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Dear Mr. Fur:

SASSAN Geosciences, Inc. (SAS) has completed a preliminary geotechnical engineering and engineering geology investigation for the subject property. Our investigation was performed to determine the nature of surface and subsurface soils and to evaluate their physical and engineering properties. The results were then analyzed, and recommendations for design and construction of the proposed improvements and related parameters were prepared. This report presents our findings and recommendations.

## LOCATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject property is located on the west side of Hayvenhurst Avenue in Encino section of the City of Los Angeles, California. A vicinity map is presented on Figure A-1 in Appendix A of this report. This property is comprised of a one-story single-family
residence with an attached garage and a swimming pool in the backyard to the west of the residence. The residence and swimming pool are located on the eastern half of the property, within a relatively level area. The western half of the property is an ascending, east-facing slope with a total relief of approximately eighty (80) feet. The westerly ascending slope is comprised of two parts, separated by an existing concrete swale: the lower gentle slope and the upper moderate slope. The lower part is a natural slope with gradients up to approximately $2: 1(\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V})$, and the upper part is a compacted fill slope with gradients up to approximately 1.5:1 ( $\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V}$ ). A plot plan indicating the locations of the existing improvements is presented on Figure A-2 in Appendix A of this report.

## OBJECTIVE

The owners wish to assess the geotechnical and geological characteristics of the underlying ground in order to demolish the existing residence, to backfill the existing swimming pool, and to construct a two-story single-family residence with a basement, a two-story accessory dwelling unit (ADU) in the north-western corner of the rear yard and a swimming pool in the rear yard to the west of the residence at the subject property. Construction of the proposed improvements will required grading within the western half of the property and construction of retaining walls, up to approximately twelve (12) feet in height for the basement, and up to approximately thirty-six (36) feet in height in the western portion of the rear yard, along the toe of the westerly-ascending slope. In addition, the rear yard retaining wall along the toe of the westerly-ascending slope will incorporate a storage space throughout its entire length. A plot plan and cross-sections, indicating the locations of the existing and proposed improvements, are presented on Figures A-2 through A-4 in Appendix A of this report.

## FIELD INVESTIGATION

Subsurface exploration was performed on November 27, 2020 and involved excavating four (4) test pits to a maximum depth of approximately five and one-half (5.5) feet. The excavating operation was performed by manual labor. Two and one-half-inch (2.5) diameter split spoon ring samples of soil and grab samples of bedrock were obtained from the test pits. Earth materials encountered were classified in accordance with the visualmanual procedures of the Unified Soil Classification System.

A plot plan indicating the approximate test pit locations is presented on Figure A-2 in Appendix A of this report.

## SOIL AND GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS

Published geologic maps (Dibblee, T.W.Jr., 1991, Geologic Map of the Beverly Hills and Van Nuys [South $1 / 2$ ] Quadrangles) indicate that the project site is underlain at depth by sedimentary bedrock of the Miocene age Topanga formation consisting of interbedded sandstone, conglomeratic sandstone, and claystone with bedding dipping to the north. The eastern portion of the property, where the proposed residence and swimming pool will be located, is mapped as underlain by alluvium within the north flowing canyon, where Hayvenhurst Avenue is located. The sloping, western portion of the property is mapped as underlain by bedrock of the Topanga formation. A copy of a regional geologic map (Dibblee) is presented on Figure D-1 in Appendix D of this report.

Our field investigation, which consisted of four (4) hand excavated test pits and hand auger borings, generally confirmed the published soil and geologic conditions with the following exceptions:

In the area of the proposed residence and swimming pool, the alluvium is mantled with fill, ranging in thickness from approximately two (2) to four (4) feet, consisting of silty clay. The underlying alluvium consists of sandy silt with rock (shale) fragments.

In the slope area to the west, the lower portion is underlain by bedrock of the Topanga formation, consisting of massive conglomeratic sandstone. The upper portion of the slope, at a steeper gradient is a graded fill slope, consisting of silty sand with fine to coarse gravel of siltstone and sandstone fragments. Research of city files did not find compaction reports, prepared for grading/construction of the fill slope.

Soil and geologic conditions, determined by our field investigation and review of published maps, are shown on the attached Geologic Plan, Figure A-2, and Geologic Section, Figure A-3 in Appendix A of this report.

## EARTH MATERIALS

The earth materials encountered in the test pits vary by location. The test pit TP-1 is located on the upper moderate slope and was excavated in compacted fill material to the total depth of approximately five and one-half (5.5) feet. The test pit TP-2 is located on the lower gentle slope and encountered approximately eight (8) inches of topsoil, underlain by bedrock, which extends to the depths explored. The test pits TP-3 and TP-4 were excavated in the level pad area, and encountered up to approximately four and onehalf (4.5) feet of fill, underlain by alluvium, which extends to the depths explored. The fill layer is thinner in the western parts of the pad, and thickens towards the east. Detailed logs of the test pits are presented on Figures B-1 through B-4 in Appendix B of this report.

## GROUNDWATER

Groundwater seepage was not encountered in the test pits to the depths explored, and is not anticipated to impact the proposed construction.

## LABORATORY TESTING

Moisture content (ASTM D 2216) and shear strength (ASTM D 3080) tests were performed for selected samples of soil considered to be representative of those encountered. The results of direct shear tests are presented on Figures B-5 and B-6 in Appendix B of this report. Evaluation of the test data is reflected throughout this report.

## LIQUEFACTION

The subject property is shown on the "State of California Seismic Hazard Zones" map presented on Figure C-1 in Appendix C of this report. The site is located outside of the seismically induced liquefaction hazard zones.

## SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS

The stability of the slope was analyzed using GSTABL7, a computer program developed to handle general slope stability problems by the Simplified Janbu and the Modified Bishop method of slices.

A set of strength parameters was obtained from the laboratory direct shear test results. The most critical slope was selected for the analysis. The plan line of the cross-section for this slope is presented on Figure A-2 in Appendix A of this report. Section A-A, used in static slope stability analyses for temporary excavations, is presented on Figure E-1 in Appendix E, section A-A, used in static and pseudo-static slope stability analyses, is presented on Figure F-1, and the surficial slope stability analysis is presented on Figure F2 in Appendix F of this report. Following table summarizes the strength parameters used in slope stability analyses:

|  | Strength Parameters |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Material Type | Bedrock | Fill | Alluvium | Alluvium | Surficial |
| Depth (ft) | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.5 | 2 |
| Location Number I | Type II | Soil |  |  |  |
| Internal Friction Angle (deg) | 36 | 27 | 24 | 29 | 32 |
| Cohesion (psf) | 890 | 410 | 220 | 110 | 260 |
| Total Unit Weight (pcf) | 141 | 136 | 139 | 139 | 136 |
| Saturated Unit Weight (pcf) | 141 | 136 | 139 | 139 | 136 |

Seismic coefficient $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{eq}}=0.258$ was used in the pseudo-static slope stability analyses. A copy of the analysis to determine the seismic coefficient is presented in Appendix J of this report.

Series of deep-seated static slope stability analyses for section A-A with temporary excavations resulted in a minimum factor of safety of 1.541 , which is above the minimum Code requirements. The results of the stability analyses for temporary excavations are presented in Appendix E of this report.

Series of deep-seated static and pseudo-static slope stability analyses for section A-A resulted in minimum factors of safety of 1.419 and 0.934 , which are below the minimum Code requirements. A surficial slope stability analysis for section A-A resulted in a minimum factor of safety of 1.88 , which is above the minimum Code requirements. The results of the stability analyses are presented in Appendix F of this report.

Additional deep-seated slope stability analyses were performed without piles to determine the locations of the potential failure planes with factors of safety of 1.5 and 1.0 for static and pseudo-static conditions, respectively. Based on our analyses, the lowest potential failure planes with factors of safety above 1.5 and 1.0 for static and pseudo-static conditions, respectively, are crossing the soldier piles, supporting the backyard retaining wall at the toe of the ascending slope, at one (1) inch below the proposed pad level. The results of the stability analyses are presented in Appendix F of this report.

Also, deep-seated slope stability analyses were performed with piles to determine the values of the lateral loads, acting on the soldier piles, supporting the backyard retaining wall at the toe of the ascending slope, required to raise the minimum factors of safety to 1.5 and 1.0 for static and pseudo-static conditions, respectively. Based on our analyses, the lateral load required to raise the minimum factor of safety of the slope to 1.5 for static condition equals to 10,100 pounds per lineal foot in horizontal direction, and the lateral load required to raise the minimum factor of safety of the slope to 1.0 for pseudo-static condition equals to 11,100 pounds per lineal foot in horizontal direction. These values translate into EFPs of $15.6 \mathrm{pcf}\left[\left(10,100^{*} 2\right) /\left(36^{\wedge} 2\right)=15.6\right]$ for static condition and 17.1 pcf $\left[\left(11,100^{*} 2\right) /\left(36^{\wedge} 2\right)=17.1\right]$ for pseudo-static condition. The results of the stability analyses are presented in Appendix F of this report.

Additional deep-seated slope stability analyses were performed to determine the factors of safety of the portion of the slope above the backyard retaining wall at the toe of the ascending slope. Series of deep-seated static and pseudo-static slope stability analyses for overtopping on section A-A resulted in minimum factors of safety of 1.646 and 1.054 , respectively, which are above the minimum Code requirements. The results of the stability analyses are presented in Appendix F of this report.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## General

The referenced property is considered to be suitable for construction of the proposed improvements from a geotechnical engineering and engineering geology standpoint, provided that our recommendations are incorporated into the approved construction plans.

The conclusions and recommendations presented here are based on our observations at the site during our investigation, engineering judgment, and analysis of the soil samples obtained from the test pits. Minor variations of subsurface conditions are common, and major variations are possible.

## General Grading

Grading areas must be stripped of all vegetation, debris, and other deleterious material. All loose soil disturbed by the removal of trees and/or structures (if applicable) must be removed and recompacted.

The existing fill and surficial soil, in the area of the proposed residence, are up to approximately four and one-half (4.5) feet thick and are not suitable for foundation support. At locations where new fill is proposed, the existing fill and unsuitable soil must be entirely removed and replaced with a certified engineered fill. The proposed new fill must be placed in horizontal layers, and must be benched into undisturbed bedrock or competent alluvial deposits.

## Removal of Old Pool Shell

The concrete shell of the existing old swimming pool must be completely removed. Below are provided recommendations for initial preparation, performed prior to backfilling of the existing old pool, and complete removal of the old pool shell:

1. Water must be completely drained from the old swimming pool.
2. All organic mater and debris (if any) must be completely removed from the bottom of the old pool.
3. All inlet and outlet pipes must be plugged.
4. The concrete shell of the old swimming pool must be cut/broken into small pieces and completely removed from the property.
5. The excavation must be backfilled with engineered fill per recommendations provided later in this report.
6. The new fill must be benched into the sides of the excavation.

## Temporary Excavations

The review of the architectural plans indicates that excavations up to approximately twelve (12) feet in depth will be required during construction of the proposed basement retaining walls, and up to approximately thirty-six (36) feet in height will be required during construction of the proposed backyard retaining wall along the toe of the ascending slope.

The temporary excavations for the proposed basement on the east and west sides will be located at a significant distance from the street, property lines and existing structures on the neighboring properties, and will not be surcharged by the street and neighboring structures. Therefore, the temporary excavations on the east and west sides may be performed continuously in accordance with the table, provided below. However, the basement excavations on the north and south sides will be located from the adjacent property lines at a distance that is less than the depth of the excavation. As such, the temporary excavations on the north and south sides will be surcharged by the neighboring properties and must be shored. Recommendations for design and construction of shoring are provided in the following sections of this report.

Excavations up to approximately thirty-six (36) feet in height will be required during construction of the proposed backyard retaining walls. As such, due to topography of the subject property and heights of the proposed backyard retaining walls, the temporary excavations for construction of the rear yard retaining walls must be performed in accordance with the recommendations for the sequence of the construction of the proposed backyard retaining walls, provided in the next section of this report.

Based on the integrity of the site earth materials, it is our opinion that unsurcharged temporary excavations may be performed continuously in accordance with the following table:

| Maximum <br> Depth of Cut <br> $(\boldsymbol{f t})$ | Maximum <br> Slope Ratio <br> $(\boldsymbol{H}: \boldsymbol{V})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bedrock |

When the above system becomes impractical, shoring has to be designed for the temporary excavations. If such a condition arises, this office can provide the necessary strength parameters needed in the design of shoring elements.

The contractor may perform the excavation under continuous monitoring of a grading inspector who would ensure the quality of grading and presence of competent earth materials. The excavations may be left open for a temporary period of four (4) weeks. A grading inspector must be present when laborers are working within five (5) feet of the temporary cut area.

## Sequence of Construction of Backyard Retaining Wall

Due to topography of the subject property and heights of the proposed rear yard retaining walls, we are providing following recommendations for the sequence of the construction of the proposed backyard retaining wall and associated storage space. The construction of the backyard retaining walls must be performed in two (2) stages. First Stage: The initial excavation in the western portion of the property must be performed up to the level of the bottom of the storage space structure, which will create a temporary level pad that may be used by drilling equipment. The temporary excavation along the toe of the westerlyascending slope may be performed in accordance with the table, recommended in the "Temporary Excavations" section of this report. Second Stage: The temporary excavations for construction of the proposed backyard retaining wall below the storage space may commence only after completion of the first stage. The proposed soldier piles will extend up to the existing surface and will serve as shoring during temporary excavations. Following are our recommendations for the sequence of construction of the proposed backyard retaining wall:

1. The initial excavation in the western portion of the property must be performed up to the level of the bottom of the storage space structure.
2. Create a temporary level pad that may be used by drilling equipment.
3. Perform the temporary excavation along the toe of the westerlyascending slope in accordance with the table, recommended in the "Temporary Excavations" section of this report. The results of the deep-seated static slope stability analyses for section A-A with temporary excavations are presented in Appendix E of this report.
4. Drill shafts for the piles for support of proposed backyard retaining walls. The shafts must be drilled from the existing surface down to the required depth (to be determined by the consulting civil engineer).
5. The allowable maximum spacing of the piles must be twelve (12) feet side-to-side. The results of the analysis for stability of the temporary excavations after installation of the soldier piles are presented in Appendix $G$ of this report.
6. Install reinforcement for the proposed piles in the drilled shafts per approved structural plans and pour concrete.
7. Install the subdrain system for the proposed retaining wall at the bottom of the storage space.
8. Construct curtain of the retaining wall/storage space reinforcement per approved structural plans.
9. Construct the proposed retaining wall/storage space above the soldier piles.
10. After the concrete attains the required strength, commence the temporary excavations for construction of the proposed retaining wall below the proposed storage space. The temporary excavation may be performed up to the maximum depth of approximately ten (10) feet below the ground surface.
11. Install dowels on the soldier piles and construct curtain of the retaining wall reinforcement per approved structural plans.
12. Construct the proposed retaining wall between the soldier piles.
13. Continue the temporary excavation in ten (10) foot vertical intervals repeating the steps 10,11 and 12 , until proposed finish subgrade level is reached.
14. Install the subdrain system for the proposed retaining wall at the bottom of the wall.
15. Install dowels on the soldier piles and construct curtain of the retaining wall reinforcement per approved structural plans.
16. Construct the proposed retaining wall between the piles.

## Shoring Installation

Based on existing architectural plans, temporary excavations up to approximately fourteen (14) feet in depth will be required during construction of the retaining walls of the proposed basement. The basement excavations on the north and south sides will be located from the adjacent property lines at a distance that is less than the depth of the excavation and must be shored. The temporary excavations on the north and south sides may commence only after installation of the soldier piles of the shoring system. The shoring may consist of wide flange I-beams imbedded in concrete soldier piles and wooden lagging that spans between the I-beams. The final design of the shoring must be performed by the consulting civil engineer. The recommendations for the soldier piles are
provided in the following section of this report. The installation of the shoring must be performed in the following order:

1. The shoring piles must be drilled from the existing surface down to the required depth (to be determined by the consulting civil engineer).
2. Soldier pile reinforcement (steel I-beams) for shoring must be installed.
3. The soldier piles must be filled with concrete up to the bottom of the proposed grade beam.
4. The rest of the soldier pile must be filled with one-sack-slurry up to the existing surface.
5. The initial excavation may be performed up to five (5) feet below the existing grade.
6. The wooden lagging must be installed up to the bottom of the excavation.
7. The lagging must be backfilled with incompressible material such as compacted construction sand or a half-sack-slurry.
8. The excavation may be performed up to the design depth (bottom of the proposed grade beam) in five (5) foot vertical intervals, repeating the steps 5,6 and 7 .
9. The wooden lagging must be installed up to the level of the top of the proposed grade beam (two (2) feet above the bottom of the excavation).
10. The lagging must be backfilled with incompressible material such as compacted construction sand or a half-sack-slurry.

## Shoring Design Recommendations

The shoring may consist of wide flange I-beams imbedded in concrete soldier piles and wooden lagging that spans between the I-beams. The pressure distribution diagram for the design of the shoring elements and the back-up calculations are presented in Appendix H of this report. The final design of the shoring must be performed by the consulting civil engineer. The consulting structural engineer may combine the proposed shoring piles and foundation piles for support of the basement retaining walls. The following minimums apply to the design of the shoring elements:

1. Soldier piles of the shoring system must be founded at a minimum depth of eight (8) feet into undisturbed alluvium. The actual depth of soldier piles, however, must be determined by the structural engineer in conjunction with this office.
2. The maximum allowable horizontal spacing of the shoring piles must be eight (8) feet center-to-center. The results of the analysis for stability of the temporary excavations after installation of the shoring piles are presented in Appendix $G$ of this report.
3. Soldier piles must have a minimum diameter of twenty-four (24) inches.
4. The pile excavations must be covered if left overnight.
5. Soldier piles must be assumed fixed at two (2) feet into undisturbed alluvium.
6. A Registered Grading Deputy Inspector, approved by and responsible to this office, will be required to provide continuous inspection during the drilling of the proposed soldier piles and installation of shoring.
7. Active earth pressure increasing at a minimum rate of 49 psf per foot of depth must be used in the design of shoring elements. The backup calculations are presented in Appendix H of this report.
8. Active earth pressure increasing at a minimum rate of 30 psf per foot of depth up to the maximum of 400 psf must be used in the design of wooden lagging that spans between the I-beams.
9. The shoring elements must be design for a maximum allowable horizontal deflection of one-half ( $1 / 2$ ) inch.
10. An allowable passive earth pressure increasing at a maximum rate of 300 psf per foot of depth, to a maximum of $4,500 \mathrm{psf}$, must be applied to portions of the shoring piles that are embedded a minimum two (2) feet into alluvium.
11. The suggested passive pressure may be doubled for an isolated pile condition ( $\mathrm{d}>2.5 \mathrm{D}$ ).

## Foundations

The proposed residence and backyard retaining walls must be supported on a grade beam/soldier pile combination foundation. The following recommendations should be implemented. A side friction value of 750 psf in compression and 375 psf in tension may be utilized for the portion of the soldier piles that are penetrated a minimum two (2) feet into undisturbed bedrock. The allowable side friction values may be increased by thirty (30) percent for momentary wind and seismic loads. The following minimums apply to the soldier piles:

1. Soldier piles must be founded at a minimum depth of eight (8) feet into undisturbed bedrock. The actual depth of soldier piles, however, must be determined by the structural engineer in conjunction with this office.
2. The allowable maximum spacing of the soldier piles, supporting the backyard retaining walls, must be twelve (12) feet side-to-side. The horizontal spacing of the friction piles, supporting the basement retaining walls, may be determined by the consulting structural engineer.
3. Soldier piles must have a minimum diameter of twenty-four (24) inches.
4. The pile excavations must be covered if left overnight.
5. A Registered Grading Deputy Inspector approved by and responsible to this office will be required to provide continuous inspection for the proposed soldier pile drilling and installation.
6. Active earth pressure increasing at a minimum rate of 58 psf per foot of depth must be used in the design of cantilevered basement retaining walls, and at -rest earth pressure increasing at a minimum rate of 90 psf per foot of depth must be used in the design of basement retaining walls that are braced at the top and the bottom. Our analyses indicate, that the values of static and combined static and seismic earth pressures are below the above-recommended values, therefore additional earth pressure due to seismic forces does not need to be applied to the proposed retaining walls. The results of the earth pressure analyses are presented in Appendix I of this report.
7. Based on our analyses, the lateral load required to raise the minimum factor of safety of the slope to 1.5 for static condition equals to 10,100 pounds per lineal foot in horizontal direction, and the lateral load required to raise the minimum factor of safety of the slope to 1.0 for pseudo-static condition equals to 11,100 pounds per lineal foot in horizontal direction. These values translate into EFPs of 15.6 pcf $\left[\left(10,100^{*} 2\right) /\left(36^{\wedge} 2\right)=15.6\right]$ for static condition and 17.1 pcf $\left[\left(11,100^{*} 2\right) /\left(36^{\wedge} 2\right)=17.1\right]$ for pseudo-static condition. As such, active earth pressures, increasing at rates listed in the following table, must be used in the design of the proposed rear yard retaining walls:

| Slope of the Retained Backfill | Active EFP <br> $(\boldsymbol{p} \boldsymbol{f})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $(\boldsymbol{H}: \boldsymbol{V})$ | 30 |
| Level | 33 |
| $5: 1$ | 35 |
| $4: 1$ | 38 |
| $3: 1$ | 43 |
| $2: 1$ | 55 |
| $112: 1$ |  |

Our analyses indicate, that the values of static and combined static and seismic earth pressures are below above recommended values, therefore additional earth pressure due to seismic forces does not need to be applied to the proposed retaining walls. The results of the analyses are presented in Appendix F of this report.
8. Passive earth pressure increasing at the rate of 400 psf per foot of depth, to a maximum of $8,000 \mathrm{psf}$, must be applied to portions of the soldier piles that are embedded a minimum two (2) feet into undisturbed bedrock.
9. The suggested passive pressure may be doubled for an isolated pile condition (d>2.5D).

## Subdrain System

The proposed retaining walls must be provided with weep holes or perforated pipe and gravel sub-drain to prevent entrapment of water in the backfill. The perforated pipe must consist of four-inch (4") minimum diameter PVC Schedule 40, or ABS SDR-35, with a minimum of sixteen (16) perforations per foot on the bottom one-third of the pipe. Every
foot of the pipe should be embedded in three (3) cubic feet of three-quarter-inch (3/4") gravel wrapped in filter fabric (Mirafi 140N or equal). Placement of gravel and filter fabric is also required for weep holes. The subdrain system behind the basement retaining walls will be located below the street level and will not drain via gravity. The subdrain water must be collected in a concrete catch basin and pumped to the street via sumppumps.

In addition, the retaining walls of the basement must be provided with extensive dampproofing. The damp-proofing must be designed by a water proofing specialist.

## Freeboard

All retaining walls, surcharged by a sloping condition, must be provided with a minimum twelve-inch (12") high freeboard for slough protection. An open Vee Channel at the toe of the slope must be constructed behind the wall to carry off the slope water.

## Swimming Pool Recommendations

The concrete shell of the proposed swimming pool must be designed as a freestanding structure. A bearing capacity of $3,000 \mathrm{psf}$ must be used for the base of the swimming pool, founded minimum twenty four (24) inches into undisturbed bedrock. The following minimums apply to the lateral loading of the pool shell:

1. Water pressure increasing at a minimum rate of 65 psf per foot of depth and acting upon the inner wall of the swimming pool shell must be used in calculations.
2. Active earth pressure increasing at a minimum rate of 60 psf per foot of depth and acting upon the outer wall of the swimming pool shell must be used in calculations.
3. Passive earth pressure increasing at the rate of 400 psf per foot of depth, to a maximum of $6,000 \mathrm{psf}$, must be used in calculations for the portion of the pool shell that is in contact with the bedrock.
4. A coefficient of friction of 0.4 must be utilized for resisting lateral loads at the contact surface of concrete and foundation soils.
5. The swimming pool must be located at a minimum distance of seven (7) feet from the neighboring retaining walls, measured from inside face of the wall.

## Settlements

Maximum total and differential settlements are expected to be less than one-half ( $1 / 2$ ) and one-quarter ( $1 / 4$ ) inches, respectively, provided that our recommendations are followed.

## Seismic Hazards

The subject property is shown on the "State of California Seismic Hazard Zones" map presented in Appendix C of this report. The site is located outside of potential seismically induced landslide and liquefaction hazard zones.

## Seismic Parameters

The seismic parameters for the design of the proposed structure based on the 2020 Los Angeles Building Code are as follows:

| Latitude | $34^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Longitude | $118^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 54^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$ |
| Site Classification | D |
| Site Coefficient, $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{a}}$ | 1.2 |
| Site Coefficient, $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 1.7 |
| Site Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters (g): |  |
| Mapped Acceleration, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}(0.2 \mathrm{sec})$. | 1.872 |
| Mapped Acceleration, $\mathrm{S}_{1}(1 \mathrm{sec})$. | 0.665 |
| Adjusted Maximum Acceleration, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{MS}}(0.2 \mathrm{sec})$. | 2.246 |
| Adjusted Maximum Acceleration, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{M} 1}(1 \mathrm{sec})$. | 1.131 |
| Design Acceleration, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{DS}}(0.2 \mathrm{sec})$. | 1.498 |
| Design Acceleration, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{D} 1}(1 \mathrm{sec})$. | 0.754 |

A long period coefficient ( Fv ) of 1.7 may be utilized for calculation of Ts, provided that the value of the Seismic Response Coefficient (Cs) is determined by Equation 12.8-2 (ASCE/SEI 7-16) for values of the fundamental period of the building (T) less than or equal to 1.5 Ts , and taken as 1.5 times the value computed in accordance with either Equation 12.8-3 (ASCE/SEI 7-16) for T greater than 1.5 Ts and less than or equal to $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{L}}$ or Equation 12.8-4 (ASCE/SEI 7-16) for $T$ greater than $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{L}}$.

Conformance with the above listed criteria for seismic design does not constitute any kind of warranty, guarantee, or assurance that significant structural damage or ground failure will not occur if a maximum level earthquake occurs. The primary goal of seismic design is to protect life and limb, and to prevent catastrophic failures, and not to avoid all damage, since such design may be economically prohibitive.

## Engineered Fill

All fill earth materials must consist of clean soil that is free of vegetation and other debris. The fill must be placed in six- (6-) to eight- (8-) inch thick lifts at near optimum moisture content and compacted. Particles larger than three (3) inches in diameter must not be allowed in the backfill material. Earth materials must not be imported to the site without prior approval by the soil engineer. All engineered fill must be compacted to a minimum of ninety (90) percent of its maximum dry density (ASTM D 1557). Where cohesionless soil having less than fifteen (15) percent finer than 0.005 millimeter is used for fill, it must be compacted to a minimum of ninety-five (95) percent of its maximum dry density. Neither jetting nor water tamping are permitted.

Heavy construction equipment must be maintained at a minimum distance of three (3) feet from the existing structures. Hand-operated compaction equipment must be used to compact the backfill soils within this 3-foot-wide zone.

## Bulking and Shrinkage

Estimates of bulking and shrinkage factors are based on empirical judgments. Bulking is estimated by comparing the material in its natural state, as encountered in the exploratory excavations, to a loose excavated state. Shrinkage is estimated by comparing the material in its loose excavated state to a properly compacted state.

Based on our experience, the shrinkage and bulking factors for the types of earth materials, encountered at the subject property, are anticipated to be for the bedrock $40 \%$ and for the top soil $20 \%$.

## Internal Concrete Slabs

The subgrade for the proposed internal concrete slabs-on-grade must consist of undisturbed alluvium or a minimum two (2) foot thick layer of certified compacted fill. The competent subgrade must be covered with four (4) inches of crushed miscellaneous aggregate (CMA) and compacted to ninety-five percent ( $95 \%$ ) of its maximum dry density (ASTM D 1557). The CMA must be covered with one (1) inch of sand. The sand must be covered by a ten (10)-mil vapor barrier. The vapor barrier must be installed so that the edges of the sheet overlap at least twelve (12) inches onto any adjacent sheet. The vapor barrier must be covered with one (1) inch of sand. The sand must be covered with four (4) inches of non-expansive hard rock concrete mix (3/4" max. rock size). The reinforcement must be a minimum of \#4 bars at sixteen (16) inches on center in both directions. The reinforcement must be placed at the mid-depth of the concrete slab. The slab must be covered with a vapor barrier for at least two (2) days to slow the curing time, reduce the shrinkage crack potential and be self-watering.

The consulting structural-engineer-of-record may decide to increase the slab thickness according to the proposed traffic loads.

## Driveway

The subgrade for the proposed driveway must consist of undisturbed alluvium or a minimum two (2) foot thick layer of certified compacted fill. The competent subgrade must be covered with four (4) inches of crushed miscellaneous aggregate (CMA) and compacted to ninety-five percent (95\%) of its maximum dry density (ASTM D1557). The CMA must be covered by asphalt concrete, concrete slab, stone pavers or equal.

## Pipe Bedding and Trench Backfill

The pipe bedding must consist of sand or similar granular material having a minimum sand equivalent value of thirty (30). The sand must be placed in a zone that extends a minimum of six (6) inches below and twelve (12) inches above the pipe for the full trench width. The bedding material must be compacted. The trench backfill above the pipe bedding may consist of approved, on-site or imported soils, and it must be compacted. Where utility trenches are parallel to the footings, the bottom of the trench must be located above a plane with a slope of $1: 1$, projected downward from the adjacent bottom edge of the footing.

## Site Drainage

Drainage devices such as sloping sidewalks and area drains must be provided around the building to collect and direct all water away from the structure. Neither rain nor excess irrigation water should be allowed to collect or pond against foundations. The collected water must be directed to the proper drainage system via non-erosive devices. The actual site drainage, however, must be designed by the consulting civil engineer-of-record.

## DESIGN REVIEW

We suggest that the geotechnical and geological aspects of the project be reviewed by this firm during the design process. The scope of our services may include assistance to the design team by providing specific recommendations for special cases, reviewing the foundation design, reviewing the geotechnical and geological portions of the project for possible cost savings through alternative approaches, and evaluating the overall applicability of our recommendations. Additional site-specific explorations may also be considered if significant foundation modifications are required using the above recommendations.

The owner should anticipate that both the geologist and soils engineer must review and approve the detailed plans prior to issuance of any permits. This approval shall be by signature on the plans which clearly indicates that the geologist and soils engineer have reviewed the plans prepared by the design engineer and that the plans include the recommendations contained in their reports.

## INSPECTIONS

All excavations must be inspected and approved. All fill placed for engineering purposes must be tested for compaction and moisture content and certified. The subdrain system must be observed and approved. Inspection of excavations and subdrain system may also be required by the appropriate reviewing governmental agencies.

It is recommended that SAS be retained to verify compliance with the recommendations made in this report, to ensure compliance with the design concepts, specifications, and recommendations, and to allow design changes in the event that exposed subsurface conditions differ from those anticipated herein.

A joint meeting among the parties involved in this project is recommended prior to the start of groundbreaking to discuss specific procedures and scheduling.

Inspections performed by SAS are for verification purposes only and shall under no circumstance relieve other parties involved in the design and construction from their obligation to perform work in accordance with the approved plans.

In the event that the recommendations contained herein are interpreted by others, SAS will not accept responsibility for such interpretations.

## INVESTIGATION LIMITATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are based on the findings and observations in the field and the results of laboratory tests performed on representative samples. The soils encountered in the test pits are believed to be representative of the total area; however, soil characteristics can vary throughout the site. SAS should be notified if subsurface conditions are encountered which differ from those described in this report.

This report has not been prepared for use by parties or projects other than those named and described above. It may not contain sufficient information for other parties or other purposes. The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are professional opinions. These opinions have been derived in accordance with current standards of geotechnical engineering and engineering geology practice, field observations and laboratory test results. No other warranty is expressed or implied.

Samples secured for this investigation will be retained in our laboratory for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this report and will be disposed after this period unless other arrangements are made.

This report should be reviewed and updated after a period of one year or if the project concept changes from that described herein.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you. If you have any questions, please call our office.

Sincerely,


## SAS/TH:ak/0fur229a3.doc

Appendices
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1. California Division of Mines and Geology, 1997, Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the Van Nuys 7.5 Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California; SHZR 08
2. California Division of Mines and Geology, 1998, Seismic Hazard Zones Map for the Van Nuys Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California; Scale 1:24,000
3. City of Los Angeles, Preliminary Geologic Maps, Map \# 44
4. Dibblee, T.W., 1991, Geologic Map of the Beverly Hills and Van Nuys (South $1 / 2$ ) Quadrangles, Los Angeles County, California. Dibblee Geological Foundation, Santa Barbara, California; Map DF31; Scale 1:24,000
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APPENDIX B

| Sample <br> Number | $\underset{(\mathrm{pcf})}{\gamma_{\mathrm{d}}}$ | Moisture <br> (\%) | N | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \sqrt{y} \\ 3 \end{array}$ | Depth <br> (ft) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbb{T V}_{\mathrm{R}-1}$ | 118 | 6 |  | $\sum$ | -0 -1 <br> - - <br> -1 - <br> - - <br> -2 - <br> -2 - <br>   | Fill: Yellow brown silty sand with F-C gravel of Siltstone / Sandstone. Slightly moist. Loose to 10 inches then dense and gray silty sand with thin bedded siltstone fragments. Slightly moist. Dense |
| $\underset{\mathrm{R}-2}{\text { ® }}$ | 116 | $13$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} - & - \\ - & - \\ \hline- & - \\ \hline- & 5 \\ \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Change to yellow brown sandy silt with hard volcanic rock fragments. Moist, dense <br> Refusal @5.5' |
|  |  |  |  |  | -6 -1 <br> - - <br> -7 - <br> - - <br> -8 - <br> - - <br> -9 - <br> - - | Excavation Terminated at Depth of 5.5 Feet Water Seepage Was Not Encountered |

R = Ring Sample

$\mathrm{R}=$ Ring Sample

$\mathrm{R}=$ Ring Sample

$\mathrm{R}=$ Ring Sample


|  | Test <br> Location | Sample <br> Number | Depth <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Soil <br> Type | Cohesion <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Friction <br> Angle <br> $(\mathrm{deg})$ | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| u | TP-1 | R-2 | 4 | ML | 410 | 27 | 1 |
| $\boldsymbol{\square}$ | TP-2 | R-1 | 1.0 | Bedrock | 890 | 36 | 2 |
| $\boldsymbol{\square}$ | TP-3 | R-1 | 2.0 | ML | 220 | 24 | 3 |

Remarks:
1 - FILL; Saturated Moisture Content: 16\%, Dry Density: 116 pcf; Ultimate
2 - BEDROCK; Saturated Moisture Content: 12\%, Dry Density: 126 pcf; Ultimate
3 - ALLUVIUM; Saturated Moisture Content: 20\%, Dry Density: 108 pcf; Ultimate
4 - ALLUVIUM; Saturated Moisture Content: 13\%, Dry Density: 123 pcf; Ultimate


|  | Test <br> Location | Sample <br> Number | Depth <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Soil <br> Type | Cohesion <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Friction <br> Angle <br> $(\mathrm{deg})$ | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| u | TP-1 | R-1 | 2 | SM | 260 | 32 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Remarks:
1 - FILL; Saturated Moisture Content: 15\%, Dry Density: 118 pcf; Ultimate

## APPENDIX C



APPENDIX D
 Conejo Volcanics of Yerkes and Campboll 1979 Tva andesitic volcanic rocks, black where fresh, weathers dark gray to brown, fine grained, in part vesicular, brecciated; may range to basaltic bl intrusive basalt-andesite

Dibblee, T.W., Jr., Dibblee Geological Foundation, Geologic Map of
Beverly Hills and Van Nuys (South $1 ⁄ 2$ ) Quadrangles, 1991, Map \# DF-31

APPENDIX E
(1) FILL: C $=410 \mathrm{psf}, \varphi=27^{\circ}$
(2) BEDROCK: $\mathrm{C}=390 \mathrm{psf}, \varphi=36^{\circ}$


SCALE: $1^{\prime \prime}=30^{\prime}$
*** GSTABL7 ***
** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 1:27PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-1t.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-1t.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-1t.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis
Section A-A (Temp; Circ; Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 0.00 to $X$-values and 0.00 to $Y$-values listed.


A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.
1100 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated.
100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 11 Points Equally Spaced
Along The Ground Surface Between $X=88.00(f t)$
and $X=118.00$ (ft)
Each Surface Terminates Between $\quad X=180.00(f t)$
and $X=250.00$ (ft)
Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation
At Which A Surface Extends Is $Y=0.00$ (ft)
7.00(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 Evaluated $=1100$ Statistical Data On All Valid FS Values:

FS Max $=15.146$ FS Min $=1.541 \quad$ FS Ave $=3.245$ Standard Deviation $=0.882$ Coefficient of Variation $=27.18 \%$





4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Temp; Circ; Static)


APPENDIX F
(1) FILL: $\mathrm{C}=410 \mathrm{psf}, \varphi=27^{\circ}$
(2) BEDROCK: $\mathrm{C}=890 \mathrm{psf}, \varphi=36^{\circ}$


SCALE: $1^{\prime \prime}=30^{\prime}$

## *** GSTABL7 ***

** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 1:31PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-1s.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-1s.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-1s.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis Section A-A (Circular; Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 36.00 to $X$-values and 0.00 to $Y$-values listed.

| 12 Top Boundaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boundary | X-Left | Y-Left | X-Right | Y-Right | $t$ Soi | 1 Type |
| No. | (ft) | (ft) | (ft) | (ft) | Bel | ow Bnd |
| 1 | 37.00 | 94.00 | 57.00 | 94.00 |  | 2 |
| 2 | 57.00 | 94.00 | 57.01 | 100.00 |  | 2 |
| 3 | 57.01 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |  | 2 |
| 4 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.01 | 114.00 |  | 2 |
| 5 | 100.01 | 114.00 | 106.00 | 114.00 |  | 2 |
| 6 | 106.00 | 114.00 | 106.01 | 125.00 |  | 2 |
| 7 | 106.01 | 125.00 | 106.02 | 136.00 |  | 1 |
| 8 | 106.02 | 136.00 | 120.00 | 136.00 |  | 1 |
| 9 | 120.00 | 136.00 | 132.00 | 143.00 |  | 1 |
| 10 | 132.00 | 143.00 | 180.00 | 175.00 |  | 1 |
| 11 | 180.00 | 175.00 | 192.00 | 179.00 |  | 1 |
| 12 | 192.00 | 179.00 | 251.00 | 179.00 |  | 1 |
| 13 | 106.01 | 125.00 | 251.00 | 160.00 |  | 2 |
| Default Y-Origin $=0.00$ (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ISOTROPIC SOIL PARAMETERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Type(s) of Soil |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Total | Saturated | Cohesion | Friction | Pore P | Pressure | Piez. |
| Type Unit Wt | . Unit Wt. | Intercept | Angle | Pressure | Constant | Surface |
| No. (pcf) | (pcf) | (psf) | (deg) | Param. | (psf) | No. |
| 1136.0 | 136.0 | 410.0 | 27.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 1 |
| 2141.0 | 141.0 | 890.0 | 36.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 1 |

A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.
1100 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated.
100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 11 Points Equally Spaced
Along The Ground Surface Between $X=88.00$ (ft)
and $X=118.00(f t)$
Each Surface Terminates Between $\quad X=180.00(f t)$
and $X=250.00$ (ft)
Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation
At Which A Surface Extends Is $Y=0.00$ (ft)
7.00 (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 * *




```
                                    C:\stedwin\0fur9-1s.OUT Page 5
\begin{tabular}{lll}
10 & 154.85 & 131.47 \\
11 & 160.52 & 135.58 \\
12 & 166.09 & 139.81 \\
13 & 171.56 & 144.18 \\
14 & 176.94 & 148.66 \\
15 & 182.20 & 153.28 \\
16 & 187.36 & 158.01 \\
17 & 192.41 & 162.86 \\
18 & 197.34 & 167.82 \\
19 & 202.16 & 172.90 \\
20 & 206.86 & 178.09 \\
21 & 207.65 & 179.00
\end{tabular}
Circle Center At X = -20.01 ; Y = 378.90 ; and Radius = 302.98
Factor of Safety
*** 1.497 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 17 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No. (ft) (ft)
    100.00 100.70
    105.22 105.37
    110.43 110.04
    115.64 114.71
    120.85 119.39
    126.05 124.08
    131.25 128.77
    136.44 133.47
    141.62 138.17
    146.80 142.88
    151.98 147.59
    157.15 152.31
    162.32 157.03
    167.48 161.76
    172.63 166.49
    177.79 171.23
    182.93 175.98
Circle Center At X = -4415.49 ; Y = 5158.97 ; and Radius = 6780.54
    Factor of Safety
        *** 1.497 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 22 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No. (ft) (ft)
                                100.00 100.70
                            106.09 104.15
                        112.16 107.65
                        118.20 111.18
                        124.21 114.76
                        130.20 118.39
                        136.17 122.05
                        142.10 125.76
                        148.01 129.51
                        153.90 133.31
                        159.75 137.14
                        165.58 141.02
                        171.38 144.94
                        177.15 148.90
                        182.89 152.90
                        188.61 156.95
                        194.29 161.03
                        199.95 165.16
                        205.57 169.32
                        211.17 173.53
                                216.73 177.78
                                218.31 179.00
Circle Center At X = -376.45 ; Y = 949.19 ; and Radius = 973.11
            Factor of Safety
                *** 1.500 ***
```

```
Failure Surface Specified By 18 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No. (ft) (ft)
                        100.00 100.70
            106.47 103.37
            112.82 106.32
            119.04 109.53
            125.11 113.02
            131.03 116.76
            136.77 120.76
            142.34 125.00
            147.72 129.48
                        152.90 134.19
            157.87 139.12
            162.62 144.26
            167.14 149.60
                        171.43 155.14
            175.47 160.85
            179.26 166.74
            182.79 172.78
            184.81 176.60
Circle Center At X = 41.97 ; Y = 250.89 ; and Radius = 161.01
    Factor of Safety
        *** 1.504 ***
            **** END OF GSTABL7 OUTPUT ****
```

4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Circular; Static)


## *** GSTABL7 ***

** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 1:33PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-1p.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-1p.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-1p.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis Section A-A (Circular; Pseudo-Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 37.00 to $X$-values and 0.00 to $Y$-values listed.


A Horizontal Earthquake Loading Coefficient
Of0. 260 Has Been Assigned
A Vertical Earthquake Loading Coefficient
Of0.000 Has Been Assigned
Cavitation Pressure $=0.0(p s f)$
A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.
1100 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated.
100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 11 Points Equally Spaced
Along The Ground Surface Between $X=88.00$ (ft)
and $X=118.00(f t)$
Each Surface Terminates Between $\quad X=180.00$ (ft)
and $X=250.00$ (ft)
Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation
At Which A Surface Extends Is $Y=0.00$ (ft)




```
            Factor of Safety
        *** 0.977 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 24 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No. (ft) (ft)
    100.00 100.70
                        106.12 104.10
                        112.24 107.50
                        118.35 110.92
                        124.45 114.35
                        130.54 117.80
                        136.63 121.26
                        142.71 124.73
                        148.78 128.22
                        154.84 131.72
                        160.89 135.23
                        166.94 138.76
                        172.97 142.31
                        179.00 145.86
                        185.02 149.43
                            191.04 153.02
                        197.04 156.61
                        203.04 160.23
                        209.03 163.85
                        215.01 167.49
                        220.98 171.14
                        226.94 174.81
                            232.89 178.49
                            233.72 179.00
Circle Center At X = -1383.21 ; Y = 2787.21 ; and Radius = 3068.76
            Factor of Safety
Failure Surface Specified By 18 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No. (ft) (ft)
                            100.00 100.70
                        105.36 105.21
                        110.70 109.73
                        116.03 114.27
                        121.34 118.84
                        126.63 123.42
                        131.90 128.02
                        137.16 132.65
                        142.40 137.29
                        147.62 141.95
                        152.82 146.63
                        158.01 151.33
                        163.18 156.05
                        168.33 160.79
                        173.47 165.55
                        178.58 170.33
                        183.68 175.12
                            185.48 176.83
Circle Center At X = -1101.19 ; Y = 1535.61 ; and Radius = 1871.31
                    Factor of Safety
                *** 1.005 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 22 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No. (ft) (ft)
            1 100.00 100.70
                        106.58 103.10
                        113.09 105.66
                        119.54 108.39
                        125.92 111.28
                        132.22 114.33
                        138.44 117.54
```

4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Circular; Pseudo-Static)


## *** GSTABL7 ***

** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 2:06PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-4s.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-4s.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-4s.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis Section A-A (Srch FS=1.5; Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 37.00 to $X$-values and 0.00 to $Y$-values listed.


Searching Routine Will Be Limited To An Area Defined By 1 Boundaries
Of Which The First 1 Boundaries Will Deflect Surfaces Upward
Boundary X-Left Y-Left X-Right Y-Right
No. (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft)

A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.
1100 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated.
100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 11 Points Equally Spaced
Along The Ground Surface Between $X=60.00$ (ft)
and $X=90.00(f t)$
Each Surface Terminates Between $\quad X=180.00$ (ft) and $X=250.00$ (ft)
Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation
At Which A Surface Extends Is $Y=0.00$ (ft)






4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Srch FS=1.5; Static)


## *** GSTABL7 ***

** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 2:05PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-4p.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-4p.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-4p.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis Section A-A (Srch FS=1.0; Pseudo-Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 37.00 to $X$-values and 0.00 to $Y$-values listed.


Searching Routine Will Be Limited To An Area Defined By 1 Boundaries
Of Which The First 1 Boundaries Will Deflect Surfaces Upward
Boundary X-Left Y-Left X-Right Y-Right
No. (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft)

A Horizontal Earthquake Loading Coefficient
Of0.260 Has Been Assigned
A Vertical Earthquake Loading Coefficient
Of0.000 Has Been Assigned
Cavitation Pressure $=0.0$ (psf)
A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.
1100 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated.
100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 11 Points Equally Spaced
Along The Ground Surface Between $X=60.00$ (ft)



```
Failure Surface Specified By 21 Coordinate Points \(\begin{array}{ccc}\text { Point } & \text { X-Surf } & \text { Y-Surf } \\ \text { No. } & \text { (ft) }\end{array}\) \(\begin{array}{lll}1 & 75.00 & 100.00\end{array}\) \(83.94 \quad 98.93\) \(92.92 \quad 98.46\) 101.9298 .59 \(110.89 \quad 99.32\) \(119.80 \quad 100.65\) \(128.59 \quad 102.57\) \(137.23 \quad 105.07\) \(145.69 \quad 108.14\) \(153.93 \quad 111.77\) \(161.90 \quad 115.95\) \(169.58 \quad 120.64\) \(176.93 \quad 125.84\) \(183.91 \quad 131.52\) \(190.50 \quad 137.65\) \(196.67 \quad 144.20\) \(202.38 \quad 151.16\) \(207.62 \quad 158.48\) 212.35166 .13 \(216.57 \quad 174.08\) \(218.77 \quad 179.00\)
Circle Center At \(\mathrm{X}=95.48\); \(\mathrm{Y}=233.18\); and Radius \(=134.75\) Factor of Safety
Failure Surface Specified By 20 Coordinate Points
Point X-Surf Y-Surf No. (ft) (ft) \(72.00 \quad 100.00\) \(80.90 \quad 98.66\) \(89.88 \quad 98.08\)
\(98.88 \quad 98.25\)
\(107.83 \quad 99.17\)
\(116.68 \quad 100.84\)
\(125.35 \quad 103.25\)
\(133.79 \quad 106.37\)
\(141.94 \quad 110.20\)
\(149.73 \quad 114.69\)
\(157.13 \quad 119.82\)
\(164.07 \quad 125.55\)
\(170.50 \quad 131.85\)
\(176.38 \quad 138.66\)
\(181.67 \quad 145.94\)
\(186.33 \quad 153.64\)
\(190.33 \quad 161.70\)
\(193.64 \quad 170.07\)
\(196.23 \quad 178.69\)
\(196.30 \quad 179.00\)
Circle Center At \(\mathrm{X}=92.37\); \(\mathrm{Y}=205.24\); and Radius \(=107.19\) Factor of Safety
Failure Surface Specified By 20 Coordinate Points
Point X-Surf Y-Surf
\(\begin{array}{ccc}\text { No. } & \text { (ft) } & \text { (ft) } \\ 1 & 78.00 & 100.00\end{array}\)
\(1-78.00-100.00\)
```




```
Failure Surface Specified By 22 Coordinate Points
    Point 
        1 72.00 100.00
        80.94 98.94
        89.92 98.43
        98.92 98.47
        107.90 99.04
        116.83 100.17
        125.68 101.83
        134.41 104.03
        142.99 106.75
        151.38 109.99
        159.57 113.73
        167.51 117.96
        175.19 122.66
        182.56 127.82
        189.60 133.42
        196.30 139.44
        202.61 145.85
        208.53 152.63
        214.02 159.76
        219.08 167.21
        223.66 174.95
        225.74 179.00
Circle Center At X = 93.90 ; Y = 246.49 ; and Radius = 148.12
        Factor of Safety
        *** 1.325 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 20 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No. (ft) (ft)
        78.00 100.00
        86.90 98.68
        95.88 98.05
        104.88 98.13
        113.85 98.90
        122.73 100.37
        131.46 102.53
        140.01 105.36
        148.30 108.85
        156.31 112.97
        163.96 117.70
        171.23 123.01
        178.05 128.87
        184.41 135.25
        190.24 142.10
        195.53 149.39
        200.23 157.06
        204.32 165.08
        207.78 173.39
        209.61 179.00
Circle Center At X = 99.45 ; Y = 213.40 ; and Radius = 115.41
    Factor of Safety
        *** 1.329 ***
            **** END OF GSTABL7 OUTPUT ****
```

4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Srch FS=1.0; Pseudo-Static)


## *** GSTABL7 ***

** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 1:37PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-2s.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-2s.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-2s.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis Section A-A (Pile Load; Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 0.00 to $X$-values and 0.00 to $Y$-values listed.


NOTE - An Equivalent Line Load Is Calculated For Each Row Of Piers/Piles Assuming A Uniform Distribution Of Load Horizontally Between Individual Piers/Piles.
A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.
1300 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated.
100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 13 Points Equally Spaced
Along The Ground Surface Between $X=88.00$ (ft)
and $X=124.00$ (ft)
Each Surface Terminates Between $\quad X=180.00$ (ft)





| 12 | 137.14 | 124.12 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | 140.25 | 126.65 |
| 14 | 143.30 | 129.24 |
| 15 | 146.29 | 131.89 |
| 16 | 149.24 | 134.59 |
| 17 | 152.13 | 137.36 |
| 18 | 154.96 | 140.19 |
| 19 | 157.73 | 143.07 |
| 20 | 160.45 | 146.00 |
| 21 | 163.11 | 148.99 |
| 22 | 165.70 | 152.04 |
| 23 | 168.24 | 155.13 |
| 24 | 170.71 | 158.28 |
| 25 | 173.12 | 161.47 |
| 26 | 175.46 | 164.71 |
| 27 | 177.74 | 168.00 |
| 28 | 179.95 | 171.33 |
| 29 | 182.09 | 174.71 |
| 30 | 182.84 | 175.95 |

Circle Center At X = 13.30 ; Y = 279.38 ; and Radius = 198.60
Factor of Safety
Failure Surface Specified By 37 Coordinate Points
Point X-Surf Y-Surf
No. (ft) (ft)
100.00 100.70
103.45 102.74
106.89 104.77
110.32 106.82
113.76 108.88
117.18 110.94
120.60 113.02
124.02 115.10
127.43 117.19
130.83 119.29
134.23 121.40
137.63 123.51
141.01 125.64
144.40 127.77
147.78 129.91
151.15 132.06
154.52 134.22
157.88 136.39
161.23 138.57
164.58 140.75
167.93 142.95
171.27 145.15
174.60 147.36
177.93 149.57
181.26 151.80
184.57 154.04
187.88 156.28
191.19 158.53
194.49 160.79
197.78 163.06
201.07 165.34
204.36 167.62
207.63 169.92
210.91 172.22
214.17 174.53
217.43 176.85
220.45 179.00
Circle Center At X = -702.78 ; Y = 1467.44 ; and Radius = 1585.06
Factor of Safety
*** 1.566 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 31 Coordinate Points

```

```

        28 180.71 172.43
    ```
        28 180.71 172.43
        29 183.61 175.19
        29 183.61 175.19
        30 185.23 176.74
        30 185.23 176.74
Circle Center At X = -936.45 ; Y = 1348.23 ; and Radius = 1621.90
Circle Center At X = -936.45 ; Y = 1348.23 ; and Radius = 1621.90
        Factor of Safety
        Factor of Safety
        *** 1.573 ***
        *** 1.573 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 38 Coordinate Points
Failure Surface Specified By 38 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No. (ft) (ft)
        No. (ft) (ft)
    100.00 100.70
    100.00 100.70
    103.52 102.60
    103.52 102.60
    107.04 104.51
    107.04 104.51
    110.54 106.44
    110.54 106.44
    114.04 108.38
    114.04 108.38
    117.52 110.34
    117.52 110.34
    121.00 112.32
    121.00 112.32
    124.47 114.31
    124.47 114.31
    127.93 116.32
    127.93 116.32
    131.38 118.35
    131.38 118.35
    134.82 120.39
    134.82 120.39
    138.25 122.44
    138.25 122.44
    141.67 124.52
    141.67 124.52
    145.08 126.61
    145.08 126.61
    148.48 128.71
    148.48 128.71
    151.87 130.83
    151.87 130.83
    155.25 132.97
    155.25 132.97
    158.63 135.12
    158.63 135.12
    161.99 137.29
    161.99 137.29
    165.34 139.47
    165.34 139.47
    168.68 141.67
    168.68 141.67
    172.01 143.89
    172.01 143.89
    175.33 146.12
    175.33 146.12
    178.64 148.37
    178.64 148.37
    181.94 150.63
    181.94 150.63
    185.23 152.91
    185.23 152.91
    188.51 155.20
    188.51 155.20
    191.77 157.51
    191.77 157.51
    195.03 159.83
    195.03 159.83
    198.28 162.17
    198.28 162.17
    201.51 164.52
    201.51 164.52
    204.73 166.89
    204.73 166.89
    207.95 169.27
    207.95 169.27
    211.15 171.67
    211.15 171.67
    214.34 174.08
    214.34 174.08
    217.52 176.51
    217.52 176.51
    220.68 178.95
    220.68 178.95
    220.74 179.00
    220.74 179.00
Circle Center At X = -303.85 ; Y = 855.74 ; and Radius = 856.25
Circle Center At X = -303.85 ; Y = 855.74 ; and Radius = 856.25
    Factor of Safety
    Factor of Safety
        *** 1.582 ***
        *** 1.582 ***
            **** END OF GSTABL7 OUTPUT ****
```

            **** END OF GSTABL7 OUTPUT ****
    ```

4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Pile Load; Static)


\section*{*** GSTABL7 ***}
** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 1:50PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-2p.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-2p.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-2p.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis Section A-A (Pile Load; Pseudo-Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 37.00 to \(X\)-values and 0.00 to \(Y\)-values listed.


A Horizontal Earthquake Loading Coefficient
Of0. 260 Has Been Assigned
A Vertical Earthquake Loading Coefficient
Of0.000 Has Been Assigned
Cavitation Pressure \(=0.0(p s f)\)
PIER/PILE LOAD (S)
1 Pier/Pile Load(s) Specified
Pier/Pile X-Pos Load Spacing Inclination Length
No. (ft) (ft) (lbs) (deg) (ft)
1 \begin{tabular}{lllllll}
106.02 & 136.00 & 11100.0 & 1.0 & 90.00 & 50.0
\end{tabular}

NOTE - An Equivalent Line Load Is Calculated For Each Row Of Piers/Piles Assuming A Uniform Distribution Of Load Horizontally Between Individual Piers/Piles.
A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.







4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Pile Load; Pseudo-Static)


\section*{*** GSTABL7 ***}
** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 1:54PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-3s.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-3s.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-3s.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis Section A-A (Overtoping; Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 37.00 to \(X\)-values and 0.00 to \(Y\)-values listed.


NOTE - An Equivalent Line Load Is Calculated For Each Row Of Piers/Piles Assuming A Uniform Distribution Of Load Horizontally Between Individual Piers/Piles.
A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.
900 Trial Surfaces Have Been Generated.
100 Surface(s) Initiate(s) From Each Of 9 Points Equally Spaced
Along The Ground Surface Between \(X=108.00\) (ft)
and \(X=124.00\) (ft)
Each Surface Terminates Between \(\quad X=180.00\) (ft)
and \(X=250.00(f t)\)
Unless Further Limitations Were Imposed, The Minimum Elevation At Which A Surface Extends Is \(Y=0.00\) (ft)
5.00(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 Evaluated \(=900\)
Statistical Data On All Valid FS Values:
FS Max \(=5.235\) FS Min \(=1.646 \quad\) FS Ave \(=3.457\)
Standard Deviation \(=0.939\) Coefficient of Variation \(=27.15 \%\)
Failure Surface Specified By 21 Coordinate Points
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Point & X-Surf & Y-Surff \\
No. & (ft) & (ft)
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{lll}1 & 120.00 & 136.00\end{array}\)
\(\begin{array}{lll}2 & 125.00 & 135.86\end{array}\)
\(130.00 \quad 135.99\)
\(134.98 \quad 136.40\)
\(139.93 \quad 137.08\)
\(144.84 \quad 138.04\)
\(149.69 \quad 139.27\)
\(154.46 \quad 140.76\)
\(159.14 \quad 142.52\)
\(163.72 \quad 144.53\)
\(168.18 \quad 146.79\)
\(172.51 \quad 149.29\)
\(176.69 \quad 152.03\)
\(180.71 \quad 155.00\)
\(184.57 \quad 158.19\)
\(188.24 \quad 161.58\)
\(191.72 \quad 165.17\)
\(194.99 \quad 168.95\)
\(\begin{array}{ll}198.05 & 172.90 \\ 200.89 & 177.02\end{array}\)
\(202.10 \quad 179.00\)
Circle Center At \(\mathrm{X}=125.09\); \(\mathrm{Y}=226.24\); and Radius \(=90.38\) \(\underset{* * *}{\text { Factor of }} \underset{\text { Safety }}{\text { St }}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & Individua & data Water Force & on the Water Force & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 23 \text { sli } \\
& \text { Tie } \\
& \text { Force }
\end{aligned}
\] & ces Tie Force & Earthq For & ake e Sur & charge \\
\hline Slice & Width & Weight & Top & Bot & Norm & Tan & Hor & Ver & Load \\
\hline No. & (ft) & (lbs) & (lbs) & (lbs) & (lbs) & (lbs) & (lbs) & (lbs) & (lbs) \\
\hline 1 & 5.0 & 1039.6 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 2 & 5.0 & 3024.8 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 3 & 2.0 & 1728.2 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 4 & 3.0 & 3126.9 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 5 & 5.0 & 6665.5 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 6 & 4.9 & 8250.1 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 7 & 4.8 & 9571.8 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 8 & 4.8 & 10621.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 9 & 4.7 & 11393.1 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 10 & 4.6 & 11888.6 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 11 & 4.5 & 12112.8 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 12 & 4.3 & 12076.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 13 & 4.2 & 11792.9 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 14 & 3.3 & 9297.4 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 15 & 0.7 & 1974.1 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 16 & 3.9 & 10108.7 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 17 & 3.7 & 8615.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 18 & 3.5 & 7073.2 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 19 & 0.3 & 523.2 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 20 & 3.0 & 4792.6 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 21 & 3.1 & 3360.8 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline 22 & 2.8 & 1558.4 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

    1.2 162.7 0.0 0.0 0.0.0.0
    Failure Surface Specified By 21 Coordinate Points
    Point X-Surf Y-Surf
        No.
            1
            2 118.00 122.98 136
                            (ft)
                            136.00
                            135.53
                                127.98 135.38
                                132.97 135.54
                                137.95 136.02
                                142.89 136.82
                                147.76 137.92
                                152.56 139.34
                                157.25 141.05
                                161.83 143.06
                                166.27 145.36
                                170.56 147.93
                                174.68 150.77
                                178.60 153.87
                                182.33 157.21
                                185.83 160.77
                                189.10 164.56
        192.12 168.54
        194.89 172.71
        197.38 177.04
        198.35 179.00
    Circle Center At X = 127.89 ; Y = 214.16 ; and Radius = 78.78
Factor of Safety
*** 1.651 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 21 Coordinate Points
Point X-Surf Y-Surf
No. (ft) (ft)
116.00 136.00
120.97 135.48
125.97 135.28
130.97 135.40
135.95 135.83
140.89 136.58
145.78 137.64
150.59 139.00
155.31 140.66
159.91 142.62
164.37 144.87
168.69 147.40
172.84 150.19
176.80 153.24
180.56 156.53
184.11 160.06
187.42 163.80
190.50 167.74
193.31 171.87
195.86 176.17
197.31
179.00
Circle Center At X = 126.63; Y = 214.33 ; and Radius = 79.05
Factor of Safety
*** 1.662 ***
Failure Surface Specified By 20 Coordinate Points
Point X-Surf Y-Surf
No.
(ft) (ft)
122.00 137.17
126.95 136.44
131.93 136.08
136.93 136.07
141.92 136.42
146.87 137.13
151.76 138.19
156.55 139.60

```




4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Overtoping; Static)


\section*{*** GSTABL7 ***}
** GSTABL7 by Garry H. Gregory, P.E. **
** Original Version 1.0, January 1996; Current Version 2.002, December 2001 ** (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 Earthquake, and Applied Force Options.

Analysis Run Date: 1/27/2021
Time of Run: 1:55PM
Run By: Username
Input Data Filename: C:0fur9-3p.in
Output Filename: C:0fur9-3p.OUT
Unit System: English
Plotted Output Filename: C:0fur9-3p.PLT
PROBLEM DESCRIPTION: 4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability Analysis Section A-A (Overtoping; Pseudo-Static)
BOUNDARY COORDINATES
Note: User origin value specified.
Add 37.00 to \(X\)-values and 0.00 to \(Y\)-values listed.


A Horizontal Earthquake Loading Coefficient
Of0. 260 Has Been Assigned
A Vertical Earthquake Loading Coefficient
Of0.000 Has Been Assigned
Cavitation Pressure \(=0.0(p s f)\)
PIER/PILE LOAD (S)
1 Pier/Pile Load(s) Specified
Pier/Pile X-Pos Load Spacing Inclination Length
No. (ft) (ft) (lbs) (deg) (ft)
\begin{tabular}{lllllll}
1 & 106.02 & 136.00 & 11100.0 & 1.0 & 90.00 & 50.0
\end{tabular}

NOTE - An Equivalent Line Load Is Calculated For Each Row Of Piers/Piles Assuming A Uniform Distribution Of Load Horizontally Between Individual Piers/Piles.
A Critical Failure Surface Searching Method, Using A Random
Technique For Generating Circular Surfaces, Has Been Specified.

```

                                    C:\stedwin\0fur9-3p.OUT Page 3
    | 3.5 | 7073.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0. | 1839.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.3 | 523.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0. | 136.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3.0 | 4792.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0. | 1246.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3.1 | 3360.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0. | 873.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2.8 | 1558.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0. | 405.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.2 | 162.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0. | 42.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Failure Surface Specified By 21 Coordinate Points
Point X-Surf Y-Surf
.ccc
118.00 136.00
127.98 135.38
132.97 135.54
137.95 136.02
142.89 136.82
147.76 137.92
152.56 139.34
157.25 141.05
161.83 143.06
166.27 145.36
170.56 147.93
174.68 150.77
178.60 153.87
182.33 157.21
185.83 160.77
189.10 164.56
192.12 168.54
194.89 172.71
197.38 177.04
198.35 179.00
Circle Center At X = 127.89 ; Y = 214.16 ; and Radius = 78.78
Factor of Safety
Failure Surface Specified By 24 Coordinate Points
Point X-Surf Y-Surf
No. (ft) (ft)
120.00 136.00
124.99 135.66
129.99 135.55
134.99 135.68
139.97 136.03
144.94 136.61
149.87 137.41
154.77 138.45
159.61 139.70
164.38 141.18
169.09 142.88
173.71 144.79
178.24 146.91
182.66 149.23
186.98 151.76
191.17 154.48
195.23 157.40
199.16 160.49
202.94 163.77
206.56 167.21
210.03 170.82
213.32 174.58
216.44 178.49
216.81 179.00
Circle Center At X = 129.86 ; Y = 244.29 ; and Radius = 108.74
Factor of Safety
Failure Surface Specified By 21 Coordinate Points
Point X-Surf Y-Surf
No. (ft) (ft)

```




4057 Hayvenhurs Slope Stability AnalysisSection A-A (Overtoping; Pseudo-Static)


\section*{ASSUMPTIONS:}
1. The slip surface is 3 feet from the slope surface and parallel to the slope
2. The saturation is to extend 3 feet below the slope surface
3. There is sufficient permeability to establish water flow and the flow lines are parallel to the slope surface.
\[
\text { F.S. }=\frac{C+\left(\gamma_{t}-\gamma_{w}\right) h \cos ^{2}(\alpha) \tan (\phi)}{\gamma_{t} \mathrm{~h} \cos (\alpha) \sin (\alpha)}
\]

Where:

\section*{F.S. - Factor of Safety}
h - Vertical Depth of Saturation \(\quad h=3\) feet
\(\gamma_{t} \quad-\quad\) Total Unit Weight of Saturated Soil \(\quad \gamma_{t}=136 \mathrm{pcf}\)
\(\gamma_{\mathrm{w}}\) - Unit Weight of Water \(\quad \gamma_{\mathrm{w}}=62 \mathrm{pcf}\)
C - Cohesion \(\quad \mathrm{C}=260 \mathrm{psf}\)
\(\phi\) - Friction Angle \(\quad \phi=32\) degrees
\(\alpha\) - Slope Angle \(\alpha=34\) degrees
F.S. \(=\frac{260+(136-62)(3) \cos ^{2}(34) \tan (32)}{(136)(3) \cos (34) \sin (34)}\)
F.S. \(=1.88\)

APPENDIX G

\section*{STABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXCAVATIONS \\ FOR 24 FEET HIGH EXCAVATION \\ (ALLOWABLE SPACING BETWEEN SOLDIER PILES OF BACKYARD RETAINING WALL)}

\section*{Data:}
Height of Cut, \(\quad h=24.0 \mathrm{ft}\)

Slope Angle, \(\quad \beta=33.0 \mathrm{deg}\)
Density of Soil, \(\quad \gamma_{\mathrm{S}}=141 \mathrm{pcf}\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=890 \mathrm{psf}\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=36 \mathrm{deg}\)
Factor of Safety, F.S. \(=1.50\)

Maximum Width of Slot:
\(\mathrm{b}=11.2 \quad \mathrm{a}=14.2\)

\[
\mathrm{d}=\frac{1 / 3 * \gamma_{\mathrm{s}} * \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{o}} * \tan \phi *\left(\mathrm{~h}^{2} *(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b})-\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}^{2} * \mathrm{a}\right)+2 \mathrm{~A} * \mathrm{C}}{(\mathrm{~F} . \mathrm{S} .) * \mathrm{~W} * \sin \alpha * \cos \alpha-\mathrm{W} * \cos ^{2} \alpha * \tan \phi-\mathrm{C} * \mathrm{~b}}
\]

Determination of the components of equation:
\begin{tabular}{llc} 
Slide plane angle, & \(\alpha=57.9 \mathrm{deg}\) \\
Location of Tension Crack \(\mathrm{a}=14.2 \mathrm{ft}\) \\
Length of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{b}=11.2 \mathrm{ft}\) \\
Height of Tension Crack, & \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=13.4 \mathrm{ft}\) \\
Area of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{b} *\left(\mathrm{~h}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) / 2=\) & \\
Weight of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{W}=\mathrm{A} * \gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & \(209.1 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\) \\
Coef. of latteral pressure, & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{o}}=1-\sin \phi=\) & 0.486 lbs
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{d}=\frac{1 / 3 * 141 * 0.41 * \tan 36 *(24 * 24 *(14.2+11.2)-13.4 * 13.4 * 14.2)+2 * 890 * 209.1}{1.5 * 29486.3 * \sin 57.9 * \cos 57.9-29486.3 * \cos 57.9 * \cos 57.9 * \tan 36-890 * 11.2} \\
& \mathrm{~d}=\frac{541894.8}{3915.3}=\quad 138.4 \mathrm{ft}
\end{aligned}
\]

Maximum Allowable Spacing Between Piles is \(\mathbf{1 3 8}\) Feet

\section*{TENSION CRACK LOCATION} FOR 24 FEET HIGH EXCAVATION

\section*{DATA:}
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
Soil Density, & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=141\) & pcf \\
Cohesion, & \(\mathrm{C}=890\) & psf \\
Friction Angle, & \(\phi=36\) & degrees \\
Surface Angle, & \(\beta=33.0\) & degrees \\
Fail. Plane Angle, & \(\alpha=57.9\) & degrees \\
Height of Cut, & \(\mathrm{h}=24.0\) & ft
\end{tabular}

Factor of Safety, F.S.= 1.5


\section*{HEIGHT AND LOCATION OF TENSION CRACK:}

Total Length of Block, \(\quad L_{B}=(h * \cos \beta) /(\sin (\alpha-\beta))=47.8 \mathrm{ft}\)
Height of Crack, \(\quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=\mathrm{C} /\left(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}} * \cos \alpha^{*}\left(\sin \alpha^{*}\right.\right.\) F.S. \(\left.\left.-\cos \alpha^{*} \tan \phi\right)\right)=13.4 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\quad \mathrm{a}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}} /(\tan \alpha-\tan \beta)=14.2 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\quad \mathrm{b}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}} * \cos \alpha-\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}} /(\tan \alpha-\tan \beta)=11.2 \mathrm{ft}\)
Length of Failure Plane, \(\quad \mathrm{L}=\mathrm{b} / \cos \alpha=21.0 \mathrm{ft}\)

\section*{STABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXCAVATIONS \\ FOR 14 FEET HIGH EXCAVATION}
(ALLOWABLE SPACING BETWEEN SHORING PILES OF BASEMENT RETAINING WALL)

\section*{Data:}
\begin{tabular}{lrl} 
Height of Cut, & h & \(=14.0 \mathrm{ft}\) \\
Slope Angle, & \(\beta\) & \(=0.0 \mathrm{deg}\) \\
Density of Soil, & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}\) & \(=139 \mathrm{pcf}\) \\
Cohesion, & C & \(=110 \mathrm{psf}\) \\
Friction Angle, & \(\phi\) & \(=29 \mathrm{deg}\)
\end{tabular}

Factor of Safety, F.S. \(=1.50\)

Maximum Width of Slot:

\[
\mathrm{d}=\frac{1 / 3 * \gamma_{\mathrm{s}} * \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{o}} * \tan \phi *\left(\mathrm{~h}^{2} *(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b})-\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}^{2} * \mathrm{a}\right)+2 \mathrm{~A} * \mathrm{C}}{(\mathrm{~F} . \mathrm{S} .) * \mathrm{~W} * \sin \alpha * \cos \alpha-\mathrm{W} * \cos ^{2} \alpha * \tan \phi-\mathrm{C} * \mathrm{~b}}
\]

Determination of the components of equation:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Slide plane angle, & \(\alpha=55.1 \mathrm{deg}\) & (Search for Critical Failure Plane) \\
\hline Location of Tension Crack & \(\mathrm{a}=1.1 \mathrm{ft}\) & \\
\hline Length of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{b}=8.7 \mathrm{ft}\) & \\
\hline Height of Tension Crack, & \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\) & \\
\hline Area of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{b} *\left(\mathrm{~h}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) / 2=\) & \(67.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\) \\
\hline Weight of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{W}=\mathrm{A} * \gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 9377 lbs \\
\hline Coef. of latteral pressure, & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{o}}=1-\sin \phi=\) & 0.52 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\mathrm{d}=\frac{1 / 3 * 139 * 0.52 * \tan 29 *(14 * 14 *(1.1+8.7)-1.5 * 1.5 * 1.1)+2 * 110 * 67.5}{1.5 * 9377.4 * \sin 55.1 * \cos 55.1-9377.4 * \cos 55.1 * \cos 55.1 * \tan 29-110 * 8.7}
\]
\[
\mathrm{d}=\frac{40100.2}{3942.3}=10.17 \mathrm{ft}
\]

Maximum Allowable Spacing Between Piles is 10 Feet

\section*{TENSION CRACK LOCATION} FOR 14 FEET HIGH EXCAVATION

\section*{DATA:}
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
Soil Density, & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=139\) & pcf \\
Cohesion, & \(\mathrm{C}=110\) & psf \\
Friction Angle, & \(\phi=29\) & degrees \\
Surface Angle, & \(\beta=0.0\) & degrees \\
Fail. Plane Angle, & \(\alpha=55.1\) & degrees \\
Height of Cut, & \(\mathrm{h}=14.0\) & ft
\end{tabular}

Factor of Safety, F.S. \(=1.5\)


\section*{HEIGHT AND LOCATION OF TENSION CRACK:}

Total Length of Block, \(\quad L_{B}=(h * \cos \beta) /(\sin (\alpha-\beta))=17.1 \mathrm{ft}\)
Height of Crack,
\(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=\mathrm{C} /\left(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}} * \cos \alpha^{*}\left(\sin \alpha^{*}\right.\right.\) F.S. \(\left.\left.-\cos \alpha^{*} \tan \phi\right)\right)=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\quad \mathrm{a}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}} /(\tan \alpha-\tan \beta)=1.1 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\quad b=L_{B} * \cos \alpha-H_{c} /(\tan \alpha-\tan \beta)\)
8.7 ft

Length of Failure Plane, \(\quad \mathrm{L}=\mathrm{b} / \cos \alpha=15.2 \mathrm{ft}\)

\section*{STABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXCAVATIONS \\ FOR 14 FEET HIGH EXCAVATION \\ (ALLOWABLE SPACING BETWEEN SHORING PILES OF BASEMENT RETAINING WALL)}

\section*{Data:}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Height of Cut, & \(\mathrm{h}=14.0 \mathrm{ft}\) \\
Slope Angle, & \(\beta=0.0 \mathrm{deg}\) \\
Density of Soil, & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=139 \mathrm{pcf}\) \\
Cohesion, & \(\mathrm{C}=220 \mathrm{psf}\) \\
Friction Angle, & \(\phi=24 \mathrm{deg}\)
\end{tabular}

Factor of Safety, F.S. \(=1.50\)

Maximum Width of Slot:

\[
\mathrm{d}=\frac{1 / 3 * \gamma_{\mathrm{s}} * \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{o}} * \tan \phi *\left(\mathrm{~h}^{2} *(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b})-\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}^{2} * \mathrm{a}\right)+2 \mathrm{~A} * \mathrm{C}}{(\mathrm{~F} . \mathrm{S} .) * \mathrm{~W} * \sin \alpha * \cos \alpha-\mathrm{W} * \cos ^{2} \alpha * \tan \phi-\mathrm{C} * \mathrm{~b}}
\]

Determination of the components of equation:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Slide plane angle, & \(\alpha=53.3 \mathrm{deg}\) & (Search for Critical Failure Plane) \\
\hline Location of Tension Crack & \(\mathrm{a}=2.1 \mathrm{ft}\) & \\
\hline Length of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{b}=8.3 \mathrm{ft}\) & \\
\hline Height of Tension Crack, & \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=2.8 \mathrm{ft}\) & \\
\hline Area of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{b} *\left(\mathrm{~h}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) / 2=\) & \(70.2 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\) \\
\hline Weight of Wedge, & \(\mathrm{W}=\mathrm{A} * \gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 9751 lbs \\
\hline Coef. of latteral pressure, & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{o}}=1-\sin \phi=\) & 0.59 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{d}=\frac{1 / 3 * 139 * 0.59 * \tan 24 *(14 * 14 *(2.1+8.3)-2.8 * 2.8 * 2.1)+2 * 220 * 70.2}{1.5 * 9751.4 * \sin 53.3 * \cos 53.3-9751.4 * \cos 53.3 * \cos 53.3 * \tan 24-220 * 8.3} \\
& \mathrm{~d}=\frac{55723.6}{3623.8}=15.38 \mathrm{ft}
\end{aligned}
\]

Maximum Allowable Spacing Between Piles is 15 Feet

\section*{TENSION CRACK LOCATION} FOR 14 FEET HIGH EXCAVATION

\section*{DATA:}
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
Soil Density, & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=139\) & pcf \\
Cohesion, & \(\mathrm{C}=220\) & psf \\
Friction Angle, & \(\phi=24\) & degrees \\
Surface Angle, & \(\beta=0.0\) & degrees \\
Fail. Plane Angle, & \(\alpha=53.3\) & degrees \\
Height of Cut, & \(\mathrm{h}=14.0\) & ft
\end{tabular}

Factor of Safety, F.S.= 1.5


HEIGHT AND LOCATION OF TENSION CRACK:
Total Length of Block, \(\quad L_{B}=(h * \cos \beta) /(\sin (\alpha-\beta))=17.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Height of Crack,
\(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=\mathrm{C} /\left(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}} * \cos \alpha^{*}\left(\sin \alpha^{*}\right.\right.\) F.S. \(\left.\left.-\cos \alpha^{*} \tan \phi\right)\right)=2.8 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\quad \mathrm{a}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}} /(\tan \alpha-\tan \beta)=2.1 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\quad \mathrm{b}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}} * \cos \alpha-\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}} /(\tan \alpha-\tan \beta)=8.3 \mathrm{ft}\)
Length of Failure Plane, \(\mathrm{L}=\mathrm{b} / \cos \alpha=13.9 \mathrm{ft}\)

APPENDIX H

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR SHORING \\ CONTILEVERED 14 FOOT HIGH SHORING}

SURCHARGED BY NEIGHBORING ONE-STORY BUILDING AND SIDE YARD; NORTH SIDE Initial Input:
Soil and Shoring Data:
Shoring Type - Cantilever C
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Height of Shoring & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 14 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 110 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 29 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.373
\end{tabular}

Required Factor of Safety FS \(=1.25\)

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 50 & psf \\
Distance from Shoring & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 1.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 6.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & bb \\
Distance from Shoring & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Adjacent Footing Data:
Linear Load on Footing \(\mathrm{Q}=1000\) plf
Distance from Shoring
\(\mathrm{L}_{3}=7 \mathrm{ft}\)
Width of Footing
\(\mathrm{B}_{3}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Depth of Footing
\(\mathrm{D}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)


\section*{Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 48.5 pcf}

Total Force Acting on Shoring: 4756 lb/ft
Point of Application: 9.6 ft Below Top of Shoring
Pressure at Poin 'A': 156.05 psf @ 4.1 ft Below Top of Shori
Pressure at Poin 'B': \(\mathbf{5 2 2 . 2 8}\) psf @ \(\mathbf{1 0 . 5} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Shos
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{7 2 0 . 0 8} \mathbf{~ p s f}\) @ \(\mathbf{1 4} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Shorin

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR SHORING \\ CONTILEVERED 14 FOOT HIGH SHORING}

SURCHARGED BY NEIGHBORING ONE-STORY BUILDING AND SIDE YARD; NORTH SIDE Initial Input:
Soil and Shoring Data:
Shoring Type - Cantilever C
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Height of Shoring & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 14 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 220 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 24 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.399
\end{tabular}

Required Factor of Safety FS \(=1.25\)

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 50 & psf \\
Distance from Shoring & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 1.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 6.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & bb \\
Distance from Shoring & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Adjacent Footing Data:
Linear Load on Footing \(\mathrm{Q}=1000\) plf
Distance from Shoring \(\mathrm{L}_{3}=7 \mathrm{ft}\)
Width of Footing \(\quad \mathrm{B}_{3}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Depth of Footing \(\quad \mathrm{D}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)


Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 45.5 pcf
Total Force Acting on Shoring: 4457 lb/ft
Point of Application: 9.7 ft Below Top of Shoring
Pressure at Poin 'A': 228.75 psf @ 6.4 ft Below Top of Shori
Pressure at Poin 'B': 497.1 psf @ \(\mathbf{1 0 . 5} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Shori
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{7 3 1 . 1}\) psf @ \(\mathbf{1 4} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Shoring

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR SHORING \\ CONTILEVERED 14 FOOT HIGH SHORING SURCHARGED BY NEIGHBORING SIDE YARD; SOUTH SIDE}

\section*{Initial Input:}

Soil and Shoring Data:
Shoring Type - Cantilever C
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Height of Shoring & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 14 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 110 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 29 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.373
\end{tabular}

Required Factor of Safety FS \(=1.25\)

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 50 & psf \\
Distance from Shoring & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 1.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 13.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Distance from Shoring & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

\section*{Adjacent Footing Data:}

Linear Load on Footing \(Q=0\) plf
Distance from Shoring \(L_{3}=0 \quad \mathrm{ft}\)
Width of Footing
\(\mathrm{B}_{3}=0.0 \mathrm{ft}\)
Depth of Footing
\(\mathrm{D}=0.0 \mathrm{ft}\)


Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 46.9 pcf
Total Force Acting on Shoring: 4597 lb/ft
Point of Application: 9.7 ft Below Top of Shoring
Pressure at Poin 'A': \(\mathbf{1 4 0 . 4} \mathbf{p s f}\) @ 4.1 ft Below Top of Shorin
Pressure at Poin 'B': \(\mathbf{5 1 0 . 1 5} \mathbf{p s f}\) @ \(\mathbf{1 0 . 5} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Sho
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{7 1 3 . 4 2}\) psf @ \(\mathbf{1 4} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Shorin

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR SHORING \\ CONTILEVERED 14 FOOT HIGH SHORING SURCHARGED BY NEIGHBORING SIDE YARD; SOUTH SIDE}

\section*{Initial Input:}

Soil and Shoring Data:
Shoring Type - Cantilever C
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Height of Shoring & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 14 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 220 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 24 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.399
\end{tabular}

Required Factor of Safety FS \(=1.25\)

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 50 & psf \\
Distance from Shoring & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 1.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 13.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Distance from Shoring & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

\section*{Adjacent Footing Data:}

Linear Load on Footing \(Q=0 \quad\) plf
Distance from Shoring \(L_{3}=0 \quad \mathrm{ft}\)
Width of Footing
\(\mathrm{B}_{3}=0.0 \mathrm{ft}\)
Depth of Footing
\(\mathrm{D}=0.0 \mathrm{ft}\)


Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 43.9 pcf
Total Force Acting on Shoring: 4298 lb/ft
Point of Application: 9.8 ft Below Top of Shoring
Pressure at Poin 'A': \(\mathbf{2 0 9 . 1 4}\) psf @ 6.4 ft Below Top of Shori
Pressure at Poin 'B': 484.97 psf @ \(\mathbf{1 0 . 5} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Sho
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{7 2 4 . 4 4}\) psf @ \(\mathbf{1 4} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Shorin

APPENDIX I

\title{
STATIC EQUIVALENT FLUID PRESSURE \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT \\ FOR 12 FEET HIGH RETAINING WALL
}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Wedge \\
No. & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lateral Load from \\
Active Pressure \\
(Single Wedge) \\
(lbs/lf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lateral Load from \\
Active Pressure \\
(Accumulated) \\
(lbs/lf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Equivalent \\
Fluid Pressure
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & 3,707 & 3,707 & \(\mathrm{psf} / \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{or} \mathrm{pcf}\)
\end{tabular}

EFP calculated for \(\mathrm{H}=\quad 12 \mathrm{ft}\)
\begin{tabular}{lcll} 
Total Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf & \\
Saturated Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf & \\
Water Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 62.4 & pcf & \\
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\) & 29 & degrees & \\
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 110 & psf & \\
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\) & 0 & degrees & \\
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\) & 55.1 & degrees & (Search for Critical Failure Plane)
\end{tabular}

\title{
LATERAL LOAD APPLIED ON BLOCK 1 \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT \\ FOR 12 FEET HIGH RETAINING WALL
}

DATA:
Total Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\)
Saturated Density, \(\gamma_{s}=\)
Water Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{w}}=\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\)
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\)
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\)
Water Table Angle, \(\delta=\)
Wedge Length, \(\mathrm{L}=\)
Factor of Safety, FS =

139 pcf
139 pcf
62.4 pcf
29.0 degrees

110 psf
55.1 degrees
0.0 degrees
55.1 degrees
12.8 ft
1.5

Mobilized, \(\phi_{\mathrm{m}}=\)
Mobilized, \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}=\)
20.3 degrees

73 psf


\section*{TENSION CRACK LOCATION \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT}

DATA:

Soil Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\)
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\)
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\)
Wedge Length, L =
Factor of Safety, F.S.=

139 pcf
29 degrees
110 psf
0.0 degrees
55.1 degrees

15 ft
1.5


HEIGHT AND LOCATION OF TENSION CRACK:
Height of Crack, \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=\quad 1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\Delta \mathrm{L}=1.1 \mathrm{ft}\)

SECTION OF WEDGE ABOVE THE CRACK:
\begin{tabular}{lclrcc} 
Length of Section, \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 2 & ft & Driving Force, \(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{D} 1}=\) & 91 & lbs \\
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{1}=\) & 1 & \(\mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}\) & Friction, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{fr} 1}=\) & 35 & lbs \\
Weight of Section, \(\mathrm{W}_{1}=\) & 111 & lbs & Cohesion, \(\mathrm{CL}_{1}=\) & 203 & lbs
\end{tabular}

Horizontal Projection of Resulting Force, \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=-84 \mathrm{lbs}\)

\section*{SECTION OF WEDGE BELOW THE CRACK:}
\begin{tabular}{lclrll} 
Length of Section, \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 13 & ft & Driving Force, \(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{D} 2}=\) & 5,629 & lbs \\
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{2}=\) & 49 & sq. ft & Friction, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{fr} 2}=\) & 2,173 & lbs \\
Weight of Section, \(\mathrm{W}_{2}=\) & 6,860 & lbs & Cohesion, \(\mathrm{CL}_{2}=\) & 1,406 & lbs \\
Horizontal Projection of Resulting Force, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & \(1,172 \mathrm{lbs}\) & & 0tou194f1.xls
\end{tabular}

\title{
STATIC EQUIVALENT FLUID PRESSURE \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT \\ FOR 12 FEET HIGH RETAINING WALL
}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Wedge \\
No. & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lateral Load from \\
Active Pressure \\
(Single Wedge) \\
(lbs/lf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lateral Load from \\
Active Pressure \\
(Accumulated) \\
(lbs/lf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Equivalent \\
Fluid Pressure
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & 3,257 & 3,257 & \(\mathrm{psf} / \mathrm{ft}\) or pcf
\end{tabular}

EFP calculated for \(\mathrm{H}=\quad 12 \mathrm{ft}\)
\begin{tabular}{lcll} 
Total Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf & \\
Saturated Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf & \\
Water Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 62.4 & pcf & \\
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\) & 24 & degrees & \\
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 220 & psf & \\
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\) & 0 & degrees & \\
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\) & 53.3 & degrees & (Search for Critical Failure Plane)
\end{tabular}

\title{
LATERAL LOAD APPLIED ON BLOCK 1 \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT \\ FOR 12 FEET HIGH RETAINING WALL
}

DATA:
Total Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\)
Saturated Density, \(\gamma_{s}=\)
Water Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{w}}=\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\)
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\)
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\)
Water Table Angle, \(\delta=\)
Wedge Length, \(\mathrm{L}=\)
Factor of Safety, FS =

139 pcf
139 pcf
62.4 pcf
24.0 degrees

220 psf
53.3 degrees
0.0 degrees
53.3 degrees
11.4 ft
1.5

Mobilized, \(\phi_{\mathrm{m}}=\)
Mobilized, \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}=\)
16.5 degrees

147 psf
\(\mathrm{X}=6.8\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=12.0\)
\(\mathrm{X}=6.8\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=9.2\)
\(Y=9.2\)
\(X=6.8\)
\(Y=9.2\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=9.2\)

\(\mathrm{Y}=12.0 \quad \mathrm{a}=2.8 \quad \mathrm{ft}\)
\(\mathrm{b}=12.0 \mathrm{ft}\)
\(\mathrm{c}=0.0 \quad \mathrm{ft}\)
\(\mathrm{d}=0.0 \quad \mathrm{ft}\)
\(\mathrm{X}=0.0 \quad \mathrm{~h}_{1}=\quad 2.8 \quad \mathrm{ft}\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=0.0 \quad \mathrm{~h}_{2}=12.0 \quad \mathrm{ft}\)

\(\mathrm{X}=0.0\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=0.0\)


\section*{TENSION CRACK LOCATION \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT}

DATA:

Soil Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\)
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\)
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\)
Wedge Length, L =
Factor of Safety, F.S.=

139 pcf
24 degrees
220 psf
0.0 degrees
53.3 degrees

15 ft
1.5


HEIGHT AND LOCATION OF TENSION CRACK:
Height of Crack, \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=\quad 2.8 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\Delta \mathrm{L}=2.1 \mathrm{ft}\)

SECTION OF WEDGE ABOVE THE CRACK:
\begin{tabular}{lclrll} 
Length of Section, \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 4 & ft & Driving Force, \(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{D} 1}=\) & 332 & lbs \\
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{1}=\) & 3 & \(\mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}\) & Friction, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{fr} 1}=\) & 110 & lbs \\
Weight of Section, \(\mathrm{W}_{1}=\) & 415 & lbs & Cohesion, \(\mathrm{CL}_{1}=\) & 776 & lbs
\end{tabular}

Horizontal Projection of Resulting Force, \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=-332 \mathrm{lbs}\)

\section*{SECTION OF WEDGE BELOW THE CRACK:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Length of Section, \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 11 & ft & Driving Force, \(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{D} 2}=\) & 5,653 & lbs \\
\hline Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{2}=\) & 51 & sq. ft & Friction, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{fr} 2}=\) & 1,878 & lbs \\
\hline Weight of Section, \(\mathrm{W}_{2}=\) & 7,054 & lbs & Cohesion, \(\mathrm{CL}_{2}=\) & 2,518 & lbs \\
\hline Horizontal Projection of & Iting & rce, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 752 lbs & & Dou \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\title{
PSEUDO-STATIC EQUIVALENT FLUID PRESSURE \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT \\ FOR 12 FEET HIGH RETAINING WALL
}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Wedge \\
No. & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lateral Load from \\
Active Pressure \\
(Single Wedge) \\
(lbs/lf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lateral Load from \\
Active Pressure \\
(Accumulated) \\
(lbs/lf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Equivalent \\
Fluid Pressure
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & 4,160 & 4,160 & \(\mathrm{psf} / \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{or} \mathrm{pcf}\)
\end{tabular}

EFP calculated for \(\mathrm{H}=\quad 12 \mathrm{ft}\)
\begin{tabular}{lcll} 
Total Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf & \\
Saturated Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf & \\
Water Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 62.4 & pcf & \\
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\) & 29 & degrees & \\
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 110 & psf & \\
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\) & 0 & degrees & \\
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\) & 46.3 & degrees & (Search for Critical Failure Plane) \\
Required F.S. \(=\) & 1 & & \\
Seismic Forces & Yes & & \\
Coef. of Horiz. Accel. \(=\) & 0.286 & & \(\left(\mathrm{PGA}_{\mathrm{M}}=\right.\) \\
Coef. of Vert. Accel. \(=\) & 0 & & 0.857
\end{tabular}

NOTE: - The Pseudo-Static Analysis Combines The Earth Pressures From Static And Seismic Forces

\title{
LATERAL LOAD APPLIED ON BLOCK 1 \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT \\ FOR 12 FEET HIGH RETAINING WALL
}

DATA:
Total Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\)
Saturated Density, \(\gamma_{s}=\)
Water Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{w}}=\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\)
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\)
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\)
Water Table Angle, \(\delta=\)
Wedge Length, \(\mathrm{L}=\)
Factor of Safety, FS =

139 pcf
139 pcf
62.4 pcf
29.0 degrees

110 psf
46.3 degrees
0.0 degrees
46.3 degrees
14.3 ft
1.0
\(\mathrm{X}=9.9\)
\(Y=12.0\)
\(X=9.9\)
\(Y=10.4\)
Y
\(\mathrm{X}=9.9\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=10.4\)

THE WEDGE:
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{1}=\)
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{2}=\)
Total Area, \(\mathrm{A}=\)
Weight of Soil, \(\mathrm{W}=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{L}=\)
Uplift Force, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}=\)

Vert. Seism. Force, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Veq}}=\)

Coef. of Horiz. Accel. =
0.285667

Coef. of Vert. Accel. =
0

Mobilized, \(\phi_{\mathrm{m}}=\)
29.0 degrees

Mobilized, \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}=\)
110 psf

68 sq. ft 0 sq. ft 68 sq. ft 9,397 lbs/lf \(1,578 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{lf}\)
\(0 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{lf}\)
Horiz. Seism. Force, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Heq}}=\quad 2,684 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{lf}\)
\(0 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{lf}\)



\(\mathrm{X}=0.0\)
\begin{tabular}{cccc}
\(\mathrm{Y}=12.0\) & \(\mathrm{a}=\) & 1.6 & ft \\
& \(\mathrm{b}=\) & 12.0 & ft \\
& \(\mathrm{c}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
& \(\mathrm{d}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
\(\mathrm{X}=0.0\) & \(\mathrm{~h}_{1}=\) & 1.6 & ft \\
\(\mathrm{Y}=0.0\) & \(\mathrm{~h}_{2}=\) & 12.0 & ft
\end{tabular}
\[
\mathrm{X}=0.0
\]
\(\mathrm{Y}=0.0\)


\section*{TENSION CRACK LOCATION \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT}

DATA:

Soil Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\)
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\)
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\)
Wedge Length, L =
Factor of Safety, F.S.=

139 pcf
29 degrees
110 psf
0.0 degrees
46.3 degrees

17 ft
1.5


HEIGHT AND LOCATION OF TENSION CRACK:
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Height of Crack, \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=\) & 1.6 & ft \\
Location of Crack, \(\Delta \mathrm{L}=\) & 1.6 & ft
\end{tabular}

SECTION OF WEDGE ABOVE THE CRACK:
\begin{tabular}{lclrcc} 
Length of Section, \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 2 & ft & Driving Force, \(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{D} 1}=\) & 128 & lbs \\
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{1}=\) & 1 & \(\mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}\) & Friction, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{fr} 1}=\) & 68 & lbs \\
Weight of Section, \(\mathrm{W}_{1}=\) & 177 & lbs & Cohesion, \(\mathrm{CL}_{1}=\) & 249 & lbs
\end{tabular}

Horizontal Projection of Resulting Force, \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=-130 \mathrm{lbs}\)

\section*{SECTION OF WEDGE BELOW THE CRACK:}
\begin{tabular}{lclrll} 
Length of Section, \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 14 & ft & Driving Force, \(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{D} 2}=\) & 6,790 & lbs \\
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{2}=\) & 68 & sq. ft & Friction, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{fr} 2}=\) & 3,601 & lbs \\
Weight of Section, \(\mathrm{W}_{2}=\) & 9,397 & lbs & Cohesion, \(\mathrm{CL}_{2}=\) & 1,578 & lbs \\
Horizontal Projection of Resulting Force, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 1,114 & lbs & 0tou194g1.xls
\end{tabular}

\title{
PSEUDO-STATIC EQUIVALENT FLUID PRESSURE \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT \\ FOR 12 FEET HIGH RETAINING WALL
}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Wedge \\
No. & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lateral Load from \\
Active Pressure \\
(Single Wedge) \\
(lbs/lf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lateral Load from \\
Active Pressure \\
(Accumulated) \\
(lbs/lf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Equivalent \\
Fluid Pressure
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & 3,543 & 3,543 & \(\mathrm{psf} / \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{or} \mathrm{pcf}\)
\end{tabular}

EFP calculated for \(\mathrm{H}=\quad 12 \mathrm{ft}\)
\begin{tabular}{lcll} 
Total Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf & \\
Saturated Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf & \\
Water Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 62.4 & pcf & \\
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\) & 24 & degrees & \\
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 220 & psf & \\
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\) & 0 & degrees & \\
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\) & 44.5 & degrees & (Search for Critical Failure Plane) \\
Required F.S. \(=\) & 1 & & \\
Seismic Forces & Yes & & \\
Coef. of Horiz. Accel. \(=\) & 0.286 & & \(\left(\mathrm{PGA}_{\mathrm{M}}=\right.\) \\
Coef. of Vert. Accel. \(=\) & 0 & &
\end{tabular}

NOTE: - The Pseudo-Static Analysis Combines The Earth Pressures From Static And Seismic Forces

\title{
LATERAL LOAD APPLIED ON BLOCK 1 \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT \\ FOR 12 FEET HIGH RETAINING WALL
}

DATA:
Total Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\)
Saturated Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\)
Water Density, \(\gamma_{w}=\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\)
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\)
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\)
Water Table Angle, \(\delta=\)
Wedge Length, \(\mathrm{L}=\)
Factor of Safety, FS =

139 pcf
139 pcf
62.4 pcf
24.0 degrees

220 psf
44.5 degrees
0.0 degrees
44.5 degrees
12.8 ft
1.0

Coef. of Horiz. Accel. =
0.285667

Coef. of Vert. Accel. =

Mobilized, \(\phi_{\mathrm{m}}=\)
Mobilized, \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}=\)
24.0 degrees 220 psf
\(\mathrm{X}=9.1\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=12.0\)
\(\mathrm{X}=9.1\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=9.0\)

THE WEDGE:
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{1}=\) 69 sq. \(\mathrm{ft} \quad 4\)
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{2}=\)
0 sq. ft
Total Area, \(\mathrm{A}=\)
69 sq. ft
Weight of Soil, \(\mathrm{W}=\) 9,546 lbs/lf
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{L}=\) 2,818 lbs/lf
Uplift Force, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}=\)
\(0 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{lf}\)
Horiz. Seism. Force, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Heq}}=\)
2,727 lbs/lf
Vert. Seism. Force, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Veq}}=\)
\(0 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{lf}\)


Lateral Load, \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{a}}=\)
3,543 lbs/lf

\section*{TENSION CRACK LOCATION \\ RETAINING WALLS OF BASEMENT}

DATA:

Soil Density, \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\)
Friction Angle, \(\phi=\)
Cohesion, \(\mathrm{C}=\)
Surface Angle, \(\beta=\)
Fail. Plane Angle, \(\alpha=\)
Wedge Length, L =
Factor of Safety, F.S.=

139 pcf
24 degrees
220 psf
0.0 degrees
44.5 degrees

17 ft
1.5
\(\mathrm{X}=12.2\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=12.0\)
\(\mathrm{X}=12.2\)
\(\mathrm{Y}=12.0\)


HEIGHT AND LOCATION OF TENSION CRACK:
Height of Crack, \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{c}}=\quad 3.0 \mathrm{ft}\)
Location of Crack, \(\Delta \mathrm{L}=3.1 \mathrm{ft}\)

SECTION OF WEDGE ABOVE THE CRACK:
\begin{tabular}{lclrll} 
Length of Section, \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 4 & ft & Driving Force, \(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{D} 1}=\) & 454 & lbs \\
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{1}=\) & 5 & \(\mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}\) & Friction, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{fr} 1}=\) & 206 & lbs \\
Weight of Section, \(\mathrm{W}_{1}=\) & 648 & lbs & Cohesion, \(\mathrm{CL}_{1}=\) & 950 & lbs
\end{tabular}

Horizontal Projection of Resulting Force, \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=-501 \mathrm{lbs}\)
SECTION OF WEDGE BELOW THE CRACK:
\begin{tabular}{lclrll} 
Length of Section, \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 13 & ft & Driving Force, \(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{D} 2}=\) & 6,688 & lbs \\
Area of Section, \(\mathrm{A}_{2}=\) & 69 & sq. ft & Friction, \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{fr} 2}=\) & 3,033 & lbs \\
Weight of Section, \(\mathrm{W}_{2}=\) & 9,546 & lbs & Cohesion, \(\mathrm{CL}_{2}=\) & 2,818 & lbs \\
Horizontal Projection of Resulting Force, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 597 & lbs & 0tou194g2.xls
\end{tabular}

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR RETAINING WALL \\ CANTILEVERED 12 FOOT HIGH BASEMENT WALLS}

SURCHARGED BY NEIGHBORING ONE-STORY BUILDING AND SIDE YARD; NORTH SIDE Initial Input:
Soil and Retaining Wall Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Wall Type - Cantilever & & C & \\
Height of Wall & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 12 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 110 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 29 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.395
\end{tabular}

Required Factor of Safety FS \(=1.5\)

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 50 & psf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 1.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 6.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

\section*{Adjacent Footing Data:}

Linear Load on Footing \(Q=1000\) plf
Distance from Wall
\(\mathrm{L}_{3}=7 \mathrm{ft}\)
Width of Footing \(\quad \mathrm{B}_{3}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Depth of Footing
\(\mathrm{D}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)


Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 57 pcf
Total Force Acting on Wall: 4104 lb/ft
Point of Application: 8.3 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'A': \(\mathbf{1 0 9 . 9 2}\) psf @ 2.8 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'B': \(\mathbf{5 1 3 . 3 4} \mathbf{p s f}\) @ 8.8 ft Below Top of Wall
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{7 2 2} .4\) psf @ \(\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Wall

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR RETAINING WALL \\ CANTILEVERED 12 FOOT HIGH BASEMENT WALLS}

SURCHARGED BY NEIGHBORING ONE-STORY BUILDING AND SIDE YARD; NORTH SIDE Initial Input:
Soil and Retaining Wall Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Wall Type - Cantilever & & C & \\
Height of Wall & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 12 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 220 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 24 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.417
\end{tabular}

Required Factor of Safety FS \(=1.5\)

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 50 & psf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 1.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 6.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

\section*{Adjacent Footing Data:}

Linear Load on Footing \(Q=1000\) plf
Distance from Wall
\(\mathrm{L}_{3}=7 \mathrm{ft}\)
Width of Footing \(\quad \mathrm{B}_{3}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Depth of Footing
\(\mathrm{D}=1.5 \mathrm{ft}\)


Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 52.6 pcf
Total Force Acting on Wall: \(3787 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft}\)
Point of Application: 8.4 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'A': \(\mathbf{1 7 6 . 3 6}\) psf @ 4.7 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'B': 483.99 psf @ 8.8 ft Below Top of Wall
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{7 2 5} .37\) psf @ \(\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Wall

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR RETAINING WALL \\ CANTILEVERED 12 FOOT HIGH BASEMENT WALLS SURCHARGED BY NEIGHBORING SIDE YARD; SOUTH SIDE}

\section*{Initial Input:}

Soil and Retaining Wall Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcc} 
Wall Type - Cantilever & & \(C\) & \\
Height of Wall & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 12 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 110 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 29 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.395
\end{tabular}

Required Factor of Safety FS \(=1.5\)

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 50 & psf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 1.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 11.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

\section*{Adjacent Footing Data:}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
Linear Load on Footing & \(\mathrm{Q}=\) & 0 & plf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{3}=\) & 0 & ft \\
Width of Footing & \(\mathrm{B}_{3}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Depth of Footing & \(\mathrm{D}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}


Depth of Footing
\[
0=0.0 \quad \mathrm{ft}
\]

Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: \(\mathbf{5 4 . 8} \mathbf{~ p c f}\)
Total Force Acting on Wall: \(\mathbf{3 9 4 6} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft}\)
Point of Application: 8.3 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'A': 101.47 psf @ 2.8 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'B': 495.99 psf @ 8.8 ft Below Top of Wall
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{7 1 1 . 6 7} \mathbf{~ p s f}\) @ \(\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ f t ~ B e l o w ~ T o p ~ o f ~ W a l l ~}\)

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR RETAINING WALL \\ CANTILEVERED 12 FOOT HIGH BASEMENT WALLS SURCHARGED BY NEIGHBORING SIDE YARD; SOUTH SIDE}

\section*{Initial Input:}

Soil and Retaining Wall Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Wall Type - Cantilever & & \(C\) & \\
Height of Wall & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 12 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 220 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 24 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.417
\end{tabular}

Required Factor of Safety FS \(=1.5\)

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 50 & psf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 1.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 11.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

\section*{Adjacent Footing Data:}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
Linear Load on Footing & \(\mathrm{Q}=\) & 0 & plf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{3}=\) & 0 & ft \\
Width of Footing & \(\mathrm{B}_{3}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Depth of Footing & \(\mathrm{D}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}


Deph of Footing
\[
0=0.0 \quad \mathrm{ft}
\]

Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 50.4 pcf
Total Force Acting on Wall: \(\mathbf{3 6 3 0} \mathbf{~ l b / f t}\)
Point of Application: 8.5 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'A': 157 psf @ 4.7 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'B': \(\mathbf{4 6 6 . 6 4} \mathbf{~ p s f}\) @ 8.8 ft Below Top of Wall
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{7 1 4 . 6 4} \mathbf{~ p s f}\) @ \(\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Wall

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR RETAINING WALL RESTRAINED 12 FOOT HIGH BASEMENT WALLS SURCHARGED BY ADJACENT DRIVEWAY}

\section*{Initial Input:}

Soil and Retaining Wall Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Wall Type - Braced & \multicolumn{3}{c}{B} \\
Height of Wall & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 12 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 110 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 29 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.340
\end{tabular}

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 200 & psf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 2.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 10.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

\section*{Adjacent Footing Data:}

Linear Load on Footing \(Q=0 \quad\) plf
Distance from Wall
\(\mathrm{L}_{3}=0 \quad \mathrm{ft}\)
Width of Footing
\(\mathrm{B}_{3}=0.0 \mathrm{ft}\)
Depth of Footing
\(\mathrm{D}=0.0 \mathrm{ft}\)


Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 78.9 pcf
Total Force Acting on Wall: \(5682 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft}\)
Point of Application: 7.8 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'A': 207.3 psf @ 2 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'B': 473.3 psf @ 6 ft Below Top of Wall
Relative Maximum: 877.32 psf @ \(\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Wall

\section*{LATERAL LOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR RETAINING WALL RESTRAINED 12 FOOT HIGH BASEMENT WALLS SURCHARGED BY ADJACENT DRIVEWAY}

\section*{Initial Input:}

Soil and Retaining Wall Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Wall Type - Braced & \multicolumn{3}{c}{B} \\
Height of Wall & \(\mathrm{H}=\) & 12 & ft \\
Total Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{t}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Saturated Density & \(\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}=\) & 139 & pcf \\
Cohesion & \(\mathrm{C}=\) & 220 & psf \\
Friction Angle & \(\phi=\) & 24 & deg \\
Depth of Water Table & \(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{w}}=\) & 30 & ft \\
Poisson Ratio & \(\mu=\) & 0.372
\end{tabular}

Distributed Surcharge Data:
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Distributed Load & \(\mathrm{q}=\) & 200 & psf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\) & 2.0 & ft \\
Width of Load & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\) & 10.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

Concentrated Load Data:
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Concentr. Load 1 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Concentr. Load 2 & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) & 0 & lb \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Dist. between Loads & \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}

\section*{Adjacent Footing Data:}
\begin{tabular}{llcl} 
Linear Load on Footing & \(\mathrm{Q}=\) & 0 & plf \\
Distance from Wall & \(\mathrm{L}_{3}=\) & 0 & ft \\
Width of Footing & \(\mathrm{B}_{3}=\) & 0.0 & ft \\
Depth of Footing & \(\mathrm{D}=\) & 0.0 & ft
\end{tabular}


Depth of Footing
\(\mathrm{D}=0.0 \mathrm{ft}\)

Eqiuvalent Fluid Pressure: 89.9 pcf
Total Force Acting on Wall: 6472 lb/ft
Point of Application: 7.8 ft Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'A': \(\mathbf{2 2 9 . 4 4}\) psf @ \(2 \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Wall
Pressure at Poin 'B': \(\mathbf{5 3 8 . 4 2}\) psf @ 6 ft Below Top of Wall
Relative Maximum: \(\mathbf{1 0 0 7 . 5 4} \mathbf{p s f}\) @ \(\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{f t}\) Below Top of Wall

APPENDIX J

\title{
DETERMINATION OF SEISMIC COEFFICIENT
}

Input Data:
\begin{tabular}{llr} 
Peak Ground Acceleration & PGA \(_{M}=\) & 0.857 \\
Magnitude & \(\mathrm{M}=\) & 6.31 \\
Threshold & \(\mathrm{u}=\) & 5 cm \\
Distance & \(\mathrm{r}=\) & 13.19 km
\end{tabular}

Analysis:
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
Peak Ground Acceleration & PGA \(=\) & 0.571 \\
Duration of Shaking for \(\mathrm{r}>10 \mathrm{D}_{5-95}=\) & 8.309 \\
Non Linear Response Factor & \(\mathrm{NRF}=\) & 0.877 \\
Site Seismicity Factor & \(\mathrm{f}_{\text {eq }}=\) & 0.452 \\
Seismic Coefficient & \(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{eq}}=\) & 0.258
\end{tabular}```

