order to pass screen criteria outlined in the SCEC publication) when applying the seismic coefficient of 0.25. Therefore, it is our opinion the proposed slope repair shown on the proposed repair plans is appropriate for the site.

The results of our slope stability analyses also show that a properly functioning new and existing surface drainage and subdrain system is critical to the global stability of the rebuilt slope and the existing slope below and adjacent the repair area. A non-functioning subdrain system will allow

the groundwater levels to rise within the hillslope and can lower the factor of safety below acceptable values, especially during seismic events. Also, during or immediately after heavy rainfall events, a non-functioning surface and/or subsurface drainage system at the site can cause hillslope failure.

### **5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

It is our opinion that the Hillview Drive landslide was caused by a combination of weakened fill materials, added water weight within the slope due to the rainfall during the winter of 2016/2017, and the lack of proper surface drainage (mid-slope drainage benches and ditches) and subsurface drainage (subdrains) within the area.

We recommend the conditions and outlets of the existing surface drainage and subdrain system be checked in the field and both the proposed new and existing surface drainage and subdrain systems be regularly maintained by the HOA. As is common for all hillside residential subdivisions, we recommend routine maintenance of the hillslope be performed, including maintenance prior to rainstorms. Maintenance should include the re-compaction of loosened soils, collapsing and infilling holes with compacted soils or low strength sand/cement grout, removal and control of digging animals, modifying storm water drainage patterns to allow for sheet flow into drainage inlets or ditches rather than concentrated flow or ponding, removal of debris within drainage ditches and inlets, and immediately repairing any erosion or soil flow. The maintenance should also include checking drainage patterns, making sure both surface and subsurface drainage systems are functional and not clogged, and erosion control measures are adequate for anticipated storm events. Maintenance and repair should be performed if any of these measures appears to be inadequate. Temporary and permanent erosion and sediment control measures should be installed over any exposed soils after repairs are made.

Our landslide repair recommendations are shown on the Hillview Drive slope repair plans, including our recommended locations for keyways, subgrade benches, subdrains, surface drainage ditches and pipes, and finished grades. The repair plans also provide our specifications for fill materials, fill placement, moisture conditioning, compaction, and placement of erosion/sediment control measures. Please refer to the Hillview Drive slope repair plans for more details.

We recommend SFB be retained by the HOA to provide consulting services during the hillslope repair project and to perform construction observation and testing services during the construction phase of the hillslope repair project to observe, test, and document the implementation of our recommendations and the plans and specifications. Our onsite work will allow us to provide supplemental or revised recommendations in the event subsurface conditions

different than those described in this report are encountered and/or if there is a need to modify plans, specifications, or details shown on the repair plans. We are not responsible for misinterpretation of our recommendations or misinterpretation of the repair plans, specifications, and details. The long-term stability of the repair area is highly dependant upon the proper implementation of the Hillview Drive slope repair plans.

### **6.0 Conditions and Limitations**

It is not uncommon for slope movements to occur within the site's rebuilt and existing fills, soils, and bedrock and the hillside region; the magnitude of such movements depend upon numerous factors including degree of slope maintenance, drainage, rainfall, irrigation, earthquake shaking, and changes to the topography. Therefore, the stability of the site and vicinity can change over time. It is beyond the purpose of this report and the Hillview drive slope repair plans and specifications (and SFB's scope of work) to address the stability of areas beyond the Hillview drive slope repair limits.

SFB is not responsible for the validity or accuracy of information, analyses, test results, or designs provided to SFB by others. The analysis, designs, opinions, and recommendations submitted in this report and the associated plans and specifications are based in part upon the data obtained from field work and upon information provided by others. Site exploration and testing characterizes subsurface conditions only at the locations where the explorations or tests are performed; actual subsurface conditions between explorations or tests may be different than those described in this report and/or shown on the slope repair plans. Variations of subsurface conditions from those analyzed or characterized in this report and shown on the slope repair plans are not uncommon and may become evident during construction. In addition, changes in the condition of the site can occur over time as a result of either natural processes (such as earthquakes or changes in groundwater levels) or human activity (such as construction adjacent to the site, modifying topography, dumping of fill, or excavating). If changes to the site's surface or subsurface conditions occur, or if differing subsurface conditions are encountered, we should be contacted immediately to evaluate the differing conditions to assess if the opinions, conclusions, and recommendations provided in this report and shown on the slope repair plans are still applicable or should be amended.

This report is a design document that has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted geological and geotechnical engineering. It should be understood that advancements in the practice of geotechnical engineering and engineering geology, or discovery of differing surface or subsurface conditions, may affect the validity of this report and the slope repair plans and are not uncommon. SFB strives to perform its services in a proper and professional manner with reasonable care and competence. Geological engineering and geotechnical engineering are

### **Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey Engineering Company, Inc.** Page 9 of 9

*Hillview Drive Slope Repair, 768-1.001 June 5, 2017*

disciplines that are far less exact than other engineering disciplines; therefore we should be consulted if it is not completely understood what the limitations to using this report and the slope repair plans are.

In the event that there are any changes in the nature, design or location of the project, as described in this report, or if any future changes to the slope are planned, the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report shall not be considered valid unless we are contacted in writing, the project changes are reviewed by us, and the conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are modified or verified in writing.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please call our office.

Sincerely,

**Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey Engineering Company, Inc.**

 $\therefore$  04

Taiming Chen, PE, GE Ken Ferrone, PE, GE, CEG



TC/KCF Copies: Addressee (1 by email) Attachments: Figures 1 through 5 Appendices A, B, C & D

Tura

*Civil/Geotechnical Engineer Civil/Geotechnical Engineer Certified Engineering Geologist*



**FIGURES**



Engineering Company, Inc

# **KEY**



Approximate Location of SFB Exploratory Boring (4/19/17)



Approximate Location of Previous Berlogar Exploratory Boring (December 1987)



Approximate Current Landslide Boundary



Approximate Location of Cross-Section (See Figures 2 and 3 for the Sections)

# **GEOLOGIC UNIT**

- Qls **Landslide Deposit**
- Artificial Fill Placed in 1988  $Qaf$



SITE PLAN AND ENGINEERING GEOLOGY MAP

HILLVIEW DRIVE SLOPE REPAIR Danville, California

**FIGURE** 

1







**FIGURE** 

4



### **APPENDIX A**

Field Investigation

*Hillview Drive Slope Repair, 768-1.001 June 5, 2017*

### **APPENDIX A**

### Field Investigation

Our field investigation for the proposed Hillview Drive slope repair project in Danville, California, consisted of surface reconnaissance and a subsurface exploration program. Geotechnical reconnaissance and geologic mapping of the site and surrounding area on February 22, April 5 and 19, and May 2, 2017. Subsurface exploration was performed using a trackmounted drill rig equipped with 6-inch diameter, continuous flight, solid stem auger. On April 19, 2017, three exploratory borings were drilled to depths of about 26-1/2 to 36 feet below existing ground surface. The soils are described in general accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System (ASTM D2487). The logs of the borings as well as a key for the classification of the soil (Figure A-1) are included as part of this appendix.

Representative samples were obtained from our exploratory boring at selected depths appropriate to the investigation. Relatively undisturbed samples were obtained using a 3-inch O.D. split barrel sampler with liners, and disturbed samples were obtained using the 2-inch O.D. split spoon sampler. All samples were transmitted to our offices for evaluation and appropriate testing. Both sampler types are indicated in the "Sampler" column of the boring log as designated in Figure A-1. The elevations discussed in this report and shown on the boring logs in this appendix were obtained from the base map shown on Figure 1; datum unknown.

Resistance blow counts were obtained in our boring with the samplers by dropping a 140-pound safety hammer through a 30-inch free fall. The sampler was driven 18 inches and the number of blows were recorded for each 6 inches of penetration. The blows per foot recorded on the boring log represent the accumulated number of converted blows that were required to drive the last 12 inches, or the number of inches indicated where hard resistance was encountered. The blow counts recorded on the boring log have been converted to equivalent SPT field blowcounts, but have not been corrected for overburden, silt content, or other factors.

The attached boring log and related information show our interpretation of the subsurface conditions at the dates and locations indicated, and it is not warranted that they are representative of subsurface conditions at other locations and times.

# **UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM**



# **ROCK MASS CHARACTERISTICS**

**WEATHERING**<br>WEATHERING<br>FRESH - Rock fresh, crystals bright, few joints may show slight staining. Rock rings under hammer blows if crystalline.

VERY SLIGHT - Rock generally fresh, joints stained, some joints may show thin clay coatings, crystals in broken face show bright. Rings under hammer blows if crystalline.

SLIGHT - Rock generally fresh, joints stained, and discoloration extends into rock up to 1 inch. Joints may contain clay. In granitiod rocks, some occasional feldspar crystals are dull and discolored. Crystalline rock rings under hammer blows.

MODERATE - Significant portions of rock show discoloration and weathering effects. In granitiod rocks, most feldspars are dull and discolored; some show clayey. Rock has dull sound under hammer and shows significant loss of strength as compared with fresh rock.

MODERATELY SEVERE - All rock except quartz discolored or stained. In granitiod rocks, all feldspars dull and discolored and majority show kaolinization. Rock shows severe loss of strength and can be excavated with geologist's pick. Rock goes "clunk" when struck.

SEVERE - All rock except quartz discolored or stained. Rock "fabric" clear and evident, but reduced in strength to strong soil. In some granitiod rocks, all feldspars kaolinized to some extent. Some fragments of strong rock usually remain.

VERY SEVERE - All rock except quartz discolored or stained. Rock "fabric" discernible, but rock mass effectively reduced to "soil" with only fragments of strong rock remaining.

COMPLETE - Rock reduced to "soil." Rock "fabric" not discernible or discernible only in small scattered locations. Quartz may be present as dikes or stringers.

### **STRENGTH**

VERY STRONG - Resists breakage from hammer blows; but will yield dust and small chips. STRONG - Withstands a few hammer blows; but will yield large fragments. MODERATELY STRONG - Withstands a few firm hammer blows.<br>
WEAK - Crumbles with light hammer blows.<br>
FRIABLE - Can be broken down with hand and finger pressure.<br>
LOW - Soil-like strength<br> **DI SCONTINUITY SPACING**<br>
JOINTS BED WEAK - Crumbles with light hammer blows. FRIABLE - Can be broken down with hand and finger pressure. LOW - Soil-like strength



### **HARDNESS**

VERY HARD - Cannot be scratched with a knife; metal powder left on sample. HARD - Scratched with knife with difficulty; trace of metal powder left on samples; scratch faintly visible. MODERATELY HARD - Readily scratched with knife, scratch leaves heavy trace of dust and is readily visible. LOW HARDNESS - Gouged or grooved to 1/16 inch by firm pressure on knife; scratches with penny. SOFT - Gouged or grooved readily with a knife; small thin pieces can be grooved by finger pressure. VERY SOFT - Carves with knife; scratched by fingernail. HARD - Sciatched with Kille with difficulty, trace of filed powde<br>MODERATELY HARD - Readily scratched with knife, scratch le<br>LOW HARDNESS - Gouged or grooved to 1/16 inch by firm press<br>SOFT - Gouged or grooved readily with

SMOOTH - Appears smooth and is essentially smooth to the touch. May be slickensided. SLIGHTLY ROUGH - Asperities on the fracture are clearly visible. MEDIUM ROUGH - Asperities are clearly visible and fracture surface feels abrasive. ROUGH - Large angular asperities can be seen. Some ridge and high side angle steps are evident. VERY ROUGH - Near vertical steps and ridges occur on the fracture surface.











**APPENDIX B**

Laboratory Investigation

### **APPENDIX B**

### Laboratory Investigation

Our laboratory testing program for the proposed Hillview Drive slope repair project in Danville, California was directed toward a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the physical and mechanical properties of the soils underlying the site.

The natural water content was determined on sixteen samples of the subsurface soils. The water contents are recorded on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Dry density determination was performed on thirteen samples of the subsurface soils to evaluate their physical properties. The results of the tests are shown on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Unconfined compression test was performed on eight relatively undisturbed samples of the subsurface soils to evaluate the undrained shear strengths of these materials. Failure was taken as the peak normal stress. The results of the tests are presented on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths and are also attached to this appendix.

Gradation and hydrometer tests were performed on six samples of the subsurface soils. These tests were performed to assist in the classification of the soils and to determine their grain size distribution. The results of the tests are presented on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths and are also attached to this appendix.

Laboratory compaction tests were performed on two representative samples of the onsite soils to determine the maximum dry density and optimum moisture content of these materials. The compaction tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D1557, latest edition. The results of the tests are attached to this appendix.

Consolidated drained direct shear tests (ASTM D3080) were performed on a set of remolded samples of the onsite fill materials. The results of the tests are attached to this appendix.

Drained fully softened peak (ASTM D7608) and residual (ASTM D6467) torsional shear tests were performed on a set of remolded samples of the onsite fill materials. The results of the tests are attached to this appendix.



### Atterberg Limits Test – ASTM D4318









### Hydrometer Analysis – ASTM D422







### Atterberg Limits Test – ASTM D4318









### Hydrometer Analysis – ASTM D422







### Atterberg Limits Test – ASTM D4318









### Hydrometer Analysis – ASTM D422







### Atterberg Limits Test – ASTM D4318









### Hydrometer Analysis – ASTM D422







### Atterberg Limits Test – ASTM D4318









### Hydrometer Analysis – ASTM D422







### Atterberg Limits Test – ASTM D4318









### Hydrometer Analysis – ASTM D422







# **Project Number:** 768-1 **Boring #:** SFB-1 **Depth:** 26 ft

**Project Name:** Hillview Drive Landslide **Date:** 4/26/2017

**Description:** Gray brown silty CLAY some sand (CH) **Tested By:** R









# **Project Number:** 768-1 **Boring #:** SFB-2 **Depth:** 11 ft

**Project Name:** Hillview Drive Landslide **Date:** 4/26/2017

**Description:** Olive gray brown silty CLAY some sand (CH) **Tested By:** R









# **Project Number:** 768-1 **Boring #:** SFB-2 **Depth:** 16 ft

**Project Name:** Hillview Drive Landslide **Date:** 4/26/2017

**Description:** Gray brown silty CLAY some sand (CH) **Tested By:** R









# **Project Number:** 768-1 **Boring #:** SFB-2 **Depth:** 21 ft

**Project Name:** Hillview Drive Landslide **Date:** 4/26/2017

**Description:** Gray brown silty CLAY some sand (CH) **Tested By:** R









# **Project Number: 768-1 Boring #: SFB-2**

**Project Name:** Hillview Drive Landslide

**Description:** Gray brown silty CLAY some sand (CH)





### Max Unconfined



**Depth:** 26 ft **Date:** 4/27/2017 **Tested By:** R



# **Project Number:** 768-1 **Boring #:** SFB-3 **Depth:** 6 ft

**Project Name:** Hillview Drive Landslide **Date:** 4/27/2017

**Description:** Gray brown silty CLAY trace sand (CH) **Tested By:** R









# **Project Number:** 768-1 **Boring #:** SFB-3 **Depth:** 11 ft

**Project Name:** Hillview Drive Landslide **Date:** 4/27/2017

**Description:** Gray brown silty CLAY some sand (CH) **Tested By:** R

0 500 1000 1500 2000 2500 3000 3500 4000 4500 0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0 Unconfined Strength (lb/ft2) Strain (%)







# **Project Number:** 768-1 **Boring #:** SFB-3 **Depth:** 16 ft

**Project Name:** Hillview Drive Landslide **Date:** 4/27/2017

**Description:** Gray brown silty CLAY (CH/MH) **Tested By:** R









# Compaction Curve – ASTM D1557







### **Consolidated Drained Direct Shear (ASTM D3080)**







### **APPENDIX C**

Logs of Previous Borings by Others



 $\mathbf{r}$ 



### BERLOGAR GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

# **BORING LOG**  $\frac{B-8}{2}$

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 



**NOTES:** 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2$ 



 $\mathbb{R}^2$ 

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

PROJECT Vista Tassajara DRILLING METHODS  $-832 +$ ELEVATION (FEET) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_





 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



 $\sim 10^7$ 

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\sim 10$ 

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 



### **BERLOGAR GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS**

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

 $\sim 10^{-10}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ 

 $\sim 10^{11}$  km  $^{-1}$ 

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



### **BERLOGAR GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS**

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 





### **BERLOGAR GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS**

 $\lesssim 4$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

# **BORING LOG**  $\frac{B-10}{2}$



**NOTES:** 

 $\sim 10^{-10}$ 



### BERLOGAR GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS



**NOTES:** 







### **BERLOGAR GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS**

# **BORING LOG \_\_\_\_\_\_\_**



 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ 



### **BERLOGAR GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANTS**

 $\sim 1$ 

 $\Delta \sim 10^4$ 

 $\mathcal{A}$ 

### **APPENDIX D**

Slope Stability Analysis Results





 $F = 0.992$ 























