

# Staff Report for Administrative Approval - Hillside Review - Notice of Approval <br> Weber County Planning Division 

## Synopsis



- Weber Country Land Use Code Title 108 (Standards) Chapter 14 (Hillside Development Review)
- Weber County Land Use Code Title 104 (Zones) Chapter 27 (Natural Hazards Overlay District)


## Background

It was determined during the building permit review process by the County Engineering Division that due to the slope and the potential of a geologic hazard being located on the site that the property be subject to a Hillside Review. The property owner hired AGEC to perform the required geologic and geotechnical investigation to determine if there is a geologic hazard in order to better design the home for safety purposes. Information related to the construction of the dwelling including a site plan, grading plans, and a geotechnical report, were distributed to the Hillside Review Board for comment. The plans have been reviewed and approved by all applicable review agencies.

## Planning Division Review

The Planning Division Staff has determined that the requirements and standards provided by the Hillside Review Chapter have been met for the excavation and construction of the dwelling. The following submittals were required:

1. Approved Plans (see Exhibit A)
2. Geotechnical Investigation Report (see Exhibit B)
3. Geologic Investigation Report (see Exhibit C)
4. Utah Pollution Discharge Elimination system (UPDES) Permit with Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan (See Building Permit Application Packet for UPDES and SWPPP)

## Weber County Hillside Review Board comments

The Weber County Hillside Review Board, on this particular application, made comments related to the following:
Weber County Engineering Division: The Engineering Division granted approval on May 18, 2016. The approval is subject to the applicant following all recommendations found in the applicable Geotechnical and Geological Investigation Reports including any subsequent recommendations that are provided by their geo-technical and geological consultants. Subsequent recommendations may be necessary if additional geologic hazards are exposed during the excavation and construction phase of the dwelling.

Weber Fire District: The Fire district has granted an approval on May 26, 2016 subject to providing:

1. A residential fire suppression system in the dwelling
2. An address marker at the construction site
3. A Weber Fire District approved access road and fire apparatus access driveway
4. A fully functional water system including fire hydrants prior to any combustible construction
5. If the building is equipped with an fire suppression system, there shall be a weather proof horn/strobe device located on the street side of the building as approved by the Fire Prevention Division (coordinate with fire inspector regarding location)

Weber County Building Inspection Department: The Building Inspection Office has granted an approval due to the applicant's ability to satisfy all requirements provided in their review dated May 27, 2016.

Weber-Morgan Health Department: The Health Department has verified that that they will not impose any requirements or conditions for this application due to the existence of a culinary water and waste water system being in place.

Weber County Planning Division: The Planning Division has granted approval subject to the applicant complying with all Board requirements and conditions. This approval is also subject to the applicant developing Lot 127 according to approved plans.

## Planning Division Findings

Based on site inspections and review agency comments, the Planning Division Staff has determined that it is not necessary to impose additional requirements or conditions prior to approving HSR \#2016-05 and is recommending approval based on the following findings:

1. The application was submitted and has been deemed complete.
2. The requirements and standards found in the Hillside Development Review Procedures and Standards Chapter have been met or will be met during the excavation and construction phase of the dwelling.
3. The Hillside Review Board members reviewed the application individually and have provided their comments.
4. The applicant has met or will meet, as part of the building permit process and/or during the excavation and construction phase of the dwelling, the requirements and conditions set forth by the Hillside Review Board. As a condition it is understood, by the applicant and his geo-technical engineer and geologist, that if any geologic hazards are revealed during the excavation and construction phase of the dwelling, work on Lot 127 will cease pending the development of appropriate mitigation measures and subsequent approval by the County and the County's contracted geo-technical and/or geological consultant.
5. The Planning Division Staff has determined that the proposed improvements have been sited within the required setbacks for the RE-15 zone with the exception of the driveway and retaining wall(s).

Administrative Approval
Administrative approval of Lot 127 Hillside Review (HR\#2016-05), is hereby granted based upon its compliance with the Weber County Land Use Code. This approval is subject to the requirements of applicable review agencies and is based on the findings listed in this staff report.

Date of Administrative Approval: June 1, 2016


Rick Grover
Weber County Planning Director

## Exhibits

A. Approved Plans
B. Geotechnical Investigation Report
C. Geologic Report
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## GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

 PROPOSED HANNOY RESIDENCE3563 PINEVIEW COURT

EDEN, UTAH

PREPARED FOR:
BIG CANYON HOMES, INC.
1925 SW HOYTSVILLE ROAD WANSHIP, UTAH 84017

ATTENTION: PAUL BERMAN

## Exhibit B

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY Page 1
SCOPE ..... Page 2
SITE CONDITIONS ..... Page 2
FIELD STUDY ..... Page 3
SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS ..... Page 3
SUBSURFACE WATER. ..... Page 4
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION ..... Page 5
SLOPE STABILITY EVALUATION ..... Page 5
RECOMMENDATIONS ..... Page 6
A. Site Grading ..... Page 6
B. Foundations ..... Page 8
C. Concrete Slab-on-Grade ..... Page 10
D. Lateral Earth Pressures ..... Page 10
E. Seismicity, Faulting and Liquefaction. ..... Page 11
F. Water Soluble Sulfates ..... Page 12
G. Subsurface Drain ..... Page 12
H. Preconstruction Meeting ..... Page 13
LIMITATIONS ..... Page 14
REFERENCES ..... Page 15
FIGURES

TEST PIT AND BORING LOCATIONS
BORING \& TEST PIT LOGS, LEGEND AND NOTES CONSOLIDATION TEST RESULTS GRADATION TEST RESULTS SUMMARY OF LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

FIGURE 1
FIGURE 2
FIGURE 3
FIGURE 4
TABLE I

## APPENDIX

SLOPE STABILITY PRINTOUTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The subsurface soil encountered in Boring B-1 consists of approximately 4 feet of fill overlying clay. The clay extends to a depth of approximately $101 / 2$ feet and is underlain by clayey gravel extending the full depth of the boring, approximately 15 feet where practical auger refusal was encountered. The test pits encountered approximately $1 / 2$ foot of topsoil overlying clayey gravel extending the full depth investigated, approximately 26 feet.
2. No subsurface water was encountered to the maximum depth investigated.
3. The proposed residence may be supported on spread footings bearing on the undisturbed natural gravel or on structural fill extending down to the undisturbed natural gravel and may be designed for a net allowable bearing pressure of 3,500 pounds per square foot.
4. Geotechnical information related to foundations, subgrade preparation and materials is included in the report.
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## SCOPE

This report presents the results of a geotechnical investigation for a proposed Hannoy residence to be constructed at 3563 Pineview Court in Eden, Utah. The report presents the subsurface conditions encountered, laboratory test results and recommendations for foundations. The study was conducted in general accordance with our proposal dated March 14, 2016. A geologic-hazard study is being prepared in conjunction with this study and was reported May 2, 2016 under Project No. 1160176A.

Field exploration was conducted to obtain information on the subsurface conditions. Samples obtained from the field investigation were tested in the laboratory to determine physical and engineering characteristics of the on-site soil. Information obtained from the field and laboratory was used to define conditions at the site for our engineering analysis and to develop recommendations for the proposed foundations.

This report has been prepared to summarize the data obtained during the study and to present our conclusions and recommendations based on the proposed construction and the subsurface conditions encountered. Design parameters and a discussion of geotechnical engineering considerations related to construction are included in the report.

## SITE CONDITIONS

At the time of our field study, there were no permanent structures or pavement on the site. The site consists of an undeveloped residential lot. It appears that some fill has been placed along the north edge of the site. This fill is approximately 4 feet thick at the boring location.

The ground surface at the site slopes gently to moderately down toward the south and southwest with slopes of approximately 6 horizontal to 1 vertical and flatter throughout most of the proposed building area and slopes on the order of 3 horizontal to 1 vertical and flatter south of the proposed building area.
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Vegetation at the site consists of grass and brush.

There is a residential house west of the site and Pineveiw Court to the north. There are undeveloped lots to the south and east.

## FIELD STUDY

The field study was conducted on April 13, 2016. One boring was drilled and two test pits excavated at the approximate locations indicated on Figure 1. The boring and test pits were logged by a geologist from AGEC. Logs of the subsurface conditions encountered in the boring and test pits are presented on Figure 2.

The test pits were backfilled without significant compaction. The backfill in the test pits should be removed and replaced with properly compacted fill where it will support proposed buildings, floor slabs or other settlement-sensitive improvements.

## SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

The subsurface soil encountered in Boring B-1 consists of approximately 4 feet of fill overlying clay. The clay extends to a depth of approximately $101 / 2$ feet and is underlain by clayey gravel extending the full depth of the boring, approximately 15 feet where practical auger refusal was encountered. The test pits encountered approximately $1 / 2$ foot of topsoil overlying clayey gravel extending the full depth investigated, approximately 26 feet.

A description of the soil encountered in the boring and test pits follows:

Fill - The fill consists of sandy lean clay with gravel and occasional cobbles. It is moist and dark brown.
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Topsoil - The topsoil consists of clayey gravel with sand, cobbles and occasional boulders up to approximately 3 feet in size. It is very moist, dark brown and contains roots and organics.

Lean Clay - The clay contains occasional gravel. It is stiff to very stiff, moist and brown.

Laboratory tests performed on a sample of the clay indicate it has a natural moisture content of 23 percent and a natural dry density of 100 pounds per cubic foot (pcf). Results a consolidation test performed on a sample of the clay indicate it will compress a small amount with the addition of light to moderate loads. Results of the consolidation test are presented on Figure 3.

Clayey Gravel with Sand - The gravel contains cobbles and boulders up to approximately 3 feet in size. It is dense to very dense, moist to very moist and brown with iron oxide staining.

Results of a gradation test performed on a sample of the gravel are presented on Figure 4.

Results of the laboratory tests are included on the boring and test pit logs and Table I.

## SUBSURFACE WATER

No subsurface water was encountered to the maximum depth investigated, approximately 26 feet.
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## PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION

A single-family residence is planned for the site. The building will be a single-story structure with a basement. We have assumed building loads to consist of wall loads up to 3 kips per lineal foot and column loads up to 50 kips.

Grading for the site will be relatively minor with most rockeries planned to be 5 feet or less in height. The tallest rockery is planned for the northeast corner of the site along the driveway where a two-tier rockery is planned to be up to approximately 10 feet in height. We understand that rockery design is to be provided by others.

If the proposed construction or building loads are significantly different from those described above, we should be notified so that we can reevaluate the recommendations given.

## SLOPE STABILITY EVALUATION

A slope stability evaluation was performed using the program SLIDE 7.0 by Rocscience. The strength selected for the clayey gravel is based on Stark and Eid (1997) for the clay component assuming a fully-softened condition and a friction angle of 39 degrees for the gravel component. The strength contributed to the clay is assumed to be 15 percent with 85 percent attributed to the gravel. The soil profile was considered to consist entirely of clayey gravel using these strengths. The slope profile was developed from the contours presented on Figure 1 in conjunction with elevation contours obtained from the Lidar data. The results of the stability analysis indicate a safety factor of 2.3 under static conditions and 1.4 under seismic conditions. The seismic condition was evaluated using a pseudostatic analysis from the same computer program and is based on a peak ground acceleration for a seismic event with a 2 percent probability of occurrence in 50 years.
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Based on this study, both static and pseudostatic slope stability safety factors are at or above the required safety factors of 1.5 and 1.0, respectively. Printouts of the stability analyses are included in the appendix.

No subsurface water was encountered to the maximum depth investigated and a perched water table is not expected to form since the building will be connected to a sewer. A longterm perched-water condition could cause stability concerns for the undeveloped slope but not the house. Site grading should be planned to promote surface runoff away from the house and sumps should not be constructed in the slope below the proposed building area.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## A. Site Grading

1. Subgrade Preparation

Prior to placing grading fill or base course, the topsoil, organic material, unsuitable fill and other deleterious materials should be removed. The north portion of the property appears to have been raised with fill and this fill is not considered suitable for support of buildings, slabs or other settlementsensitive features and should be removed from below such structures and features.
2. Cut and Fill Slopes

Temporary unretained excavation slopes may be constructed at 1 horizontal to 1 vertical or flatter. Permanent, unretained cut and fill slopes up to 15 feet in height may be constructed at slopes of 3 horizontal to 1 vertical or flatter. Slopes greater than 15 feet in height will require a stability analysis.

Good surface drainage should be provided upslope of cut and fill slopes to direct surface runoff away from the face of the slopes. The slopes should be protected from erosion by revegetation or other methods.

## 3. Excavation

We anticipate that excavation at the site can be accomplished with heavyduty excavation equipment. Significant difficulty can be expected for confined excavations where boulders are encountered. Care should be taken not to disturb the natural soil to remain in the proposed building area.
4. Materials

Listed below are materials recommended for imported structural fill:

| Fill to Support | Recommendations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Footings | Non-expansive granular soil |
|  | Passing No. 200 Sieve $<35 \%$ |
|  | Liquid Limit $<30 \%$ |
|  | Maximum size 4 inches |
| Floor Slab | Sand and/or Gravel |
| (Upper 4 inches) | Passing No. 200 Sieve < 5\% |
|  | Maximum size 2 inches |
| Slab Support | Non-expansive granular soil |
|  | Passing No. 200 Sieve <50\% |
|  | Liquid Limit $<30 \%$ |
|  | Maximum size 6 inches |

Fill placed below areas of the proposed building should consist of granular soil as indicated above. The on-site sand and gravel is generally expected to meet these criteria if the oversized particles are removed.
5. Compaction

Compaction of materials placed at the site should equal or exceed the minimum densities as indicated below when compared to the maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D 1557.

| Fill To Support | Compaction |
| :--- | :---: |
| Foundations | $\geq 95 \%$ |
| Concrete Slabs | $\geq 90 \%$ |
| Landscaping | $\geq 85 \%$ |
| Retaining Wall Backfill | $85-90 \%$ |

The moisture of the soil should be adjusted to within 2 percent of optimum to facilitate compaction.

Fill placed for the project should be frequently tested for compaction. Fill should be placed in thin enough lifts to allow for proper compaction.
6. Drainage

The ground surface surrounding the proposed building should be sloped away from the residence in all directions. Roof down spouts and drains should discharge beyond the limits of backfill.

## B. Foundations

1. Bearing Material

The proposed residence may be supported on spread footings bearing on the undisturbed natural gravel or on compacted structural fill that extends down to the natural undisturbed gravel. Structural fill placed below footings should
extend out away from the edge of footings at least a distance equal to the depth of fill below footings.

The topsoil, organics, unsuitable fill, debris and other deleterious materials should be removed from below proposed foundation areas.

## 2. Bearing Pressure

Spread footings bearing on the undisturbed, natural gravel or on compacted structural fill may be designed for a net allowable bearing pressure of 3,500 pounds per square foot.
3. Settlement

We estimate that total and differential settlement will be less than $1 / 2$ inch for footings designed as indicated above.
4. Temporary Loading Conditions

The allowable bearing pressure may be increased by one-half for temporary loading conditions such as wind or seismic loads.
5. Minimum Footing Width and Embedment

Spread footings should have a minimum width of $11 / 2$ feet and a minimum depth of embedment of 10 inches.
6. Frost Depth

Exterior footings and footings beneath unheated areas should be placed at least 36 inches below grade for frost protection.

## 7. Foundation Base

The base of foundation excavations should be cleared of loose or deleterious material prior to structural fill or concrete placement. The subgrade should not be scarified prior to structural fill placement.

## 8. Construction Observation

A representative of the geotechnical engineer should observe footing excavations prior to structural fill or concrete placement.

## C. Concrete Slab-on-Grade

## 1. Slab Support

Concrete slabs may be supported on the undisturbed natural soil or on compacted structural fill that extends down to the undisturbed natural soil.

Topsoil, unsuitable fill, organics, debris and other deleterious materials should be removed from below proposed slabs.
2. Underslab Sand and/or Gravel

Consideration may be given to placing a 4 -inch layer of free-draining sand and/or gravel (less than 5 percent passing the No. 200 sieve) below slabs to promote even curing of the slab concrete.

## D. Lateral Earth Pressures

1. Lateral Resistance for Footings

Lateral resistance for footings placed on natural soil or on compacted structural fill is controlled by sliding resistance between the footing and foundation soils. A friction value of 0.45 may be used in design for ultimate lateral resistance.
2. Subgrade Walls and Retaining Structures

The following equivalent fluid weights are given for design of subgrade walls and retaining structures. The active condition is where the wall moves away from the soil. The passive condition is where the wall moves into the soil and
the at-rest condition is where the wall does not move. The values listed below assume a horizontal surface adjacent the top and bottom of the wall.

| Soil Type | Active | At-Rest | Passive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Clay \& Silt | 50 pcf | 65 pcf | 250 pcf |
| Sand \& Gravel | 40 pcf | 55 pcf | 300 pcf |

## 3. Seismic Conditions

Under seismic conditions, the equivalent fluid weight should be increased by 22 pcf and 7 pcf for active and at-rest conditions, respectively, and decreased by 22 pcf for the passive condition. This assumes a peak horizontal ground acceleration of 0.35 g for a seismic event having a 2 percent probability of exceedance in a 50 -year period (IBC, 2012).

## 4. Safety Factors

The values recommended above for active and passive conditions assume mobilization of the soil to achieve the soil strength. Conventional safety factors used for structural analysis for such items as overturning and sliding resistance should be used in design.

## E. Seismicity, Faulting and Liquefaction

## 1. Seismicity

Listed below is a summary of the site parameters for the 2012 International Building Code.
a. Site Class
C
b. Short Period Spectral Response Acceleration, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{s}}$
0.89 g
c. One Second Period Spectral Response Acceleration, $\mathrm{S}_{1}$
0.30 g
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2. Faulting

There are no mapped active faults extending through the site. The closest mapped fault considered to be active is the Wasatch fault located approximately 6.7 miles west of the site (Black and others, 2003).

## 3. Liquefaction

Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at the site, published literature and our understanding of the geologic conditions in the area, liquefaction is not considered a hazard at this site.

## F. Water Soluble Sulfates

One sample of the natural soil was tested in the laboratory for water soluble sulfate content. Results of the test indicate there is less than 0.1 percent water soluble sulfate in the sample tested. Based on the results of the test and published literature, the natural soil possesses negligible sulfate attack potential on concrete. No special cement type is required for concrete placed in contact with the natural soil. Other conditions may dictate the type of cement to be used in concrete for the project.

## G. Subsurface Drain

We recommend that a subsurface drain be provided for the below-grade floor portion of the residence. The subsurface drain system should consist of at least the following items:
a. The subsurface drain system should consist of a perforated pipe installed in a gravel filled trench around the perimeter of the subgrade floor portion of the residence. A geosynthetic drain could be used as an alternative. The drain
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should extend up the foundation walls high enough (to within approximately 3 feet of the ground surface) to intercept potential subsurface water.
b. At least 6 inches of free-draining gravel should be placed below the floor slab of the residence. The gravel should connect the perimeter drainage pipe.
c. The flow line of the pipe should be placed at least 14 inches below the finished floor level and should slope to a sump or outlet where water can be removed by pumping or by gravity flow.
d. If placing the gravel and drain pipe requires excavation below the bearing level of the footing, the excavation for the drain pipe and gravel should have a slope no steeper than 1:1 (horizontal to vertical) so as not to disturb the soil below the building.
e. A filter fabric should be placed between the natural soil and the drain gravel. This will help reduce the potential for fine grained material filling in the void spaces of the gravel.
f. Consideration may be given to installing cleanouts to allow access into the perimeter drain should cleaning of the pipe be required in the future.

## H. Preconstruction Meeting

A preconstruction meeting should be held with representatives of the owner, project architect, geotechnical engineer, general contractor, earthwork contractor and other members of the design team to review construction plans, specifications, methods and schedule.
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## LIMITATIONS

This report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted soil and foundation engineering practices in the area for the use of the client for design purposes. The conclusions and recommendations included within the report are based on the information obtained from the boring drilled and test pits excavated at the approximate locations indicated on the site plan and the data obtained from laboratory testing. Variations in the subsurface conditions may not become evident until additional exploration or excavation is conducted. If the proposed construction, subsurface conditions or groundwater level is found to be significantly different from what is described above, we should be notified to reevaluate the recommendations given.

APPLIED GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC.


DRH/rs
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## APPENDIX

 SLOPE STABILITY PRINTOUTS

# Slide Analysis Information <br> SLIDE - An Interactive Slope Stability Program 

## Project Summary

| File Name: | 1160176 Seismic Condition |
| :--- | :--- |
| Slide Modeler Version: | 7.014 |
| Project Title: | SLIDE - An Interactive Slope Stability Program |
| Date Created: | 5/2/2016, 10:42:47 AM |

## General Settings

| Units of Measurement: | Imperial Units |
| :--- | :--- |
| Time Units: | days |
| Permeability Units: | feet/second |
| Failure Direction: | Right to Left |
| Data Output: | Standard |
| Maximum Material Properties: | 20 |
| Maximum Support Properties: | 20 |

Analysis Options

| Slices Type: | Vertical |
| :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Methods Used |  |
|  | Spencer |
| Number of slices: | 50 |
| Tolerance: | 0.005 |
| Maximum number of iterations: | 75 |
| Check malpha < 0.2 : | Yes |
| Create Interslice boundaries at intersections with water tables and piezos: | Yes |
| Initial trial value of FS: | 1 |
| Steffensen Iteration: | Yes |

## Groundwater Analysis

| Groundwater Method: | Water Surfaces |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pore Fluid Unit Weight [lbs/ft3]: | 62.4 |
| Advanced Groundwater Method: | None |

## Random Numbers

| Pseudo-random Seed: | 10116 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Random Number Generation Method: Park and Miller v. 3 |  |

## Surface Options

| Search Method: | Auto Refine Search |
| :--- | :--- |
| Divisions along slope: | 10 |
| Circles per division: | 10 |
| Number of iterations: | 10 |
| Divisions to use in next iteration: | $50 \%$ |
| Number of vertices per surface: | 12 |
| Minimum Elevation: | Not Defined |
| Minimum Depth: | Not Defined |
| Minimum Area: | Not Defined |
| Minimum Weight; | Not Defined |

## Seismic

Advanced seismic analysis: No
Staged pseudostatic analysis: No

## Loading

Seismic Load Coefficient (Horizontal): 0.182

## Material Properties

| Property | Clayey Gravel |
| :--- | ---: |
| Color | $\square$ |
| Strength Type | Shear Normal function |
| Unit Weight [lbs/ft3] | 120 |
| Water Surface | None |
| Ru Value | 0 |

## Shear Normal Functions

Name: Clayey Gravel

| Normal (psf) | Shear (psf) |
| :--- | ---: |
| 0 | 0 |
| 1050 | 800 |
| 2000 | 1540 |
| 4000 | 3085 |
| 8350 | 6375 |

## Global Minimums

Method: spencer

| FS | 1.388850 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Axis Location: | $91.825,5525.199$ |
| Left Slip Surface Endpoint: | $86.773,5489.939$ |
| Right Slip Surface Endpoint: | $117.002,5500.001$ |
| Resisting Moment: | $3293.89 \mathrm{lb}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| Driving Moment: | $2371.66 \mathrm{lb}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| Resisting Horizontal Force: | 97.8572 lb |
| Driving Horizontal Force: | 70.4591 lb |
| Total Slice Area: | 1.26602 ft 2 |
| Surface Horizontal Width: | 30.2298 ft |
| Surface Average Height: | 0.0418798 ft |

## Global Minimum Coordinates



| X | Y |
| ---: | ---: |
| 86.7726 | 5489.94 |
| 87.419 | 5490.11 |
| 88.4014 | 5490.44 |
| 89.3839 | 5490.76 |
| 90.312 | 5491.07 |
| 91.2402 | 5491.37 |
| 92.1683 | 5491.68 |
| 93.0964 | 5491.99 |
| 94.3228 | 5492.39 |
| 95.5491 | 5492.8 |
| 96.2066 | 5493.02 |
| 96.8835 | 5493.24 |
| 97.5604 | 5493.47 |
| 98.5661 | 5493.8 |
| 99.5718 | 5494.14 |
| 100.845 | 5494.56 |
| 102.119 | 5494.98 |
| 102.763 | 5495.2 |
| 103.406 | 5495.41 |
| 104.693 | 5495.84 |
| 105.649 | 5496.17 |
| 106.605 | 5496.49 |
| 107.561 | 5496.81 |
| 108.517 | 5497.13 |
| 109.489 | 5497.45 |
| 110.462 | 5497.78 |
| 111.434 | 5498.11 |
| 112.406 | 5498.43 |
| 113.235 | 5498.72 |
| 114.064 | 5499 |
| 114.893 | 5499.28 |
| 115.722 | 5499.56 |
| 117.002 | 5500 |

## Valid / Invalid Surfaces

## Method: spencer

Number of Valid Surfaces: 1666
Number of Invalid Surfaces: 2836

## Error Codes:

Error Code -105 reported for 38 surfaces
Error Code - 111 reported for 37 surfaces Error Code - 113 reported for 2761 surfaces

## Error Codes

The following errors were encountered during the computation:
$-105=$ More than two surface / slope intersections with no valid slip surface
-111 = safety factor equation did not converge
-113 = Surface intersects outside slope limits.

## Slice Data

Global Minimum Query (spencer) - Safety Factor: 1.38885
$\square$

| Slice Number | Width <br> [ft] | Weight [Ibs] | Angle of Slice Base [degrees] | Base Material | Base Cohesion [psf] | Base <br> Friction Angle <br> [degrees] | Shear Stress [psf] | Shear <br> Strength <br> [psf] | Base Normal Stress [psf] | Pore Pressure [psf] | Effective Normal Stress [psf] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.646406 | 0.664783 | 15.1221 | Clayey Gravel | -1.11022e-016 | 37.304 | 0.508383 | 0.706068 | 0.926714 | 0 | 0.926714 |
| 2 | 0.491235 | 1.62417 | 18.2021 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 1.54018 | 2.13908 | 2.80754 | 0 | 2.80754 |
| 3 | 0.491235 | 1.75474 | 18.2021 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 1.664 | 2.31104 | 3.03324 | 0 | 3.03324 |
| 4 | 0.982469 | 3.90117 | 18.2021 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 1.84971 | 2.56897 | 3.37177 | 0 | 3.37177 |
| 5 | 0.464066 | 2.00445 | 18.2816 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.00904 | 2.79025 | 3.6622 | 0 | 3.6622 |
| 6 | 0.464066 | 2.08126 | 18.2816 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.08602 | 2.89717 | 3.80254 | 0 | 3.80254 |
| 7 | 0.464066 | 2.15806 | 18.2816 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.163 | 3.00408 | 3.94286 | 0 | 3.94286 |
| 8 | 0.464066 | 2.23487 | 18.2816 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.23998 | 3.111 | 4.08318 | 0 | 4.08318 |
| 9 | 0.464066 | 2.31168 | 18.2816 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.31697 | 3.21792 | 4.22352 | 0 | 4.22352 |
| 10 | 0.464066 | 2.38849 | 18.2816 | Clayey Gravel | -8.88178e-016 | 37.304 | 2.39395 | 3.32484 | 4.36385 | 0 | 4.36385 |
| 11 | 0.464066 | 2.46529 | 18.2816 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.47093 | 3.43175 | 4.50417 | 0 | 4.50417 |
| 12 | 0.464066 | 2.5421 | 18.2816 | Clayey Grave! | -4,44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.54791 | 3.53867 | 4.64451 | 0 | 4.64451 |
| 13 | 0.613163 | 3.45163 | 18.3388 | Clayey Grave! | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.61545 | 3.63247 | 4.76762 | 0 | 4.76762 |
| 14 | 0.613163 | 3.53573 | 18.3388 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.67918 | 3.72098 | 4.88379 | 0 | 4.88379 |
| 15 | 0.613163 | 3.61983 | 18.3388 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.7429 | 3.80948 | 4.99995 | 0 | 4.99995 |
| 16 | 0.613163 | 3.70392 | 18.3388 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.80663 | 3.89799 | 5.11612 | 0 | 5.11612 |
| 17 | 0.657558 | 4.05209 | 18.3656 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.86169 | 3.97446 | 5.21649 | 0 | 5.21649 |
| 18 | 0.676893 | 4.22726 | 18.3972 | Clayey Gravel | -8.88178e-016 | 37.304 | 2.89838 | 4.02541 | 5.28335 | 0 | 5.28335 |
| 19 | 0.676893 | 4.26745 | 18.3972 | Clayey Gravel | -8.88178e-016 | 37.304 | 2.92594 | 4.06369 | 5.33358 | 0 | 5.33358 |
| 20 | 0.502836 | 3.19918 | 18.3869 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.95334 | 4.10175 | 5.38356 | 0 | 5.38356 |
| 21 | 0.502836 | 3.22745 | 18.3869 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.97944 | 4.138 | 5.43111 | 0 | 5.43111 |
| 22 | 0.502836 | 3.25572 | 18.3869 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 3.00554 | 4.17424 | 5.47869 | 0 | 5.47869 |
| 23 | 0.502836 | 3.28399 | 18.3869 | Clayey Gravel | -8.88178e-016 | 37.304 | 3.03164 | 4.21049 | 5.52626 | 0 | 5.52626 |
| 24 | 0.636832 | 4.18032 | 18.4279 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 3.04473 | 4.22867 | 5.55013 | 0 | 5.55013 |
| 25 | 0.636832 | 4.18695 | 18.4279 | Clayey Gravel | -8.88178e-016 | 37.304 | 3.04955 | 4.23537 | 5.55892 | 0 | 5.55892 |
| 26 | 0.636832 | 4.19358 | 18.4279 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 3.05438 | 4.24208 | 5.56773 | 0 | 5.56773 |
| 27 | 0.636832 | 4.2002 | 18.4279 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 3.05921 | 4.24878 | 5.57653 | 0 | 5.57653 |
| 28 | 0.643539 | 4.22747 | 18.4771 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 3.04413 | 4.22784 | 5.54905 | 0 | 5.54905 |
| 29 | 0.643539 | 4.18683 | 18.4771 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 3.01487 | 4.1872 | 5.4957 | 0 | 5.4957 |
| 30 | 0.643539 | 4.14619 | 18.4771 | Clayey Gravel | -8.88178e-016 | 37.304 | 2.9856 | 4.14655 | 5.44235 | 0 | 5.44235 |
| 31 | 0.643539 | 4.10555 | 18.4771 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.95634 | 4.10591 | 5.38901 | 0 | 5.38901 |
| 32 | 0.47796 | 3.00998 | 18.5257 | Clayey Gravel | -8.88178e-016 | 37.304 | 2.91561 | 4.04934 | 5.31476 | 0 | 5.31476 |
| 33 | 0.47796 | 2.96171 | 18.5257 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.86885 | 3.9844 | 5.22952 | 0 | 5.22952 |
| 34 | 0.47796 | 2.91343 | 18.5257 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.82208 | 3.91945 | 5.14427 | 0 | 5.14427 |
| 35 | 0.47796 | 2.86516 | 18.5257 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.77532 | 3.85451 | 5.05905 | 0 | 5.05905 |
| 36 | 0.47796 | 2.81688 | 18.5257 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.72856 | 3.78956 | 4.9738 | 0 | 4.9738 |
| 37 | 0.47796 | 2.7686 | 18.5257 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.6818 | 3.72462 | 4.88856 | 0 | 4.88856 |
| 38 | 0.47796 | 2.72033 | 18.5257 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.63504 | 3.65967 | 4.80332 | 0 | 4.80332 |
| 39 | 0.47796 | 2.67205 | 18.5257 | Clayey Grave! | 0 | 37.304 | 2.58828 | 3.59473 | 4.71807 | 0 | 4.71807 |
| 40 | 0.486176 | 2.64912 | 18.5959 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 2.51934 | 3.49899 | 4.59244 | 0 | 4.59244 |
| 41 | 0.486176 | 2.56051 | 18.5959 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.43507 | 3.38195 | 4.43882 | 0 | 4.43882 |
| 42 | 0.972352 | 4.8552 | 18.5959 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.30867 | 3.2064 | 4.2084 | 0 | 4.2084 |
| 43 | 0.972352 | 4.50075 | 18.5959 | Clayey Grave! | 0 | 37.304 | 2.14013 | 2.97232 | 3.90117 | 0 | 3.90117 |
| 44 | 0.486176 | 2.11746 | 18.5959 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 2.01372 | 2.79676 | 3.67076 | 0 | 3.67076 |
| 45 | 0.486176 | 2.02885 | 18.5959 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 1.92946 | 2.67973 | 3.51714 | 0 | 3.51714 |
| 46 | 0.828803 | 3.15522 | 18.7196 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 1.75605 | 2.43889 | 3.20105 | 0 | 3.20105 |
| 47 | 0.828803 | 2.69939 | 18.7196 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 1.50236 | 2.08655 | 2.73851 | 0 | 2.73861 |
| 48 | 0.828803 | 2.24357 | 18.7196 | Clayey Gravel | -4.44089e-016 | 37.304 | 1.24867 | 1.73422 | 2.27615 | 0 | 2.27615 |
| 49 | 0.828803 | 1.78775 | 18.7196 | Clayey Gravel | 0 | 37.304 | 0.994981 | 1.38188 | 1.81371 | 0 | 1.81371 |
| 50 | 1.28081 | 1.21389 | 19.0595 | Clayey Gravel | -1.11022e-016 | 37.304 | 0.434372 | 0.603277 | 0.791798 | 0 | 0.791798 |

## Interslice Data

Global Minimum Query (spencer) - Safety Factor: 1.38885
$\square$

| Slice Number | X coordinate [ft] | coordinate - Bottom <br> [ft] | Interslice Normal Force [lbs] | Interslice Shear Force [llbs] | Interslice Force Angle [degrees] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 86.7726 | 5489.94 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 87.419 | 5490.11 | 0.045752 | 0.0230554 | 26.7445 |
| 3 | 87.9102 | 5490.27 | 0.0532396 | 0.0268286 | 26.7445 |
| 4 | 88.4014 | 5490.44 | 0.061329 | 0.030905 | 26.7445 |
| 5 | 89.3839 | 5490.76 | 0.0793137 | 0.0399679 | 26.7445 |
| 6 | 89.848 | 5490.91 | 0.0853778 | 0.0430237 | 26.7445 |
| 7 | 90.312 | 5491.07 | 0.0916743 | 0.0461967 | 26.7445 |
| 8 | 90.7761 | 5491.22 | 0.0982032 | 0.0494867 | 26.7445 |
| 9 | 91.2402 | 5491.37 | 0.104964 | 0.0528938 | 26.7446 |
| 10 | 91.7042 | 5491.53 | 0.111958 | 0.056418 | 26.7445 |
| 11 | 92.1683 | 5491.68 | 0.119184 | 0.0600593 | 26.7445 |
| 12 | 92.6324 | 5491.83 | 0.126642 | 0.0638177 | 26.7445 |
| 13 | 93.0964 | 5491.99 | 0.134333 | 0.0676932 | 26.7445 |
| 14 | 93.7096 | 5492.19 | 0.140842 | 0.0709731 | 26.7444 |
| 15 | 94.3228 | 5492.39 | 0.147509 | 0.0743329 | 26.7445 |
| 16 | 94.9359 | 5492.6 | 0.154335 | 0.0777725 | 26.7445 |
| 17 | 95.5491 | 5492.8 | 0.161319 | 0.0812921 | 26.7445 |
| 18 | 96.2066 | 5493.02 | 0.165801 | 0.0840544 | 26.7445 |
| 19 | 96.8835 | 5493.21 | 0.169856 | 0.0855913 | 26.7116 |
| 20 | 97.5604 | 5493.47 | 0.172941 | 0.0871488 | 26.7445 |
| 21 | 98.0633 | 5493.63 | 0.175912 | 0.088646 | 26.7446 |
| 22 | 98.5661 | 5493.8 | 0.17891 | 0.0901565 | 26.7445 |
| 23 | 99.0689 | 5493.97 | 0.181933 | 0.0916801 | 26.7446 |
| 24 | 99.5718 | 5494.14 | 0.184983 | 0.0932171 | 26.7446 |
| 25 | 100.209 | 5494.35 | 0.185458 | 0.0934561 | 26.7445 |
| 26 | 100.845 | 5494.56 | 0.185933 | 0.0936955 | 26.7445 |
| 27 | 101.482 | 5494.77 | 0.186408 | 0.0939352 | 26.7446 |
| 28 | 102.119 | 5494.98 | 0.186885 | 0.0941754 | 26.7445 |
| 29 | 102.763 | 5495.2 | 0.183239 | 0.0923381 | 26.7445 |
| 30 | 103.406 | 5495.41 | 0.179628 | 0.0905186 | 26.7446 |
| 31 | 104.05 | 5495.63 | 0.176053 | 0.0887166 | 26.7444 |
| 32 | 104.693 | 5495.84 | 0.172512 | 0.0869324 | 26.7445 |
| 33 | 105.171 | 5496.01 | 0.167017 | 0.0841634 | 26.7445 |
| 34 | 105.649 | 5496.17 | 0.16161 | 0.0814389 | 26.7446 |
| 35 | 106.127 | 5496.33 | 0.156292 | 0.0787587 | 26.7445 |
| 36 | 106.605 | 5496.49 | 0.151061 | 0.0761229 | 26.7445 |
| 37 | 107.083 | 5496.65 | 0.145919 | 0.0735316 | 26.7445 |
| 38 | 107.561 | 5496.81 | 0.140865 | 0.0709847 | 26.7445 |
| 39 | 108.039 | 5496.97 | 0.135898 | 0.0684822 | 26.7446 |
| 40 | 108.517 | 5497.13 | 0.131021 | 0.0660241 | 26.7444 |
| 41 | 109.003 | 5497.29 | 0.122506 | 0.0617333 | 26.7445 |
| 42 | 109.489 | 5497.45 | 0.114276 | 0.057586 | 26.7445 |
| 43 | 110.462 | 5497.78 | 0.0986703 | 0.0497221 | 26.7445 |
| 44 | 111.434 | 5498.11 | 0.084204 | 0.0424322 | 26.7445 |
| 45 | 111.92 | 5498.27 | 0.0773981 | 0.0390026 | 26.7445 |
| 46 | 112.406 | 5498.43 | 0.070877 | 0.0357165 | 26.7446 |
| 47 | 113.235 | 5498.72 | 0.0530306 | 0.0267232 | 26.7445 |
| 48 | 114.064 | 5499 | 0.0377623 | 0.0190293 | 26.7446 |
| 49 | 114.893 | 5499.28 | 0.0250723 | 0.0126345 | 26.7446 |
| 50 | 115.722 | 5499.56 | 0.0149605 | 0.00753893 | 26.7446 |
| 51 | 117.002 | 5500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## List Of Coordinates

External Boundary

$\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{rc}X & Y \\ 0 & 5450 \\ 250 & 5450 \\ 250 & 5525 \\ 237 & 5525 \\ 206 & 5523 \\ 206 & 5512 \\ 185 & 5512 \\ 146 & 5510 \\ 144 & 5506 \\ 124 & 5502 \\ 117 & 5500 \\ 87 & 5490 \\ 50 & 5480 \\ 0 & 5470\end{array}\right.$
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## PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

This report presents the results of a geologic-hazard study for the proposed Hannoy residence to be constructed at 3563 Pineview Court in Eden, Utah. A geotechnical study is being prepared under Project No. 1160176 B along with this report to provide geotechnical related recommendations.

This study was conducted to evaluate geologic hazards that may affect the proposed development of the lot. The hazards evaluated are surface fault rupture, landslide, tectonic subsidence, rockfall, debris flow and liquefaction. The study included a review of geologic literature, aerial photographs and Lidar data, site reconnaissance, subsurface exploration and geologic analysis. This report has been prepared to summarize the data obtained during the study and to present our conclusions.

## PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION

A single-family residence is planned for the site. The building will be a single-story structure with a basement. Grading for the site will be relatively minor with most rockeries planned to be 5 feet or less in height. The tallest rockery is planned for the northeast corner of the site along the driveway where a two-tier rockery is planned to be up to approximately 10 feet in height.

## SITE DESCRIPTION

At the time of our field study, there were no permanent structures or pavement on the site. The site consists of an undeveloped residential lot. It appears that some fill has been placed along the north edge of the site. This fill is approximately 4 feet thick at the boring location.

## Exhibit C

The ground surface at the site slopes gently down toward the south and southwest with slopes of approximately 6 horizontal to 1 vertical and flatter throughout most of the proposed building area and slopes on the order of 3 horizontal to 1 vertical and flatter south of the proposed building area.

Vegetation at the site consists of grass and brush.

There is a residential house west of the site and Pineveiw Court to the north. There are undeveloped lots to the south and east.

## OFFICE METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

Geologic conditions at the site were evaluated by a review of geologic literature, aerial photographs and Lidar data. Aerial photographs used during the investigation were downloaded from the Utah Geological Survey website. They have photograph numbers of ELK-2-205 and 206 and a photograph date of June 25, 1963. The Lidar data has a date of 2011 and was obtained from the Open Topography website.

## A. Geologic Literature Review

The site is located in Ogden Valley, which is a northwest trending valley within the Wasatch Mountains of north/central Utah. The valley is filled with an accumulation of lacustrine, alluvial and colluvial sediments from deposition during the past 15 million years (Sorensen and Crittenden, 1979). The surface deposits across the site consist of Quaternary-age colluvium consisting of clayey gravel with cobbles and boulders. These sediments are underlain by bedrock consisting of Tertiary-age pyroclastics of the Norwood Tuff.

Ogden Valley is a down-dropped structure with the Ogden Valley Northeast margin fault along the northeast side of the valley and the Ogden Valley Southwest margin
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fault and the Ogden Valley North Fork fault along the southwest side of the valley. These faults are oriented in a general northwest/southeast direction with the two western faults estimated to have moved in the last 750,000 years and the east fault having evidence of movement in the last 2.6 million years. The faults are considered normal faults with dip direction down to the northeast on the two west fault systems and down to the southwest for the Ogden Valley Northeast margin fault. The faults are considered relatively old structures and do not represent a significant surface-fault-rupture hazard for development within the Ogden Valley area. Tectonic subsidence associated with fault movement would similarly not be a significant hazard at this site.

The Utah Fault and Fold database shows the Ogden Valley North Fork fault located along the north fork of the Ogden River approximately 1.9 miles to the southwest and the Ogden Valley Northeast margin fault located on the hillside to the northeast, approximately 1.1 miles from the site. No active faults are mapped through or near the site. The closest active fault to the site based on the Utah Geological Survey database is the Wasatch fault located approximately 6.7 miles to the west.

The geologic map by Sorensen and Crittenden (1979) shows the site to be underlain by colluvium and slope wash of Holocene age.

Mapping by Coogan and King (2001) shows the area underlain by alluvium and colluvium of Quaternary age and states that this unit locally includes mass-movement deposits. The map shows a fault with sense of movement down to the southwest approximately 1,500 feet northeast of the site.

The Elliott and Harty (2010) landslide map shows the site and surrounding area as landslide deposits.

## Exhibit C

The King and others (2014) geologic map, which is a map in progress and currently has no legend, shows the site mapped as "Omso? (QTg?)" with a note stating "like Tcg" (see Figure 1). This mapping would suggest that the site is underlain by potential older landslide or gravel deposits. Gravel deposits were encountered in the boring drilled and test pits excavated at the site. The map shows a fault approximately 1,700 feet to the northeast of the site and several lineations in the area with the closest located approximately 700 feet to the west. The map shows a queried back-tilt feature about 800 feet to the southeast. The lineations can be attributed to differential weathering of the underlying bedrock in the area. The backtilt features are dubious in nature.

## B. Aerial Photograph and Lidar Review

The geologic literature indicates that there are landslide deposits in the area of the site. Review of aerial photographs and Lidar data finds evidence of potential geomorphology consistent with landslide deposits in the area but no evidence of landslide geomorphology at the site. Based on the mapped landslide deposits for the site and vicinity, a slope stability evaluation was made for the site. The results of the study are reported in the geotechnical report and find slope stability not to be a significant hazard for the proposed development.

Based on the topography of the site and surrounding area, rockfall and debris flow are not potential geologic hazards at the site. The site is protected from potential debris-flow sources on the steep mountain slopes approximately $1 / 2$ mile to the northeast by a ridge just to the north of the site, which would effectively divert debris flows away from the site.

## C. Seismicity

The property is located in the Intermountain Seismic Zone, which consists of an area of relatively high historical seismic activity. The most intense seismic ground shaking at the site is expected to originate from the Wasatch fault zone. The Wasatch fault
zone is considered capable of producing earthquakes on the order of 7 to 7.5 magnitude and can result in significant seismic ground shaking at the site. The US Geological Survey data indicate that a peak ground acceleration of 0.35 g can be expected to have a 2 percent probability of being exceeded in a 50 -year time period at this site (IBC, 2012).

## FIELD METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

Two test pits and a boring were used to determine subsurface conditions at the site. Test Pits TP-1 and TP-2 were extended to depths of approximately 26 and 21 feet, respectively. Clayey gravel with sand, cobbles and boulders up to approximately 3 feet in size was encountered the full depths of the test pits and the lower 5 feet of the boring, where practical auger refusal was met. The gravel is primarily matrix to clast-supported and represents colluvial deposits. No evidence of faults or landslide slip planes were found in the test pits. Logs for the upper 15 feet of the test pits are presented on Figure 3. Photographs of the upper 15 feet of the test pits are presented in the appendix.

Liquefaction is not a hazard at this site because of the type of sediments encountered and the expected depth to groundwater.

## CONCLUSIONS

Seismic ground shaking is considered the only significant geologic hazard at the site. This hazard will be mitigated through structural design. It is our professional opinion that landslide, debris flow, rockfall, surface fault rupture, tectonic subsidence and liquefaction are not significant hazards at the site.
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## LIMITATIONS

The analysis and report findings are based on published geologic maps and reports, aerial photographs and Lidar data of the site, the test pits excavated and boring drilled at the approximate locations indicated on Figure 2 and our interpretation of geologic conditions at the site. Our conclusions are based on currently accepted geologic interpretation of this information. The geologic logs of the excavations presented in this report depict geologic conditions only along the specific corridors and to the depths excavated. The logs do not necessarily reflect geologic conditions at other locations or at greater depths. No attempt has been made to predict earthquake ground motions or to determine the potential magnitude for earthquakes associated with faults in the area.

The test pits were backfilled without significant compaction. The backfill in the test pits should be removed and properly compacted where it will support settlement-sensitive structures, slabs or pavement.

## APPLIED GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC.
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DESCRIPTION OF GEOLOGIC UNITS AND SYMBOLS
Qac－Quarternary Alluvium and Colluvium
Qaf－Quarternary Alluvial－fan deposit
Qms－Quarternary Landslide deposits
Omso（QTg）－Quarternary Older Landslide deposits（gravel deposits）
－．ー．ー．ー．－Lineation
－－contact between units，dashed where approximate
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