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## 1. Introduction

This Addendum is an analysis of proposed changes to the Skyline Ranch Project (Approved Project) (Approved Tentative Tract Map[TTM] No. 60922, County Project No. 04-075) for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2004101090) prepared by the County of Los Angeles was certified on December 7, 2010. This document uses the County of Los Angeles' adopted CEQA checklist as a format to identify the appropriate level of environmental review (i.e., an addendum, supplemental EIR, etc.).

The Skyline Ranch EIR analyzed development of 622 acres of the 2,173-acre project site, which included a total of 1,313 total lots- 1,260 residential lots, an approximately 11 -acre elementary school site, 10 lots for park areas, 13 debris basin lots, 4 water tank/booster pump station lots, and 25 open space lots ( 1,313 total lots). This Addendum evaluates the incremental environmental impacts of proposed modifications to the Approved Project, including a realignment of Skyline Ranch Road, reduction of 40 residential lots (but inclusion of age-qualified homes and a recreation center), modifications to housing product types, relocation and expansion of park sites, and extension of multipurpose trails and bike lanes. After consideration of the incremental environmental impacts of the proposed modifications to the Approved Project, the County of Los Angeles will be able to clearly determine whether an addendum or supplemental EIR is required to provide appropriate analysis and legal defensibility.

### 1.1 PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

### 1.1.1 CEQA Requirements

According to Section 21166 of CEQA and Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines, when an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall be prepared for the project unless the lead agency determines that one or more of the following conditions are met:

1. Substantial project changes are proposed that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes would occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that require major revisions to the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
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3. New information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified or the negative declaration was adopted shows any of the following:
a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration.
b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than identified in the previous EIR.
c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.
d. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Preparation of an Addendum to an EIR is appropriate when none of the conditions specified in Section 15162 (above) are present and some minor technical changes to the previously certified EIR are necessary.

After consideration of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed modifications to the Approved Project, the County of Los Angeles has determined that 1) none of the conditions requiring preparation of a subsequent or supplement to an EIR have occurred, and 2) the circumstances described in Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines exist. Therefore, an Addendum to the Skyline Ranch EIR has been deemed appropriate.

### 1.1.2 Scope of Analysis in this Addendum

The discretionary approval subject to CEQA for this project is the modification of Approved TTM 60922. As lead agency under CEQA for this action, the County of Los Angeles is required to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with this discretionary approval (modified tract map). The "scope" of the review for project-related impacts for this Addendum is limited to changes between the Approved Project and the requested modifications to the project (Modified Project). The previously certified environmental documentation and related approved mitigation for impacts associated with the Approved Project effectively serve as the "baseline" for the environmental impact analysis. This Addendum also addresses changes in circumstances or new information that would potentially involve new environmental impacts.

### 1.2 CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION OF THIS ADDENDUM

This Addendum uses the County of Los Angeles' adopted CEQA checklist, included as Section 2.0, Environmental Checklist, the analysis for each environmental topic is provided in Section 5.0, Environmental Analysis. Each environmental topic has the following subheadings:

- Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR (County Project No. 04-075)
- Impacts Associated with the Modified Project
- Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project
- Level of Significance After Mitigation

Formerly adopted mitigation measures as part of the Certified EIR are identified and carried forward or noted as being satisfied. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been updated, refined, and/or supplemented to ensure mitigation is implemented as intended for the Modified Project. Such changes are shown in strikeout/ underlined bold format and will be incorporated in the final mitigation monitoring program for the Modified Project.
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## 2. Environmental Setting

### 2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

As shown in Figure 1, Regional Location, the 2,173-acre Skyline Ranch project site is in the community of Canyon Country in the Santa Clarita Valley of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The project site is north of Highway 14 (Antelope Valley Freeway) and the City of Santa Clarita. The site includes undeveloped parcels west of Sierra Highway between the Santa Clara River and Vasquez Canyon. Figure 2, Local Vicinity, shows the site roughly bounded by the Sierra Highway (Mint Canyon) to the east and southeast, residential communities in the City of Santa Clarita to the south and southwest, Plum Canyon Road to the west, Bouquet Canyon Road to the northwest, and Vasquez Canyon Road to the northeast.

Primary access to the project site is provided by the proposed extension of Whites Canyon Road (as Skyline Ranch Road) from Plum Canyon on the western boundary of the site and by Skyline Ranch Road and Sierra Highway in the southeast corner of the project site.

### 2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

### 2.2.1 Existing Land Use

The project site is completely vacant and undeveloped. The site is dominated by irregular, brush-covered terrain with ridges between Plum Canyon to the north and Whites Canyon to the south.

Additionally, a substantial portion of the Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools Significant Ecological Area (SEA) is in the northern two-thirds of the project site. This SEA was adopted by the County as part of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update: One Valley One Vision in November 2012. SEAs are officially designated areas within the County for their biological value. The Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA includes mesas, canyons, and interior slopes supporting coastal sage scrub or scrub-chaparral vegetation. The Cruzan Mesa vernal pool complex lies within an elevated, topographically enclosed basin atop an eroded foothill between Mint and Bouquet canyons. The Plum Canyon vernal pool, situated in a landslide depression on a hillside terrace, is smaller than the Cruzan Mesa pools, but possesses the same essential vernal pool characteristics as the larger system, and the two areas together form an ecologically functional unit. Refer to Section 5.4, Biological Resources, for additional information on the Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA.

### 2.2.2 Surrounding Land Use

Surrounding uses near the project site include undeveloped, open space to the north and northeast, existing and planned residential uses in the City of Santa Clarita and unincorporated Los Angeles County to the south and west, and residential uses in the community of Forest Park to the east near Sierra Highway.
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The Angeles National Forest is further south of the site, and the Castaic Lake Recreation Area is to the northwest. The Santa Clara River flows in an east-west direction through the City of Santa Clarita.

### 2.2.3 General Plan and Zoning

According to the County of Los Angeles General Plan's Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Land Use Policy Map, the entire project site is designated H2 (Residential 2, 0-2 dwelling unit [du]/acre) and RL 5 (Rural Land 5, 1 $\mathrm{du} / 5 \mathrm{acres}$ ) (Los Angeles 2012a). The area proposed for development under the Approved and Modified Projects are designated H 2 .

The County of Los Angeles Zoning Code designates the project site R-1 (Single-family residence), A-1-2 (Light agriculture), and A-2-2 (Heavy agriculture) (Los Angeles 2012b). The area proposed for development under the Approved and Modified Projects are zoned R-1.

Figure 1 - Regional Location
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Figure 2 - Local Vicinity
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## 3. Project Description

### 3.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Skyline Ranch project site occupies approximately 2,173 acres in unincorporated Los Angeles County. As shown on Figure 3, Approved TTM, the Approved Project includes development on approximately 622 acres of the 2,173-acre site with 1,260 single-family residential lots, an approximately 11.6-acre elementary school site, about 12 acres of public parkland to be dedicated to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation, and about 6.2 acres of private parkland. Nearly three-quarters of the site (the northern 1,551 acres) would remain undeveloped, with approximately 1,355 acres dedicated or designated as natural open space through establishment of the proposed Skyline Ranch Conservation Area (SRCA). Approximately 166 acres of undeveloped land in the northern portion of the site would remain undeveloped and designated as Non-development/Continuing Use Area. Also, within the northern portion of the site, approximately 22 acres would be preserved as a Mitigation Exchange Area for 22 acres of preserve area within adjacent recorded Tract 46018 that would be disturbed due to the construction of Skyline Ranch Road. These three areas would preserve approximately 80 percent of the land in the County's Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA. No development associated with the Skyline Ranch Project would occur in the SEA areas.

A proposed trail would extend the existing Mint Canyon Trail from Vasquez Canyon Road to the Plum Canyon Fire Road along an existing dirt path and southwesterly toward a lookout point. The proposed trail easement would run approximately 2.2 miles within portions of the SRCA and Nondevelopment/Continuing Use Area. The Approved Project would include two miles of hiking trails, one mile of paseo trails, and eight miles of bike lanes.

### 3.2 MODIFIED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Modified Project includes minor technical changes to the approved Skyline Ranch project. Figure 4, Approved TTM vs. Proposed Concept Plan, shows the proposed conceptual site plan, which includes the modifications described below. Figure 5, Development Footprint Comparison, shows an overlay of the Modified and Approved Projects. The Modified Project would have a smaller development footprint within the footprint of the Approved Project. In total, the site would be divided into seventeen planning areas (PAs), designated PA A through Q , one park sites, seven recreation center sites, and one school site (see Figure 6, Modified Conceptual Lot Plan).

- Realignment of Skyline Ranch Road. The Modified Project would shift Skyline Ranch Road west of the original alignment. All residential development would be east of the roadway rather than divided by the original alignment. Skyline Ranch Road would maintain its designation as a secondary highway and is proposed to have roundabouts at intersections within the project boundaries. The two access points of Skyline Ranch Road at Plum Canyon Road (to the west) and Sierra Highway (to the southeast) would not change.
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- Reduction of residential development and inclusion of age-qualified housing. Residential development would be reduced from 1,260 to 1,220 lots ( 40 fewer units). The homes along the western edge of the property would be removed and/or shifted east of the realigned Skyline Ranch Road, and 284 units of age-qualified housing with a recreation center would be provided in the northern portion of the planned community in PAs G through K.
- Modifications to housing product types. A broader range of lot sizes and housing types is now proposed, including smaller, more affordable homes for first-time buyers or move-down buyers that were not included in the original plan. There would be a total of six product types and 1,220 dwelling units. The breakdown of housing product types is provided in Table 1 and Figure 6, Modified Conceptual Lot Plan, below.

Table 1 Modified Project Housing Product Breakdown

| Product Type | Dwelling Units | Percentage of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Rate Units |  |  |
| Grayson ${ }^{1}$ | 344 | 28 |
| $55^{\prime} \times 90$ ' Lot | 198 | 16 |
| $50^{\prime} \times 100$ Lot | 186 | 15 |
| 55' $\times 100$ ' Lot | 119 | 10 |
| $65^{\prime} \times 100$ ' Lot | 89 | 7 |
| Market Rate Subtotal | 936 | 77\% |
| Age Qualified Units |  |  |
| $55^{\prime} \times 90$ ' Lot | 122 | 10 |
| $50^{\prime} \times 100^{\prime}$ Lot | 88 | 7 |
| $65^{\prime} \times 90$ ' Lot | 74 | 6 |
| Age Qualified Subtotal | 284 | 23\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 1,220 | 100\% |
| Note: du/ac = dwelling units per acre <br> ${ }^{1}$ TRI Pointe Group's Grayson housing product is a motor court home design with $45^{\prime} \times 75^{\prime}$ ' condominium lots that include stub street access and are configured in six lots to create a court. |  |  |

- Relocation of park and recreation sites. The park sites proposed under the Approved Project would be relocated and combined into one large park adjacent to the school, as shown on Figure 4, Approved TTM vs. Proposed Concept Plan. Approximately 16.9 acres of public parkland to be dedicated to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation would be relocated to be accessible without crossing streets-in particular without crossing Skyline Ranch Road. Seven recreation centers would be located within the Skyline Ranch community and connected by a multi-purpose trail system. Additionally, the Modified Project includes 2.7 acres of private parkland (a recreation center for age-qualified housing).
- Addition of multipurpose trails. The Modified Project would include 10.75 miles of pedestrian connections, which includes 3 miles of hiking trails, a 2.2 -mile trail easement, 3.3 miles of paseo trails, and 2.3 miles of multipurpose trails (see Figure 7, Open Space and Trails Map).


## 3. Project Description

- Extension of bike lanes. Bike lanes within the Skyline Ranch community would extend from 8 miles to 9.8 miles under the Modified Project.

A comprehensive comparison of the Approved and Modified Projects' land use development and housing product types is provided in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2 Approved and Modified Development Comparison

|  | Approved Project | Modified Project |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Developed Acres | $622 \mathrm{acres} \mathrm{(ac)}$ | 492 ac |
| Single Family | 348 | 313 |
| Slopes | 277 | 178 |
| Dwelling Units | 1,260 units | 1,220 units |
| Parks | 18.2 ac | 19.6 ac |
| Pocket Parks | 3.7 | 6.5 |
| Private Parks | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| Neighborhood Parks | 12.0 | 10.5 |
| Pedestrian Connections | 5.2 miles | 10.75 miles |
| Hiking Trails | 2 | 3 |
| Trail Easement | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Paseo Trails | 1.0 | 3.3 |
| Multipurpose Trails | - | 2.3 |
| Bike Lanes | 8 miles | 9.8 miles |
| School | 11.6 ac | 11.9 ac |

Table 3 Approved and Modified Projects Housing Product Type Comparison

|  | Approved Project | Modified Project |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grayson | - | 344 |
| 55x90 | - | 198 |
| $50 \times 100$ | - | 186 |
| $55 \times 100$ | - | 119 |
| $55 \times 105$ | 658 | - |
| $60 \times 100$ | - | - |
| $60 \times 105$ | 337 | - |
| $65 \times 100$ | - | 89 |
| 70×105 | 265 | - |
| Subtotal | 1,260 | 936 |
| Age Qualified |  |  |
| 55x90 | - | 122 |
| 50x100 | - | 88 |
| 65x90 | - | 74 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 284 |
| Grand Total | 1,260 | 1,220 |
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Additionally, the Modified Project would reduce the number of basins from 13 to 12, but the 4 water tanks at the northern portion of the developable area under the Approved Project would remain. Overall, the Modified Project would have a reduced development footprint within the Approved Project's development footprint (see Table 2 and Figure 5, Development Footprint Comparison). Compared to the Approved Project, grading quantities would decrease by approximately 18 and 19 percent for cut and fill quantities, respectively. The cut and fill quantities would decrease to approximately 17.1 million cubic yards (cy) cut and 16.9 million cy fill.

### 3.3 COUNTY ACTION REQUESTED

As part of the Modified Project, the following discretionary actions are required by the County of Los Angeles:

- Approval of Modification to Approved Tentative Tract Map No. 60922
- Approval of the Skyline Ranch Modified Tract 60922 Addendum

Figure 3 - Approved TTM
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APPROVED TTM


PROPOSED CONCEPT PLAN
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Figure 5 - Development Footprint Comparison
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Figure 6 - Modified Conceptual Lot Plan
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Figure 7 - Open Space and Trails Map
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## 4. Environmental Checklist

### 4.1 BACKGROUND

1. Project Title: Skyline Ranch Modified Tract 60922 Addendum
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of Los Angeles
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Steven D. Jones, AICP, Principal Regional Planning Assistant, Land Divisions
(213) 974-6433
4. Project Location: The 2,173-acre project site is in the Santa Clarita Valley north of Highway 14 and the City of Santa Clarita in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The site is roughly bounded by the Sierra Highway to the east and southeast, residential communities in Santa Clarita to the south and southwest, Plum Canyon Road to the west, Bouquet Canyon Road to the northwest, and Vasquez Canyon Road to the northeast.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

TRI Pointe Group
Mike McMillen, Vice President
19540 Jamboree Road, Suite 300
Irvine, CA 92612
6. General Plan Designation: H2 (Residential 2, 0-2 du/acre), RL 5 (Rural Land 5, 1 du/5 acres)
7. Zoning: R-1 (Single-family residence), A-1-2 (Light agriculture), and A-2-2 (Heavy agriculture)
8. Description of Project: The proposed project would modify Approved TTM 60922 within the development footprint of the Skyline Ranch property. Modifications include a realignment of Skyline Ranch Road, reduction by 40 residential lots (but inclusion of 284 units of age-qualified homes and a recreation center), modifications to housing product types, extension of trails and bikes lanes, and relocation of park and recreation center sites.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Surrounding uses near the project site include undeveloped, open space to the north and northeast, residential uses in the City of Santa Clarita to the south and southwest, and residential uses in the community of Forest Park to the east.
10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required: None.
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### 4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| $\square$ | Aesthetics |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | Biological Resources |
| $\square$ | Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| $\square$ | Land Use / Planning |
| $\square$ | Population / Housing |
| $\square$ | Transportation / Traffic |

Agricultural and Forest Resources<br>$\square$ Utilities / Service Systems

$\square$ Air Quality
Cultural Resources $\square$ Geology / Soils
Hazards \& Hazardous Materials $\square$ Hydrology / Water Quality
$\square$ Mineral Resources $\square$ Noise
$\square$ Public Services $\square$ Recreation
$\square$ Mandatory Findings of Significance

### 4.3 DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:
$\square$ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
$\square$ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

$\square$
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

$\square$
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

## Signature

Printed Name

## Date

For
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### 4.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

In Section 5.0, the Addendum identifies the incremental effects of the Modified Project in comparison with the Approved Project. This comparative analysis has been undertaken, pursuant to the provisions of CEQA, to provide the factual basis for determining whether any changes in the project or its circumstances or any new information requires additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

The incremental environmental changes of the Modified Project may involve one or more of the following: (1) new significant environmental impacts, (2) a substantial increase in severity of significant impacts previously identified, (3) substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken involving such new impacts or such a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts, or (4) new information of substantial importance as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. Under these circumstances, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR. If the incremental changes of the Modified Project result in no impacts and/or minor technical additions or additions, the lead agency shall prepare an addendum. Therefore, the analysis in Section 5.0 will determine whether a supplemental/subsequent EIR or addendum is the appropriate means to analyze the Modified Project. The bases for findings listed in the Environmental Checklist are explained in Section 5.0, Environmental Analysis.

### 4.4.1 Terminology Used in the Checklist

For each question listed in the Environmental Checklist, a determination of the level of significance of the impact is provided. Impacts are categorized in the following categories:

Substantial Change in Project or Circumstances Resulting in New Significant Effects. A Subsequent EIR is required when 1) substantial project changes are proposed or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would be undertaken, 2) those changes would result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and 3) project changes require major revisions to the EIR (CEQA Guidelines $\$ 15162$ ).

New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR. A Subsequent EIR is required if new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the EIR was certified shows 1) the project would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the EIR; 2) significant effects previously examined would be substantially more severe than shown in the EIR; or 3) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible (or new mitigation measures or alternatives are considerably different) and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative (CEQA Guidelines § 15162).

New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined. A Subsequent EIR is required if new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the EIR was certified shows that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible (or new mitigation measures or
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alternatives are considerably different) and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative (CEQA Guidelines §15162). A Supplement to an EIR can be prepared if the criterion for a Subsequent EIR is met, but only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the EIR adequately apply to the Modified Project (CEQA Guidelines § 15163).

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. An Addendum to the EIR is required if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary and none of the criteria for a subsequent EIR are met (CEQA Guidelines § 15164).

No Impact. A designation of No Impact is given when the Modified Project would cause no changes to the environment as compared to the original project analyzed in the EIR.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

This section provides evidence to substantiate the conclusions in the environmental checklist. The section will briefly summarize the conclusions of the 2010 Skyline Ranch EIR and then discuss whether or not the Modified Project is consistent with the findings contained in the Skyline Ranch EIR. Mitigation measures referenced are from the Skyline Ranch EIR.

### 5.1 AESTHETICS

### 5.1.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.E, Visual Qualities, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

## Construction Impacts

Development of the Approved Project would cause temporary visual impacts during construction, which is estimated to last approximately seven years. The grading operation would remove native vegetation and alter the natural landform of approximately 622 acres onsite. Other site preparation activities include roads, sewers, water, streets, dry utilities, entry monumentation, and landscaping/irrigation. These temporary activities would substantially degrade the visual quality of the site, mostly impacting the neighborhood to the southwest of the proposed development area due to the higher elevation of this neighborhood relative to the site. Single-family communities west of the project site near the intersection of Whites Canyon Road and the proposed Skyline Ranch Road would also observe landform alterations. Impacts of construction activities would be significant and unavoidable until construction activities are completed.

## Visual Impacts

Photo simulations were prepared to illustrate the conceptual design, massing, and views of the Approved Project from short-range and long-range views. To reduce significant impacts on views toward the project site, onsite landscaping mitigation is provided. However, impacts associated with the change in views from the existing residential neighborhood to the west-particularly from residences west of the project site that are oriented to the east-would remain significant and unavoidable due to the alteration of a scenic vista and the modification of hillsides and ridgelines.

## Light and Glare

Implementation of the Approved Project would introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site and surrounding areas. Project lighting would be typical of lighting in other residential neighborhoods south and west of the project site. Lighting will be shielded and concentrated along streets to the interior of the development area, rather than along the edges of the site. Lighting impacts would be less than significant.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Glare is primarily a daytime occurrence caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light by highly polished surfaces, such as window glass or reflective materials and, to a lesser degree, from broad expanses of light-colored surfaces. The Approved Project would use building materials that are nonreflective in nature and typical of residential development throughout the area. Therefore, the project was not anticipated to have a significant impact associated with glare.

### 5.1.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | No Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |  |  |  |  | X |
| d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features? |  |  |  | X |  |
| e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? |  |  |  | X |  |

## Comments:

## a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Impacts to visual quality are due to the alteration of landform and development of rural hillside areas. As approved, the character of the Skyline Ranch master-planned residential community has a scenic backdrop, primarily to the north and northeast of natural open space consisting of vegetated steep terrain, canyons, and ridgelines. The proposed modifications to the Approved Project would consist of realigning Skyline Ranch Road, reducing residential lots by 40 units (but including 284 units of age-qualified homes and a community center), modifying housing product types, relocating and expanding park and recreation center sites, and extending multipurpose trails and bike lanes. These modifications would occur within the development footprint of the Approved Project, and no additional grading or construction would occur outside of the developable area analyzed in the previously certified EIR. Grading quantities would be reduced from 20.8 million cy each of cut and fill to 17.1 million cy of cut and 16.9 million cy of fill under the Modified Project.
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The Modified Project would shift the location of the residential lots within the project site farther north, away from existing uses to the south and west of the site (see Figure 4, Approved TTM vs. Proposed Concept Plan). Therefore, views from the south and west toward the Skyline Ranch community and rural hillsides to the north would be improved in comparison to the Approved Project. Figures 8 through 10, Visual Simulation Comparison, compare the visual impacts of the Approved and Modified Projects' development. The development footprint of the Approved Project is shown in purple, and the footprint of the Modified Project is shown in orange. Seven viewpoints from the south and west of the project site were chosen to represent major public views toward the site and are numbered on Figures 8 through 10:

1. Sierra Highway looking northeast
2. Sierra Highway looking west
3. Hawks Ridge Drive and Canyon Creek Drive looking west
4. Via Princessa and Whites Canyon looking north
5. Todd Longshore Park looking east
6. Canyon high School looking east
7. Canyon Springs Elementary School looking northeast

Table 4 compares the seven viewsheds' impact percentages based on development of the Approved Project and that of the Modified Project. The impact percentages compare how much of the complete viewshed ( 100 percent) is changed by development of the Approved and Modified Projects.

Table 4 Visual Simulation Impacted Comparison

| Viewshed <br> No. | Location | Impact Percentage |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Approved Project | Modified Project | Percentage Change |  |
| 1 | Sierra Highway looking northeast | $2.72 \%$ | $2.88 \%$ | $0.16 \%$ |
| 2 | Sierra Highway looking west | 5.07 | 6.08 | 1.01 |
| 3 | Hawks Ridge Drive and Canyon Creek Drive looking <br> west | 4.77 | 1.12 | -3.65 |
| 4 | Via Princessa and Whites Canyon looking north | 1.36 | 0.85 | -0.51 |
| 5 | Todd Longshore Park looking east | 3.14 | 1.28 | -1.86 |
| 6 | Canyon High School looking east | 3.30 | 1.05 | -2.25 |
| 7 | Canyon Springs Elementary School looking <br> northeast | 4.15 | 2.06 | -2.09 |

All seven views toward the project site would have a decrease in impact percentage with the exception of Views 1 and 2 from Sierra Highway. However, this is because the Modified Project does not require expansive grading of the hillsides shown in Views 1 and 2, and would actually preserve the natural topography of the hills. Also, the changes in percentage impacted for Views 1 and 2 are nominal, approximately 0.2 and 1.0 percent, respectively.

Overall, scenic views looking toward the residential community under the Modified Project would be less impacted and remain more in character with existing conditions compared to development of the Approved
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Project. Therefore, the proposed modifications would have no new significant impact to scenic vistas in the project area.

## b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The Bouquet Canyon Trail, Mint Canyon Trail, and one unnamed trail are in the vicinity of the project site and are part of the approved adopted County trail system detailed in the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. The Bouquet Canyon Trail is approximately one mile northwest of the site and generally follows Bouquet Canyon Road. The Mint Canyon Trail is immediately north and northeast of the project site in an area proposed to remain as open space and adjacent to Sierra Highway and Sand Canyon Road.

Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would include a trail easement of approximately 2.2 miles that would connect to the Mint Canyon Trail to the north and the existing Plum Canyon fire road to the south. The proposed development under the Approved and Modified Projects would not be visible from the Mint Canyon or Bouquet Canyon trails due to irregular topography looking southerly toward the developable area. Therefore, modifications to the Approved Project would have no new significant impacts to regional trails.
c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. The project site is not visible from a designated scenic highway, and the Modified Project would not impact scenic resources within a state scenic highway (Caltrans 2011). The incremental differences of the proposed modifications to the recorded map do not result in substantial impacts to scenic resources. Therefore, no new significant damage to scenic resources would occur as a result of the Modified Project or changed circumstances.
d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Skyline Ranch Road would maintain its approved roadway crosssection details, including roundabouts at intersections within the project boundary. Modifications include reducing the number of residential lots by 40 units (but including age-qualified housing and a community center) and modifying housing product types (see Tables 2 and 3). As detailed in Table 3, the Modified Project would have fewer and smaller houses compared to the Approved Project, and the lots would be shifted north within the project site, farther away from existing residential uses to the west and south. The homes would be built with a similar character to the existing suburban community. Therefore, these modifications would not degrade the visual character or quality of the proposed Skyline Ranch community.

Figure 8 - Visual Simulation Comparison - Part 1
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Figure 9 - Visual Simulation Comparison - Part 2
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Figure 10 - Visual Simulation Comparison - Part 3
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e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Outdoor nighttime lighting in residential areas is generally limited to security lighting and street lighting. The reduced development footprint and 40 -unit reduction in residential lots under the Modified Project would reduce the overall need for lighting in the developable area of the project site. Additionally, similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would be required to comply with the exterior lighting, signage, parking lot, and security standards of the Los Angeles County Code.

General requirements include maximum fixture heights, shielding standards, and limits on the intensity of light that can be reflected onto neighboring properties (light trespass). Compliance with existing codes would ensure that lighting would not result in outdoor illumination that would exceed established standards. Therefore, nighttime lighting and glare impacts would not be greater than those identified in the certified EIR, and impacts would remain less than significant.

### 5.1.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

## Construction Impacts

4.E-1 During construction, the applicant or his contractors shall locate equipment, stockpiles, and staging areas out of direct public or private view to the extent feasible.

## Visual Impacts

4.E-2(a) To reduce the significant aesthetic impact associated with graded slopes and paved terrace drains along the southern entrance to the project site, the slopes on both sides of proposed Skyline Ranch Road shall be revegetated and landscaped as soon as feasible following grading and roadway development. Landscaping in this area shall be selected and planted to screen proposed terrace drains from public views and to merge ornamental and native materials such that sharp contrasts in form and color with undeveloped areas are avoided.
4.E-2(b) A landscape plan for the planned residential development shall be prepared by a Landscape Architect with a plant palette that will merge ornamental and native materials such that shape contrasts in form and color are avoided with adjacent undeveloped areas. Trees and shrubs on streets, slopes and ridgelines should emphasize mounded rather than columnar forms (such as palm trees and cypress). Plantings on the hillsides to the south and east of the entry road shall be specifically selected, sized, and placed to soften angular forms created by grading at the interface of manufactured slopes and natural hillsides. Furthermore, every effort shall be made as grading plans are finalized and during grading to create rounded landforms that are generally reflective of the natural topography of the area. Planting of common landscape areas shall be undertaken as soon as possible following grading to avoid prolonged view degradation. Landscaping on the site shall be routinely maintained by a homeowners association and/or through Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC\&Rs)
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throughout the life of the project. The landscape plan shall be subject to review and approval by the County prior to issuance of any grading permits.

### 5.1.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

### 5.2.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

Impacts to agricultural resources were closed out in the Initial Study prepared for the 2010 Certified EIR. The Approved Project would have no impact on prime, unique, or farmland of Statewide importance; would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract; would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland; would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; and would not involve other changes to the existing environment that may involve the conversion of either farmland or forest land to non-farm or non-forest land.

### 5.2.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information <br> Showing <br> Greater <br> Significant <br> Effects than <br> Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? |  |  |  |  | X |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract? |  |  |  |  | X |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code §51104(g))? |  |  |  |  | X |
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| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information <br> Showing <br> Greater <br> Significant <br> Effects than <br> Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  |  |  | X |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  |  |  | X |

## Comments:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

No Impact. The Modified Project would not involve changes outside of the development footprint already analyzed in the 2010 Certified EIR. Therefore, similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would have no impact on prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. Based on the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Zoning Map, the developable area of the project site (southern 492 acres) is zoned R-1 (Single-family residence) and does not have land under Williamson Act contracts (Los Angeles 2012b, DOC 2013). The remaining undevelopable area of the project site is zoned A-1-2 (Light agriculture) and A-2-2 (Heavy agriculture); however, no development is proposed in these areas. Thus, no impact would occur.
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section $12220(\mathrm{~g})$ ), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. Although the northern portion of the project site is zoned A-1-2 and A-2-2, no development is proposed in these areas. Therefore, no impact would occur.
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. See response to Section 5.2.2(c), above.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to nonforest use?

No Impact. See response to Section 5.2.2(b) and (c), above.
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### 5.2.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

No mitigation measures related to agricultural resources were outlined in the 2010 Certified EIR.

### 5.2.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would have no impact on agriculture or forestry resources.

### 5.3 AIR QUALITY

### 5.3.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.H, Air Quality, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

## Construction Impacts

Construction of the Approved Project has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the project site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition and construction activities. Based on project construction emissions modeling, regional emissions from construction phases would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) daily significance thresholds for $\mathrm{PM}_{10}, \mathrm{PM}_{2.5}, \mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$, and volatile organic compounds (VOC). Regional construction emissions for $\mathrm{SO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ would not exceed daily significance thresholds. Therefore, project construction activities would result in a temporary but significant and unavoidable regional air quality impact.

Based on localized construction air quality analysis, development of the Approved Project could cause exceedance of the $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ incremental thresholds but would not cause ambient concentrations to exceed $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ or CO ambient air quality standards. Localized impacts to $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ would be significant and unavoidable.

An assessment of toxic air contaminants (i.e., diesel particulate emissions) yielded that the project would not emit carcinogenic or toxic air contaminants that individually or cumulatively exceed the maximum individual cancer risk of ten in one million. Additionally, compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1166 and 1113 would limit the amount of VOC emissions from potentially contaminated soils or architectural coating sand solvents. Thus, no construction activities or building materials would create objectionable odors.

## Operational Impacts

Operational emissions would be generated by area and mobile sources as a result of normal day-to-day activities on the project site. At buildout and in full operation, the project would generate total emissions that would exceed the SCAQMD recommended thresholds for regional $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{VOC}, \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}, \mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$, and $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$. Thus, operational emissions would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. Additionally, the Approved Project would contribute to regionwide emissions on a cumulative basis, and therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impact is concluded to be significant and unavoidable.
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Additionally, single-family residences on the project site would be occupied while later phases of construction activities would be occurring. Concurrent construction and operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD daily thresholds for $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}, \mathrm{PM}_{10}, \mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$, and VOC. Thus, regional air quality impacts from concurrent construction and operational activities would be significant and unavoidable.

Based on traffic intersection analysis for local area CO impacts, the Approved Project would not have a significant impact upon 1-hour or 8 -hour local CO concentrations due to mobile source emissions (primarily vehicle exhaust). Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be significantly affected by CO emissions generated by the net increase in traffic. Localized operational air quality impacts would be less than significant.

The Approved Project would not generate substantial quantities of toxic air contaminants (TACs). Any air pollutants to the project vicinity which would be well below any levels that would result in a significant impact on human health. As such, no significant impact on human health would occur.

The Approved Project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Therefore, the Approved Project would not create adverse odors as discussed above and would have no impact related to objectionable odors.

## AQMP Consistency

The determination of air quality management plan (AQMP) consistency is primarily concerned with the longterm influence of the Approved Project on air quality in the Southern California Air Basin (SoCAB) and whether or not a project will exceed the assumptions utilized in preparing the AQMP. Although the project may cause an exceedance of the localized $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ significance criteria, this exceedance would be short-term in nature. This impact would only occur during the grading phase of project construction and would not have a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet state and federal air quality standards. In addition, the Approved Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 and would implement all feasible mitigation measures for control of $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$. Also, the Approved Project would be consistent with the goals and policies of the AQMP for control of fugitive dust. Therefore, the Approved Project would be consistent with AQMP strategies to bring the SoCAB into $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ attainment. With regard to the second criterion, the Approved Project is well within and consistent with the population growth for the subregion identified in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan and subsequent updates. Consequently, the Approved Project would be consistent with local air quality plans and policies.

### 5.3.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

## Regulatory Background

The environmental and regulatory settings for the Modified Project have changed since certification of the 2010 Certified EIR. The following discussion is provided to update conditions relative to development of the Modified Project.
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The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for $\mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{PM}_{2.5}, \mathrm{PM}_{10}$, and lead (Los Angeles County only) under the California and National AAQS and nonattainment for $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ under the California AAQS (CARB 2014a). ${ }^{1,2}$ SCAQMD prepares an AQMP that details measures taken to achieve the national and California AAQS. The most recent AQMP is the 2012 AQMP.

## SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan

SCAQMD is responsible for preparing the AQMP for the SoCAB in coordination with SCAG. After the Skyline Ranch EIR was certified in 2010, SCAQMD adopted the 2012 AQMP, which employs the most up-to-date science and analytical tools and incorporates a comprehensive strategy aimed at controlling pollution from all sources, including stationary sources, on- and off-road mobile sources, and area sources. It also addresses several state and federal planning requirements, incorporating new scientific information, primarily in the form of updated emissions inventories, ambient measurements, and new meteorological air quality models. The 2012 AQMP builds upon the approach identified in the 2007 AQMP for attainment of federal PM and ozone standards and highlights the significant amount of reductions needed. It also highlights the urgent need to engage in interagency coordinated planning to identify additional strategies, especially in the area of mobile sources, to meet all federal criteria air pollutant standards within the time frames allowed under the Clean Air Act. The 2012 AQMP demonstrates attainment of federal 24-hour $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ standard by 2014 and the federal 8-hour ozone standard by 2023. It includes an update to the revised EPA 8-hour ozone control plan with new commitments for short-term $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and VOC reductions. The plan also identifies emerging issues—ultrafine $\left(\mathrm{PM}_{1.0}\right)$ particulate matter and near-roadway exposure and an analysis of energy supply and demand.

The SCAQMD is in the process of updating the AQMP. The 2016 AQMP will address strategies and measures to attain the 2008 federal 8-hour ozone standard by 2032 and the 2012 federal annual $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ standard by 2021. The 2016 AQMP will also take an initial look at the 2015 federal 8-hour ozone standard. It will also update previous attainment plans for ozone and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ that have not yet been met (SCAQMD 2015).
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Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |  |  |  | X |  |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? |  |  |  | X |  |

## Comments:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. By reducing residential development, the Modified Project would reduce impacts on housing and population projections within the SCAG region and would reduce vehicle trips relative to the Approved Project since fewer homes would be developed. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD's AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant.
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The Modified Project would develop 40 fewer residential homes and require less grading compared to the Approved Project. The Modified Project would require 17.1 million cy of cut and 16.9 million cy of fill, approximately 18 and 19 percent less cut and fill than the Approved Project. The Modified Project would also reduce the number of residential lots by 40 and would result in a decrease in vehicle trips compared to that analyzed in the 2010 Certified EIR. This would result in a decrease of construction- and operational-phase air pollutant emissions due to a decrease in area, energy, and mobilesource emissions. Overall, air quality impacts would be less than generated by the Approved Project. The incremental difference would result in a beneficial impact. Mitigation measures applied for the previous project would be applicable to the proposed project.
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c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for $\mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{PM}_{10}, \mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$, and lead (Los Angeles County only) under the California and National AAQS, and nonattainment for $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ under the California AAQS (CARB 2014a). In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the daily threshold values does not add significantly to a cumulative impact (SCAQMD 1993). The CalEEMod modeling included in the 2010 Certified EIR demonstrates that unmitigated concurrent operation and construction emissions associated with the Approved Project would exceed thresholds for $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}, \mathrm{PM}_{10}, \mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$, and VOC.

The modifications to the project would result in a decrease of construction and operational air pollutant emissions compared to the Approved Project due to the decrease in residential units ( 40 fewer units). Mitigation measures applied for the Approved Project would also be applicable to the proposed Modified Project.

## d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Sensitive receptors near the project site include residential areas to the west and south of the site, Canyon High School, Leona Cox Community School, Montessori Preschool, Super-8 Motel, Santa Clarita Little People Daycare and Preschool, and Travel Lodge (Los Angeles 2010). As stated above, the construction activities associated with the Approved Project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations that exceed $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ incremental thresholds. Construction equipment used to develop the Modified Project would be same as that of the Approved Project and would include, but not be limited to, concrete mixers, heavy-duty trucks, scrapers, dozers, graders, backhoes, pavers, and front-end loaders. Given that the Modified Project would reduce grading quantities, the overall development footprint, and the number of residential lots onsite, construction activities and associated pollutant concentrations would also be slightly reduced in the project area. Overall, development of the Modified Project would have a beneficial impact compared to the Approved Project.

## e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The Modified Project would not emit objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. The threshold for odor is if a project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which states:

A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.
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The types of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. Residential developments are not associated with foul odors that constitute a public nuisance; therefore, odor impacts would be less than significant.

During construction activities, equipment exhaust and application of asphalt and architectural coatings would temporarily generate odors. Any construction-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent, and would not affect a significant number or people. Neither the Approved Project nor the Modified Project would generate substantial odors, and impacts would be less than significant.

### 5.3.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

The following mitigation measures were taken directly from the 2010 Certified EIR. All of these mitigation measures apply to and would be implemented for the Modified Project. Modifications to the original mitigation measures reflect changes in current emission control technologies and are identified in strikemt to indicate deletions and underlined/bold to signify additions.

## Construction Emissions

(1) Regional Emissions
4.H-1(a) Develop and implement a construction management plan, as approved by the County of Los Angeles prior to issuance of a grading permit, which includes the following measures recommended by the SCAQMD to implement SCAQMD Rule 403.
a. Ground cover shall be replaced in disturbed areas as quickly as practicable;
b. Soil stabilizers/dust suppressants shall be applied to inactive disturbed areas in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface;
c. Haul roads and site access roads shall be watered no less than three times daily;
d. Disturbed surfaces shall be watered no less than two times daily;
e. All stockpiles shall be covered with tarps as soon as practicable;
f. Travel speed on unpaved surfaces shall not exceed 15 miles per hour;
g. Provide a publicly visible sign and directly notify property owners in the vicinity of a contact person and telephone number to call regarding dust complaints; the contact person shall respond with appropriate corrective actions within 24 hours;
h. Prohibit construction vehicle idling in excess of 10 minutes;
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i. Stockpiles, haul routes, staging locations, and parking areas shall be located as far as possible from adjacent residential uses;
j. Pave or place gravel on all construction access roads at least 100 feet on to the site from the main road;
k. Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference;

1. Provide temporary traffic controls when construction activities have the potential to disrupt traffic to maintain traffic flow (e.g., signage, flag person, detours);
m . Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours (e.g., between 7:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M. and between 10:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M.);
n. Develop a construction traffic management plan that includes the following measures to address construction traffic that has the potential to affect traffic on public streets:

- Consolidate truck deliveries
- Provide temporary dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off of the site;
o. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second stage smog alerts. Contact the SCAQMD at 800/242-4022 for daily forecasts;
p. Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary fossil fuel powered generators; and
q. Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment and pile drivers instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.
4.H-1(b) Maintain construction equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust emissions.
4.H-1 (c) All on-site heavy-duty construction equipment shall be equipped with diesel particulate traps as feasible.
(2) Local Emissions

Please refer to Mitigation Measures 4.H-1 (a), 4.H-1(b), and 4.H-1(c) above.

## Operational Emissions

(1) Regional Emissions
4.H-2(a) Subdivisiond buildings will be required to exceed Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (also known as the California Building Standards Code) 20052016 Building and Energy Efficiency requirements by 15 percent.
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4.H-2(b) Lighting for public streets, parking areas, and recreation areas shall utilize energy efficient light and mechanical, computerized or photo cell switching devices to reduce unnecessary energy usage.
(2) Concurrent Construction and Operational Activity

Please refer to Mitigation Measures 4.H-1 (a), 4.H-1(b), 4.H-1(c), 4.H-2(a), and 4.H-2(b) above.

### 5.3.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### 5.4.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.C, Biological Resources, of the 2010 Certified EIR.
As part of the Approved Project, approximately 1,355 acres in the northern portion of the project site would be dedicated or designated natural open space and managed through the establishment of the SRCA, which includes the Plum Canyon vernal pool and four artificial pools on the southern portion of Cruzan Mesa. Additionally, the Approved Project would provide approximately 21.6 acres for preservation as a "Mitigation Exchange Area" for 21.6 acres of preserve area that would be disturbed in the adjacent Tract 46018 due to the construction of Skyline Ranch Road.

## Sensitive Plant Species

Three plant species on the California Native Plant Society's List 4 were detected onsite: Paso Robles navarretia, Peirson's morning-glory, and Palmer's grappling hook. However, their susceptibility to threat is considered low. The loss of these species resulting from the Approved Project is not expected to reduce regional population levels such that their existence is threatened. Therefore, impacts to these plant species are considered less than significant. Additionally, 43 acres (approximately 5,300 plants) of slender mariposa lily were mapped onsite. Only one acre (approximately 100 plants) would be impacted by the project; therefore, impacts are not considered to be substantial.

## Sensitive Wildlife Species

A number of sensitive wildlife species or special-status species were either observed onsite or have the potential to occur onsite due to the presence of suitable habitat; however, considerable habitat for these species would be preserved onsite within the SRCA. Additionally, focused surveys for the Riverside fairy shrimp, San Diego fairy shrimp, and coastal California gnatcatcher did not detect any of these species within the study area. Thus, impacts to sensitive wildlife species are less than significant.
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## Sensitive Plant Communities

Development of the project would impact coastal sage scrub (CSS), disturbed CSS, coastal sage-chaparral scrub, sycamore riparian woodland, and holly-leafed cherry scrub. Additionally, the Approved Project may result in temporary impacts to vegetation communities within a 50 -foot grading buffer zone surrounding the permanent grading development footprint. Impacts to these plant communities would be significant prior to mitigation. Thus, the SRCA was proposed as part of the project to offset project impacts on the identified sensitive plant communities.

## Wildlife Movement

Proposed open space areas in the northern portion of the project site would continue to foster wildlife movement between areas of the Angeles National Forest to the north and west (i.e., Lake Hughes, San Francisquito Canyon, Bouquet Canyon) and areas to the east and south (i.e., Placerita Canyon State Park, Tujunga Wash). In addition to the project's proposed SRCA, the Approved Project avoids impacts to the Cruzan Mesa, which contributes additional resources (i.e., water, foraging areas, vegetative cover) to facilitate wildlife movement. Therefore, impacts on wildlife movement corridors would be less than significant.

## Jurisdictional Areas

Approximately 5.22 acres of waters of the U.S. under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and 9.30 acres of streambed under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) would be permanently impacted by the Approved Project. Mitigation is provided to reduce impacts to these jurisdictional areas.

## Oak Trees

The Approved Project would require the removal of two coast live oak trees (one onsite and one offsite in the City of Santa Clarita). The project applicant would be required to obtain oak tree removal permits from the city and County and replace the oak trees as detailed in the mitigation measure below.

### 5.4.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Regulatory Background

## Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA

Significant Ecological Areas are officially designated areas within the County for their biological value. These areas warrant special management because they contain biotic resources that are considered rare or unique, are critical to the maintenance of wildlife, represent relatively undisturbed areas of County habitat types, or serve as linkages.

After the Skyline Ranch EIR was certified in 2010, the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update: One Valley One Vision was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on November 27, 2012. As part of the updated plan, the Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA was adopted. A significant portion of the SEA is within the northern portion of the Skyline Ranch project site.
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The Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA includes mesas, canyons, and interior slopes, with Plum Canyon creek running east-west through the southern portion of the overall SEA. Uplands in the SEA consist of slopes and canyons supporting coastal sage scrub or scrub-chaparral vegetation. The Cruzan Mesa vernal pool complex lies within an elevated, topographically enclosed basin atop an eroded foothill between Mint and Bouquet canyons. The Plum Canyon vernal pool, situated in a landslide depression on a hillside terrace, is smaller than the Cruzan Mesa pools, but possesses the same essential vernal pool characteristics as the larger system, and the two areas together form an ecologically functional unit.

Wildlife diversity and abundance within the SEA are moderate, commensurate with the relative homogeneity of the natural open space habitat types. A number of local wildlife species are more or less dependent upon coastal sage scrub or scrub-chaparral formations, and other species are strictly limited to seasonal pool habitats. The vernal pools, when ponded, form aquatic habitats for a moderately diverse fauna of freshwater arthropods and other invertebrates, including native fairy shrimp, aquatic flies, diving beetles, water scavengers, ostracods, and snails. The only insect order presently known to have a vernal pool endemic within the SEA is Coleoptera, with one vernal pool ground beetle species thus far having been found.

Amphibians are relatively common in coastal sage scrub habitats with persistent surface hydrology during the breeding season, and the SEA supports abundant populations of Pacific chorus frog, western toad, and western spadefoot toad. At least two species of salamander may also be present within more moist areas of the surrounding canyons and chaparral.

Reptile populations in the SEA include numerous lizard species, including San Diego banded gecko, yucca night lizard, side-blotched lizard, western fence lizard, western skink, San Diego alligator lizard, coastal western whiptail, San Diego horned lizard, and silvery legless lizard. A robust snake fauna also would be expected within the SEA, including western blind snake, coachwhip ("red racer"), chaparral whipsnake, coastal patch-nosed snake, California rosy boa, San Diego gopher snake, California kingsnake, California mountain kingsnake, night snake, and southern Pacific rattlesnake.

Bird diversity within the SEA is related to habitat opportunities for year-round residents, seasonal residents, migrating raptors, and song birds. Open coastal sage scrub hosts a suite of birds typical of such sites at lower elevations over most of the coastal slopes of Southern California. The most productive sites for resident coastal sage scrub and chaparral birds are around riparian and freshwater systems, which also attract large numbers of migrants during spring and fall. The vernal pools attract moderate numbers of migrating waders and waterfowl, and provide important winter foraging areas for resident and migratory birds of prey. Coastal sage and chaparral birds resident or breeding within the SEA include ashy rufous-crowned sparrow, Bell's sparrow, black-chinned sparrow, lark sparrow, California thrasher, spotted towhee, California towhee, phainopepla, northern mockingbird, lazuli bunting, and several species of hummingbird, with additional species (western meadowlark, California horned lark, and perhaps also savannah and grasshopper sparrows) nesting and foraging in the grassland and ruderal habitats surrounding the vernal pools. Birds of prey observed around the vernal pools include red-tailed hawk, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, prairie falcon, and golden eagle. Barn owl, great horned owl, and common raven all nest in the cliffs surrounding Cruzan Mesa.
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Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by CDFW or USFWS? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by $\S 404$ of the Clean Water Act or California Fish and Wildlife Code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? |  |  |  | X |  |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? |  |  |  | X |  |
| e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than $10 \%$ canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan? |  |  |  | X |  |
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## Comments:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The Modified Project would include a realignment of Skyline Ranch Road, reduction of 40 residential lots (but inclusion of age-qualified homes and a community center), modifications to housing product types, relocation and expansion of park and recreation center sites, and extension of multipurpose trails and bike lanes. These modifications would be within a reduced 492-acre development footprint compared to the 622 -acre footprint of the Approved Project. Additionally, the proposed 1,355 -acre SRCA would preserve suitable habitat for sensitive and special status species within the project site. Thus, no new significant impacts or impacts of greater severity than those previously identified in 2010 Certified EIR would occur.
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As stated above, the Modified Project would consist of minor modifications within the 622 -acre development footprint of the previously analyzed 2010 Certified EIR. Developable acres would be further reduced to 492 acres under the Modified Project, and the proposed SRCA would preserve 1,355 acres of natural plant habitat onsite. Therefore, no new significant impacts than previously identified would occur.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by $\mathbb{\$} 404$ of the Clean Water Act or California Fish and Wildlife Code $\$ 1600$, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Development of the Modified Project would be within the 622acre footprint of the Approved Project previously analyzed and mitigated for in the 2010 Certified EIR. The proposed SRCA would preserve jurisdictional areas of the Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW vernal pools and artificial pool habitats, as detailed in the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for the Approved Project. No new significant impacts would occur under the Modified Project.
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The modifications to the Approved Project would occur within the development footprint previously analyzed in the 2010 Certified EIR. The proposed SRCA would preserve approximately 1,355 acres of contiguous open space, which would protect wildlife movement within and through the project site. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not impact the
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Cruzan Mesa vernal pools that are frequented by migrating waterfowl. Thus, no new substantial impacts would occur.
e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than $10 \%$ canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Similar to the Approved Project, development of the Modified Project would require the removal of the one isolated mature coast live oak tree onsite that has a 32 -inch diameter at breast height, and also potentially remove the one coast live oak trees offsite near the proposed installation of a 78 -inch storm drain in the City of Santa Clarita. Although the offsite coast live oak is not within the alignment the storm drain, trenching required for the installation of the storm drain falls within the drip line of the tree and could damage the root system. Therefore, the developer would be required to obtain oak tree removal permits from both the County and city. Mitigation from the 2010 EIR would also require oak tree restoration onsite. Thus, the Modified Project would not introduce new substantial impacts.
f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, $\mathbb{\$} 22.56 .215$ ), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As stated above, the County of Los Angeles has an oak tree ordinance (Los Angeles County Code Sections 22.56 .2050 through 22.56 .2260 ) that prohibits removal or damaging of oak trees and includes guidelines to avoid impacts to oak trees and their protected zones. The project applicant would be required to obtain oak tree removal permits to remove the two oak trees that would be impacted by development.

The County also has a wildflower reserve area ordinance, which protects wildflowers in designated areas, identified in the County code by section, township, and range numbers (Los Angeles County Code $\rrbracket$ 12.36.020). The project site is not in any of the areas identified as wildflower reserve areas. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

A significant portion of the Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA falls within the northern portion of the project site. However, the development footprint of both the Approved and Modified Projects would be outside of the boundary, and no impact would occur to the SEA.

Overall, the Modified Project consists of minor technical changes to the Approved Project. No significant impacts to local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur.
g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As stated above, a significant portion of the Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA falls within the northern portion of the project site. However no development would occur within
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the SEA boundary. The proposed SRCA would preserve the northern 1,355 acres of the project site as open space. No new substantial impacts would occur under the Modified Project.

### 5.4.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

## Sensitive Vegetation Communities

4.C-1 Mitigation for grading and fuel modification impacts (calculated 200 feet beyond the limits of grading) to 467.9 acres of combined coastal sage scrub and disturbed coastal sage scrub (452.3 acres within on- and off-site, and 15.6 acres within on- and off-site fuel modification zones), 77.0 acres of coastal sage-chaparral scrub ( 69.9 acres within on- and off-site grading and 7.1 acres within on- and off-site fuel modification zones), and 2.8 acres of holly-leafed cherry scrub ( 2.1 acres within on-site grading and 0.7 acre within on- and off-site fuel modification zones) shall be provided by establishing a 1,355 acre conservation area [Skyline Ranch Conservation Area (SRCA)] within the northern portion of the study area as shown in Figure 2-3, Aerial View-Development and Conservation Area, of the Skyline Ranch EIR. The applicant shall cause the preservation of this 1,355-acre area through either a Declaration of Restrictions or a Conservation Easement, or dedication or transfer of the land to a conservation organization committed to the preservation of the land in perpetuity. A Declaration of Restrictions, Conservation Easement, or similar recorded instrument shall be placed and recorded in this area to ensure its long-term preservation. The applicant shall arrange for the long-term management of the property to ensure the long-term persistence of the property's biological resources through a nonprofit organization, conservationoriented entity, or entity with experience in biological resource conservation approved by the County. The applicant shall provide long-term funding to assure the management of the property to protect its biological resources in perpetuity. The SRCA includes approximately 623.9 acres of coastal sage scrub, 115.8 acres of disturbed coastal sage scrub, 248.6 acres of coastal sage-chaparral scrub, and 10.6 acres of holly-leafed cherry scrub. This area shall be preserved as natural open space. These 1,355 acres provide substantial ecological value based on the quantity, quality, and regional value of the habitats preserved.

Establishment of the 1,355-acre SRCA shall achieve the following performance standards:

1. Provision of sufficient quantity of habitat to offset vegetation impacts associated with the proposed project. When considering coastal sage scrub, disturbed coastal sage scrub, coastal sage-chaparral scrub, and holly-leafed cherry scrub collectively, this 1,355-acre area will provide close to 2:1 preservation of like and contiguous habitats [1,354.6 acres preserved vs. 642.1 acres impacted ( 621.7 acres impacted by grading and 20.4 acres impacted by fuel modification)]. Preserved habitats are similar to those impacted by the project and most vegetation communities (with the exception of sycamore woodland), regionally common species, and special status plant and wildlife species impacted by the project are represented within the SRCA.
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2. An on-going maintenance and management program shall be adequately funded and implemented to ensure the long-term integrity of biological resources within the 1,355acre SRCA. Direct and indirect degradation of habitat shall be prevented in part through steep topography that separates the SRCA from the proposed development area and through the prohibition or restriction of uses within the SRCA.
3. The SRCA shall include signage, where appropriate, and other management practices to discourage off-road vehicles, domestic pets, and other activities harmful to natural lands.
4. Any continued use of lands within the SRCA (such as film-making) shall be subject to approval by the SRCA habitat manager and restricted to uses that are not incompatible with the resource conservation objectives of the SRCA.
5. A 21.6 -acre Mitigation Exchange Area shall be provided to replace the 21.6 acres of preserve area that would be disturbed within Tract 46018 due to the construction of Skyline Ranch Road. This shall be established separately from the SRCA through an agreement between the applicant, Shapell-Monteverde Partnership (owner of the recorded Tract 46018), the Army Corps of Engineers, and the County of Los Angeles.
6. Following grading operations any areas that have been disturbed within the 50 -foot grading buffer zone; which includes coastal sage scrub (10.7 acres), disturbed coastal sage scrub ( 6.1 acres), coastal sage-chaparral scrub ( 3.3 acres), non-native grassland (1.8 acres), disturbed ( 0.8 acres), holly-leaved cherry scrub ( 0.7 acres) and sycamore riparian woodland ( 0.2 acres), shall be restored to pre-graded conditions by a qualified biologist. Restoration shall be designed to provide the same vegetation resources and habitat value as those removed within the buffer zone. At the end of all project grading, proposed restoration actions within the buffer zone (if necessary) shall be presented in a restoration plan provided to the County. Following approval by the County, restoration shall be initiated and completed according to the approved restoration plan.

Mitigation for impacts to sycamore riparian woodland (including 96 sycamore trees and nine Fremont cottonwood trees) is discussed in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2.

## Jurisdictional Areas

4.C-2 As detailed in the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates (GLA), mitigation for impacts to 5.22 acres of Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction, none of which consists of jurisdictional wetlands, and 9.30 acres of California Department of Fish and $G$ Wildlife $(C D F G \underline{\mathbf{W}})$ jurisdiction (of which 2.91 acres is vegetated riparian habitat) shall be accomplished by the applicant through the following:

1. The preservation of 1,355 acres of natural open space within the SRCA through the use of a conservation easement or the dedication of such land to a qualified conservation organization. This 1,355-acre area includes approximately 5.35 acres of Corps and
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RWQCB jurisdiction, none of which consists of jurisdictional wetlands and approximately 5.71 acres of CDFG $\underline{\mathbf{W}}$ jurisdiction (of which 0.31 acre is vegetated riparian habitat).
2. The preservation of 1.53 acres of southern vernal pool and artificial pool habitats within the SRCA subject to RWQCB jurisdiction.
3. On-site establishment of 7.27 acres of sycamore/cottonwood riparian woodland within Plum Canyon.

As described further in the HMMP, the proposed 7.27-acre sycamore riparian woodland (mitigation site) will be established within portions of Plum Canyon on-site within the SRCA as shown in Figure 4.C-7, Proposed Conservation and Mitigation Areas, on page 4.C.74. Hydrology is currently present at the mitigation site and the mitigation site supports Cortina sandy loam and Saugus loam which are conducive to the establishment of sycamore riparian woodland. A Corps-approved reference site will be used prior to implementation of the mitigation program to provide the necessary data to measure the performance of the mitigation site.

The plant palette for the proposed mitigation site includes the planting of two riparian species: 727 one-gallon containers of Fremont cottonwood and 1,818 one-gallon containers of western sycamore. One-gallon upland buffer species will also be planted including chamise, hoaryleaf ceanothus, California buckwheat, deerweed, coast prickly pear, snake cholla, scrub oak, white sage, black sage, and our Lord's candle. A seed mix of 12 native shrub and herbaceous species will also be used.

The planting of a sycamore riparian woodland in the vicinity of the hollyleafed cherry woodland is not intended to, nor is it expected to, result in an inadvertent conversion of the riparian area from holly-leafed cherry to sycamore woodland. The creation of 7.27 acres of sycamore riparian woodland within Plum Canyon within the SRCA is expected to provide an overstory on the edges of the holly-leafed cherry woodland that replicates the conditions currently found in Drainage 5 (where impacts are proposed). Onsite occurrences of both species indicate that they can exist concomitantly without the risk of conversion from one type to another altogether. With appropriate spacing and the use of drip irrigation on the planted sycamores, the existing swath of holly-leafed cherry will not be adversely affected by the addition of the sycamore riparian woodland.

The HMMP includes a number of features to ensure the success of the mitigation site including supervision by a qualified habitat restoration specialist, a 5 -year qualitative and quantitative monitoring program, contractor education, the use of mycorrhizal fungi, supplemental irrigation, regular maintenance (e.g., exotic vegetation control, pest control, trash removal), and adaptive management assurances.
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The Hybrid Functional Assessment (HFA) conducted by GLA (2009) concluded that the proposed project, considering off-setting mitigation measures, would result in a 25 percent increase in the total functionality of the aquatic features remaining within the SRCA after project implementation.

In addition to the measures proposed above, the project will require permits from the ACOE under section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under section 401 of the CWA, and from the CDFG $\underline{\mathbf{W}}$ under section 1602 of the State Fish and Game Code. Should the Corps, RWQCB, and/or CDFG $\underline{\mathbf{W}}$ impose additional or greater mitigation measures on the project for these impacts, those measures - to the extent that they exceed what is required by the measures contained herein - may be substituted for the measures set forth herein, as the County does not intend to require the project to mitigate twice for the same impact once the project has already mitigated the impact below a level of significance.

## Nesting Birds

4.C-3 In order to avoid impacts to nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and raptors protected by State Fish and Game Code, project grading and vegetation removal should take place outside of the nesting season, roughly defined as mid-February to midAugust. If grading or vegetation removal is to take place during the nesting season, a biologist acceptable to Los Angeles County shall be present during vegetation clearing operations to search for and flag active nests so that they can be avoided. A raptor survey will also be required in the unnamed canyon prior to the fill of that drainage. An avoidance buffer of 100 to 500 feet (exact radius to be determined by the monitoring biologist) will be fenced around any active raptor nests and impacts to nests will be avoided until after the nesting season is over. After mitigation the anticipated impact on nesting birds is less than significant. The results of the nesting bird construction monitoring will be provided in writing to the CDFG $\underline{\mathbf{W}}$ and County Department of Regional Planning (DRP).

## Trees

4.C-4 To mitigate the loss of the coast live oak on-site ( 32 inches diameter at breast height [dbh]) in the southeastern section of the study area, an oak tree permit will be obtained from the County. The impacted oak tree will be replaced at a minimum ratio of $10: 1$ in the appropriate location at the interface between development and undeveloped areas. This ratio is in excess of the mitigation ratio set forth in the County ordinance, which is $2: 1$.

No mitigation is necessary for oak woodlands regulated under SB 1334 because no oak woodlands occur within the study area.

The loss of two California junipers within mixed coastal sage chaparral scrub shall be replaced in the landscaping scheme along roadways and in parks and other recreational areas at a minimum ratio of $3: 1$. Trees grown from local area stock shall be used, along with salvaged trees from the development area where possible.
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#### Abstract

To mitigate the potential loss of the coast live oak off-site, the Applicant shall obtain an oak tree removal permit from the City of Santa Clarita for the coast live oak tree that may be adversely impacted by trenching for the proposed 78 -inch pipeline installation, prior to initiation of pipeline trenching and construction. To the extent feasible, impacts to areas within the drip line (or root system) should be avoided during construction.


## Indirect Impacts - Invasives

4.C-5 To mitigate potentially significant indirect impacts to open space areas adjacent to fuel modification zones due to the possible spread of invasive plant species, the proposed project shall incorporate the use of native plant species to the maximum extent practicable and avoid the use of plant species known to be highly invasive adjacent to open space areas. The plant palette for the fuel modification areas adjacent to open space areas shall be consistent with the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Fuel Modification Plan Guidelines and shall focus on native species provided in the table of desirable plant species.

### 5.4.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 5.5.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

According to the Certified EIR, a records search conducted at the California State University, Fullerton, Archaeological Information Center showed that three prehistoric archaeological sites, one historic period archaeological site, and five isolated finds were reported as a result of previous work and recent surveying. The prehistoric sites were subjected to Phase II testing (i.e., subsurface testing and laboratory analysis), and the historic complex was subjected to a site-specific historical records search to develop a context for determining potential significance. The results of these Phase II archaeological studies indicated a low probability for the sites to provide additional information in that the sites are not considered unique archaeological resources as defined in Section 21083.2 of the PRC. However, because archaeological resources were found within the project site, there is potential for construction and grading to uncover unknown subsurface cultural materials.

A records search was also performed by the Los Angeles Museum of Natural History to determine the paleontological sensitivity of the site. The record search determined that there is high fossil sensitivity onsite due to the terrestrial Pliocene Saugus Formation near and within the project area. Also, a fossil horse was located within the project boundary on the east side of the Cruzan Mesa SEA. Overall, the project site has
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high paleontological sensitivity. Mitigation is provided to ensure impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources are minimized to less than significant.

### 5.5.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

## Regulatory Background

## Assembly Bill 52

Under the California Public Resources Code Sections 21073 et seq., the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act (Assembly Bill 52 [AB 52]) took effect July 1, 2015, and incorporates tribal consultation and analysis of impacts to tribal cultural resources (TCR) into the CEQA process. It requires TCRs to be analyzed like any other CEQA topic and establishes a consultation process for lead agencies and California tribes. Projects that require a Notice of Preparation of an EIR or Notice of Intent to adopt a ND or MND on or after July 1, 2015, are subject to AB 52. A significant impact on a TCR is considered a significant environmental impact, requiring feasible mitigation measures.

TCRs must have certain characteristics:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes (must be geographically defined), sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that are either included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources or included in a local register of historical resources.
2. The lead agency, supported by substantial evidence, chooses to treat the resource as a TCR.

The first category requires that the TCR qualify as a historical resource according to PRC Section 5024.1. The second category gives the lead agency discretion to qualify that resource-under the conditions that it supports its determination with substantial evidence and considers the resource's significance to a California Tribe. The following is a brief outline of the process.

1. A California Native American tribe asks agencies in the geographic area with which it is traditionally and culturally affiliated to be notified about projects. Tribes must ask in writing.
2. Within 14 days of deciding to undertake a project or determining that a project application is complete, the lead agency must provide formal written notification to all tribes who have requested it.
3. A tribe must respond within 30 days of receiving the notification if it wishes to engage in consultation.
4. The lead agency must initiate consultation within 30 days of receiving the request from the tribe.
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5. Consultation concludes when both parties have agreed on measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect to a TCR, OR a party, after a reasonable effort in good faith, decides that mutual agreement cannot be reached.
6. Regardless of the outcome of consultation, the CEQA document must disclose significant impacts on TCRs and discuss feasible alternatives or mitigation that avoid or lessen the impact

Given that AB 52 only recently took effect, the previously certified 2010 EIR did not analyze impacts related to tribal cultural resources. The County of Los Angeles also does not include tribal cultural resources as part of its adopted CEQA checklist. However, impacts of the Modified Project on tribal cultural resources are analyzed below using the Office of Planning and Research's proposed update to the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist (see Section 5.5.2(e), below).

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial Change in Project or Circumstances Resulting in New Significant Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous ElR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | No Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? |  |  |  | X |  |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? |  |  |  |  | X |
| e) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074? |  |  |  |  | X |

## Comments:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines $\mathbb{\$ 1 5 0 6 4 . 5 ?}$

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The development footprint of the Modified Project is reduced and within the footprint of the Approved Project. The entire site is vacant and undeveloped. Grading of the Modified Project would not involve any demolition of existing structures or buildings that may have historic significance. Thus, no impact would occur to any historic resources, and the Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially altered conditions in comparison to the Approved Project.
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b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines $\mathbb{\$ 1 5 0 6 4 . 5}$ ?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As discussed above, archaeological resources were discovered onsite; however, Phase II testing determined that the resources were not significant. Similar to the Approved Project, implementation of the Modified Project would involve grading activities that may unearth previously undiscovered archaeological resources. Therefore, mitigation from the 2010 Certified EIR is provided to ensure impacts remain less than significant. The Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially altered conditions in comparison to the Approved Project.
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The record search performed for the Approved Project by the Los Angeles Museum of Natural History determined the project site to have high paleontological sensitivity. Grading activities associated with the Modified Project would be reduced compared to the Approved Project; however, it would still involve grading of the majority of the developable area. Any excavations in the Saugus Formation or Mint Canyon Formation have a high chance of discovering significant fossil vertebrate remains. Thus, mitigation is provided to ensure impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources are minimized to less than significant. However, the Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially altered conditions in comparison to the Approved Project.

## d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No Impact. California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5; CEQA Section 15064.5; and Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98 mandate the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery. Specifically, California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5 , requires that if human remains are discovered on a project site, disturbance of the site shall remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Although soil-disturbing activities associated with development of the Modified Project could result in the discovery of human remains, compliance with existing law and applicable mitigation measure from the Certified EIR would ensure that significant impacts to human remains would not occur.
e) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?

No Impact. As part of the Certified 2010 EIR, the NAHC performed a records search of its Sacred Land Files for a one-mile radius around the project site to determine the presence of Native American resources.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

The record search did not indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the area that may be impacted by the Skyline Ranch project development. The NAHC also forwarded a list of Native American groups or individuals that may have additional information on the project area. These groups or individuals were notified of the Skyline Ranch project and asked for input. However, there were no responses to the inquiry. Given the results of the Native American consultation, it is unlikely that there are significant tribal cultural resources onsite. The modifications to the Approved Project would be developed within a reduced development footprint. Therefore, there would be no additional potential to affect other tribal cultural resources on the project site. No impact would occur.

### 5.5.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

## Archaeological Resources

4.D-1 (a) Archaeological Monitoring. At the commencement of project grading or construction, all workers associated with earth disturbing activities (particularly remedial grading and excavation) shall be given an orientation regarding the possibility of exposing unexpected archaeological material and/or cultural remains by a qualified archaeologist who satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (prehistoric/historic archaeology) pursuant to 36 CFR 61. The archaeologist shall also instruct the workers as to what steps are to be taken if such a find is encountered. Due to the moderate sensitivity and possibility of buried cultural materials within the project area, it is recommended that initial grading and ground disturbing activities in areas determined to be sensitive (primarily those areas proximal to recorded sites) be monitored by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology (prehistoric/historic archaeology) pursuant to 36 CFR 61. The archaeologist shall have the authority to stop work if sensitive or potentially significant cultural remains are discovered during excavation or ground disturbing activities. Test excavations may be necessary to reveal whether such cultural materials are significant. In the event the archaeologist indicates that a significant or unique archaeological/cultural find has been unearthed, grading operations shall cease in the affected area until the geographic extent and scientific value of the resources can be reasonably verified. Upon such discoveries, the archaeologist shall notify the applicant and Los Angeles County. Any excavation and recovery of resources shall be performed by a qualified archaeologist using standard archaeological techniques. If necessary, a mitigation plan shall be formulated. Work in the area shall only resume with the approval of the project archaeologist. Artifacts, notes, photographs, and other project materials recovered during the monitoring program shall be curated at a facility meeting federal and state standards.
4.D-1(b) Human Remains. If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will
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then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Native American, who will have 24 hours to make a formal recommendation as to disposition of the remains. All work associated with the remains will be done respectfully, and with recognition that the remains are considered sacred. All work in the area of the remains will be monitored by an authorized representative of the MLD.

## Paleontological Resources

4.D-2(a) Paleontological Survey and Treatment Program. Prior to the implementation of grading or construction related activities, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to survey the project area to relocate known fossil localities, and determine the most sensitive areas. Following the survey, a paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation program will be developed that will include salvage of known fossil resources, areas that will be monitored during project-related earth-moving activities. The paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation program shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to construction grading activities. The program shall define specific procedures for construction monitoring; emergency discovery; sampling and data recovery, if needed; museum storage of any specimen and data recovered; preconstruction coordination; and reporting.
4.D-2(b) Paleontological Monitoring. The paleontologist shall monitor earth-moving construction activities at depths determined to be sensitive as specified in the County approved monitoring plan. Monitoring will not be conducted in areas where the ground has been previously disturbed or in areas where exposed sediment will be buried, but not otherwise disturbed.
4.D-2(c) Paleontological Data Recovery. Prior to the start of grading or construction related activities, construction personnel involved with earth-moving activities shall be informed of procedures to follow if fossil remains are encountered. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered during construction-related earth-moving activities, all work shall cease within the immediate area and be redirected elsewhere until the paleontological monitor has evaluated the situation and provided recommendations for the protection of, or mitigation of adverse effects to, significant paleontological resources assessed. Upon such discoveries, the contractor shall notify the applicant and Los Angeles County. Procedures for mitigating potential impacts to significant paleontological resources shall follow the monitoring and mitigation program previously developed under this mitigation measure. Construction work within this area shall resume upon approval from the principal project paleontologist.

### 5.5.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### 5.6 ENERGY

### 5.6.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The topic of energy was not discussed in the 2010 Certified EIR. The 2014 version of the County's checklist includes an energy section, and Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines discusses energy.

### 5.6.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

## Regulatory Background

## Los Angeles County Green Building Standards

The green building standards of Los Angeles County (County Code Title 22, Chapter 22.52, Part 20) are required for all new development to reduce water, energy, natural resources, and solid waste; reduce impacts to infrastructure; and promote a healthier environment.

The green building standards apply to new residential and commercial projects that file for building permits after January 1, 2009. Exemptions include agricultural accessory structures, registered historic sites, and firsttime tenant improvements with a gross floor area of less than 10,000 square feet.

Projects that file for building permits with five dwelling units or more (the category under which the proposed project would fall) must meet the County's green building standards:

- Energy Conservation: Buildings must reduce energy demand by at least 15 percent below Title 24 (2005 Update).
- Outdoor Water Conservation: A smart irrigation controller must be installed for any landscaped area of the project.
- Indoor Water Conservation: All tank-type toilets installed must be high efficiency with a maximum 1.28 gallons per flush.
- Resource Conservation: At least 65 percent of construction waste (by weight) must be recycled.
- Tree Planting: A minimum of two 15-gallon trees must be planted and maintained for each singlefamily residence lot. At least one of the trees must be listed on the drought-tolerant approved plant list.

In addition to the green building standards, projects of five residential units or more must demonstrate compliance with another certification program. Applicants may choose from the following certification programs: Green Point Rated (GPR), California Green Builder (CGB), or Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED).
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Title 21, Subdivisions, Section 21.24.440, Green Building, of the Los Angeles County Building Code requires all subdivision projects to follow the County's green building standards outlined in Title 22, Chapter 22.52, Part 20 of the County code.

## Environmental Setting

Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project site is within the service area of Southern California Edison, which supplies both electricity and natural gas in the area. Table 5 summarizes the energy used by the residential and nonresidential sectors in Los Angeles County between 2006 and 2013 (most recent data available).The average electricity consumption between 2006 and 2013 was $69,589.52$ million kilowatt hours (kWh) per year, with a high of 73,783 million kWh in 2008 and a low of 66,597 million kWh in 2011. The average natural gas consumption between 2006 and 2013 was $3,055.22$ million therms, with a high of 3,130.53 million therms in 2013 and a low of 2,950.07 million therms in 2009.

Table 5 Historic Energy Use in Los Angeles County, 2006-2013

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electricity <br> (millions of kWh) | $70,662.03$ | $70,812.65$ | $73,783.84$ | $70,149.49$ | $67,323.12$ | $66,597.58$ | $69,277.09$ | $68,110.33$ |
| Natural Gas <br> (millions of therms) | $3,001.95$ | $3,028.12$ | $3,033.47$ | $2,950.07$ | $3,125.79$ | $3,121.43$ | $3,050.37$ | $3,130.53$ |
| Source: CEC 2013a 2013b |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CEQA Guidelines Appendix F

In the 2010 update of the state's CEQA Guidelines, Appendix F was added to assure that energy implications are considered as part of the project approval process. All potentially significant energy impacts shall be considered in an EIR to the extent relevant and applicable to the project.

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial Change in Project or Circumstances Resulting in New Significant Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31) |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)? |  |  |  | X |  |

## a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project falls under the County's Green Building category of "residential projects with 5 or more dwelling units," which means housing must be constructed in compliance with the County's green building standards as well as the
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requirements of GPR, CGB, or LEED. This requirement applies to all projects requiring building permits after January 1, 2010.

Additionally, the Director of Public Works must approve all project applications for building permits and verify that the project has complied with the County's green building standards as well as one of the additional sets of standards, or their equivalent, as described in the County Code (Title 22, Chapter 22.52, Part 20). The Modified Project would be required to demonstrate this compliance; without compliance, the project would not be issued building permits.

Both the Approved and Modified Projects would fall under the category of residential projects of five units or more and would be required to comply with the County's green building standards. The Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially altered conditions in comparison with Approved TTM 60922.

## b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Electricity demand was not calculated for the Approved Project. Based on a projected total of 1,260 units, the Approved Project would have used $10,372,440 \mathrm{kWh}$ of electricity per year and 597,320 British thermal units (BTUs) (or 6.0 therms) of natural gas per year. The Modified Project proposes 1,220 residential units (a decrease of 40 units), which would slightly decrease the projected use of electricity and natural gas per year by $330,681 \mathrm{kWh} / \mathrm{yr}$ and $19,043 \mathrm{BTUs} / \mathrm{yr}$ ( 0.2 therms), respectively (see Table 6).

Table 6 Approved Project vs. Modified Project, Projected Energy Use

| Units | Population ${ }^{1}$ | CEC Electricity Demand Rate (kWh/capita/yr) | CEC Natural Gas Demand Rate (BTUs/capita/yr) | Projected Electricity Use (kWh/yr) | Projected Natural Gas Use (BTUs/yr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approved Project |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1,260 units | 4,360 | 2,379 | 137 | 10,372,440 | 597,320 |
| Modified Project |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1,220 units | 4,221 | 2,379 | 137 | 10,041,759 | 578,277 |
|  |  |  | Difference | (330,681 kWh/yr) | (19,043 BTUs/yr) |
| Source: USDOE 2008. <br> Notes: $\mathrm{kWh}=$ Kilowatt hours; BTU = British thermal units; yr = year; CEC = California Energy Commission <br> ${ }^{1}$ Based on an average of 3.46 persons per household in Los Angeles County from the 2010 US Census Bureau census tract data for tracts $9200.32,9200.33$, and 9200.34. |  |  |  |  |  |

As described in the analysis for Section 5.6.2 (a), the Modified Project would also be required to incorporate the County's green building standards as well as demonstrate compliance with another green building certification program, such as GPR, CGB, LEED, or an equivalent, as approved by the Director of Public Works. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to meet the California 2008 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and the Title 24 Net-Zero Building Standards. By meeting these requirements, total energy use would be further reduced.
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The development of the Modified Project would result in a lower usage of electricity and natural gas than the Approved Project, which would be a beneficial impact.

### 5.6.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

The 2010 Certified EIR did not include mitigation measures related to energy resources.

### 5.6.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR and would not result in significant impacts related to energy.

### 5.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

### 5.7.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.A, Geotechnical Resources, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

According to the Certified EIR, the Approved Project would be exposed to strong seismic ground shaking if an earthquake occurs along major faults in the vicinity; however, the project would conform to International Building Code (IBC) standards which include design requirements to reduce potential for significant damage to structures from seismic activities. The IBC and County of Los Angeles building standards, including those associated with hillside management, would ensure impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant.

Canyons within the project site contain very coarse-grained alluvial deposits, landslide debris, and terrace deposits, which are subject to liquefaction. Additionally, much of the sloping terrain onsite have potential for earthquake-induced landslides. Mitigation is provided to ensure potentially significant impacts due to settlement and landsliding are reduced to less than significant levels.

Approximately $20,800,000$ cubic yards of soil would be graded within the southern 622 acres of the site and on 33.7 acres of adjacent property to the east, west, south, and southwest. Most of the offsite grading is associated with the extension of roadways. A few areas onsite would be exposed to surficial instability and debris flow hazard. Therefore, mitigation in the form of drainage ditches, impact walls, slop design, berms, and drainage swales is provided to reduce impacts to less than significant.

The extensive excavation and grading associated with the Approved Project could also result in substantial soil erosion regardless of compliance with applicable best management practices and required erosion control plans. Mitigation is provided to reduce soil erosion impacts to less than significant levels.
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### 5.7.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical report:

- Geotechnical Report Amended Tentative Tract Map 060922, Canyon Country, County of Los Angeles, California, LGC Valley, Inc., March 28, 2016.

A complete copy of the study is included in Appendix A.
Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information <br> Showing <br> Greater <br> Significant <br> Effects than <br> Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: |  |  |  |  |  |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map issues by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |  |  |  |  | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? |  |  |  |  | X |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading? |  |  |  |  | X |
| iv) Landslides? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? |  |  |  |  | X |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? |  |  |  |  | X |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? |  |  |  |  | X |
| f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element? |  |  |  | X |  |
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## Comments:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Impact. The Modified Project site is the same as the Approved Project site and is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. There are also no known or potentially active faults that pass through the site. The nearest active faults to the site are the San Gabriel Fault, approximately 4.3 miles to the southwest of the site, and the Holser Fault, approximately 5 miles to the west of the site. Given the distance and lack of active faults across the site, potential damage due to ground rupture from nearby faults is considered nil (LGC 2016). Thus, the modifications to the Approved Project would have no impact on the project's susceptibility to ground rupture.

## ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No Impact. As discussed above, the Skyline Ranch project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no active faults pass through the site. However, the project site is situated in southern California, which is a seismically active area. Therefore, seismic ground shaking is anticipated to occur from time to time. Similar to the Approved Project, development in accordance with the Modified Project would be required to comply with the IBC, California Building Code, and County regulations to reduce seismic hazards to persons and structures. Therefore, the proposed modifications to Approved TTM 60922 would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to seismic strong ground shaking compared to those already analyzed in the Certified EIR.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

No Impact. Seismic-related ground failure can include lateral spreading (shallow ground rupture), liquefaction, and seismically induced settlements.

## Lateral Spreading

Lateral spreading due to active faulting is not likely to occur on site due to the lack of active or potentially active fault traces across the site. Therefore, this is not considered a significant hazard.

## Liquefaction

Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated, granular soils behave similarly to a fluid when subject to high-intensity ground shaking. Liquefaction occurs when three general conditions exist: 1) shallow groundwater; 2) low density noncohesive (granular) soils; and 3) high-intensity ground motion. Liquefaction is typified by a buildup of pore-water pressure in the affected soil layer to a point where a total loss of shear strength occurs, causing the soil to behave as a liquid. Studies indicate that saturated,
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loose to medium dense, near-surface cohesionless soils exhibit the highest liquefaction potential, while dry, dense, cohesionless soils and cohesive soils exhibit low to negligible liquefaction potential.

Due to the presence of shallow bedrock at the site, complete removal of loose alluvial materials beneath compacted fills, and the general lack of shallow groundwater, the site is considered to have a low liquefaction hazard.

## Seismically Induced Settlements

During a strong seismic event, seismically induced settlement can occur within loose to moderately dense, dry or saturated granular soil. Settlement caused by ground shaking is often not uniformly distributed, which can result in differential settlement. Mitigation Measure 4.A-1 from the Certified EIR would ensure that all unsuitable materials would be removed and recompacted in the grading of the site to mitigate potential for seismic settlement.

Overall, modifications to the Approved Project would not result in new or substantially more severe seismic-related ground failure impacts.

## iv) Landslides?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As identified in the Certified EIR, much of the sloping terrain on the project site has been delineated a Seismic Hazard Zone with potential for earthquakeinduced landslides. The Modified Project would reduce cut and fill quantities based on the modifications to Approved TTM 60922, including the realignment of Skyline Ranch Road, relocation of the park sites, and revisions to the product types. As stated above, the Modified Project would reduce cut and fill quantities to 17.1 million cy of cut and 16.9 million cy of fill, decreasing grading quantities under the Approved Project by approximately 18 and 19 percent, respectively.

The design and construction of the Modified Project would still be required to comply with provisions of the IBC, CBC, Los Angeles County Municipal Code, and grading ordinances, which are intended to reduce hazards to persons and damage to structures. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.A-2 would require that landslide soils be removed and recompacted or designated Restricted Use Areas. Therefore, while the proposed modifications to the Approved Project would result in changes to the project's grading footprint and volumes, these changes would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to landslides.

## b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Erosion is the movement of soil and rock from place to place. Erosion occurs naturally by agents such as wind and flowing water; however, grading and construction activities can cause substantial erosion if effective erosion-control measures are not used. Common means of soil erosion from construction sites include water, wind, and being tracked offsite by vehicles.

The Modified Project would eliminate 40 residential lots, relocate park sites, and realign Skyline Ranch Road. These modifications would significantly decrease the project's required grading areas and volumes.
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Additionally, the realignment of Skyline Ranch Road to the east would preserve much of the site's western portion as is and would not cause substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil in the area.

Regardless, both the Approved and Modified Projects would result in exposed slopes that require proper planting and landscaping for the most effective erosion control. Similar to the Approved Project, implementation of the Modified Project would also be required to comply with best management practices, required erosion control plans, and other regulatory requirements (e.g., IBC and CBC standards). Mitigation Measure 4.A-5 from the Certified EIR requires that finer soils be placed and compacted in the upper five feet of fill slopes to reduce the amount of infiltration and erosion. Cut slopes exposing erodible soils would require stabilization with engineered fill. Overall, impacts associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

No Impact. As discussed above in Sections 5.7(a) and (b), implementation of the Modified Project in conjunction with applicable mitigation measures from the Certified EIR would ensure that impacts from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, and collapse are less than significant. The Modified Project would be on the same geologic unit and soil as the Approved Project and would have a reduced development footprint. Thus, the changes proposed by the Modified Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to unstable geologic units and soils.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No Impact. The vast majority of the soils on the project site are within very low and low expansion index ranges. However, expansive rock units within the Saugus Formation are located in the westerly portion of the project site. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure 4.A-4 from the Certified EIR, which ensures that expansive soils are overexcavated between 7 and 10 feet to mitigate potential for differential expansion. The changes proposed by the Modified Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to expansive soil.
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. Neither the Approved nor Modified Projects would include septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Modified Project would include sewers connecting to nearby sewer mains. No impact would occur and the proposed modifications would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to alternative wastewater disposal systems than those already analyzed in the 2010 Certified EIR.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

## f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The 2010 Certified EIR did not discuss impacts related to the Hillside Management Area (HMA) Ordinance. The County Board of Supervisors adopted an update to the HMA ordinance as part of the 2035 General Plan Update in March 2015. The HMA ordinance protects resources in significant ecological areas, as specified in the County General Plan, from incompatible development that may result in or have the potential for environmental degradation. Additionally, Section 22.56.217 (Hillside Management Areas - Additional Regulations) was added to the updated HMA ordinance. This section was established to ensure that development preserves and enhances the physical integrity and scenic value of HMAs, provides open space, and is compatible with and enhances community character.

The Conservation and Natural Resources Element of the 2035 General Plan includes Figure 9.8, Hillside Management Areas and Ridgeline Management Map, which indicates that the developable footprint of the Modified Project is in an area that has HMAs (slopes greater than 25 percent). A conditional use permit (CUP) is required for any development located wholly or partially in an HMA, including the proposed project. A CUP is granted when several findings are made. The following table provides a consistency analysis of the Modified Project with the HMA Ordinance. As shown, the Modified Project would meet the criteria of HMA compliance and impacts would be less than significant.

## Table 7 HMA Ordinance Consistency Analysis

1. The proposed development preserves the physical integrity of HMAs to the greatest extent feasible, resulting in lesser amount of impacts to hillside resources, by: locating development outside of HMAs to the extent feasible, locating development in the portions of HMAs with fewer hillside constraints, and using sensitive hillside design techniques tailored to the site requirements;
2. That the proposed development preserves the scenic value of HMAs to the extent feasible, resulting in lesser amount of impacts to on-site and off-site scenic views of slopes and ridgelines as well as to views of other unique, site-specific aesthetic or significant natural features of the hillside by: locating development outside of HMAs to the extent feasible, locating development in the portions of HMAs with the fewest hillside constraints; and using sensitive hillside design techniques tailored to the site requirements;
3. That the proposed development is compatible with or enhances community character, and provides open space as requires in this Section;

Consistent: The Modified Project would have a smaller development footprint than the Approved Project-492 acres compared to 622 acres in the southern third of the project site. The northern 1,355 acres would be preserved as natural open space in the Skyline Ranch Conservation Area. Additionally, as shown on Figure 4, Approved TTM vs. Proposed Concept Plan, the Modified Project would not impact a large portion of slopes and hills in the southwestern portion of the site (west of Skyline Ranch Road) compared to development of the Approved Project. Overall, the Modified Project would reduce grading quantities by approximately 18 and 19 percent for cut and fill, respectively. This preserves the physical integrity of the HMAs to the greatest extent feasible.
Consistent: As indicated in Sections 5.1.2(a) through (e), implementation of the Modified Project and applicable mitigation measures would ensure impacts to scenic views of slopes, ridgelines, and significant natural features of the hillsides are minimized. The Modified Project would shift the residential lots further north within the project site, away from existing views toward the Skyline Ranch community and northern hillsides; thereby reducing impacts on scenic vistas (see Figures 8 through 10, Visual Simulation Comparison).
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|  | design of the project would complement the surrounding natural area <br> and match similar adjacent developments. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. That the proposed development is in compliance with the |  |
| Hillside Design Guidelines. | The remaining northern 1,355 acres of the project boundary would be <br> preserved as natural open space in the Skyline Ranch Conservation <br> Area. |
| Consistent: The Approved Project complied with the Los Angeles <br> County Subdivision Section Code 22.56.215 Hillside Management <br> and Significant Ecological Areas guidelines and the density controlled <br> Development Code 22.56.205. The Modified Project would have a <br> smaller development footprint than the Approved Project as shown on |  |
| Figure 4, Approved TTM vs. Proposed Concept Plan, and would not |  |
| impact a large portion of slopes and hills in the southwestern portion |  |
| of the site (west of Skyline Ranch Road) compared to development of |  |
| the Approved Project. |  |

### 5.7.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

The following mitigation measures have been carried through from the 2010 Certified EIR.

## Liquefaction/Dry Seismic Settlement

4.A-1 The following materials are considered unsuitable and shall be removed and recompacted in the grading of the site: existing fill soils, colluvial deposits and slopewash, alluvial deposits, landslide debris, and terrace deposits. Their removal and recompaction mitigate the potential for seismic settlement.

## Landslides

4.A-2 Landslide deposits within the limits of the planned grading shall be completely removed and replaced with competent material during site grading. The locations of landslide deposits to be removed are identified in the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by LGC Valley (dated March 28, 2016). The actual depth of stripping or overexacavation shall be determined during grading based on field observations by a qualified geotechnical consultant.

Landslides (or portions thereof) that remain in place and are not removed and recompacted following the grading of the project site shall be designated as Restricted Use Areas, in accordance with Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) requirements. Landslides designated as Restricted Use Areas and landslides that are removed and recompacted are identified in the Geotechnical Investigations prepared by GeolabsWestlake Village (dated March, 6, 2004, August 23, 2004, January 3, 2005, November 16, 2006, April 13, 2007, and August 28, 2008).
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## Slope Stability

4.A-3(a) Interior slopes with daylighted bedding conditions shall be analyzed for appropriate buttress design. Tall cut slopes in the southerly portion of the site are anticipated to expose friable, uncemented bedrock zones and large cobbles and boulders. Several of these slopes require stabilization in order to mitigate the potential for raveling and dislocation of cobbles and boulders. All stability fills and buttresses shall be provided with backdrains and shall incorporate the generalized stability fill key dimensions for the "refacing" of planned cuts slopes.
4.A-3(b) Fill caps for cut/fill lots shall be constructed to provide uniform foundational support for future structures. Shallow cut lots and cut/fill lots shall be provided with a minimum 5 -foot cap of compacted fill. Cut/fill lots underlain by 10 feet or less of compacted fill on the fill portion of the lot shall have the cut portion overexcavated a minimum of 5 feet below finish grade and replaced with compacted fill, thus providing a fill cap with a minimum 5 -foot fill thickness. For those transition lots with 10 to 20 feet of fill on the fill side, the cut side shall be provided with a minimum 7 -foot-thick fill cap. For those transition lots with in excess of 20 feet of fill on the fill side, the cut side shall be provided with a minimum 10 -foot-thick fill cap. Fill caps shall extend a minimum of 5 feet beyond the perimeter footings.

Where the backslope is $3: 1$ or steeper, the last bench prior to reaching the undercut shall be at least 15 feet in width. The 15 -foot-wide bench is intended to reduce the steep dip of the fill-bedrock contact commonly created during undercutting.
4.A-3(c) All vegetation, trash debris, or other deleterious material shall be stripped from the area to be graded. These materials shall be removed from the site and deposited at a local landfill or recycled on site. Soils bearing sparse grasses may be thoroughly mixed with at least ten parts clean soil and incorporated into the engineered fill. Other materials shall be removed from the site.
4.A-3(d) Fill slopes, which toe onto sloping ground, shall be founded in bedrock, below the compressible surface soils. The key shall be at least 20 feet wide and 3 feet deep (measured on the downslope side). The bottom of the key shall be graded so that there is at least 1 foot of fall across its width (toward the upslope side). The key shall be located in front of the toe of slope (as shown on the plan) so that the outside limit of the key lies at or beyond a $1: 1$ projection from the planned toe of the slope.
4.A-3(e) Fill-over-cut slopes shall have the fill founded on a 20 -foot-wide bench cut into the bedrock or, where bedrock is not present in the cut portion of the slope, on a key cut below the toe of the slope. The 20 -foot bench shall be graded to provide at least 1 foot of fall toward its upslope side. If keyed below the toe of slope, then the key shall be at least 20 feet wide, 3 feet deep (below the toe), and tilted (at least 1 foot) into the slope. The cut portion of the slope shall be exposed (and observed by a representative of a qualified geotechnical firm) prior to constructing the fill portion of the slope.
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4.A-3(f) Exposed surfaces shall be scarified, moistened, or air-dried, as appropriate, and compacted to 90 percent of the material's maximum dry density prior to placement of fill.
4.A-3 (g) Where the ground slopes steeper than $5: 1$ (horizontal:vertical), the fill shall be properly benched into bedrock.
4.A-3(h) All fill slopes shall utilize mixed soils [sand with some proportion of fines; i.e., clayey sand] in the outer 20 feet of the fill slope in order to minimize the potential for surficial slope deterioration.
4.A-3(i) Fill materials shall be placed in thin lifts, watered to near the material's optimum moisture content (or to near two percent over optimum moisture content and compacted to the applicable level of relative compaction prior to placing the next lift).
4.A-3(j) The 90 percent relative compaction standard applies to the face of fill slopes. This may be achieved by overfilling the constructed slope and trimming to a compacted finished surface, rolling the slope face with a sheepsfoot, or any method that achieves the desired product.
4.A-3(k) All retaining walls constructed within the project site shall be constructed in accordance with the Los Angeles County Building Code requirements and a design-level geotechnical investigation.
4.A-3(l) Backfill for retaining walls shall be properly compacted. An impervious cap shall be provided at the top of the backfill to retard infiltration of water.
4.A-(m) Slope setbacks set forth in the Los Angeles County Building Code shall be applied to residences and appurtenant structures. Structures situated within the setback area shall require special foundation design, which might include deepening footings, pile/caisson construction, and/or consideration of creep loads.
4.A-3(n) Backfill for utility trench excavations shall be compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. Where installed in sloping areas, the backfill shall be properly keyed and benched.
4.A-3(o) Those lots exposed to ascending natural slope conditions shall be provided with drainage ditches or swales, berms or impact walls, and/or small slopes descending from the pads to the natural slopes, to provide protection from potential debris flow hazard.

## Expansive Soils

4.A-4 Expansive lithologies shall be overexcavated where encountered within lots and streets in order to mitigate the potential for differential expansion. The depth of such overexcavation shall range between 7 and 10 feet.
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## Soil Erosion

4.A-5 During grading, soils containing significant fines content (cohesive soils) shall be preferentially placed in the outer five feet of fill slopes. In addition, the required 90 percent relative compaction standard shall be applied to the outer face of fill slopes in order to reduce the amount if infiltration and erosion. Cut slopes exposing erodible bedrock formations shall require stabilization with engineered fill.

### 5.7.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions in comparison to the to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

### 5.8.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.S, Global Climate Change, of the 2010 Certified EIR., which evaluated the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts of the Approved Project.

## GHG Emissions

GHG emissions were calculated for construction and operation of the Approved Project and are shown in Table 8. Construction of the Approved Project was estimated to take approximately seven years to complete and included two separate grading phases. In total, the project would generate 45,406 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent $\left(\mathrm{MTCO}_{2} \mathrm{e}\right)$ from on-road mobile sources and onsite construction equipment. GHG emissions were calculated for existing and projected future uses with implementation of the Approved Project. Total operational emissions generated from on-road mobile sources, electricity, natural gas, and water conveyance associated with the Approved Project was $35,078 \mathrm{MTCO}_{2}$ e per year ( $36,592 \mathrm{MTCO}_{2} \mathrm{e}$ per year if 30 -year amortized construction emissions are included).

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Table 8 Skyline Ranch Approved Project GHG Emissions

| Sector | GHG Emissions (MTCO2e/Year) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Construction Emissions (2008-2016) | 45,406 |
| $30-$ Year Amortized Construction Emissions | 1,514 |
| Transportation | 27,211 |
| Electricity | 3,817 |
| Natural Gas | 1,945 |
| Water Conveyance | 2,105 |
| Total | 36,592 |
| Service Population (SP) ${ }^{1}$ | 4,360 residents |
| MTCO2e/SP | 8.4 MTCO $2 \mathrm{e} / \mathrm{SP}$ |
| 2010 Working Group SCAQMD Efficiency Metric | 4.8 MTCO2e/SP |
| Exceeds Efficiency Metric | Yes |
| Source: Los Angeles County 2009. |  |
| 1 Based on a service population of Approved Project: 4.360 residents. The Modified Project would result in 190 fewer residents (4,170 people). |  |

The 2010 Certified EIR concluded that, at the time of the analysis, there was no generally accepted methodology to determine the extent to which GHG emissions associated with a specific project represent new emissions or existing emissions and therefore concluded that it was too speculative to determine the significance of impacts on global climate change. The 2010 Certified EIR conservatively concluded that the Approved Project's contribution to global warming was cumulatively considerable. The Approved Project included several mitigation measures to ensure consistency with the goals of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and the California Climate Action Team strategies. Although these features and measures would reduce the Approved Project's GHG emissions impacts, the 2010 Certified EIR identified that the Approved Project would result in cumulatively significant and unavoidable impacts to global climate change.

### 5.8.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

The Draft EIR for the Approved Project was circulated in July of 2009, which was prior to the amendments to the CEQA Guidelines, which were adopted on December 30, 2009, and became effective March 18, 2010. The information provided in this section includes the most current scientific data on GHG emissions and global climate change, but does not change the conclusions of the 2010 Certified EIR. Updated information on GHG emissions and global climate change does not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR pursuant to Public Resources Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. The current scientific information does not demonstrate that the Modified Project would result in new or more severe significant impacts than those determined in the 2010 Certified EIR.

## Regulatory Background

The environmental and regulatory settings for the Modified Project have changed since certification of the 2010 Certified EIR. The following discussion is provided to update conditions relative to development of the Modified Project.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

## State

Recent State of California guidance and goals for reductions in GHG emissions are generally embodied in Executive Order B-30-15, Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), and Senate Bill 375 (SB 375).

- Executive Order B-30-15 (2015). Executive Order B-30-15, signed April 29, 2015, sets a goal of reducing GHG emissions within the state to 40 percent of 1990 levels by year 2030. It also directs CARB to update the Scoping Plan to quantify the 2030 GHG reduction goal for the state and requires state agencies to implement measures to meet the interim 2030 goal of Executive Order B-30-15 as well as the long-term goal for 2050 in Executive Order S-03-5.
- Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act (2006). AB 32 was passed on August 31, 2006 and follows the 2020 tier of emissions reduction targets established in Executive Order S-3-05.
- Senate Bill 375 (2008). The intent of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, is to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty trucks and automobiles (excludes emissions associated with goods movement) by aligning regional long-range transportation plans, investments, and housing allocations to local land use planning to reduce VMT and vehicle trips.


## Regional

## SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS

SB 375 requires metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a sustainable communities strategy in their regional transportation plan. For the SCAG region, the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) was adopted in April 2016 (SCAG 2016). The SCS outlines a development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, would reduce GHG emissions from transportation (excluding goods movement). The SCS is meant to provide growth strategies that will achieve the regional GHG emissions reduction targets. However, the SCS does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS; instead, provides incentives to governments and developers for consistency.

The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS projects that the SCAG region will meet or exceed the passenger vehicle per capita targets set in 2010 by CARB. Pursuant to the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, SCAG anticipates lowering GHG emissions below 2005 levels by 8 percent by 2020, 18 percent by 2035, and 21 percent by 2040. Land use strategies to achieve the region's targets include planning for new growth around High Quality Transit Areas (HQTA), Livable Corridors, and creating Neighborhood Mobility Areas to integrate land use and transportation and plan for more active lifestyles (SCAG 2016).

Would the Modified Project:
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| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |  |  |  | X |  |

## Comments:

a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly, so the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact. The State of California, through its governor and its legislature, has established a comprehensive framework for the substantial reduction of GHG emissions over the next 40-plus years. This will occur primarily through the implementation of AB 32 and SB 375 , which will address $G H G$ emissions on a statewide cumulative basis.

Based on the 2010 Certified EIR, the Approved Project would generate 36,592 $\mathrm{MTCO}_{2}$ e per year (see Table 8). Modifications to the Approved Project would reduce the grading quantities, development footprint, and residential lots by 40 units, thereby also reducing trip generation. Therefore, development of the Modified Project would result in less GHG emissions than identified in the 2010 Certified EIR. Although GHG emissions generated by the Modified Project could cumulatively contribute to statewide GHG emissions, the Modified Project would result in a beneficial impact compared to the Approved Project.
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. CARB's 2008 Scoping Plan is California's GHG reduction strategy to achieve the state's GHG emissions reduction target established by AB 32, which is 1990 levels by year 2020. Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions include the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, California Appliance Energy Efficiency regulations, California Renewable Energy Portfolio standard, changes in the corporate average fuel economy standards (Pavley and the California Advanced Clean Cars program), and other early action measures would ensure the state is on target to achieve the GHG emissions reduction goals of AB 32 . In addition, new buildings constructed are required to comply with or exceed the most recent Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Code. The Modified Project's GHG emissions would be reduced through compliance with statewide measures that have been adopted since AB
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32 was adopted. Compared to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would generate less GHG emissions due to the reduction of residential homes ( 40 units) and reduced grading quantities. Additionally, compliance with the aforementioned state regulations would ensure that the Modified Project does not interfere with regional plans and policies or the State of California's ability to achieve GHG reduction goals and strategies.

### 5.8.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

GCC-1 The builder shall strive to construct at least 10 percent of dwelling units in the proposed project with LIVINGSMART® features so as to achieve a minimum of 25 percent reduction in projected GHG emissions. The builder commits to offer enhanced advertising, education, and, if needed, other incentives to encourage market acceptance of these various energy- and water-conserving options.

GCC-2 The builder shall plant approximately 40 trees per landscaped acre as a means to capture (sequester) carbon dioxide emissions and to provide shade to the buildings, which can decrease the need for air conditioning.

GCC-3 To facilitate the extension of existing bus service to include Skyline Ranch Road, the builder shall work with the Santa Clarita Transit District to design and provide bus turnouts and shelters along Skyline Ranch Road.

GCC-4 In order to increase awareness of green building practices and to promote water and energy conservation, the builder will develop and implement a green educational program. The program will include but not necessarily be limited to a pamphlet that educates and promotes conservation practices that homeowners can implement, with specific guidance on landscaping with drought tolerant plants, use of efficient irrigation systems, compact florescent lighting, and other measures that help lower GHG emissions.

Please also see Mitigation Measures 4.H-2(a) and 4.H-2(b) in Section 5.3.3, and Mitigation Measures 4.I-1 through 4.I-5 in Section 5.18.3.

### 5.8.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions in comparison to the previously certified EIR and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

### 5.9.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

Impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials (previously called "Environmental Safety") were determined to be less than significant and were closed out in the Initial Study for the 2010 Certified EIR. The
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Initial Study concluded that no hazardous materials would be used, transported, produced, handled, or stored onsite; no pressurized tanks would be used onsite; no significant hazards due to accidental release of materials would occur; and no hazardous emissions would be emitted. The project is not on a site listed as a hazardous materials site or within an airport land use plan and would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan.

### 5.9.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information <br> Showing <br> Greater <br> Significant <br> Effects than <br> Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? |  |  |  |  | X |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment? |  |  |  |  | X |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses? |  |  |  |  | X |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? |  |  |  |  | X |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  |  |  | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  |  |  | X |
| g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |  |  |  |  | X |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located: |  |  |  |  |  |
| i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access? |  |  |  | X |  |
| iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow hazards? |  |  |  |  | X |
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| Issues | Substantial Change in Project or Circumstances Resulting in New Significant Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard? |  |  |  |  | X |
| i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? |  |  |  | X |  |

## Comments:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No Impact. No new land uses are proposed that may involve additional hazardous materials that would not already be used during construction and operations of the Approved Project. Construction would involve small quantities of hazardous materials, such as fuels, greases, paints, and cleaning materials. Similar to the Approved Project, the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials by the Modified Project would be required to comply with existing regulations of several agencies, including the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety \& Health Administration, and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD). Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner, and would minimize potential hazards. Long-term operations of the Modified Project (a residential community) would not involve routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of substantial amounts of hazardous materials. Project operation would require use of small amounts of materials such as cleansers, paints, and pesticides for cleaning and maintenance purposes. The use of these materials would be in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions for use, storage, transport, and disposal. Therefore, there would be no significant new impacts arising from the routine handling of hazardous materials as a result of the proposed modifications to the approved TTM.
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?

No Impact. As stated above, the proposed modifications to the recorded track would not result in new sources of hazardous materials during construction or operations. No hazardous materials would be used other than household and vehicle maintenance materials (i.e., cleaning supplies, paints, fertilizers, oil, and grease) and landscaping and maintenance. Similar to the Approved Project, the use of hazardous materials by the Modified Project would not result in substantial hazards to people or to the environment arising from accidental release of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no new substantial impacts would occur from the proposed modifications.
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c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

No Impact. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would include an 11.9-acre school site, which is considered a sensitive land use. Nearby uses to the school would include a park and residential homes (see Figure 4, Approved TTM vs. Proposed Concept Plan). However, no hazardous materials would be used other than typical household and landscaping maintenance materials (i.e., cleaning supplies, paints, fertilizers, oil, and grease). Therefore, the proposed modifications to the approved TTM would not result in significant impacts.
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code $\$ 65962.5$ and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. The proposed modifications to the Approved Project would all be within the development footprint previously analyzed in the 2010 Certified EIR, which concluded that the project site is not located on a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Thus, the modifications to the project would not create new significant hazards to the public or environment.
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. There are no public airports within two miles of the project site (AirNav 2014), and the site is not in an airport land use plan. The nearest public airport to the site is Agua Dulce Airpark, approximately 9.2 miles northeast of the developable area of the project site. The nearest major airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, over 17 miles south of the project site. No impacts would occur.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. There are no private airstrips near the project site (AirNav 2014).
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. Modifications to the Approved Project would constitute minor technical changes and would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Modifications include realigning Skyline Ranch Road, reducing residential lots by 40 units (but including agequalified homes and a community center), modifying housing product types, relocating and expanding park and recreation center sites, and extending multipurpose trails and bike lanes. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would be required to comply with fire apparatus access road requirements as detailed in the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 9, Section 503). The design of Skyline Ranch Road and private roads onsite would comply with LACoFD requirements for access roads and turning radii. All onsite roadways and emergency access provisions would also be subject to review and approval by
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the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, the LACoFD, and the Sheriff's Department. Therefore, no impacts to emergency access and/or emergency evacuation plans would occur.

## h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because

 the project is located:
## i) Within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The project site is currently undeveloped and within a large area of natural open space. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the entire project site is in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) (CAL FIRE 2007). In October 2007, the vast majority of the project site was burned as a result of the 38,000 -acre Buckweed (Agua Dulce) Fire.

The Los Angeles County Fire Code (Title 32) and County Building Code (Title 26) establish requirements and regulations for the design, construction, and provision of fire protection facilities and equipment related to new development within the LACoFD jurisdiction, including the project site. Basic requirements for new development projects include the provision of multiple ingress/egress access points, fire suppression systems, fire flow standards, and minimum street widths. Additional specific requirements are also applicable to projects in LACoFD-designated VHFHSZ (formerly Fire Zone 4), such as the proposed project.

The modifications to the Approved Project would consist of realigning Skyline Ranch Road, reducing residential lots by 40 units (but including 284 units of age-qualified homes and a community center), modifying housing product types, relocating and expanding park and recreation center sites, and extending multipurpose trails and bike lanes. None of these minor technical changes would alter the project's requirement to comply with the County's fire or building codes. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would be required to submit for review and approval a fuel modification plan, a landscape plan, and an irrigation plan to the Department of Regional Planning and the Forestry Division of the LACoFD (Fuel Modification Unit). A fuel modification plan requires that a project establish a fuel modification zone where existing vegetation is managed and/or replaced to reduce the risk of fire, and it must be consistent with LACoFD's Fuel Modification Plan Guidelines. Additional site-specific requirements for a fuel modification plan, including the minimum width of a fuel modification zone, are determined by the LACoFD at the time of project plan review and prior to issuance of grading permits. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, implementation of the Modified Project would comply with other applicable requirements, including the County Fire and Building Codes, the California Fire Code, and conditions of approval from the LACoFD regarding site access, fire hydrant spacing, water storage, building materials, and fire flow. Pursuant to conditions of approval, the proposed water system would be designed to deliver fire flow in compliance with LACoFD requirements for the proposed land uses. Therefore, the Modified Project would provide sufficient fire flows. The Modified Project is also required to equip proposed structures with design features and fire suppression equipment, including an automatic fire suppression system, a fire alarm system, and an evacuation life safety system. Project plans would be reviewed by LACoFD

## 5. Environmental Analysis

prior to the issuance of building permits to ensure that the project would be compliant with applicable fire codes, regulations, and conditions.

Upon compliance with the above-specified codes, project-related hazards arising from fire hazards would be less than significant. Modifications to the approved TTM would not result in any uses that would expose residents to an unusually high level of fire hazards. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in new significant impacts as a result of project modifications or a substantial change in circumstances.

## ii) Within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As required by the Los Angeles County Building and Fire Codes, any project in a VHFHSZ must have adequate access points to allow fire department equipment to enter the site and for residents to evacuate (Los Angeles County Code Title 32 Part 1, Access, and Section 326, Activities in Hazardous Fire Areas). The Modified Project would not alter the accessibility of the approved TTM. Although Skyline Ranch Road would be realigned within the project site, the two main access points would be in the same location as proposed under the Approved Project—Skyline Ranch Road/Whites Canyon Road and Skyline Ranch Road/Sierra Highway. All onsite roadways would be designed to accommodate fire engines, as required by Title 32, Part 1, of the Los Angeles County Code. The Modified Project would not alter the number of access roads or their widths. Therefore, it would not result in new significant impacts as a result of project modifications.

## iii) Within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow hazards?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 5.9.2(h)(i), the project's water system would be designed to deliver fire flow in compliance with LACoFD requirements for the proposed land uses. Therefore, the project would provide sufficient fire flows. Modifications to the Approved Project would not alter the site design in a way that would prevent inadequate fire flow. No new significant impacts are identified.
iv) Within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?

No Impact. The project site is surrounded by natural open space to the north and northeast and residential uses to the west, south, and east. There is no potential for dangerous fire situations involving flammables, refineries, or explosives manufacturing. No impacts related to these types of fire hazards would occur.

## i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The proposed project would modify Approved TTM 60922 within the approved development footprint of the Skyline Ranch property. Modifications include a realignment of Skyline Ranch Road, reduction of 40 residential lots (but inclusion of 284 units of agequalified homes and a community center), modifications to housing product types, relocation and expansion of park and recreation center sites, and extension of multipurpose trails and bike lanes. These modifications would not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in new significant impacts as a result of project modifications or a substantial change in circumstances.
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### 5.9.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

The 2010 Certified EIR did not include mitigation measures related to hazards and hazardous materials.

### 5.9.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

### 5.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

### 5.10.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.B, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

## Hydrology

Based on the 2010 Certified EIR, implementation of the Approved Project would decrease flow rates for onsite watersheds by 231 cubic feet per seconds (cfs) and would discharge into existing or proposed storm drain systems designed to accommodate this runoff volume. Installation of debris basins, both upstream and downstream, in conjunction with the urbanization of the site would remove approximately 13,009 cubic yards of debris from the site's entire watershed. On-site drainage facilities would be designed and constructed in accordance with City and County standards and would be subject to review and approval by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and City of Santa Clarita Public Works Department. As a result, construction of the Approve Project would not have a significant impact on flow rates or debris production.

## Flood Plains

Development of the entrance of the project site from Sierra Highway would include a bridge over a series of culverts and catch basins, which would allow water from Sierra Highway to flow under Skyline Ranch Road in order to minimize the potential for flooding at the project entrance and reduce the flow rate along Sierra Highway during a 50-year storm event. With the proposed improvements, total flow rate in this area of the site would decrease by 40 cfs . Water surface levels would not rise above existing conditions during 50-year storm events. In addition, the County Flood Plain Boundary would change upon implementation of these improvements. Although, as proposed, impacts on flooding would be less than significant, because these drainage facilities are preliminarily designed and not yet approved, mitigation was provided.

## Water Quality

## Construction

Grading and construction activities associated with the Approved Project would remove existing vegetation and expose topsoil. Additionally, construction activities would involve several large construction vehicles, wash areas, temporary facilities, and construction materials and supplies. These sources may come in contact
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with precipitation or irrigation water and result in polluted runoff from the project site. Mitigation was provided to ensure construction activities do not have a significant impact on water quality.

## Operations

Approximately 18 percent of previously permeable surfaces would become impervious due to the development of the Approved Project. This would result in an increase of urban-related pollutants that can be carried offsite by nuisance and stormwater runoff into downstream receiving waters (i.e., Santa Clara River). Therefore, mitigation was provided to reduce impacts on stormwater runoff quality to less than significant levels.

### 5.10.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? |  |  |  | X |  |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? |  |  |  | X |  |
| e) Add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use? |  |  |  |  | X |
| f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? |  |  |  | X |  |
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| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information <br> Showing <br> Greater <br> Significant <br> Effects than <br> Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | No Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality? |  |  |  | X |  |
| h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance? |  |  |  |  | X |
| j) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g., high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)? |  |  |  |  | X |
| k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? |  |  |  | X |  |
| l) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain? |  |  |  | X |  |
| m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain? |  |  |  | X |  |
| n) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? |  |  |  |  | X |
| o) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? |  |  |  |  | X |

## Comments:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Compared to the approved TTM, the Modified Project would reduce overall net site imperviousness and stormwater runoff as a result of removing 40 residential units, relocating Skyline Ranch Road, and reducing the project's overall development footprint from 622 acres to 492 acres and associated reduction in impervious surfaces.

## Construction

The Modified Project would generally have similar grading and construction activities as compared to the Approved Project. Grading would require the removal of existing vegetation, which would expose much of the topsoil in the developable areas and can lead to erosion from construction irrigation (i.e., dust-control
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measures) and precipitation. Additionally, due to the extent of soils that would be graded, reengineered, and reused, stockpiling of soils would occur within the overall project site and would be subject to erosion from construction irrigation and/or precipitation.

Similar to the Approved Project, construction activities would involve large construction vehicles, wash areas, temporary facilities, and construction materials and supplies. Maintenance and refueling of construction vehicles have the potential to result in spills of petroleum-related engine fluids and coolants. Washing of vehicles and equipment can discharge waters polluted with sediment, oils and grease, trace metals, and detergent-based organics (e.g., adhesives, cleaners, sealants, and solvents). Equipment and facilities that may be required during construction include concrete mixers, portable sanitary and septic systems, and temporary trailers. All of these sources could come in contact with precipitation or irrigation waters and result in polluted runoff from the project site.

However, water quality effects would be controlled and maintained at less than significant levels by preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in accordance with State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order No. 2009-0009 DWQ, which is required prior to receiving site demolition and/or grading permits. The SWPPP would be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and RWQCB for approval. The SWPPP would meet all applicable regulations by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that use best available technology economically achievable and best conventional pollutant control technology to reduce pollutants. In compliance with the SWPPP, non-stormwater level best management practices (BMPs) would also be implemented that include controls and objectives for vehicle and equipment maintenance, cleaning, and fueling, and potable water/irrigation practices.

Compliance with BMP would reduce or eliminate soil erosion impacts from construction activities. Common means of soil erosion from construction sites include water, wind, and being tracked offsite by vehicles. Compliance with these BMPs is required by the federal Clean Water Act and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Flood Control and Watershed Management Divisions. Title 26 (County of Los Angeles Building Code), Appendix J, also requires compliance with International Building Code provisions for preventing sedimentation. Additional mitigation is provided to ensure erosion, sedimentation, and construction-related pollutants are minimized during construction activities.

As a result, adherence to SWRCB/RWQCB standards and applicable mitigation measures would ensure that the Modified Project would result in less than significant impacts to water quality during construction.

## Operations

Development in accordance with the Modified Project or the Approved Project would increase urban pollutants that can be carried offsite by stormwater runoff into downstream receiving waters (i.e., Santa Clara River). Urban pollutants may include roofing materials, atmospheric deposition, grease, oil, suspended solids, metals, solvents, and phosphates. Lawn maintenance and use of fertilizers and pesticides are also potential sources of pollutants that, if untreated, would result in impacts to natural drainage channels and the Santa Clara River.
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In terms of post-construction stormwater management, the Modified Project would have less of an impact than the Approved Project because the overall net imperviousness of the site and pollutants of concern would be reduced. Regardless, pursuant to existing regulations, the developer would complete and have approved a Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP) and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) outlining BMPs for nonpoint-source pollution control measures to address urban pollutants. Implementation of the SQMP and SUSMP would reduce impacts to a less than significant level and would ensure that the Modified Project would not violate discharge requirements or water quality standards.

Compliance with regulatory standards, applicable mitigation measures, and BMPs would reduce water quality impacts to less than significant levels and ensure that the project would not violate discharge requirements or water quality standards. Adherence to these standards would ensure that operation of the Modified Project, like the Approved Project, would result in less than significant impacts related to water quality during operations.
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The project site would receive water supply from the Santa Clarita Water Division, which receives water from both groundwater and imported water sources from the Castaic Lake Water Agency, which receives water from the State Water Project. The Santa Clarita Valley has historically depended for its water supply on an underground water basin (the East Subbasin of the Santa Clara River Valley Groundwater Basin), or aquifer, divided into upper and lower levels. Overall, the groundwater basin covers about 84 square miles and includes a shallow upper basin, the Alluvial Aquifer, and a deeper layer called the Saugus Formation. The Modified Project would develop approximately 492 acres compared to the 622 acres that would be developed under the Approved Project. Since less land would be developed with impermeable surfaces, the Modified Project would have a beneficial impact on preserving pervious areas onsite and allowing more groundwater recharge. Therefore, the proposed modifications to Tract 46018-11 would not result in new substantial impacts.
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The existing drainage pattern onsite is by surface flow from northeast to southwest. Similar to the Approved Project, development of the Modified Project would include installation of onsite catch basins to catch surface water flow, which in turn would discharge into the existing storm drains and flood control channels in the City of Santa Clarita and ultimately discharge into the Santa Clara River. Erosion and siltation impacts potentially resulting from the Modified Project would, for the most part, occur during the project's sites preparation and grading phase. However, there is a potential for erosion and siltation to occur during project operation.
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## Project Construction

As discussed in Section $5.10 .2(\mathrm{a})$, the project applicant would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP. The SWPPP would specify BMPs the project applicant would implement prior to and during grading and construction to minimize erosion and siltation impacts on- and offsite. Erosion controls include installation of mulch, geotextiles, mats, hydroseedings, earth dikes, and swales, and siltation controls include installation of barriers such as straw bales, sandbags, fiber rolls, and gravel bag berms, desilting basins, and cleaning measures (i.e., street cleaning).

## Project Operation

As shown in Figure 6, Modified Conceptual Lot Plan, the project site would consist of impervious surfaces (residential homes, driveways, and other paved areas), but would mostly consist of significant amounts of open space and landscaped areas. The open space area west of the proposed realigned Skyline Ranch Road would not be disturbed, and the landscaped areas adjacent to the planned community would not be left exposed. Thus, there would be no substantial areas of bare or disturbed soil onsite that would be vulnerable to erosion. Additionally, details of the project's storm drain system and desilting basins would be provided in the final storm drain plans and grading plans to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. As discussed in Section 5.10.2(a), compliance with required regulatory standards, mitigation measures, and BMPs would reduce water quality impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the proposed modifications to the approved TTM would not result in significant impacts.
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. See discussion in Section 5.10.2(c). The Modified Project would relocate proposed storm drains and desilting basins in the proposed roadways to connect with the existing storm drain system. Similar to the Approved Project, all storm drains and desilting basins would be designed to accommodate drainage from a 50 -year storm event. The rate and volume of runoff from the proposed storm drains would not exceed the capacity of existing or the proposed future storm drains, and would not result in flooding on- or offsite. Additionally, all onsite and offsite drainage facilities would be designed and constructed in accordance with City of Santa Clarita and Los Angeles County standards and would be subject to review and approval by the County Flood Control District, County Department of Public Works, and City of Santa Clarita Public Works Department.
e) Add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use?

No Impact. Similar to the Approved Project, existing and proposed storm drains and desilting basins have been designed to accommodate drainage onsite and prevent standing water from accumulating. The proposed project modifications would not include any water features, such as ponds and lakes, that could create standing water environments. Therefore, the Modified Project would not create habitat for mosquitoes or other vectors, and no impact would occur.
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f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. See Section 5.10.2(c).
g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As discussed in Section 5.10.2(a), the Modified Project would not create altered conditions that cause new significant impacts. Adherence to SWRCB and RWQCB standards would ensure that the Modified Project would result in less than significant impacts related to downstream water quality during construction.
h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The Los Angeles County Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance encourages site sustainability and smart growth in a manner that respects and preserves the characteristics of the County's watersheds, drainage paths, water supplies, and natural resources. The development requirements of the LID ordinance went into effect January 1, 2009, and apply to any development where a complete discretionary or nondiscretionary permit is filed. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would be required to implement these design standards. Modifications would not alter the design of the project in a way that would introduce new significant impacts.
i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?

No Impact. The project site is not in an Area of Special Biological Significance designated by the SWRCB and would not directly drain into one of these areas (SWRCB 2014). Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not cause any impacts.
j) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g., high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

No Impact. As with the approved TTM, the Modified Project does not include the use of septic tanks or other private sewer disposal systems. Wastewater would be collected via sewer pipes installed throughout the developable area onsite to connect with the existing sewer network. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As discussed in Sections 3.10.2(a) and 3.10.2(c), compliance with required regulatory standards and guidelines would reduce potential hydrology and water quality impacts to a less than significant level.
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1) Place housing within a 100 -year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate map for the project area, two small southeast portions of the project site are located in areas designated as Zone A, which means the areas are subject to 100 -year flood hazards, but no hydraulic analyses have been performed, and therefore no base flood elevations have been determined (FEMA 2008). Additionally, the County Floodway Map shows the same area designated FEMA Zone A along Sierra Highway as a County flood hazard zone for a 50 -year storm event (Los Angeles 2014). Compared to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not relocate housing or structures in the flood hazard zone. Instead, the modifications would result in a reduced development footprint within the Approved Project's footprint. Additionally, the construction of Skyline Ranch Road at Sierra Highway would be the same as under the Approved Project and consist of a bridge over a series of culverts and catch basins to allow water from Sierra Highway to flow southwesterly under Skyline Ranch Road to minimize the potential for flooding at the project's southwestern entrance and reduce the flow rate along Sierra Highway during a 50 -year storm event. Therefore, the Modified Project would not introduce new substantial impacts to flood hazard zones.
m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100 -year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. See response to Section 5.10.2 (l), above.
n) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No Impact. Lake Castaic is approximately ten miles northwest of the project site and the nearest dam is the Bouquet Canyon Dam ten miles northeast of the site. Given the long distance from the project site, there is no risk of flooding to the site due to levee or dam failure. No new impacts would occur related to flooding and levee or dam failure.
o) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. There are no aboveground water tanks, reservoirs, or artificial bodies of water near the project site that could cause inundation by seiches. Additionally, the project site is over 30 miles from the ocean and is not at risk of flooding due to a tsunami. No impact associated with seiches or tsunamis would occur.

At project completion, the developable area would consist of buildings, paved areas, and landscaped areas, and is not expected to pose a hazard of mudflow onsite or downstream from the site. The project would comply with mitigation measures concerning slope stability, soil erosion and sedimentation, and landslides as detailed in Section 5.7.3 (Geology and Soils) and below in Section 5.10.3; in addition, the construction phase of the project would use BMPs to minimize erosion, which would help reduce the potential for mudflows. No new significant impacts would result from project modifications or changed circumstances.
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### 5.10.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

## Storm Drains and Flooding

4.B-1 Final drainage plans for the project shall ensure that there is no displacement of flood plain area in the vicinity of Sierra Highway and its intersection with proposed Skyline Ranch Road through construction of a culvert, bridge, or combination thereof, within the flood plain area. Final drainage plans and the culvert or bridge shall be designed during the engineering stage by a licensed engineer to ensure that the water surface shall be equal or lower than existing conditions both downstream and upstream of the proposed project entrance along Sierra Highway and adjacent properties during a 50 -year storm event and that postdevelopment flow rates shall be less than existing conditions downstream along Sierra Highway and adjacent properties. Final drainage plans to achieve these standards shall be designed to the satisfaction of, and approved by, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and City of Santa Clarita, Department of Public Works.

## Erosion and Sedimentation

4.B-2 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the construction contractor shall prepare an Erosion Control Plan (ECP) that incorporates BMPs to specifically address and reduce the potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts on downstream receiving waters. The project shall include any combination of the following erosion control BMPs: Hydraulic mulch, preservation of existing vegetation, hydroseeding, streambank stabilization, diversion of runoff (such as earth dikes, temporary drains, slope drains), velocity dissipation devices (outlet protection, check dams, and slope roughening/terracing), and dust control measures (such as sand fences and watering). Sedimentation control BMPs may include filtration devices and barriers (such as silt fencing, check berms, debris basins, sediment traps, fiber rolls, sandbags, gravel inlet filters, and straw bale barriers) and/or settling devices (such as sediment traps or basins). Stabilization control BMPs may include blankets, reinforced channel liners, soil cement, fiber matrices, geotextiles, or other erosion resistant soil coverings or treatments. The construction entrance(s)/exit(s) should also be stabilized (e.g. aggregate underdrain with filter cloth). Specific application of these BMPs shall occur before site runoff is discharged to proposed and existing off-site storm drain/flood control channel systems that ultimately discharge water to the Santa Clara River.

The ECP shall be reviewed by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board for inclusion of appropriate and effective erosion and sedimentation controls.

## Construction-Related Pollutants

4.B-3 Prior to issuance of any grading permits, a Notice of Intent (NOI) and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the Los Angeles
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Regional Water Quality Control Board for approval. The SWPPP shall meet all applicable regulations by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize best available technology economically achievable (BAT) and best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) to reduce pollutants. The SWPPP shall be certified in accordance with the signatory requirements of the General Construction Permit.

The SWPPP shall be developed and amended or revised, when necessary to meet the following objectives:

- Identify all pollutant sources including sources of sediment that may affect the quality of storm water discharges associated with construction activity (storm water discharges) from the construction site;
- Identify non-storm water discharges;
- Identify, construct, implement in accordance with a time schedule, and maintain Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges from the construction site during construction; and,
- Develop a maintenance schedule for BMPs installed during construction designed to reduce or eliminate pollutants after construction is completed (post-construction BMPs). Paving operations shall be performed using measures to prevent runoff pollution.

In compliance with the SWPPP, non-stormwater level BMPs shall be implemented that include controls and objectives for vehicle and equipment maintenance, cleaning, and fueling, and potable water/irrigation practices. Material/waste management BMPs shall include: liquid waste management, spill prevention and control, hazardous waste management, and sanitary/septic waste management. Specific BMPs to be implemented by the construction contractor may include but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- Paving operations shall be performed using measures to prevent runoff pollution;
- Wash out areas for concrete trucks, construction vehicles and equipment, paint and stucco equipment, and other construction materials shall be designated, and containment measures employed, to prevent discharges of wash water;
- Vehicle and equipment maintenance and fueling activities shall occur offsite to the degree feasible;
- Construction area, street and pavement washing shall be controlled to preclude discharges of wash water;
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- Discharging super-chlorinated water pipe and sprinkler system flushing and test water to the storm drain system shall be prohibited;
- All waste shall be properly stored and disposed of off-site;
- Employees and subcontractors shall be trained in the prevention of storm water contamination;
- Hazardous material (specifically chlorine- and ammonia-containing products) shall be stored in elevated (e.g., on palates or a deck) and covered structures to prevent any contact between the chemicals and irrigation or precipitation;
- All hazardous and chemical materials generated during construction (i.e., diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, motor oil, etc.) shall be cleaned up and disposed of in compliance with Federal, State, and local laws, regulations and ordinances; and
- All structure construction and painting areas shall be enclosed, covered, or bermed to prevent run-on/run-off in these areas and associated contamination of storm water.


## Discharge of Urban-Related Pollutants

4.B-4 Prior to approval of a NPDES Stormwater Permit No. CAS004001 (Order No. 01-182) and issuance of a grading permit, the applicant or an applicant designee shall complete and have approved a Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP) and a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) outlining usage of BMPs for non-point source pollution control measures to address pollutants from such sources as roofing materials, atmospheric deposition, grease, oil, suspended solids, metals, solvents, phosphates, fertilizers and pesticides. Post-construction structural or treatment BMPs shall be designed to meet performance standards that mitigate (treat) storm water runoff from either: (1) the 85th percentile 24-hour runoff event determined as the maximized capture storm water volume for the area, from the formula recommended in Urban Runoff Quality Management, WEF Manual of Practice No. 23/ASCE Manual of Practice No. 87, (1998), or; (2) the volume of annual runoff based on unit basin storage water quality volume, to achieve 80 percent or more treatment by the method recommended in California Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook-Industrial Commercial, (1993), or: (3) the volume of runoff produced from a 0.75 inch storm event, prior to its discharge to a storm water conveyance system; and, (4) the volume of runoff produced from a historical record based reference 24 -hour rainfall criterion for "treatment" ( 0.75 inch average for the Los Angeles County area) that achieves approximately the same reduction in pollutant loads achieved by the 85 th percentile 24-hour runoff even. Furthermore, project BMPs and design features shall control peak flow discharge to provide stream channel and over bank flood protection, based on design criteria selected by the local agency.

The range of BMPs, which shall meet the performance standards identified above, shall include but not be limited to the following to the extent feasible:
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## Site Planning and Design BMPs

Minimize Impervious Area and Directly Connected Impervious Areas

- Minimize impervious areas by incorporating landscaped areas over substantial portions of the project area. For the Skyline Ranch Project, the area designated solely for uses with impervious surfaces are about 401 acres or 18 percent of the entire project site. This means the remaining 1,772 acres or 82 pereent will be either vacant or in uses with impervious ground surface such as landseaped and park areas.]
- If possible, minimize directly connected impervious areas by draining parking lots to landscaped areas, desilting (secondary infiltration) basins or other previous surfaces to promote filtration and infiltration of storm water, if landscaping slopes are less than 2 percent and the area is not directly adjacent to steep slopes (which promotes further erosion); or the area is being treated with catch basin inserts. Furthermore, lot runoff (from the pervious surfaces) shall be infiltrated from the graded pad areas through onsite pervious soils.
- To the extent practicable, utilize vegetated areas (e.g., parks, setbacks, end islands, and median strips) for biofiltration and/or bioretention of nuisance and storm runoff flows from parking lots.


## Selection of Construction Materials and Design Practices

- Select building materials for roofs, roof gutters and downspouts that do not include exposed copper or zinc.
- Construct streets, sidewalks, and parking lot aisles to the minimum widths as specified in the Los Angeles County Department of Public Work's requirements (also in compliance with regulations for the Americans with Disabilities Act) for safety requirements for fire and emergency vehicle access and incorporate landscaped buffer areas between sidewalks and streets.


## Conserve Natural Areas

- Concentrate or cluster the development on the least environmentally sensitive portions of the project site while leaving the remaining land in a natural, undeveloped condition. [For the Skyline Ranch Project, about 1,551 acres of the site ( 71 percent of the project site) is proposed to remain undeveloped, including 1,355 acres to be designated as natural open space through the establishment of the Skyline Ranch Conservation Area (SRCA).]
- Maximize canopy interception and water conservation by preserving existing native trees and shrubs and planting additional native or drought tolerant trees and large shrubs. [For the Skyline Ranch Project, approximately 71 percent of the project site is proposed to
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remain undeveloped, and along the perimeter of the site, landscaping would consist of a mix of native, drought-tolerant and non-invasive plant species.]

## Protect Slopes and Channels

- Protect slopes and minimize erosion potential by covering highly erodible soils with vegetative cover (preferably native or drought tolerant plants), route flows safely from or away from steep and or sensitive slopes, stabilize disturbed slopes. All slopes within the project should be designed and constructed to minimize erosion.
- Protect channels and minimize erosion by controlling and treating flows in landscaping and/or other controls prior to reaching existing natural drainage systems; stabilize channel crossings; ensure that increases in runoff velocity and frequency caused by the project do not erode the channel; install energy dissipaters (riprap), at the outlets of storm drains, culverts and conduits.

Source (non-structural) Control BMPs

- Drain Inlet Stenciling or Signage. Stenciling (or signage) is intended to raise public awareness and limit illegal dumping of trash, debris, oil, and other pollutants into storm drains. "Stenciling" may be accomplished via a traditional stencil or via the use of grates with text such as "Warning! Drains to Ocean" notes or other equivalent symbols. All catch basins and inlets shall be stenciled.
- Irrigation Controls and Management. Irrigation controls shall be implemented to ensure that irrigation is conducted efficiently. Where feasible, plants with similar watering requirements shall be grouped in order to reduce excess irrigation runoff and promote surface filtration. Efficient irrigation systems may include computerized and/or radio telemetry that controls the amount of irrigation based on soil moisture or other indicators.
- Proper Application of Fertilizers and Pesticides. Best management practices shall be implemented to minimize the application of fertilizers, pesticides, and other landscape management products on slopes and landscaped areas maintained by the homeowners' association (HOA) and/or landscape maintenance districts (if any). Examples of these management practices include, but are not to limited to: the use of slow release fertilizers, applying fungicides only to greens to limit the use of pesticides, and closely monitoring weather forecast to ensure appropriate timing (during dry periods) for the application of landscape management products.
- Community Education Program. Public education shall be used to reduce the potential for hazardous materials entering the storm drain system. This shall be accomplished through distribution of brochures or other materials to property managers, owners and occupants, and employees at the time of initial sale or lease of property or hiring of employees and periodically thereafter. Brochures shall discuss, among other topics and
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as appropriate for the audience: 1) the importance of downstream water bodies, the storm water system, management of fertilizers, pesticides, and other harmful chemicals, 2) the impacts of dumping oil, antifreeze, pesticides, paints, and other pollutants into storm drains and proper handling and disposal of these materials, 3) effective cleaning practices such as the cleaning of vehicles only in maintenance areas where the water will be recycled or routed to the sanitary sewer system to prevent nuisance flows, 4) the benefits of the prevention of excessive erosion and sedimentation, 5) the benefits of proper landscaping practices, 6) pavement clean-up practices, 7) the impacts of overirrigation, 8) swimming pool draining practices, and 9) other relevant issues.

- Prevention of Nuisance Flows. Grease traps shall be included for school cafeterias (if any). Draining swimming pools into storm drains shall be prohibited. These flows shall be properly connected to sewer lines.
- Pavement Sweeping Program. The majority of roads in the project area are proposed to be dedicated to the public, and would thus be maintained by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The County has street sweeping programs that will help control trash, vegetation debris and sediment that may accumulate on roadways. Other non-public roadways shall also be periodically swept.
- Litter Control Program \& Design of Trash Storage Areas. A program for litter control shall be implemented to control litter in common areas. The program may include standards for proper placement and emptying of trash receptacles, practices to ensure that trash bins are maintained in the closed position, and regular removal of trash from parking and landscaped areas. In conjunction with the litter control program, trash storage areas shall be designed to prevent introduction of pollutants into runoff. The design principles to prevent this pollution from occurring are using impervious surfaces for storage areas which prevent run-on from adjacent areas, ensuring that there is no connection of trash drains to the storm drain system, and keeping lids on all trash receptacles in addition to the use of roofs or awnings to minimize direct precipitation.
- Proper Connection and Maintenance of Sewer Lines. Sewer lines shall be properly connected and adequately maintained.
- Activity Restrictions (Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions). For source control BMPs, County maintenance and implementation of BMPs or Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions (CC\&Rs) shall be prepared requiring maintenance and implementation of BMPs by the HOA for the purpose of surface water quality protection, or use restrictions shall be developed through lease terms.
- BMP Maintenance. Los Angeles County shall assume responsibility for the inspection and maintenance of structural BMPs within their boundaries. For the public school site, the school district with jurisdiction shall be responsible for the inspection and
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maintenance of structural BMPs. For private roads and private parks the HOA shall be responsible for BMP maintenance.

- Common Area Drainage Facility Inspection. Privately-owned common area drainage facilities shall be inspected each year and, if necessary, cleaned and maintained prior to the storm season.


## Structural and Treatment Control BMPs

Implementation of NPDES General Permit requirements entails the use of postconstruction structural controls that will remain in service to protect water quality throughout the life of the project. Therefore, these BMPs will need to be regularly maintained for proper function. As Los Angeles County will assume maintenance of BMPs in public rights-of-way, the main structural BMPs recommended below are systems that the County currently approves of for use within their jurisdiction. Final selection, design and siting of structural BMPs will ultimately depend on the project-wide drainage plan approved by the County. The following BMP options were selected due to their relative effectiveness for treating potential pollutants from the project site; as well as consideration for County of Los Angeles requirements and acceptance of these systems (as they would be maintained by the County), site feasibility, relative costs and benefits; and other constraints. The recommended BMP design flow rates, volumes, types and other specifications will be provided during final design stage of the project (with hydrology map approval).

- Hydrodynamic Separator Systems and Gross Solids Removal Devices. Hydrodynamic Separation Systems (HSS) and Gross Solids Removal Devices (GSRDs) are flow-based, flow-through BMPs that are installed within a storm drain line in order to remove large sediment particles and associated storm water pollutants, as well as trash, oils, and grease. HSS and/or GSRDs, such as a Continuous Deflective Separator (CDS), manufactured by CDS Technologies, Inc., supplemented with oil absorbent materials (such as pellets), are recommended for use at various locations in the proposed storm drain systems. Depending on the particular model and manufacturer, maintenance shall occur quarterly to yearly for clean-outs. Cleaning after a storm event may also be required. Inspection is required to make certain that the unit is operating correctly and to make any repairs.
- Stormscreen. The StormScreen is a manufactured patented BMP by CONTECH Stormwater Solutions, Inc., designed to remove mostly trash and debris and larger suspended solids at high flow rates. The StormScreen is comprised of a grouping of StormScreen cartridges placed in a precast or cast-in-place concrete vault. Although maintenance may be required within six (6) months of project completion due to erosion occurring on newly constructed sites, it is intended that the StormScreen be maintained annually by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Flood Control Division. For the StormScreen maintenance, during the first year, an inspection is recommended every other month for the first six months of operation in order to
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develop an ongoing maintenance schedule. A visual inspection can be conducted without entering the vault. Sediments and water must be disposed of in accordance with all applicable waste disposal regulations.

- Catch Basin Inserts. Catch basin inserts are flow-based BMP options for consideration at various locations to treat runoff before it enters the storm drain system by filtering or screening out sediments and associated storm water pollutants during dry weather and low flow events. During large flow events, they are typically designed to allow storm water runoff to bypass the inlet device and continue directly into the storm drain system. Although treatment levels are generally low for the pollutants of concern for this project, the inserts would provide pre-treatment of storm water runoff prior to further treatment at downstream BMPs. Drainage inserts could be replaced with HSS or GSRDs that perform similar functions and are interchangeable. At the time of final design, if the implementation of a CDS is deemed infeasible, a catch basin insert may be used in its place. Although maintenance requirements vary greatly depending on the particular model and manufacturer, they are typically maintained quarterly to yearly for clean-outs. Cleaning after a storm event and in anticipation of storm events after extended dry periods or periods of typical debris removal is recommended. Inspection will be required to make certain that the unit is operating correctly and to make any repairs.
- Detention/Retention Basins. Detention and retention basins require a fairly large amount of space to build them. Basins can be used on sites with slopes up to about 15 percent. The design should incorporate enough elevation drop from the basins inlet to the outlet to ensure that flow can move through the system. These systems require regular maintenance (semi-annual and annual), as well as sediment removal from the forebay every 5 to 7 years and monitoring the sediment accumulation and removal when the volume has been significantly reduced (about every 25 to 50 years). Basins shall be properly maintained to avoid safety hazards.


### 5.10.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

### 5.11.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.Q, Land Use, of the 2010 Certified EIR.
The 2010 Certified EIR concluded that land use impacts associated with the Approved Project would be less than significant. The Approved Project consists of a residential development that supports and encourages
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the efficient use of infrastructure facilities by placing housing adjacent to existing development; concentrating development in an area via a density transfer to preserve environmentally sensitive lands; developing land uses (such as paseos, bike lanes and hiking trails) that create opportunities for residents to walk and bike; and preserving open space. Project implementation would increase the supply of housing to accommodate the region's growth. The proposed infrastructure improvements and the provision of an on-site school and parks would serve the residents' demand for public services. Therefore, the Approved Project would be consistent with the Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan. Additionally, the project would be supportive of and consistent with the Los Angeles County General Plan policies.

### 5.11.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial Change in Project or Circumstances Resulting in New Significant Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Physically divide an established community? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property? |  |  |  |  | X |
| d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria? |  |  |  |  | X |

Comments:

## a) Physically divide an established community?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The realignment of Skyline Ranch Road within the project site would enhance the Skyline Ranch community in comparison to its planned alignment under the Approved Project (see Figure 4, Approved TTM vs. Proposed Concept Plan). By realigning the roadway, the entire residential community would be developed on the east side of Skyline Ranch Road, rather than divided by the approved alignment. This modification would enhance and centralize the planned Skyline Ranch community, which would be a beneficial impact. Additionally, the inclusion of age-qualified homes and a community center in the northern portion of the developable area would further benefit the community. The other modifications to the Approved Project (i.e., reduced residential lots, modified housing product type, and relocation of park sites) would have no impact on dividing communities. Overall, the Modified Project would be a beneficial change from the Approved Project.
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b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The proposed project would modify Approved TTM 60922 within the development footprint analyzed in the 2010 Certified EIR. Modifications include a realignment of Skyline Ranch Road, reduction of 40 residential lots (but inclusion of 284 units of age-qualified homes and a community center), modifications to housing product types, relocation and expansion of park and recreation center sites, and extension of multipurpose trails and bike lanes. These minor technical changes would be consistent with all applicable County plans, including the Los Angeles County General Plan and Santa Clarita Area Plan.
c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?

No Impact. Based on the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Zoning Map, the project site is zoned as R-1 (Singlefamily residence), A-1-2 (Light agriculture), and A-2-2 (Heavy agriculture) (Los Angeles 2012b). The Modified Project would only develop 492 acres (zoned R-1) in the southern portion of the 2,173-acre project site. The remaining 1,681 acres zoned Agriculture would not be developed. Thus, no impact would occur.
d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?

No Impact. See response to Sections 3.4.2(f) and 3.7.2(f), above.
A portion of the Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools SEA falls within the northern portion of the project site. However, this northern portion is outside of the 492 acres of developable land onsite. Therefore, no impact would occur.

### 5.11.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

The 2010 Certified EIR did not include mitigation measures related to land use and planning.

### 5.11.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts related to land use and planning.

### 5.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

### 5.12.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

Impacts to mineral resources were closed out in the Initial Study prepared for the 2010 Certified EIR. The Approved Project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. No impact would occur.
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### 5.12.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Would the Modified Project:

|  |  | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in <br> New Significant <br> Effects | New Information <br> Showing <br> Greater <br> Significant <br> Effects than <br> Previous EIR | New Mitigation <br> or Alternative to <br> Reduce <br> Significant <br> Effect is <br> Declined | Minor Technical <br> Changes or <br> Additions | No <br> Impact |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a)Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral <br> resource that would be of value to the region and the <br> residents of the state? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b)Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important <br> mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local <br> general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. Modifications to the Approved Project would be implemented within the development footprint already analyzed in the 2010 Certified EIR. Therefore, similar to the Approved Project, no impact would occur to any known mineral resources or locally important mineral resource recovery sites.
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. See Section 5.12 .2 (a), above.

### 5.12.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

No mitigation measures related to mineral resources were outlined in the 2010 Certified EIR.

### 5.12.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would have no impact on mineral resources.

### 5.13 NOISE

### 5.13.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.G, Noise, of the 2010 Certified EIR.
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## Construction Noise and Vibration

Occupied noise-sensitive uses with an uninterrupted line of sight to the construction noise sources could periodically be exposed to temporary noise levels that exceed the County's construction noise standards (depending on the location of the uses), which would be a significant impact. For example, onsite grading and building construction activities could occur as close as 25 feet from existing residential subdivisions to the west of the project site, and construction of offsite infrastructure improvements at Sierra Highway would also occur within 25 feet of existing residential homes. Grading activities involving heavy-duty construction equipment would exceed the County's 60 dBA construction noise thresholds of significance. Although temporary, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

Ground-borne vibration would be generated primarily during the site clearing, grading, and soils compaction processes. Vibration values from bulldozer and heavy truck operations are below the architectural damage threshold of 0.2 inch per second as well as the annoyance PPV threshold of 0.1 inch per second for all vibration-sensitive receptors. Therefore, vibration impacts associated with construction would be less than significant.

## Operational Noise and Vibration

As detailed in Section 5.17, Transportation and Traffic, the Approved Project would generate approximately 13,121 vehicle trips. The proposed residences onsite that are within 50 feet from Skyline Ranch Road right-of-way central to the project site would experience a noise level in excess of 60 dBA CNEL without mitigation. Point-source impacts (e.g., people talking, air conditioning units, lawn care equipment, domestic animals) would not exceed ambient noise level standards and would be consistent with adjacent uses in the project vicinity. However, the proposed school and park sites could generate noise levels in excess of the standards in the County code for single-family residences. Impacts would be significant; therefore, mitigation is provided.

Additionally, offsite roadway noise levels were also calculated at various sensitive receptors along arterial and highway segments. Noise levels at these sensitive uses are already considered unacceptable; therefore, offsite mobile noise levels associated with the Approved Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. Cumulative noise impacts at sensitive receptors along segments of Sierra Highway and Whites Canyon Road would also be significant and unavoidable.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### 5.13.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Would the Modified Project result in:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in <br> New Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | No Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas? |  |  |  | X |  |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems? |  |  |  | X |  |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  |  |  | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  |  |  | X |

## Comments:

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?

## Minor Technical Changes or Additions.

## Mobile Source Impacts

Noise impacts from operation of the Modified Project would occur primarily from project-generated traffic. The Modified Project would eliminate 40 single-family dwelling units, which would reduce vehicle trips compared to the Approved Project. Traffic noise generated by the Modified Project would be slightly below that estimated for the Approved Project, and no new significant impacts would occur as a result of the Modified Project or as a result of changed circumstances.
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## Stationary Source Impacts

Project implementation would result in the generation of noise from stationary sources related to the planned single-family homes (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air conditions units). By eliminating 40 single-family homes, stationary-source noise impacts associated with the Modified Project would be reduced compared to the Approved Project. No new significant impacts would occur as a result of the project modifications.
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The Modified Project would result in the construction of 40 fewer single-family residential dwelling units on a reduced development footprint compared to the Approved Project. In general, construction equipment associated with the Modified Project would be the same as for the Approved Project; however, the construction schedule may be shorter for less development. Therefore, groundborne vibration and noise impacts would likely be lessened under the Modified Project.
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As described in Section 5.13.2(a), operational noise levels related to the Modified Project would be similar or slightly reduced in comparison to the Approved Project. Therefore, the Modified Project would not introduce new substantial ambient noise impacts.
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The operation of the Modified Project would not involve the use of amplified sound systems. Temporary noise levels associated with construction activities would be higher than the project area's existing ambient noise levels, but would subside once construction of the proposed project were completed. Generally, two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction: 1) mobile-source noise from transport of workers and material deliveries and 2) stationary construction noise from use of onsite equipment. Construction noise from on-road vehicles associated with the Modified Project would be similar to the Approved Project because it would likely generate a similar number of construction worker and vendor trips.

In general, construction activities associated with the Modified Project would require the same type of construction equipment as the Approved Project and therefore would generate similar magnitudes of noise. Since the Modified Project would involve constructing 40 fewer residential units within a reduced development footprint, construction activities would be slightly reduced. Therefore, the Modified Project would not introduce new substantial temporary noise impacts.
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e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The Skyline Ranch project site is not within an airport land-use plan or within two miles of a public use airport. The nearest major airport, Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, is over 17 miles to the south of the project site. The nearest public airport, Agua Dulce Airpark, is over 9 miles northeast of the project site. The residents and workers of the Modified Project would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from a public airport. No impact would occur.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. There are no private airstrips near the project site. The residences and workers onsite would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

### 5.13.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

## Construction Noise

(1) Movement of Construction Equipment Noise
4.G-1 (a) Construction truck routes and equipment shall, to the extent feasible, avoid residential areas and roadways adjacent to noise sensitive receptors.
4.G-1(b) Wherever heavy duty truck traffic associated with project construction utilizes roadways with adjacent noise sensitive receptors, the trucks shall avoid peak hour traffic in order to minimize potential truck idling in proximity to these receptors.
(2) Grading/Building Construction Noise
4.G-2(a) All construction activities within 300 feet of an occupied single- or multifamily residential lot shall be restricted to between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, and between 8:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. on Saturday. Construction work shall be prohibited on Sundays, New Year's Day, Independence Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, Memorial Day, and Labor Day.
4.G-2(b) The construction contractor shall provide at least 72-hour advance notice of the start of construction activities to all noise sensitive uses within 300 feet of on-site and off-site occupied residences. Notification shall be by mail. The announcement shall state specifically where and when construction activities will occur, and provide contact information for filing noise complaints. Notices shall provide tips on reducing noise intrusion, for example, by closing windows facing the planned construction.
4.G-2(c) When construction operations occur within 300 feet of on- or off-site occupied residences, all feasible measures to reduce construction equipment noise levels at the residences shall be
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employed. These measures shall include among other things changing the location of stationary construction equipment to increase the distance between the equipment and the receptors, shutting off idling equipment, notifying residents in advance of construction work, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.
4.G-2(d) Prior to construction of structures on the residential lots east of existing residences east of Falcon Crest Drive and Bakerton Avenue, temporary acoustic barriers, shall be erected along the rear lot lines within 300 feet of the western site boundary. The extent of this requirement, including the height, length, number of properties, etc., shall be determined by an acoustical consultant retained by the applicant with access to project-related design and construction information. These barriers may be constructed of any solid material, shall be continuous with no gaps, and shall remain in place until building construction on these lots is completed.

## Operational Noise

(1) On-Site Roadway Noise
4.G-3(a) Prior to construction of any residential development along Skyline Ranch Road a detailed acoustical analysis report prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant shall be submitted to the County for review and approval. For all on-site single family residences that have rear and/or side yard lines within 100 feet from the centerline of the proposed Skyline Ranch Road, the acoustical analysis report shall describe and quantify the noise sources impacting the area and the measures required to meet the 60 dBA CNEL residential noise standard. Based on a preliminary acoustical analysis included in Appendix G of theis Skyline Ranch Draft EIR, the placement of a 6 -foot high solid masonry wall is recommended at the locations shown in Appendix G, Figures 1 through 8, in order to achieve this noise standard.
4.G-3(b) Balconies, greater than six (6) feet in depth, are considered exterior living areas and must also meet the exterior noise standard. Therefore, balconies shall either be discouraged from exposure to exterior noise levels greater than the 65 dBA CNEL (residences that are within 50 feet from the edge of the proposed Skyline Ranch Road) standard for single-family residences through architectural or site design, or balconies shall be enclosed by solid noise barriers, such as $3 / 8$-inch glass or 5/8-inch Plexiglas or other equally effective construction materials to a height specified by a qualified noise consultant.
4.G-3(c) All on-site single-family residences within 50 feet of the Skyline Ranch Road right-of-way shall include whole-house air conditioning so that windows facing the roadway may be closed without compromising a comfortable interior living environment.

## (2) Point Source Noise

## 5. Environmental Analysis

4.G-4(a) Prior to issuance of building permits, a detailed acoustical analysis study shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant for all on-site single family residences that have rear and/or side yard lines within line-of-site of the proposed school and/or park and shall be submitted to the County. This acoustical analysis report shall describe and quantify the noise sources impacting the area. In the event the report shows that noise levels for the residences would exceed applicable standards, measures shall be required to reduce noise to levels that are within applicable standards. Such measures may include:

- Locate student pick-up/drop-off and parking areas as far away from residences as feasible;
- Arrange school buildings such that they will provide shielding between the play field and the residences; or
- Provide acoustical walls with sufficient mass, length and height to break the line-of-sight between the residences and the play field.

The acoustical analysis report shall be subject to review and approval by the County and shall ensure compliance with applicable noise standards in the County Code.
4.G-4(b) Prior to completion of plans for the proposed elementary school and public park, a detailed acoustical analysis report shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant in consultation with the Sulfur Springs School District and the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation. The requirements set forth in the report shall ensure that on-site single family residences that have rear and/or side yard lines within line-of-site of the proposed school and/or park are not subject to unacceptably high levels of noise (i.e., noise levels in excess of the standards provided in the County Code) from school yard or park activities. The acoustical analysis report, subject to review and approval by the County, shall include requirements relating to the locations of courts and playfields and the materials and heights of property walls as necessary to support compliance with applicable noise standards in the County Code.

### 5.13.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

### 5.14.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.R, Population, Housing and Employment, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

The 2010 Certified EIR concluded that impacts to population and housing would be less than significant. The Approved Project would allow for up to 1,260 residential units and 4,158 residents (based on an average household size of 3.3 persons per household). Based on SCAG's adopted growth forecasts for the regional, subregional, and local areas, the project-generated population represented only $0.6,1.6$, and 6.0 percent of the total forecast population, respectively.

The 1,260 units proposed under the Approved Project represents a total of 0.4 percent, 1.6 percent, and 5.5 percent of the total housing unit growth projected by SCAG for the regional, subregional, and local areas during that period, respectively.

Additionally, the proposed school and park would generate 62 new jobs. The employment opportunities generated by the project represent 0.32 percent of the SCAG employment growth forecast for the local area, which is negligible. The relative employment for the regional and subregional areas is less.

Overall, population and housing impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

### 5.14.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in <br> New Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |  |  |  |  | X |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |  |  |  |  | X |
| d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? |  |  |  | X |  |

## Comments:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. In comparison to Approved TTM 60922, the Modified Project would allow for 1,220 single-family homes rather than 1,260 homes. This would reduce the expected population onsite by 139 persons (see Table 9).

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Table 9 Approved Project vs. Modified Project - Population

| Tract 60922 | Number of Residential Units | Generation Rate <br> (persons per household) | Total Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approved | 1,260 | 3.46 | 4,360 |
| Modified | 1,220 | 3.46 | 4,221 |
| Difference | -40 Units | - | -139 Persons |

Thus, while population growth would occur upon development of the Modified Project, the 40 -unit reduction from the Approved Project would reduce the project's total population. Impacts would be less than significant.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. Neither the Approved TTM 60922 nor the Modified Project would displace substantial numbers of existing housing, because the site is vacant and undeveloped. The Modified Project would allow for up to 1,220 residential units compared to 1,260 units under the Approved Project. Existing housing would not be displaced, and no impact would occur.
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. As stated in Section 5.14.2(b), Approved TTM 60922 and the Modified Project would not displace residents from the project site because the site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The Modified Project would allow for up to 1,2020 single-family homes, which would generate a population of approximately 4,221 persons. This is a rate of 3.46 persons per household taken from the 2010 US Census Bureau for Los Angeles County Tracts 9200.32, 9200.33, and 9200.34. No impact would occur.
d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. According to the 2010 US Census Bureau for Los Angeles County Tracts $9200.32,9200.33$, and 9200.34 , the average household size is 3.46 persons. Applying this average household size, development of the Modified Project would add approximately 4,221 additional residents to the existing population, 139 fewer residents than Approved TTM 60922 (see Table 9). The Approved Project would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. Thus, given that the Modified Project would result in fewer residents, impacts would not result in significant cumulative growth.

Furthermore, as discussed in Section 5.18, Utilities and Service Systems, adequate infrastructure and utilities are available in the immediate vicinity of the project site, and no substantial new infrastructure or extension of existing infrastructure would be required that could directly induce additional population growth in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

### 5.14.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

The 2010 Certified EIR did not include mitigation measures related to population and housing.

### 5.14.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts.

### 5.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

### 5.15.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Sections 4.L, Law Enforcement Services, 4.M, Fire Services and Hazards, 4.N, Education, and 4.O, Libraries, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

## Law Enforcement Services

Primary law enforcement protection services to the project site are provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and traffic regulation enforcement and traffic incident response are provided by the California Highway Patrol (CHP). The nearest sheriff's station is the Santa Clarita Valley Station, approximately five miles from the site. The nearest CHP station is the Newhall Ranch Station, approximately eight miles from the site. Based on the Certified EIR, implementation of the Approved Project would increase calls for service and demand on the Santa Clarita Valley Sheriff's station. Under Chapter 22.74 of the Los Angeles County Code, the project is subject to developer impact fees that would fully fund the project's share of capital improvements and reduce the project's impacts on police services. Additionally, development in accordance with the Approved Project would increase annual revenues in the form of taxes (e.g., income, property, sales tax). The project-generated revenue would be deposited in the County's General Funds, which would allocate a portion for the Sheriff's Department's services.

The Approved Project would also increase demand on CHP services and further extend existing resources for traffic control and incident responses if additional staffing and upgrades are not adequately funded in the future. The Certified EIR concluded that if sufficient County and state funds were not allocated to support increases in law enforcement services in the area, project-related impacts to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and CHP would be significant and unavoidable.

## Fire Services and Hazards

The Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) provides fire protection services to the project site. The closest fire stations are Fire Station 107 in Canyon Country and Fire Station 128 in Santa Clarita, approximately 1.0 mile south and 3.7 miles west of the site, respectively. Buildout of the Approved Project would require additional staff, equipment, and facilities. The project would be required to pay developer impact fees pursuant to the Los Angeles County Fire Department's Developer fee program, which would help fund land acquisition, facility improvements, and new equipment. Additionally, the County's General

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Funds would proportionally increase with project-generated tax revenue from development of the Approved Project.

The project site is in an area highly susceptible to wildfires and is designated a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) due to the Santa Clarita Valley weather conditions and the topography and vegetation onsite. Because the site is in a VHFHSZ, the Approved Project would be required to prepare a fuel modification plan, a landscape plan, and an irrigation plan. The Approved Project would also be required to adhere to applicable standards in the County Fire Code, Building Code, and California Fire Code. Mitigation measures are proposed to ensure fire hazards are reduced to less than significant levels.

## Education

The project site is within the attendance boundaries of the Sulphur Springs School District (SSSD), Saugus Union School District (SUSD), and William S. Hart Union High School District (HUHSD). The Approved Project included an 11-acre school site that would be developed, operated, and maintained by SSSD. Approximately 305 elementary school students would be generated in SSSD by the Approved Project. These students would be accommodated by the proposed SSSD elementary school on-site, which has a proposed capacity of 750 students. In addition, the Approved Project would generate approximately 178 elementary school students within SUSD, and approximately 160 junior high students and 301 senior high students in HUHSD. Under the provisions of SB 50, the payment of developer fees is "deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation" for purposes of CEQA.

## Libraries

The Canyon Country Jo Anne Darcy Library would service the project residents and is approximately 1.15 miles from the site. Project residents would increase the demand for library services and resources (i.e., items, facility space, and staffing). Since the Darcy Library currently has a deficit of 88,070 items and 21,345 square feet of library space, the project would contribute to this deficit and further hinder the library's efforts to meet its service guidelines. However, the project would be subject to the payment of library impact fees pursuant to Section 22.72 of the Los Angeles County Code. Fees would be used to compensate for the project's increased demand for library resources. The County Public Library has indicated that payment of fees would mitigate the project's impacts on libraries to less than significant.

### 5.15.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Would the Modified Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

## 5. Environmental Analysis

|  | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information <br> Showing <br> Greater <br> Significant <br> Effects than <br> Previous ElR | New Mitigation <br> or Alternative to <br> Reduce <br> Significant <br> Effect is <br> Declined |  <br> Minor Technical <br> Changes or <br> Additions | No <br> Impact |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Would the project create capacity or service level <br> problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts <br> associated with the provision of new or physically altered <br> governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable <br> service ratios, response times or other performance <br> objectives for any of the public services: |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Fire protection? |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Sheriff protection? |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Schools? |  |  |  | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |
| d) Parks? |  |  |  | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |
| e) Libraries? |  |  |  | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |
| f) Other public facilities? |  |  |  | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |

## Comments:

## a) Fire protection?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The minor technical changes to the approved TTM would not result in substantial impacts to fire protection services. Payment of LACoFD developer fees would ensure that the Modified Project funds its fair share of fees to offset its demand for services. Additionally, development in accordance with the Modified Project would proportionally increase taxes (e.g., income, property, and sales tax), which would increase the County's General Funds and allocate more funding to LACoFD for staffing and equipment.

Emergency access to the project site would be provided primarily via Skyline Ranch Road and the Sierra Highway. The proposed realignment of Skyline Ranch Road through the Modified Project site would not alter the alignments of the access points at the borders of the project site. Internal access within the project site would be provided via the project's internal residential streets. All project roadways would be constructed to meet the requirements (minimum street width, turning radii, slope, etc.) of the LACoFD conditions of approval, which are required to be implemented as part of project approval.

Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would still be required to prepare a fuel modification plan, landscape plan, and irrigation plan to minimize fire hazards onsite. Project buildings would also adhere to all applicable state and County fire and building codes. Project plans would be reviewed by LACoFD prior to the issuance of building permits to ensure that the Modified Project would be compliant with applicable fire codes, regulations, and conditions. Additionally, the proposed mitigation measures would ensure that such fire codes, regulations, and conditions are adhered to.

The elimination of 40 single-family homes would reduce the project-generated population by 139 people. The population reduction would also reduce calls for fire service compared to the Approved Project.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Additionally, the proposed modifications to the approved TTM would not result in any uses that would expose residents to an unusually high level of public safety risks associated with fire protection services (i.e., earthquakes, fires, etc.).These modifications also would not impact LACoFD's ability to provide fire protection service to the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur as a result of modification to Tract 60922. Project modifications would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to fire protection services, either as a result of the project or changed circumstances.

## b) Police protection?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The elimination of 40 single-family homes would reduce the project's population by 139 people and reduce calls for service. Modifications to the Approved Project would not result in any uses that would expose residents to an unusually high level of public safety risks associated with law enforcement services. Residents would be exposed to the same level of public safety risks, such as break-ins, car thefts, and domestic disturbances. The Modified Project would not result in significant new impacts compared to the Approved Project.

As with other public services, funding for the Sheriff's Department is derived from various types of tax revenue deposited in the County General Fund. The Law Enforcement Facilities Fee provides additional revenue for law enforcement facilities in the unincorporated Santa Clarita, Newhall, and Gorman areas of north Los Angeles County. Under Chapter 22.74 of the Los Angeles County Code, developers of new residential, commercial, office, and industrial development projects in these areas are required to pay a Law Enforcement Facilities Fee to mitigate impacts to law enforcement facilities, including new or expanded sheriff's stations and new patrol vehicles. Fees collected are deposited in a special law enforcement capital facilities fund for the fee zone corresponding with the area in which a project is located. The project site is in Zone 1, Santa Clarita. Fees would be used exclusively for the purpose of land acquisition, engineering, construction, installation, purchasing, or any other direct cost of providing law enforcement facilities to the development. Payment of the fee would ensure that the Modified Project funds its fair share of fees to offset its demand for police services.

Additionally, all onsite roadways and emergency access provisions would be subject to review and approval by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the Sheriff's Department. In addition, development projects are required to incorporate Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design features into the project, in coordination with and to the satisfaction of the Sheriff's Department. Such features may include lighting in parking lots and low-level security lighting; doors and windows visible from the street and between buildings; lighting of building address numbers to ensure visibility from the street for emergency response agencies; and landscaping that would minimize opportunities for hiding. The applicant must also provide the Sheriff's Department with plans indicating the project's street circulation system and building addresses to facilitate emergency response. Therefore, no impacts to emergency access and/or emergency evacuation plans would occur. Pursuant to existing regulations, impacts relating to the exposure of public safety risks would remain less than significant. Project modifications would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to police protection services, either as a result of the project or changed circumstances.
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## c) Schools?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The student population generated by the Modified Project would be served by SSSD, SUSD, and HUHSD. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would include an 11.9-acre school site ( 750 -student capacity) to be maintained and operated by SSSD. It is assumed that all student residents on the project site would attend the proposed SSSD school onsite from kindergarten through 6th grade before moving onto junior high and high school in HUHSD.

The elimination of 40 single-family homes would reduce the project's population to 4,221 residents. Table 10 compares the estimated student generation between the Approved and Modified Projects. As shown, the Modified Project would result in 60 fewer students than the Approved Project. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to school services.

Table 10 Approved Project vs. Modified Project, Student Generation

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{School District} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Student Generation Rate \({ }^{1}\)} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Approved Project (1,260 total units)} \& \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Modified Project (1,220 Units)} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Difference} \\
\hline \& \& Units \& No. of Students \& Units \& No. of Students \& \\
\hline Sulphur Springs \& 0.359 \& 849 \& 305 \& 1,220 \& 438 \& 133 \\
\hline Saugus Union \& 0.4329 \& 411 \& 178 \& 0 \& 0 \& -178 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Hart USD \\
(Jr. High School, Grades 7-8) \\
Hart USD \\
(High School, Grades 9-12)
\end{tabular} \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 0.1270 \\
\& 0.2386
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 1,260 \\
\& 1,260
\end{aligned}
\] \& 160
301 \& 1,220
1,220 \& 155

291 \& -5
-10 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Total} \& - \& 944 \& - \& 884 \& -60 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Source: County of Los Angeles, Skyline Ranch Project Draft EIR, July 2009.} <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Additionally, under state law, development projects are required to pay established school impact fees in accordance with Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) at the time of building permit issuance. The funding program established by SB 50 has been found by the legislature to constitute "full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act... on the provision of adequate school facilities" (Government Code $\S 65995[\mathrm{~h}]$ ). The fees authorized for collection under SB 50 are conclusively deemed full and adequate mitigation of impacts to SSSD, SUSD, and HUHSD. Therefore, the increases in school facilities and services demand due to development are adequately mitigated by the payment of SB 50 fees. Overall, project modifications would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to schools, either as a result of the project or changed circumstances.

## d) Parks?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. See response in Section 5.16, Recreation, below.

## e) Libraries

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The project is served by the Canyon Country Jo Anne Darcy Library at 18601 Soledad Canyon Road. Project demand for library services is based on guideline factors of
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2.75 items per capita and 0.5 square foot of facility space per capita, as provided by the County of Los Angeles Public Library. Compared to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would reduce demand for library services by 139 persons, 382 items, and 69.5 square feet.

Chapter 22.72 of the Los Angeles County Code describes the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee program, which requires developers of any new residential projects to pay fees to mitigate impacts to library services. Fees are deposited in a special library capital facilities fund for the library planning area in which a project is located. Fees are to be used solely for the financing of public library facilities, the need for which is generated directly or indirectly by residential development projects. The Modified Project would be subject to the payment of library impact fees pursuant to Section 22.72 of the Los Angeles County Code. Fees paid would be used to offset the project's demand for library resources. Therefore, impacts on libraries would be less than significant. Overall, the Modified Project would not adversely impact library facilities compared to the Approved Project.

## f) Other public facilities?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Other public facilities, such as community recreation facilities, would not be substantially affected by the Modified Project. Although this issue was not discussed in the certified 2010 EIR, the Modified Project would include 19.6 acres of parkland and seven recreation centers throughout the site. This would reduce the demand for and use of existing community recreational facilities in the project area. Thus, the development of Modified Tract 60922 would result in beneficial impacts.

### 5.15.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

## Sheriff's Department

4.L-1(a) Prior to issuance of building permits, the project shall incorporate Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) features into the project, in coordination with and to the satisfaction of the Sheriff's Department. Such features should include, but are not limited to the following:

- Lighting in parking lots and low-level security lighting;
- Provision that doors and windows are visible from the street and between buildings;
- Lighting of building address numbers to ensure visibility from the street for emergency response agencies; and
- Landscaping that would minimize opportunities for hiding.
4.L-1(b) Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide the Sheriff's Department with plans indicating the project's street circulation system and building addresses to facilitate emergency response.


## Fire Protection Services

## 5. Environmental Analysis

4.M-1(a) Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay fees to support the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) pursuant to the LACoFD Developer Fee Program.
4.M-1(b) Development of the project shall occur in accordance with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows, and hydrants.
4.M-1(c) Project buildings shall adhere to all applicable State and County Fire and Building Codes.
4.M-1(d) The project shall provide adequate emergency access. Access roads shall:

- Provide a minimum width of 20 feet;
- extend to within 150 feet of any exterior portion of all structures;
- meet the minimum width requirements prescribed by the LACoFD;
- be constructed with an all-weather surface;
- have a minimum of 10 feet of brush clearance on each side;
- have an unobstructed vertical clearance clear-to-sky with the exception of protected tree species;
- have a vertical clearance of 13.5 feet when protected tree species are overhanging; and
- have a turning radii of no less than 32 feet.
4.M-1(e) A turning area satisfactory to the LACoFD shall be provided for all driveways exceeding 150 feet in length and at the end of all cul-de-sacs.
4.M-1(f) All fire lanes must be a minimum of 26 feet in width (clear-to-sky) and marked "NO PARKING——FIRE LANE."
4.M-1 (g) All access devices and gates for the proposed school shall comply with California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Article 3.05, including providing a minimum paved access width of 26 feet for circulation purposes.
4.M-1(h) Proposed traffic calming measures shall be submitted to the LACoFD for review and approval.
4.M-1(i) All fire hydrants shall:
- Measure 6 " $\times 4$ " x 2-1/2" brass or bronze, conforming to current AWWWA standard C503 or approved equal;
- On-site hydrants shall be installed a minimum 25 feet from a structure or protected by a two- hour rated firewall;
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- Fire hydrants shall be installed, tested, and accepted prior to construction;
- Vehicular access to fire hydrants shall be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction.


## Wildfire Hazard

4.M-2 Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, a Fuel Modification Plan, consistent with the Fuel Modification Plan Guidelines, shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Regional Planning and the Forestry Division of the LACoFD to reduce the threat of wildfire. The Fuel Modification Plan shall require that applicant or homeowners association provide and maintain fuel modification and brush clearance zones around each on-site structure. Said plan shall be approved by the Forestry Division prior to completion of final landscape plans.

Please also see Mitigation Measures 4.M-1(b), 4.M-1(c), and 4.M-1(d).

### 5.15.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.16 RECREATION

### 5.16.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.P, Parks, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

The Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation is responsible for the operations and maintenance of public parks in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The County has a standard of 4 acres per 1,000 residents for unincorporated areas. The Approved Project would provide approximately 18 acres of public and private park space, which includes a 12 -acre public neighborhood park, a 2.5 -acre private park, and eight pocket parks totaling approximately 3.7 acres. The proposed public park would dedicate 10.6 acres to the Parks Department. The remaining parks would be maintained by a homeowners' association. Other proposed recreational amenities onsite include 2 miles of hiking trails, 1 mile of paseos, and 8 miles of bike lanes along Skyline Ranch Road, Main Street North, and Main Street South. The undeveloped northern portion of the site would also include approximately 2.2 miles of trail easement that would connect to the Mint Canyon Trail in the north and the existing Plum Canyon fire road in the south.

Based on the County's 4 acres per 1,000 residents standard, the Approved Project is required to provide 12.23 net acres of onsite park space. The Approved Project would provide 10.6 acres of public park space and inlieu fees to meet the County requirements per Section 21.28 .140 of the Los Angeles County Code.
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Additionally, the Approved Project would not necessitate the construction of additional off-site facilities, which could result in secondary, adverse impacts on the environment. Project residents are expected to primarily utilize the proposed on-site parks and recreational facilities, which provide for both active and passive recreation. Impacts would be less than significant.

### 5.16.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity? |  |  |  |  | X |

## Comments:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The Modified Project would reduce the number of residential lots by 40 , from 1,260 to 1,220 units. This would reduce the project-generated population by 139 people. Therefore, the Modified Project would generate less demand on existing neighborhood and regional parks. Additionally, the Modified Project would include 19.6 acres of public and private parks; 3.0 miles of hiking trails, 3.3 miles of paseos, 2.3 miles of multipurpose trails, and a 2.2 -mile trail easement; and 9.8 miles of bike lanes that would be accessible to the residents onsite.

Based on the County's parkland standard of 4 acres per 1,000 residents, the reduced population would also reduce the project's park dedication requirement from 17.4 to 16.9 acres. The Modified Project includes 16.9 acres of public parks throughout the site, and 2.7 acres of private parks. Therefore, the Modified Project would meet the County's parkland standard. Although not credited under the parkland requirement, it should be noted that the Modified Project would provide an additional mile of hiking trails, 2.3 miles of paseos, 2.3 miles of multipurpose trails, and 1.8 miles of bike lanes compared to the Approved Project (see Table 2, above). Overall, impacts would be less than significant.
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b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would include a number of public parks and recreational amenities. The Modified Project would relocate and expand the parks into 16.9 acres of public parks and 2.7 acres of private parks, as shown on Figure 7, Modified Parks and Trails. As shown on Figure 4, Approved TTM vs. Proposed Concept Plan, one of the parks would be relocated near the proposed school site to provide better accessibility to the student population that would likely use the park more than other residents. Additionally, a community center is proposed near the agequalified residences, and would include a club house, pool deck area, outdoor dining, barbecue area, and seating.

The relocation and expansion of park sites by 1.4 acres, inclusion of a community center, and a reduction in the number of residents generated by the Modified Project would beneficially impact park services and the community. The net incremental impact of the Modified Project on recreational facilities would be less than significant, and no new substantial impacts would occur as a result of the Modified Project or changed circumstances.
c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?

No Impact. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would include a 2.2 -mile trail easement to connect with the existing regional Mint Canyon Trail in the undeveloped northern portion of the project site. Therefore, no new significant impacts to regional trails would occur as a result of the Modified Project or as a result of changed circumstances.

### 5.16.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

The 2010 Certified EIR did not include mitigation measures related to recreation.

### 5.16.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR and would not result in significant impacts to recreation.

### 5.17 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

### 5.17.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Section 4.F, Traffic/Access, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

## Trip Generation and Intersection Analysis

The Approved Project was forecast to generate 13,121 vehicle trips per day, with 1,268 in the AM peak hours and 1,283 in the PM peak hours. Based on intersection analysis, the project would have a significant impact at
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the County intersections of Plum Canyon Road with Skyline Ranch Road/Heller Circle (South) and Golden Valley Road with Plum Canyon Road, and at City intersections of Sierra Highway with Soledad Canyon Road and Sierra Highway with Skyline Ranch Road.

The Certified EIR found that significant cumulative impacts would occur on Sierra Highway; however, due to the speculative nature of the timing of implementation and availability of funding to implement short- and long-range plans, the reduction of cumulative impacts to less than significant levels cannot be guaranteed, and therefore cumulative impacts to Sierra Highway between Sand Canyon Road to the south of the Sierra Highway interchange would be significant and unavoidable.

## CMP Analysis

The Congestion Management Plan (CMP) intersections nearest to the project site are the intersections of Sierra Highway with Sand Canyon Road and Sierra Highway with Soledad Canyon Road. The Approved Project was not anticipated to add 50 or more peak-hour trips to the intersection of Sierra Highway / Sand Canyon Road ( 15 PM trips), but was expected to add more than 50 trips to the intersection of Sierra Highway / Soledad Canyon Road (455 PM trips). An impact analysis of this intersection concluded that the intersection was forecast to exceed LOS F prior to the addition of project traffic and that the project would cause a significant impact based on the CMP guidelines if mitigation measures were not implemented.

### 5.17.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical study and technical memorandum:

- Skeyline Ranch (Revised VTTM 060922) On-Site Roadway Analysis, Stantec Consulting Services Inc., October 18, 2016.
- Skyline Ranch (Revised VTTM 060922) Land Use and Trip Generation Update, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., December 5, 2016.

A complete copy of the study and technical memorandum is included in Appendix B.
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Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | No Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel, and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? |  |  |  |  | X |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? |  |  |  | X |  |
| f) Conflict with the adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? |  |  |  | X |  |

## Comments:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel, and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The Modified Project would develop 40 fewer residential units than the Approved Project. Stantec Consulting Services prepared a trip generation analysis to calculate the number of trips that would be generated by the Modified Project.

The trip generation estimates were calculated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers' trip generation rates for single-family residential, Los Angeles County rates for townhouse/condominium, and rates derived
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from case studies for the proposed elementary school (see Table 11). The elementary school case study rates reflect the higher trip generation characteristics of a typical southern California elementary school.

Table 11 Modified Project Trip Generation Rates

| Land Use | Units | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | ADT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Inbound | Outbound | Total | Inbound | Outbound | Total |  |
| Trip Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family | DU | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 9.52 |
| Detached Condominium | DU | 0.06 | 0.48 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 0.73 | 8.00 |
| Elementary School | STU | 0.25 | 0.20 | 0.45 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.28 | 1.29 |

Source: Stantec 2016.
Notes: DU = dwelling units; STU = students; ADT = average daily trips

Using these generation rates, the Modified Project is forecast to generate a total of approximately 12,059 vehicle trips per day, with 1,181 in the AM peak hour ( 810 outbound) and 1,127 in the PM peak hour (714 inbound). Table 12 compares the trip generation summaries of the Approved and Modified Projects. The Modified Project would generate 1,062 fewer average daily trips ( 87 fewer AM peak hour trips and 156 fewer PM peak hour trips) compared to the Approved Project; however, significant and unavoidable impacts to Highway 14 from Sand Canyon Road to the south of the Sierra Highway interchange would not be eliminated. Development of the Modified Project would not result in new significant impacts on the traffic and circulation system, and the level of impact remains unchanged from the Certified EIR.

Table 12 Trip Generation Comparison

| Land Use | Amount | Units | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | ADT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Inbound | Outbound | Total | Inbound | Outbound | Total |  |
| Approved Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family | 1,270 | DU | 241 | 711 | 953 | 813 | 470 | 1,283 | 12,154 |
| Elementary School | 750 | STU | 173 | 143 | 315 | NA | NA | NA | 968 |
| Total |  |  | 414 | 854 | 1,268 | 813 | 470 | 1,283 | 13,121 |
| Modified Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family (210) | 876 | DU | 164 | 493 | 657 | 552 | 324 | 876 | 8,340 |
| Detached Condominium | 344 | DU | 21 | 165 | 186 | 162 | 89 | 251 | 2,752 |
| Elementary School | 750 | STU | 186 | 152 | 338 | -- | -- | -- | 968 |
| Total |  |  | 371 | 810 | 1,181 | 714 | 413 | 1,127 | 12,059 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Difference |  |  | -43 | -44 | -87 | -99 | -57 | -156 | -1,062 |
| Source: Stantec 2016. <br> Notes: DU = dwelling units; STU = students; ADT = average daily trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

An analysis for the proposed school access was also provided in the 2016 Stantec report. Initially, four access alternatives were analyzed: 1) full access, unsignalized intersection, 2) a roundabout at the school entrance, 3) a right/left-in and right-out only access point at the school with a roundabout at the park, and 4) a right/leftin and right-out only access point at the school with a U-turn at the park. A fifth alternative was subsequently
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developed through consultation with the Los Angeles County Public Works staff. This preferred alternative consists of a full access unsignalized intersection at the school with a channelized/dedicated right-turn lane into the school. A dedicated acceleration/merge lane would be provided for the exiting school traffic turning left onto southbound Skyline Ranch Road. A U-turn at the park would also be developed as a secondary means for traffic to head south on Skyline Ranch Road. County Public Works anticipates prohibiting left-turn into the school during the peak times, preferring instead to have the inbound traffic proceed to the southerly roundabout to make a U-turn and return to the school in the northbound direction and enter as right-turns.

Based on the peak hour signal warrant analysis, a traffic signal is not warranted at the school intersection. A traffic signal is not recommended for the school entrance due to the close proximity to the south roundabout and because the traffic signal would not meet the minimum volume warrants.

The Modified Project would also realign Skyline Ranch Road along the western boundary of the proposed community, providing access to the development via two roundabouts-one at the northern end near the park site, and one at the southern end near the school site. An evaluation of the roundabout concepts has been prepared with SIDRA software. The analysis indicates that both the north and the south roundabouts would operate at good LOS based on a single-lane roundabout configuration (see Table 13).

Table 13 Proposed Roundabouts LOS and Delay Summary

|  | AM |  | PM |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roundabout Locations | LOS | Average Delay <br> (seconds) | LOS | Average Delay <br> (seconds) |
| Skyline Ranch Road \& North <br> Roundabout | A | 9.7 | B | 13.0 |
| Skyline Ranch Road \& South <br> Roundabout | B | 10.6 | B | 10.4 |
| Source: Stantec 2016. |  |  |  |  |

The queue lengths for each leg of the north and south roundabouts on Skyline Ranch Road are shown in Table 14.

Table 14 Queue Lengths for Each Leg of Roundabouts

|  | North Roundabout Queue Length (ft) |  | South Roundabout Queue Length (ft) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| South Leg (Skyline Ranch Rd) | 85.9 | 101.1 | 79.1 | 118.3 |
| East Leg (Loop Rd) | 97.7 | 45.5 | 66.9 | 39.5 |
| North Leg (Skyline Ranch Rd) | 139.7 | 277.5 | 204.7 | 196.0 |
| Source: Stantec 2016. |  |  |  |  |

To evaluate the operation of the Skyline Ranch Road intersections, a Synchro/SimTraffic simulation model was prepared for Skyline Ranch Road and the north, south, park and school intersections. Simulation results for the school driveway shows that the average vehicle, after dropping off students, would take approximately
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24.1 seconds and 12.7 seconds to exit left and right, respectively, out of the school driveway during the AM peak.

The park intersection also provides a convenient location for exiting traffic to make a U-turn and proceed south on Skyline Ranch Road. Table 15 summarizes the lane LOS and approach delay at the school and park intersections during both AM and PM peak. The analysis indicates that the school site access would operate at LOS C or better during both AM \& PM peak hour with a maximum queue length of 136 feet during the AM peak.

Table 15 LOS, Delay \& Queue Summary at School and Park

| Location |  | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay (sec) | Queue | LOS | Delay (sec) | Queue |
| Skyline Ranch Rd \& School | WBL | C | 24.1 | 136 | B | 14.2 | 71 |
|  | WBR | B | 12.7 | 52 | B | 12.6 | 59 |
| Skyline Ranch Rd \& Park | WBL/R | C | 20.8 | 39 | C | 21.0 | 43 |
|  | SBL | A | 8.6 | 27 | A | 8.4 | 21 |

Source: Stantec 2016.
In addition, the County and City of Santa Clarita have established multiple Bridge and Thoroughfare (B\&T) Districts. The project site is in two of the B\&T districts: the Bouquet Canyon District, which covers the western portion of the site, and the Eastside District, which covers the eastern portion of the site. Both of these $\mathrm{B} \& \mathrm{~T}$ districts were recently updated and are considered full improvement districts. By being full improvement districts, the $\mathrm{B} \& \mathrm{~T}$ fees collected in the districts are intended to cover all the anticipated improvements necessary to build out the arterial roadway network. The B\&T fees are assessed based on the number of peak hour trips generated by the proposed project collected at the time of recordation of a final tract map.
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. According to the CMP for Los Angeles County, the CMP intersections closest to the project site are Sierra Highway at Sand Canyon Road and Sierra Highway at Soledad Canyon Road.

The CMP traffic impact analysis guidelines consider that a project has a significant impact on the regional transportation system when the following thresholds are exceeded:

- The proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2 percent of capacity or more (V/C $>0.02$ ), causing LOS F (V/C > 1.00); or
- If the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2 percent of capacity or more ( $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}>0.02$ ).
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According to the CMP guidelines, the geographical area examined in a CMP traffic impact analysis consists of the CMP monitoring locations where the proposed project would add 50 or more trips during the AM or PM weekday peak hours (of adjacent street traffic) or main-line freeway locations where the project would add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours. Compared to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would reduce project-generated vehicle trips (see Table 12); therefore, it would not add trips to the Sierra Highway/Sand Canyon or Sierra Highway/Soledad Canyon Road intersections or to any main-line freeway locations. Thus, project impacts at CMP intersections and main-line freeway locations are not anticipated. Therefore, no new significant impacts result from project modification or changed circumstances.
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not alter air traffic patterns. The nearest major airport, Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, is over 17 miles to the south of the project site. The project would not increase use of the airport, causing an increase in air traffic levels, and it would not directly cause a change in flight paths due to the construction of tall buildings. No impacts to air traffic patterns would occur. No new significant impacts would result from project modification or changed circumstances.
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As part of the Modified Project, Skyline Ranch Road would be realigned through the site. However, this would not significantly increase hazardous conditions due to design features or incompatible uses. The final map is required to be designed in accordance with the County of Los Angeles design standards for subdivisions, reviewed by the Land Development Division and County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, and approved by the County Board of Supervisors. By following the design standards for subdivisions, as required by the County, hazardous conditions due to design features and incompatible uses would be reduced. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As part of the Approved and Modified Projects, Whites Canyon Road would be extended from Plum Canyon Road on the west (through VTTM 46018) to the southeast as Skyline Ranch Road, ultimately connecting to Sierra Highway. Implementation of this road alignment improves area-wide emergency access to areas north of Canyon Country and the City of Santa Clarita. The proposed realignment of Skyline Ranch Road under the Modified Project would not affect emergency access because it would still provide two access points through the site. The onsite roadways, roundabouts, and cul-de-sacs would be designed in accordance with the County's subdivision design standards, and the final tentative map would be subject to review by the County of Los Angeles Public Works Department and approval by the County's Board of Supervisors. By following the design standards in the County Code and through the process of review and approval by the County, emergency access would be maintained. The Modified Project would have less than significant emergency access impacts.
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f) Conflict with the adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The project site is served by Santa Clarita Transit Routes 1, 2, and 5, which provide service between Sierra Highway and the Transit Center located in the Valencia Town Center. Additionally, the Santa Clarita Metrolink station on Via Princessa near Whites Canyon Road is approximately two miles south of the site. Given that the Modified Project would reduce residential units and vehicle trips, the project would also decrease potential transit use by project residents.

Bicycle lanes and multipurpose trails are also proposed throughout the Skyline Ranch project site. The Modified Project would develop 10.75 miles of pedestrian connections, including 3.0 miles of hiking trails, a 2.2-mile trail easement, 3.3 miles of paseo trails, and 2.3 miles of multipurpose trails (see Figure 7, Open Space and Trails Map). An additional 1.8 miles of bike lanes would be developed in the Skyline Ranch community. Overall, the Modified Project provides more pedestrian and bicyclist connections than the Approved Project.

Thus, the Modified Project would not have any impact on adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. No new significant impacts would result from project modification or changed circumstances.

### 5.17.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

## County Intersections

4.F-1 (a) Plum Canyon Road at Skyline Ranch Road/Heller Circle (South): Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the project shall redesign and construct the new east leg (Skyline Ranch Road) to include one left-turn lane, one shared left/through lane, and one right-turn lane; and restripe the existing west leg (Heller Circle South) to consist of one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane; and restripe the existing north leg (Plum Canyon Road) left-turn pocket to allow the left-turn movement. Implementation of improvements and fair share determination shall be coordinated with adjoining Tract 46018, since many of the stated improvements are conditions of approval for Tract 46018 and are required to be in place prior to occupancy of Tract 46018 or the proposed project.
4.F-1(b) Golden Valley Road at Plum Canyon Road: The project shall pay its fair share (53 percent) to restripe the northbound Golden Valley Road approach to provide a second leftturn lane, for a total of two northbound left-turn lanes, one northbound through lane, and one northbound right-turn lane. Timing of improvement shall be determined by the County based on Bridge and Thoroughfare (B\&T) District priorities.

## City Intersections

4.F-2(a) Sierra Highway at Soledad Canyon Road: The project shall pay its fair share (100 percent) to add a second southbound left-turn lane, for a total of five approach lanes and reconfigure the approach lanes as two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right turn
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lane, so as to mirror the northbound approach. This improvement may require the acquisition of additional right-of-way to widen the southbound approach of the north leg. Timing of improvement shall be determined by the City based on B\&T District priorities.
4.F-2(b) Sierra Highway at Skyline Ranch Road: Prior to the issuance of the first building permit the project shall construct a new intersection for project access; provide one northbound left-turn lane, two northbound through lanes, two southbound through lanes, one eastbound left-turn lane, and two eastbound right-turn lanes; and install a traffic signal. The placement of the new west leg should be of sufficient distance from the Sierra Highway centerline to allow for the eventual addition of a third southbound through lane as identified in the City of Santa Clarita General Plan Circulation Element.

## State Highways

4.F-3 In the event the State approves a Caltrans impact fee mitigation program prior to implementation of the proposed project, the applicant shall pay a fair share to fund programmed improvements to Highway 14 that would mitigate the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on the highway. Such improvements may include the addition of HOV lanes, truck lanes, and additional mixed flow lanes to the segments of Highway 14 between Sand Canyon Road to south of the Sierra Highway interchange, that have been identified in the Short Range Plan outlined in the North County Combined Highway Corridors Study.

### 5.17.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR, and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

### 5.18.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

This section summarizes the analysis contained in Sections 4.I, Water Resources, 4.J, Wastewater Disposal, and 4.K, Solid Waste Disposal, of the 2010 Certified EIR.

## Water Resources

## Water Supply

The Approved Project is in the Santa Clarita Water Division (SCWD), which receives water from both groundwater sources and the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA). According to the Certified EIR, the project would have a water demand of 1,831 acre-feet per year (afy), as shown in Table 16. Sufficient water supplies would be available to meet projected water demands. The Approved Project was identified as a pending project in the County and as part of the analysis in the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan. Existing land use data and new housing construction information were compiled from each of the retail
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water purveyors, and projections were prepared in the "One Valley One Vision Plan," a joint planning effort by the City of Santa Clarita and Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

Table 16 Approved Project, Estimated Water Demand

| Land Use | Units/Acres | Water Use Factor (afy) ${ }^{1}$ | Estimated Water Use (afy) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single-Family Residential | 1,260 units | 0.82 per unit | 1,033 |  |  |  |  |
| Parks | 18 acres | 3 per acre | 54 |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary School | 11 acres | 3 per acre | 33 |  |  |  |  |
| Manufactured Slopes | 211 acres $^{2}$ | 3 per acre | 633 |  |  |  |  |
| Road Parkways | 26 acres | 3 per acre | 78 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | - | $\mathbf{1 , 8 3 1}$ |

1 Factors provided by CLWA SCWD.
2 Acreage includes off-site landscaped slope areas of 7.92 acres (VTTM 46018) and 1.96 acres (BLM property).

Impacts to water supply were considered less than significant. However, the reduction in State Water Project supply and Countywide drought conditions reinforce the need to conserve water and comply with County water conservation requirements. Therefore, mitigation was provided to ensure the Approved Project would be consistent with all applicable water conservation plans, programs, and ordinances.

## Water Supply Infrastructure

The Approved Project would provide water lines to connect to existing pipelines in Sierra Highway to tie into the CLWA/SCWD system. A new 16-inch pipeline would connect the existing CLWA/SCWD water tank to onsite infrastructure, and potable water would be conveyed to onsite uses by installing a proposed network of 6 - to 16 -inch pipes. Onsite booster/pump stations and water tanks were also proposed to ensure sufficient water pressure to deliver water onsite. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

## Groundwater Recharge

The Approved Project would increase impervious surfaces onsite by approximately 189 acres, but would not result in a significant reduction in groundwater recharge. Increased runoff from impervious surfaces was estimated to be approximately 284 afy. Most surface runoff enters the Santa Clara River south of the project site and recharges the alluvial aquifer. In addition, the land uses associated with the Approved Project would increase water usage for irrigation of landscaped areas compared to existing conditions (undeveloped land). Given that the increase in impervious surface area is not substantial, the increase in irrigation, and the fact that runoff would contribute recharge, impacts to groundwater recharge would be less than significant.

## Wastewater Disposal

## Wastewater Collection

Sewer lines ranging from 8 to 12 inches would be installed as part of the Approved Project's proposed sewer network. These sewer lines would collect wastewater generated within the development, with flows directed southeast into the 21 -inch Sierra Highway sewer. Development of the Approved Project would generate
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approximately 346,200 gallons of wastewater per day (gpd) (see Table 17). Flow rates from the site would equate to 1.41 cubic feet per second (cfs) into the Sierra Highway sewer. The capacity of this sewer was determined to be 9.58 cfs ; therefore, it would have capacity to collect wastewater generated onsite.

Table 17 Approved Project, Estimated Wastewater Generation

| Land Use | Approved Project Buildout | Wastewater Generation Factor <br> (gpd) | Estimated Wastewater Generated <br> (gpd) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single-family Residential | 1,260 units | 260 | 327,600 |  |
| Elementary School | 750 students | 20 | 15,000 |  |
| Park | 18 acres | - | 200 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Factors provided by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. | - | 34600 |  |  |

## Wastewater Treatment

Wastewater treatment for the project area is provided by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD) through the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System (SCVJSS). The SCVJSS provides primary, secondary, and tertiary wastewater treatment. It has a capacity of 7 million gallons per day ( mgd ) and an approved expansion of 6 mgd , which would be sufficient to meet forecast demand beyond 2017. The projectgenerated 346,200 gpd of wastewater (approximately 5 percent of available capacity) would be adequately treated at the SCVJSS. Additionally, the project applicant would be required to pay an annexation fee and a connection fee (based on the number of dwelling units). The project would not have a significant impact on wastewater treatment facilities.

## Solid Waste Disposal

## Construction Waste

The California Integrated Waste Management Board conservatively estimated that residential construction projects generate approximately four pounds of construction debris (mostly wood and drywall) per square foot. Based on this factor and an approximate average square footage for the residential units of 3,550 square feet, the project would generate approximately 8,946 tons of debris (see Table 18). However, the project is subject to the County's Green Building Ordinance. Pursuant to the County's Green Building Ordinance, 65 percent of the project's construction debris (i.e., 5,815 tons) would be recycled or reused. Thus, project construction would dispose of 3,131 tons of debris, approximately 0.04 percent of the Peck Road Gravel Pit landfill's 7.8 million tons of remaining capacity. Thus, construction-generated waste impacts on solid waste facilities would be less than significant.
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Table 18 Approved Project, Estimated Solid Waste Generation

| Land Use | Approved Project Buildout | Solid Waste Generation Factor ${ }^{1}$ | Estimated Solid Waste Generated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction |  |  |  |
| Single-family Residential | $\begin{gathered} 1,260 \text { units } \\ (3,550 \text { SF per unit }) \end{gathered}$ | 4 lbs per SF | 8,946 tons |
| Operations |  |  |  |
| Single-family Residential | 4,158 residents | 0.41 tons per person | 1,704.78 tons per year |
| Note: SF = square feet <br> Factors provided by California Integrated Waste Management Board. |  |  |  |

## Operation Waste

The California Integrated Waste Management Board's solid waste generation factor is 0.41 ton per capita per year. Based on this factor, the proposed project would generate approximately $1,704.78$ tons of solid waste per year (see Table 16). Solid waste generated at the project site would likely be disposed at Sunshine Canyon Landfill, Chiquita Canyon Landfill, and the Antelope Valley Landfill. The projected solid waste would comprise approximately 0.002 percent of the 95.37 million tons of remaining capacity at these landfills and would represent an increase of less than 0.5 percent of the approximate 3.667 million tons of solid waste disposed in 2008 at these facilities. Thus, existing landfills would have sufficient capacity and impacts would be less than significant.

### 5.18.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project

Would the Modified Project:

| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards? |  |  |  |  | X |
| b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  |  |  | X |  |
| d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses? |  |  |  | X |  |
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| Issues | Substantial Change in Project or Circumstances Resulting in New Significant Effects | New Information <br> Showing <br> Greater <br> Significant <br> Effects than <br> Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  |  |  | X |  |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? |  |  |  | X |  |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? |  |  |  |  | X |

## Comments:

## a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?

No Impact. Similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would be required to comply with the wastewater treatment requirements in the Construction General Permit, Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, issued by the SWRCB. The Modified Project is required apply for coverage under the Construction General Permit by submitting a Notice of Intent to the SWRCB and preparing and implementing a SWPPP specifying BMPs to minimize construction water pollution impacts. By adhering to these BMPs, the Modified Project would not exceed the SWRCB's wastewater treatment requirements, and no new or significant increase in effects would occur.

The modifications to the approved TTM would decrease impervious surfaces and preserve existing slopes and hillsides in the south and southwest portions of the developable area. Regardless, the Modified Project would be required to meet wastewater treatment requirements in Order No. 01-182 by the Los Angeles RWQCB, which includes preparing and implementing a Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan. The SUSMP would specify BMPs to be used in the Modified Project's design and operation to minimize pollution of stormwater. By adhering to these BMPs, the Modification would not exceed the Los Angeles RWQCB's wastewater treatment requirements, and no new or significant increase in effects would occur.

Additionally, as discussed in Section 5.18.2(b) below, the Modified Project would result in a reduction in wastewater generation as compared to the Approved Project. Therefore, no new substantial impacts would occur.
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b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As discussed in Sections 3.18.2(d), the incremental differences of the proposed modifications to the recorded map would not result in new substantial impacts to water supply. The Modified Project would actually reduce water demand by 324 afy.

Wastewater treatment for the project area is provided by LACSD, specifically the SCVJSS. SCVJSS provides primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment of wastewater. Table 19 compares wastewater generation under the Approved and Modified Projects. As shown, the Modified Project would reduce wastewater generation by 10,080 gallons per day.

Table 19 Approved Project vs. Modified Project, Estimated Wastewater Generation

| Land Use | Wastewater Generation <br> Factor (gpd) $)^{1}$ | Estimated Wastewater Generated (gpd) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Approved Project | Modified Project | Difference |  |  |  |  |
| Single-family Residential | 20 | 327,600 | 317,200 | $-10,400$ |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary School | 200 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Park |  | 3,600 | 3,920 | +320 |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Total |  |  |  |  |  | 346,200 | 336,120 | $\mathbf{- 1 0 , 0 8 0}$ |

1 Factors provided by SCVJSS.

Additionally, new development projects in the Santa Clarita Valley area are required to pay fees for direct and indirect connections to and services provided by the SCVJSS. These connection fees would be assessed pursuant to the LACSD's Master Connection Fee Ordinance and Master Service Charge Ordinance. The fee is charged for connecting (directly or indirectly) to LACSD's sewerage system, increasing the strength and/or quantity of wastewater attributable to a particular parcel or operation already connected, or charges for facilities furnished by or available from LACSD. These connection fees and service charges are required to support the incremental expansion of the system as new projects are developed. The connection fees provide additional conveyance, treatment, and disposal facilities (capital facilities) as well as operational and maintenance costs. Payment of a connection fee and service charge are required before a permit to connect to the LACSD system is issued. For new development in the LACSD, the developer funds onsite sewer mains.

Therefore, existing water and wastewater facilities can accommodate the demands generated by the proposed modifications to the approved TTM, and the Modified Project would have a beneficial impact on wastewater services and would have no new substantial impact.
c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Impacts to stormwater facilities are as discussed in Section 5.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Addendum.
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d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The proposed modifications to the Approved Project would reduce the single-family homes from 1,260 to 1,220 , resulting in 40 fewer homes. As shown in Table 20, the Modified Project would reduce water demand by 324 afy compared to the Approved Project.

Table 20 Approved Project vs. Modified Project, Estimated Water Demand

| Land-Use Categories | Water Use Factor (afy) ${ }^{1}$ | Estimated Water Use (afy) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Modified Project | Difference |  |
| Single Family Residential | 0.82 per unit | 1,033 | 1,000 | -33 |
| Parks | 3 per acre | 54 | 59 | +5 |
| Elementary School | 3 per acre | 35 | 36 | +1 |
| Manufactured Slopes | 3 per acre | 831 | 534 | -297 |
| Road Parkways | 3 per acre | 78 | 78 | 0 |
| Total Difference |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Factors provided by CLWA/SCWD. |  |  |  |  |

The project was included in CLWA's 2005 and 2010 Urban Water Management Plans. The analysis provided in the 2010 plan takes into account the available water supplies and water demands for CLWA's service area to assess the region's ability to satisfy demands through the year 2050. It was concluded that sufficient water supplies would continue to be available (including groundwater pumping that would not result in long-term depletion of groundwater resources) to meet projected demand, which includes the Skyline Ranch project. It also concluded that sufficient water supplies would continue to be available for single and multiple dry-year conditions through the year 2050 to meet projected demand. However, given the current drought conditions and uncertainty regarding the availability of imported water supplies from the State Water Project, the Modified Project would be required to comply with County water conservation measures. These include the Water Efficient Landscaping Requirements (Title 26, Chapter 7 of the Los Angeles County Code), Water Conservation Requirements for the Unincorporated Los Angeles County Area (Chapter 11.38, Part 4 of the Los Angeles County Code), and Drought-Tolerant Landscaping and Green Building Standards ordinances. Mitigation is provided to ensure the Modified Project implements these water conservation requirements. Overall, water demand would be reduced under the Modified Project because fewer residential homes would be developed. Therefore, the Modified Project would have a beneficial impact on water supply.
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e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The topic of energy is discussed also in Section 5.6, Energy, of this Addendum.

Development of the Modified Project would require expansion of local utility lines to provide electricity and natural gas service to the residential units. The modifications to the approved TTM would decrease the electrical demand for the project site (see Table 6, Approved Project vs. Modified Project, Projected Energy Use), creating a beneficial impact. In addition, the residential units must meet the 2010 California Green Building Standards; Los Angeles County's Green Building Standards; and another set of certification standards, such as LEED, CGB, GPR, or an equivalent program, with the approval of the Public Works Department Director. Implementation of these requirements would reduce energy impacts. No new significant impacts related to energy utilities would occur as a result of the project modifications.
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. Current data indicates that the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, Chiquita Canyon Landfill, and Antelope Valley Landfill have remaining capacities of $96,800,000$ cy, $22,400,000 \mathrm{cy}$, and $20,400,000 \mathrm{cy}$ (CalRecycle 2015a, 2015b, 2015c). Table 21 shows the total remaining capacities, daily capacities, and expected closure dates for the three landfills.

Table 21 Sunshine Canyon and Chiquita Canyon Landfills Information

| Landfill | Remaining Capacity (cy) | Daily Capacity <br> (tons per day) | Expected Closure Date |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sunshine Canyon | $96,800,000$ | 12,100 | $12 / 31 / 2037$ |
| Chiquita Canyon | $22,400,000$ | 6,000 | $11 / 24 / 2019$ |
| Antelope Valley | $20,400,000$ | 3,564 | $1 / 1 / 2042$ |
| Remaining Capacity | $139,600,000$ | 21,664 | - |
| Source: CalRecycle 2015a, 2015b, 2015c. |  |  |  |

## Construction Waste

The Modified Project would have less construction debris waste than the Approved Project because 40 fewer residential units would be constructed. Using CalRecycle's estimate for construction waste (four pounds per square foot) and an average of 5,000 square feet per unit, the Modified Project would reduce construction waste by approximately 400 tons. Therefore, the Modified Project would have a beneficial impact on construction waste.

## Operation Waste

The Modified Project would have 40 fewer residential units and 139 fewer residents than the recorded project. Based on CalRecycle, the regional estimate for overall residential waste disposal for Los Angeles
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County is 0.41 ton per capita per year. Using a solid waste disposal rate of 0.41 ton per capita per year, the Modified Project would generate approximately 57 fewer tons per year (see Table 22).

Table 22 Approved Project vs. Modified Project, Solid Waste Generation

| Approved Project |  | Modified Project |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population Buildout | Solid Waste Generated | Population Buildout | Solid Waste Generated |  |
| 4,3601 | 1,788 | 4,221 | 1,731 | -57 tons per year |
| The estimated population of the Approved Project was adjusted from 4,158 persons to 4,360 persons by using more recent data on average household size for Tracts $9200.32,9200.33$ and 9200.34 from the 2010 US Census Bureau ( 3.46 persons per household instead of 3.3 persons per household). |  |  |  |  |

Residents of the Modified Project would generate 57 fewer tons of solid waste per year. Therefore, the Modified Project would have a beneficial impact compared to the Approved Project. No new significant impacts would occur as a result of the Modified Project, and the Modified Project would not require any changes to the EIR related to solid waste.

## g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. AB 939 (Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989), the Integrated Waste Management Act, requires every California city and county to divert 50 percent of its waste from landfills by the year 2000. In addition, AB 939 requires each county and each city within the county to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element for its jurisdiction, identifying waste characterization, source reduction, recycling, composting, solid waste facility capacity, education and public information, funding, special waste (asbestos, sewage sludge, etc.), and household hazardous waste.

The Countywide Siting Element (CSE) prepared by Los Angeles County pursuant to AB 939 identifies goals, policies, and strategies that provide for the proper planning and siting of solid waste disposal and transformation facilities for the next 15 years. The CSE was approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and CalRecycle in 1998. It provides strategies and establishes siting criteria for evaluating the development of needed disposal and transformation facilities. The County is currently in the process of updating the CSE and has prepared a preliminary draft CSE (2012) to reflect the most recent information regarding remaining landfill disposal capacity and the County's current strategy for maintaining adequate disposal capacity.

The Modified Project would meet the requirements of AB 939 and would generate 57 fewer tons of solid waste per year compared to the Approved Project. The modifications would not hinder compliance with AB 939 , and no new significant impacts would occur.

### 5.18.3 Adopted Mitigation Measures Applicable to the Modified Project

## Water Supply

4.I-1 All appliances such as showerheads, lavatory faucets and sink faucets shall comply with efficiency standards set forth in Title 20, California Administrative Code Section 1604(f). Title 24 of the California Administrative Code Section 1606(b) prohibits the installation of
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fixtures unless the manufacturer has certified to the California Energy Conservation compliance with the flow rate standards.
4.I-2 Low flush toilets shall be installed as specified in California State Health and Safety Code Section 17921.3 and the County Green Building Ordinance.
4.I-3 All common area irrigation areas shall be capable of being operated by a computerized irrigation system which includes an onsite weather station/ET gage capable of reading current weather data and making automatic adjustments to independent run times for each irrigation valve based on changes in temperature, solar radiation, relative humidity, rain and wind. In addition, the computerized irrigation system shall be equipped with flow sensing capabilities, thus automatically shutting down the irrigation system in the event of a mainline break or broken head. All common area irrigation controllers shall also include a rain sensing automatic shutoff.
4.I-4 Common area landscaping shall emphasize drought-tolerant vegetation. Plants of similar water use shall be grouped to reduce over-irrigation of low-water-using plants. Those areas not designed with drought-tolerant vegetation shall be gauged to receive irrigation using the minimal requirements.
4.I-5 Residential occupants shall be informed as to the benefits of low-water-using landscaping and sources of additional assistance in such.

Please also see Mitigation Measure GCC-4 in Section 5.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

### 5.18.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Modified Project would only result in minor technical changes or additions to the previously certified EIR and would not result in significant impacts upon implementation of applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

### 5.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

### 5.19.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The 2010 Certified EIR did not include mandatory findings of significance.

### 5.19.2 Impacts Associated with the Modified Project
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| Issues | Substantial <br> Change in <br> Project or <br> Circumstances <br> Resulting in New <br> Significant <br> Effects | New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR | New Mitigation or Alternative to Reduce Significant Effect is Declined | Minor Technical Changes or Additions | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Impact } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |  |  |  | X |  |
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve shortterm environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? |  |  |  | X |  |
| c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? <br> ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? |  |  |  | X |  |
| d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |  |  |  | X |  |

## Comments:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As discussed in Sections 3.4, Biological Resources, and 3.5, Cultural Resources, and throughout this Addendum, the proposed modifications to the approved TTM would not significantly change the project's environmental impacts and would not significantly degrade the quality of the environment.
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. The proposed modifications would result in 40 fewer singlefamily homes with approximately 139 fewer persons residing onsite, but would include 284 units of agequalified housing and a community center. The Modified Project would also realign Skyline Ranch Road, modify housing product types, relocate and expand park sites, and extend multipurpose trails and bike lanes.
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These modifications would not achieve any short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals. Thus, no impacts would occur.
c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As discussed throughout this Addendum, the incremental differences of the proposed modifications to the recorded map would not result in substantial increases in demands or new significant cumulative impacts.
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Minor Technical Changes or Additions. As analyzed throughout this Addendum, the net incremental impacts of the Modified Project compared to the Approved Project on the project site and its surroundings, including human beings, would be less than significant. Individual environmental impacts are analyzed in Sections 3.1 through 3.18 of this Addendum. Overall, impacts of the minor technical changes under the Modified Project would result in reduced or similar impacts as the Approved Project.
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Purpose and Scope of Services

The main purpose of this report is to review the amended Tentative Tract Map 060922 in light of prior work performed at the site by Geolabs-Westlake Village, Inc. (GWV) and provide up-dated geotechnical interpretations, conclusions and recommendations where necessary. For this report, a supplemental investigation was undertaken in order to further evaluate the geologic and geotechnical conditions along the southwestern portion of the tract where native slopes will remain in lieu of previous fill slopes.

Our scope of services for preparation of this document included:

- Review of geotechnical reports, geologic maps and other documents relevant to the site (Appendix A, References).
- Perform a site visit to evaluate the existing condition and perform field reconnaissance mapping.
- Perform a subsurface investigation including the excavation, sampling, and logging of four large-diameter borings. The borings are labeled B-LGC-1 through B-LGC-4. Logs of the borings are presented in Appendix B, and their approximate locations are depicted on the Geotechnical Maps (Plates 1A-1E). The excavations were sampled and logged under the supervision of a geologist from our firm.
- Prepare geotechnical cross sections 1-1' through 34-34' to depict interpreted geologic conditions, to evaluate slope stability and to present mitigation measures, Plates 2a through 2f.
- Perform engineering analyses, as necessary, to review slope stability conditions.

Perform a review of the amended Tentative Tract Map prepared by SIKAND Engineering, dated October 6, 2015.

- Preparation of this report presenting our geologic and geotechnical findings, conclusions, opinions and recommendations with respect to the proposed amended Tentative Tract Map 060922.


### 1.2 Engineer-of-Record

LGC has reviewed the information presented in the geotechnical reports prepared by Geolabs-Westlake Village, Inc., (References) with respect to the subject site and accepts responsibility as geotechnical engineer-of-record, and concurs with the prior information, except where modified herein.

### 1.3 Site Location and Project Description

The subject site is located northeast of the City of Santa Clarita, northeast of Plum Canyon/Whites Canyon Road and northwest of Sierra Highway in the County of Los Angeles, California. Legal description is "A portion of Sections 3, 9, 10, 16 \& 34, Township 4 North, Range 15 West, S.B.B.M. Unincorporated area of Los Angeles County." See Figure 1, Site Location Map.

The site occupies approximately $2,173.25$ acres that currently consists of vacant open hillside terrain with light to moderate vegetation. Current access to the site is through Tract 4601811 from Whites Canyon Road or from Sierra Highway.

The Amended Tentative Tract Map No. 060922 depicts a reduced development footprint from the previous Tentative Tract Map. Proposed development will include single-family, multi-family, parks, and school and recreation sites. Additionally, development will include support areas such as, two water tank sites, streets, driveways, debris basins, and open space areas. The development of Skyline Ranch Road from Whites Canyon/Plum Canyon Road to Sierra Highway is also integral to the project. The grading of Skyline Ranch Road will be shared between Toll Brothers and Tri Pointe Group within the limits of Tract 46018-11. Toll Brothers will construct the portion of the road within Tract 46018-11. For information regarding the portion of Skyline Ranch Road within Tract 46018-11, please refer to LGC's report dated January 22, 2016.

The plan indicates that 16 million cubic yards of cut and 16 million cubic yards of fill operations will be necessary to bring the site to proposed design grades. Maximum design cuts and fills are approximately 95 and 123 feet, respectively. Slopes are planned at gradients of $2: 1$ (horizontal to vertical; $\mathrm{h}: \mathrm{v}$ ) and $3: 1$ (h:v). Cut slopes are planned to heights of 184 feet and fill slopes to 154 feet.

Remedial grading will be necessary prior to placing engineered fill in design fill areas. Removal of topsoil, surficial soils, alluvium, colluvium, landslide debris, and weathered bedrock units will be required. The approximate depths of remedial removals are shown on the attached Geotechnical Maps and are anticipated to extend to as much as approximately 62 feet below the existing ground surface.

### 1.4 Records Review

Review of previous reports for the site included those provided to us and references readily available within our library were used to prepare this report. Reports provided to us were prepared by GWV and are referenced herein. Geologic contacts, exploratory borings (1-92 were drilled between 2002 and 2013), exploratory borings (1-11 in 1995), exploratory test pits (TP-1 through TP-219 excavated between 2003 and 2007) and exploratory test pits (T1 through T23 in 1995) are shown on the Geotechnical Maps, Plates 1A through 1E attached herein. One boring drilled by Pacific Soils (B115) is also included.

Site Location Map


### 2.0 GEOTECHNICAL CONDITIONS

### 2.1 Regional Geology

The site vicinity lies in the Transverse Ranges geomorphic province of California. Westtrending valleys and ridges, reflecting a parallel series of anticlines, synclines, and reverse faults characterize this province. This structure and geomorphology is generally considered to be the result of south-directed compression caused by right lateral, strike-slip movement on the "Big Bend" segment of the San Andreas Fault (CGS, 1997 Revised 2001).

Specifically, the site lies within the Soledad Basin. The Soledad Basin is rhombohedral shaped with the long axis roughly situated east-west between the San Gabriel Fault and the San Andreas Fault. Mid-Miocene in age the basin represents an extensional or depositional region.

### 2.2 Site-Specific Geology

Tentative Tract 060922 is underlain by surficial soils, alluvium, colluvium, landslide debris, terrace deposits and bedrock assigned to the Saugus Formation and the Mint Canyon Formation. A brief description of each unit is as follows:

### 2.2.1 Surficial Soils

Surficial soils are seldom identified in the borings onsite. When surficial soils are noted in the borings they are generally less than 2.5 feet deep and consist of dark to medium brown silty and clayey fine to coarse sands that are typically dry, loose, porous and contain organic debris. Surficial soils are not suitable for support of fills or structures and should be removed and compacted. Although not noted in the borings $\operatorname{logs}$, their presence should be anticipated across the surface of the site.
2.2.2 $\quad$ Alluvium

Alluvial soils are present in the bottoms of natural drainage courses having a relatively gently sloping surface. Alluvium consists of sands, silts, gravels and cobbles that are dry, loose, and porous. Removals of alluvium will be required to competent bedrock. The alluvium has been observed from 5 to 15 feet in depth in the Whites Canyon drainage course.

### 2.2.3 Colluvium (Oc)

Colluvium is present near the base of slopes and in smaller drainage areas. Colluvium is derived from the downslope movement of surficial soils via gravity. Typically the colluvium onsite consists of brown to dark brown fine to coarse sands with varying amounts of clay, silt, cobbles and boulders. These materials are loose, porous and contain organic debris. Colluvium is not suitable for support of compacted fills or structures and should be removed to competent bedrock where fill is planned for site design. The colluvium will typically be thicker near the bottom of the canyon and thin upwards.

### 2.2.4 Landslide Debris (Qls)

Landslide debris for this report refers primarily to the larger blocks or zones of bedrock or soils that have moved down slope typically as a single event across the site. Landslide debris may consist of mixed bedrock or relatively intact blocks of bedrock, primarily within the Saugus Formation. Recent landslides are not suitable for foundation support or support of certified fills; therefore, removals of landslide debris may extend beyond the planned grading limits in order to create a $1: 1$ (horizontal to vertical, h:v) projection down away from the grading limit to competent material and a 1:1 (h:v) projection back up to the ground surface. There are 28 mapped landslides which are discussed in greater detail in the Recommendations section of this report.

### 2.2.5 Terrace Deposits (Ot)

Terrace Deposits were noted on some of the ridgelines adjacent to Whites Canyon. Terrace deposits are typically reddish brown, clayey sands and silty sands that contain local gravel and cobbles. Depths noted in the field exploration logs indicate thicknesses from 10 to 15 feet. Although not noted by GWV, terrace deposits (older alluvium) are often competent below the surficial weathering zone and are suitable for support of foundations or compacted fills. Field observation of these materials will have to be made in order to evaluate their suitability to remain in place. However, most of the terrace deposits appear to be eliminated in mass cuts.

### 2.2.6 Saugus Formation (TQs)

The Saugus Formation lies unconformably on the Mint Canyon Formation. The primary difference between the Saugus and the Mint Canyon formations is that the Saugus Formation can contain numerous red beds that signify silty clay and clay that is susceptible to landslides. Saugus Formation bedrock consists of interbedded sandstone, siltstone and claystone that are typically damp to moist, and dense to hard.

Saugus Formation is suitable for support of fill and structures below the weathered rind exposed near the existing ground surface. Where differing materials potentially having significantly different expansion potentials are present at pad grades (i.e. claystone adjacent to sandstone), over-excavation of the building pad and replacement as a fill cap will be required. The minimum depth of over-excavation is five feet and additional over-excavation may be warranted based on the observed conditions at the time of grading.

### 2.2.7 Mint Canyon Formation (Tmc)

The Mint Canyon Formation is divided into three facies; fluvial-deltaic, forsetbottomset, and marginal (Saul in AEG, 1990). The majority of the Mint Canyon Formation encountered onsite is the upper fluvial-deltaic facies. This portion of the Mint Canyon Formation consists of coarse-grained sandstones and conglomerates that contain volcanic clasts and igneous or crystalline rock types of plutonic origin; however, the igneous clasts are far more common. The sandstones are arkosic and the color is gray to gray brown. Difficulty differentiating the Saugus from the Mint Canyon arkosic sandy sediments may arise; however, Saul (1990) indicates that a primary identifier within the Mint Canyon sediments is the presence of a bright green mineral resembling epidote (under hand lens inspection).

The forest-bottomset and marginal facies of the Mint Canyon Formation are the units that typically contain lake deposits that consist of fine-grained siltstone and claystone susceptible to slope failures. These facies are not identified onsite.

Review of the boring logs by GWV, indicates that the Mint Canyon Formation is often difficult to excavate due to cementation and the presence of boulders. Thus difficult grading conditions will likely persist in the deeper cuts within the Mint Canyon formation.

The site is situated in an area where the basal conglomerate of the Saugus Formation sits on the conglomeratic unit (deltaic facies) of the Mint Canyon Formation. These conglomeratic units are not as severely affected by low angle clay beds subject to broad slope failure regimes as the upper Saugus layers where interbedded claystone and finer-grained sandstone occur.

### 2.3 Geologic Structure

The geologic structure of the region is that of northwest-southeast trending bedding that dips to the west or south, and faults and folds concurrent with the Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province. As such, the bedrock formations become younger toward the southwest. Broadly, bedding dips to the southwest across the site. However, bedding within the Saugus and the Mint Canyon Formations is variable due to the cross bedded nature of the coarse-grained deposits. Thus, bedding is not likely to be unfavorable in many cut slopes due to the conglomeratic nature of the materials; however, along bedding analyses have been performed for conservancy.

### 2.4 Groundwater

Groundwater is generally not present within most excavations performed at the site and is not anticipated during site earthwork. Seepage was noted in many borings but is not thought to be of any significance with regard to grading of the site. However, perched water and groundwater levels fluctuate with the seasons and local zones of heavy seepage that require a sub-drain system may occur.

### 2.5 Surface Water

Based on our review of local maps and site reconnaissance, sheet flow is currently in all directions with a general trend toward the southwest. Surface water runoff relative to project design is the purview of the project civil engineer, but is anticipate to be directed away from planned structures and into approved drainage devices, where necessary.

### 2.6 Seismicity, Faulting and Related Effects

### 2.6.1 Seismicity

The main seismic parameters to be considered when discussing the potential for earthquake-induced damage onsite are the distances to the causative faults, earthquake magnitudes, and expected ground accelerations. We have performed sitespecific analysis based on these seismic parameters for the site and the onsite geologic conditions. The results of our analysis are discussed in terms of the potential seismic events that could be produced by the maximum probable earthquakes. A maximum probable earthquake is the maximum earthquake likely to occur given the known tectonic framework. The Santa Susana Fault is located approximately 1.6 miles ( 2.6 km ) from the.

### 2.6.2 Seismic Design Criteria

The site seismic characteristics were evaluated per the guidelines set forth in Chapter 16, Section 1613 of the 2013 California Building Code (CBC). Representative site coordinates of latitude $34.4396^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ and longitude $-118.4531^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$ were utilized in our analyses. The maximum considered earthquake (MCE) spectral response accelerations ( $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{MS}}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{M} 1}$ ) and adjusted design spectral response acceleration parameters ( $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{DS}}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{DI}}$ ) for Site Class D are provided in Table 1.

## Table 1

## Seismic Design Parameters

| Selected Parameters from 2013 CBC, Section 1613 - Earthquake Loads | Seismic <br> Design <br> Values |
| :---: | :---: |
| Site Class per Chapter 20 of ASCE 7 | D |
| Risk-Targeted Spectral Acceleration for Short Periods ( $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}$ )* | 2.524 g |
| Risk-Targeted Spectral Accelerations for 1-Second Periods ( $\left.\mathrm{S}_{1}\right)^{*}$ | 0.901g |
| Site Coefficient $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{a}}$ per Table 1613.3.3(1) | 1.00 |
| Site Coefficient $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ per Table 1613.3.3(2) | 1.50 |
| Site Modified Spectral Acceleration for Short Periods $\left(\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{MS}}\right)$ for Site Class D <br> [Note: $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{MS}}=\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}$ ] | 2.524 g |
| Site Modified Spectral Acceleration for 1-Second Periods ( $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{M} 1}$ ) for Site Class D <br> [Note: $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{M} 1}=\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}} \mathrm{S}_{1}$ ] | 1.352 g |
| Design Spectral Acceleration for Short Periods ( $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{DS}}$ ) for Site Class D <br> [Note: $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{DS}}=(2 / 3) \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{MS}}$ ] | 1.683 g |
| Design Spectral Acceleration for 1-Second Periods ( $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{DI}}$ ) for Site Class D <br> [Note: $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{D} 1}=\left({ }^{2} / 3\right) \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{M} 1}$ ] | 0.901g |
| Mapped Risk Coefficient at 0.2 sec Spectral Response Period, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{RS}}$ (per ASCE 7) | 0.981 |
| Mapped Risk Coefficient at 1 sec Spectral Response Period, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R} 1}$ (per ASCE 7) | 0.996 |

Section 1803.5.12 of the 2013 CBC (per Section 11.8.3 of ASCE 7) states that the maximum considered earthquake geometric mean $\left(\mathrm{MCE}_{\mathrm{G}}\right)$ Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) should be used for geotechnical evaluations. The $\mathrm{PGA}_{\mathrm{M}}$ for the site is equal to 0.896 (USGS, 2013).

A deaggregation of the PGA based on a 2,475-year average return period indicates that an earthquake magnitude of 6.86 at a distance of approximately $10 \mathrm{~km}(2.1 \mathrm{mi})$ from the site would contribute the most to this ground motion (USGS, 2008).

### 2.6.3 Faulting

The subject site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (Hart and Bryant, 1997); therefore, there are no known active or potentially active faults onsite.

The possibility of damage due to ground rupture from earthquake fault rupture is considered nil since active faults are not known to cross the site. However, the site is in proximity of active faults (Sierra Madre/San Fernando, San Gabriel, and San Andreas) which are capable of producing significant ground shaking.

Secondary effects of seismic shaking resulting from large earthquakes on the major faults in the southern California region include shallow ground rupture, soil liquefaction, and seismically induced settlements, seiches and tsunamis.

In general, these secondary effects of seismic shaking are a possibility throughout the Southern California region and are dependent on the distance between the site and causative fault and the onsite geology. The major active fault that could produce these secondary effects is the Sierra Madre/San Fernando Fault located to the southwest of the site. Other active faults that may result in shaking to the site include the Northridge, San Gabriel and San Andreas Fault, among others. A discussion of liquefaction and these secondary effects is provided in the following sections

### 2.6.4 Shallow Ground Rupture

Shallow ground rupture due to active faulting is not likely to occur on site due to the lack of active or potentially active fault traces across the site. Therefore, this phenomenon is not considered a significant hazard, although it is a possibility at any site.

### 2.6.5 Liquefaction

Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated, granular soils behave similarly to a fluid when subject to high-intensity ground shaking. Liquefaction occurs when three general conditions exist: 1) shallow groundwater; 2) low density non-cohesive (granular) soils; and 3) high-intensity ground motion. Liquefaction is typified by a buildup of pore-water pressure in the affected soil layer to a point where a total loss of shear strength occurs, causing the soil to behave as a liquid. Studies indicate that saturated, loose to medium dense, near surface cohesionless soils exhibit the highest liquefaction potential, while dry, dense, cohesionless soils and cohesive soils exhibit low to negligible liquefaction potential.

Due to the presence of shallow bedrock at the site, complete removals of loose alluvial materials beneath compacted fills and the general lack of shallow groundwater, the site is considered to have a low liquefaction hazard.

### 2.6.6 Seismically Induced Settlement

During a strong seismic event, seismically induced settlement can occur within loose to moderately dense, dry or saturated granular soil. Settlement caused by ground shaking is often non-uniformly distributed, which can result in differential settlement.

Provided that the recommendations in this report are followed and removals of unsuitable materials are performed, the site is not anticipated to be susceptible to seismically induced settlement.

### 2.6.7 Seiches and Tsunamis

A seiche is a standing wave in an enclosed or partially enclosed body of water propagated by earthquake waves. Tsunamis are large ocean waves or series of waves generated by displacement of a large volume of water. The site is not in close proximity to body of water or near the ocean; therefore, the hazard associated with seiches and tsunamis is considered low.

### 2.7 Laboratory Testing

Based on the results of previous laboratory testing within the vicinity of the project site by GWV, the anticipated near-surface soils are anticipated to have a very low to medium expansion potential with a potential for high expansion, and negligible soluble sulfate attack on normal concrete, and should be considered as corrosive to severely corrosive to ferrous metals. Laboratory test results were previously provided by GWV in the referenced reports. Previous laboratory test results by GWV are provided in Appendix C of this report.

Shear strengths utilized in our analyses conform to those utilized in the previous approved reports by GWV as a part of their review of the previously approved tentative tract map and grading plan review reports. The previous data was based on laboratory testing including Atterberg limits, sieve and hydrometer, and direct shear testing of representative onsite soils, along with the observations of the subsurface soils during site subsurface investigations, along with experience within the area of the project site. LGC reviewed the previous laboratory testing and the determination of the shear strength parameters and concurred with these results. The shear strength parameters used in slope stability calculations are summarized in Appendix D, Table D-1. The following discussions are reiterated from previous approved geotechnical reports by GWV with respect to the previous derivation of the shear strengths.

### 2.7. 1 Engineered Fill Shear Strengths

Representative samples of materials to be utilized as engineered fill were remolded at $90 \%$ relative compaction and subjected to direct shear testing. As indicated on Geolabs Plate S-f of Appendix C, a shear strength envelope of $\mathrm{phi}=33^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=200 \mathrm{psf}$ yields a conservative shear strength for the modeling of the future engineered fill.

### 2.7.2 Saugus and Mint Canyon Formations Across-Bedding Shear Strengths

Direct shear testing of undisturbed samples of the materials encountered at the site were previously performed in order to develop representative "acrossbedding" strengths for the Saugus and Mint Canyon formations. Composite plots of the shear strength test data are presented on Plates S.TQs-1 (Saugus Formation) and S.Tmc-1 (Mint Canyon Formation) included in Appendix C. A shear strength of phi $=40^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=225 \mathrm{psf}$ was selected for the Saugus Formation, while a shear strength of phi $=40^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=200 \mathrm{psf}$ was selected for the Mint Canyon Formation. The higher angle of internal friction, lower cohesion strengths conform to the overwhelmingly coarse-grained nature of these formations at site.

### 2.7.3 Saugus Formation Along-Bedding Shear Strength

Based on GWV, in order to determine along-bedding strengths for the Saugus Formation, direct shear tests as well as multi-cycle residual shear tests were previously performed on a variety of material types. Along- bedding strengths were estimated for three categories: coarse-grained lithologies, unsheared finegrained lithologies, and sheared fine-grained lithologies. The results of undisturbed testing were plotted on two composite shear test diagrams S.TQs-1 and -2 by GWV. The results of the multi-cycle residual shear strength testing for the Saugus Formation is presented on Plate S.TQs-3 included in Appendix C.

Along-bedding shear strengths applicable to the three categories are indicated on the appropriate GWV plots in Appendix C. The envelope for along-bedding shear strength of coarse-grained lithologies is below the lower bound test results, yielding a shear strength of phi $=25^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=100 \mathrm{psf}$. These values logically apply to the very poorly cemented, well sorted sandstones typical of the bedrock.

GWV Plate S.TQs-2 contains the results of direct shear testing of finegrained undisturbed samples, and corresponding shear strength envelope (phi $=17^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=150 \mathrm{psf}$ ). This envelope is below the lower bound strength of the data. However, considering the relatively limited amount of data (due to the limited amount of fine-grained beds) the conservative values used in the tentative tract reports, as indicated on the plots, were maintained in the analysis. As seen on Plate S.TQs-3, the along-bedding shear strength envelope (phi=11 ${ }^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=150 \mathrm{psf}$ ) selected for sheared fine-grained beds nearly forms a lower-bound for the data (which is dominated the remolded samples).

### 2.7.4 Mint Canyon Formation Along-Bedding Strength

Borings performed within the site indicate that the Mint Canyon Formation is primarily composed of sandstone, conglomeratic sandstone, and conglomerate. Even those siltstones and claystones noted in the logs commonly contain significant sand fractions. A shear strength of $\mathrm{phi}=25^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=100 \mathrm{psf}$ was utilized to model failure surfaces along coarse-grained bedding of the Mint Canyon Formation. This shear strength envelope plots below the data presented on Plate S.Tmc-1 included in Appendix C. Multi-cycle shear test results on undisturbed and remolded samples of fine-grained materials are presented on Plate S.Tmc-2. Based on our review of the boring logs and geologic structure of the site, unsheard, finegrained shear strength parameters were used for the Mint Canyon Formation in areas assumed to have fine grained lithologies. The unsheared, fine-grained shear strength parameters consisted of a shear strength of phi $=17^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=150 \mathrm{psf}$ that was utilized to model failure surfaces along fine-grained bedding of the Mint Canyon Formation.

### 2.7.5 Landslide Slide Plane

Based on the previous evaluations and testing by GWV, the shear strength parameters phi $=9^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=150 \mathrm{psf}$ were used in our analyses for landslide slide plane materials. Two multi-cycle residual shear tests were performed by GWV on slide plane materials. The third test was performed on a soft, sheared claystone retrieved from B17 at 98 feet (see cross section 35-35' below for discussion of this unit). These test results have been added to Plate S.Qls, along with the line representing phi $=9^{\circ}, \mathrm{C}=150 \mathrm{psf}$. The landslide shear strengths have been used in slope stability calculations.

### 2.8 Slope Stability

The proposed site design consists of design cut and fill slopes planned at gradients of 2:1 (horizontal to vertical; h:v) and flatter. The highest cut slope at 3:1 (h:v) gradient is 179 feet high and is located in the northwest corner of the site, which will continue offsite to Tract 46018-11. The highest $2: 1$ (h:v) cut slope is 275 feet high and is located in the southern portion of the site. The highest fill slope is at a gradient of $2: 1$ (h:v) to a height 205 feet located in the southern portion of the site to the west of proposed Skyline Ranch Road.

LGC has accepted GWV's work which includes the shear data and determination of shear strengths; however, we disagree with the application of the data to the individual cross sections at some locations. For example, shearing is described in the boring logs as internally sheared, multidirectional, slickensides, grooved and striated. Shearing terms infer movement and movement must be denoted as slides or faults. These materials are not well bedded and are inconsistent. The boring logs indicate bedding, contacts, shears and fractures in all directions not well suited for correlation or stability analyses that conservatively assume well bedded materials. We believe this variability is due to the coarse grained nature of the conglomerates within the basal Saugus Formation and the Mint Canyon Formation. As such, the shears that are steeper than general bedding, and having conglomerate beds above and below, have been applied only where the lateral distance is small as they are unlikely to extend in any direction for more than a few tens of feet. Since they are not likely to continue long distances through conglomerate units, these features are not presented on all slope stability analyses.

For along bedding cases within the Saugus Formation Bedrock, only the along bedding clay beds that have variable terms within the boring logs are deemed applicable to use the lower clay shear strengths (cohesion 150 psf and $11^{\circ}$ phi). All other cases use the non-sheared clay bed strength (cohesion 150 psf and $17^{\circ} \mathrm{phi}$ ), which we conclude is likely far more applicable across the site for the Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation.

After a review of the latest tentative tract map and based on our review of prior field investigations by GWV, twenty-five cross-sections (1-1' through 3-3', 5-5', 7-7' through 1515', 17-17' through 24-24', 28-28', 29-29', 32-32', and 34-34') were considered representative and critical with regards to slope stability analysis.

Generally, slope stability analyses were conducted using the computer program Slope W. The Bishop's Method was used to analyze rotational failure modes, and the Janbu or Spencer Method was used to analyze translational failure modes. A coefficient of horizontal acceleration of 0.15 g (FS of 1.1) was used to evaluate the pseudostatic stability analyses.

Other fill and cut slopes of various orientations and heights are proposed across the site. Based on our inspection of these slopes relative to the collected geologic data and orientation of design slopes, remediation was determined as shown on the geotechnical maps.

Please note: the toe of design fill slopes and other "edge conditions" will require the installation of a standard stability fill in order to lock in the proposed design fills. Stability fills for designed slopes are considered part of the standard of grading and are shown on the attached Geotechnical Maps, where necessary. A brief description of the analysis per section is included herein.

## Cross Section 1-1’ and 17-17'

Cross sections 1-1' and 17-17'were drawn through a cut slope ascending along the north side of the proposed water tank pad. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 85 feet. Also on Section 17-17' a slope descending from the tank pad was also analyzed.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus Formation dips out of slope; a dip range of 3 to $10^{\circ}$ was used in our analyses. The upper portion was assigned the fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths within the specified dip range, and across bedding parameters outside the range, and the sheared along bedding strength was applied below the available data in the Saugus Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 20 deep by 40 foot wide keyway was designed for the ascending slope and a 5 foot deep by 15 foot wide keyway was designed for the slope descending from the south site of the pad. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1 , respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25.

## Cross Section 2-2' and 3-3'

Cross sections 2-2 and 3-3' were drawn through a south facing cut slope ascending along the north side of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 170 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus Formation and Mint Canyon Formation dips out of slope at various angles at shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength and fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths were data was available, and the sheared along bedding strength was applied below the available data in the Saugus Formation Bedrock, and non-sheared along bedding within the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock. Also three sheared beds were considered in the analysis of Cross section 2-2'.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 30 deep by 75 foot wide keyway was designed along cross-section 2-2' and a 30 foot deep by 100 foot wide keyway was designed along cross-section 3-3'. With the design keyways the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 5-5,

Cross section 5-5' was drawn through a southeast facing cut slope ascending along the north side of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 70 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formations dips out of slope at various angles at shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and fine-grained sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Saugus Formation Bedrock, and non-sheared along bedding within the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock. Also one sheared beds was considered within the upper/mid height of the slope in the analysis.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 5 foot deep by 35 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25.

## Cross Section 7-7

Cross section 7-7' was drawn through an interior south facing cut slope ascending from an interior road to pads within the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 70 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus Formations dips out of slope at bedding angles ranging from 4 to 8 degrees as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered fine-grained bedding strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and fine-grained sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Saugus Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 10 foot deep by 30 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 8-8'

Cross section $8-8$ ' was drawn through a southwest facing fill over cut slope ascending along the central portion of the proposed development between pads. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 120 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formations dips out of slope at various angles at shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the upper portion of the slope for the Saugus and upper Mint to the depth of the available data and fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 5 foot deep by 45 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 9-9', 29-29', 32-32', and 34-34'

These cross sections were drawn through Qls-2 and 8 along the western portion of the proposed development. Fills are proposed to be placed within the canyon areas at the toe and above the lower portions of the landslides. The upper portions of the landslide within the proposed development area and within a $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ projection from the limit of the proposed design slope/roadway should be removed. On Cross-section 9-9' an approximately 70 foot high west/southwest facing cut slope was also analyzed.

For cross-sections 9-9' $29-29^{\prime}, 32-32^{\prime}$ and 34-34’ along Qls 2 and 8, Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered translational modes of failure along the existing landslide rupture surface. Based on the slope stability analysis, with the proposed removals of the upper portion of the slide to a $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ projection from the proposed slopes and roadway and placement of buttress fills in the lower portion of the landslide, the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively.

For the upper portion of cross-section 9-9', bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formations dips out of slope at various angles at shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered fine-grained shear strength for the upper portion of the slope for the Saugus to the depth of the available data, and fine-grained sheared alongbedding shear strengths was applied to the lower portion of the Saugus and fine-grained nonsheared below the available data in the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock. Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 30 foot deep by 50 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 10-10’

Cross section 10-10' was drawn through a south facing cut slope in the northwestern portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 120 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus Formations dips out of slope at various angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered fine grained non sheared shear strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and finegrained sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Saugus Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 15 foot deep by 60 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 11-11'

Cross section 11-11' was drawn through a south facing cut slope in the northwestern portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 180 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus Formations dips out of slope at various angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered fine grained non sheared shear strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and finegrained sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Saugus Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 40 foot deep by 200 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 12-12'

Cross section 12-12' was drawn through a south facing cut slope in the northeastern portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 175 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Mint Canyon Formation dips out of slope at approximately 8 to 15 degrees as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 50 foot deep by 70 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 13-13'

Cross section 13-13' was drawn through a south facing fill over cut slope in the northeastern portion of the proposed development. It ascends to the water tank pad at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 140 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Mint Canyon Formation dips out of slope at various angles to as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 5 foot deep by 20 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 14-14'

Cross section 14-14' was drawn through a west facing cut slope in the eastern portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 170 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Mint Canyon Formation dips into slope at bedding angles between approximately 12 to 20 degrees as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 25 foot deep by 50 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 15-15’

Cross section 15-15' was drawn through a west facing cut slope in the eastern portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 120 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Mint Canyon Formation dips into slope at various bedding angles between approximately 0 to 11 degrees as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 15 foot deep by 30 foot wide keyway was designed. With the design keyway the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 18-18'

Cross section 18-18' was drawn through a west facing cut slope in the eastern portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 60 feet.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation dips out of slope at various bedding angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the upper portion of the slope to the depth of the available data and fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis, the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively.

## Cross Section 19-19'

Cross section 19-19' was drawn through a south facing cut slope descending below the road and fill over cut slope above the roadway in the central portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 100 feet below the roadway and 40 feet above the roadway.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation dips out of slope at various bedding angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered fine grained shear strength for the upper Saugus Bedrock with two sheared layers in the upper portions, and coarse grained shear strength for the upper portion of the Mint Canyon Formation to the depth of the available data and fine-grained non-sheared along-bedding shear strengths was applied below the available data in the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 20 foot deep by 50 foot wide keyway was designed for the lower slope and an approximately 10 foot deep by 25 foot wide keyway for the upper slope. With the design keyways the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 20-20,

Cross section 20-20' was drawn through a south facing cut slope in the southeastern portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 280 feet above the roadway.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation dips into slope at various bedding angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the upper Saugus Bedrock with one sheared layer in the upper portions, and coarse grained shear strength for the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 15 foot deep by 30 foot wide keyway was designed for the upper portion of the slope. With the design keyways the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1 , respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 21-21'

Cross section 21-21' was drawn through a north/northeast facing cut slope in the southeastern portion of the proposed development. It ascends at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 190 feet above the roadway.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation dips into slope to slightly out of slope at various bedding angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength for the slope in the Saugus and Mint canyon Formation Bedrock to approximately 20 to 25 feet below the the toe of slope, and fine grained shear strength for the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock below that portion.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 25 foot deep by 60 foot wide keyway was designed for the slope. With the design keyways the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 22-22'

Cross section 22-22' was drawn through a southwest and north/northeast facing cut slopes in the southeastern portion of the proposed development. The slopes ascend at a slope gradients of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 160 feet on the south side of the roadway and 120 feet on the north side of the roadway.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation dips into slope to slightly out of slope at various bedding angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength in the upper portion of the slope in the Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock, and fine grained shear strength for the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock below that portion.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis, the design slopes have a static and pseudostatic factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively.

## Cross Section 23-23'



Cross section 23-23' was drawn through a west/southwest facing cut slopes in the southeastern portion of the proposed development. The slopes ascend at a slope gradients of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 70 feet above an interior roadway and pad.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation dips out of slope at various bedding angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered coarse grained shear strength in the upper portion of the slope in the Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock, and fine grained shear strength for the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock below that portion.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis, the design slopes have a static and pseudostatic factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively.

## Cross Section 24-24'

Cross section 24-24 was drawn through a south/southwest facing sliver fill slope in the southeastern portion of the proposed development. The slopes ascend at a slope gradients of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 210 feet on the south side of the roadway.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation dips out of slope at various bedding angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered fine-grained shear strength for the Saugus Formation Bedrock and coarse grained shear strength in the upper portion of the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock to the depth of available data, and fine grained shear strength for the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock below that portion.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 30 foot deep by 100 foot wide keyway was designed for the slope. With the design keyways the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

## Cross Section 28-28,

Cross section 28-28' is representative of cross-section 26-26' and 27-27' drawn through a fill over native condition along the western portion of the site, decending to the west below Skyline Ranch Road. The slopes descend at a slope gradient of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, with benches, to an approximate height of approximately 30 to 60 feet on the west side of the roadway.

Bedding within the underlying Saugus and Mint Canyon Formation dips out of slope at various bedding angles as shown on the cross-section and analysis. The analysis considered fine-grained shear strength for the upper portion and coarse grained for the lower portion of the Saugus Formation Bedrock to the depth of available data, and fine grained shear strength for the Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock below that portion.

Static and pseudostatic slope stability calculations considered both rotational and translational modes of failure. Based on the slope stability analysis an approximately 10 foot deep by 55 foot wide keyway was designed for the slope. With the design keyways the static and pseudostatic analysis resulted in a factor of safety (FOS) greater than a 1.5 and 1.1, respectively. The proposed backcut was considered to be $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, slope stability of the temporary condition resulted in a FOS of greater that 1.25 .

### 3.0 CONCLUSIONS

Based on our review of prior reports, it is our conclusion that the site development proposed on the attached Geologic Maps (Plates 1A-1E) is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint, provided the following recommendations included in this report are incorporated into the project plans and specifications, and followed during site grading and construction.

## Our geotechnical conclusions are as follows:

- The site is within the County of Los Angeles and thus is subject to the Specifications and Guidelines set by the County.
- Sandy soils typically obtain the majority of settlement for deeper fills within a much shorter time frame than finer-grained soils. Thus the majority of site settlement for deeper fills is anticipated to occur shortly after the completion of grading.
- Engineered fill shall meet the requirements of 90 percent relative compaction and 93 percent relative compaction for fill zones less than and greater than 40 feet in thickness, respectively.
- Deeper fill zones (>50 feet) will require the review of settlement monuments installed at the completion of major grading operations to help ensure that primary and secondary settlement are within design limits prior to the release of lots for home construction.
- Remedial removals are not anticipated to encounter deep alluvium (greater than approximately 15 feet). Thicker sections of landslide debris and large landslide complexes will be encountered. Estimated depths of removals of these units are shown on the Geotechnical Maps. As such, removal depths are anticipated to vary, and steeper portions of slopes may have to be laid back to accommodate benching and the required cut-fill transition angle of $2: 1(\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V})$ near pad grade which helps reduce the potential for differential settlement below home sites. The upper portion ( 20 feet) of native slopes below pads where a cut/fill transition occurs will need to be laid back to a $2: 1$ $(\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V})$ angle to reduce the potential for differential settlement in these areas.
- No significant groundwater was encountered at the site, though local perched conditions were observed. Groundwater is not anticipated to affect site grading operations. However, water may occur anywhere and be more likely where landslide removals are required.
- Site bedrock and adjacent units are anticipated to be rippable with conventional earthwork machinery; however, the conglomeratic units within the Saugus Formation and the Mint Canyon Formation are anticipated to be difficult to excavate. Additionally, conglomeratic units contain boulders and cemented zones that are anticipated to generate oversized materials requiring disposal in deeper fills.
- Stability fill keyways are depicted on the Geotechnical Maps, Plates 1A through 1E. The typical standard for stability fill keyways is provided within this report.
- Subdrains should be installed in the bottoms of canyons and natural drainage courses once removals of unsuitable materials has been accomplished; subdrains may also be required for stability fill areas. The following pipe diameter versus length of run should be planned for site construction:

4-inch diameter pipe up to 500 feet
6 -inch diameter pipe over 500 and up to 1000 feet
8 -inch diameter pipe up to 1,500 feet
10 -inch diameter pipe Greater than 1,500 feet
(or 28 -inch pipes)

- Active or potentially active faults are not known to exist on the site; however, faults have been mapped on or trending towards the site. These faults are considered to be inactive based on the work of others and do not require structural setbacks. The location of these faults should be carefully mapped during site grading to review the potential for clay gouge or other features that may negatively affect planned structures which can occur on proposed pads should these features trend across them.
- Previous laboratory test results of representative site soils indicate a very low to medium with potential locally high expansion potentials.
- Previous laboratory test results of the onsite soils indicate a negligible potential for soluble sulfates. However, the Mint Canyon Formation may have a potential for negligible to severe sulfate content.
- Previous laboratory test results of the onsite soils indicate a negligible potential of hydro-collapse.
- From a geotechnical perspective, the existing onsite soils are suitable for use as fill, provided they are relatively free from rocks (larger than 12 inches in maximum dimension), construction debris, and organic material.



### 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 Site Earthwork

We anticipate that earthwork during the mass/rough grading operations at the site will consist of site preparation, removals of unsuitable soil, excavation of cut material, and fill placement. We recommend that earthwork onsite be performed in accordance with the recommendations herein, the County of Los Angeles grading Requirements, and the General Earthwork and Grading Specifications for Rough Grading included in Appendix E. In case of conflict, the recommendations in the following sections shall supersede those included as part of Appendix E.

### 4.1.1 Site Preparation

Prior to grading of areas to receive structural fill or engineered structures, all ground surfaces should be cleared of obstructions, any existing debris, unsuitable material, and stripped of vegetation. Heavy vegetation and debris should be removed and properly disposed of offsite. All debris from any demolition activities at the site should also be removed and disposed off-site. Holes or depressions resulting from the removal of buried obstructions should be replaced with compacted fill.

Following remedial removals, areas to receive fill should be scarified to a minimum depth of 6 inches, brought to a near-optimum moisture condition, and recompacted to at least 90 or 93 percent relative compaction (based on American Standard of Testing and Materials [ASTM] Test Method D1557) depending on the thickness of fills.

### 4.1.2 Removal and Recompaction

As discussed in Sections 2.2, portions of the site are underlain by unsuitable soils, which may settle under the surcharge of fill and/or foundation loads. These materials include surficial soils, undocumented fills (stockpiles), alluvium, landslide debris and weathered terrace deposits and bedrock of the Saugus Formation. Compressible materials not removed by the planned grading should be excavated to competent terrace deposits, Saugus Formation bedrock or Mint Canyon Formation bedrock, moisture conditioned or dried back (as needed) to obtain an above-optimum moisture content, and then recompacted prior to additional fill placement or surface improvements. The actual depth and extent of the required removals should be determined during grading operations by the geotechnical consultant; however, estimated removal depths are summarized below and are shown on the attached Geotechnical Maps (Plates 1A through 1G). The project geologist should approve all bottoms prior to fill placement.

Debris not suitable for compacted fills, such as, rebar, plastic, trash, metal, etc. should be removed and wasted from the site. Organic debris should be mulched and incorporated into compacted fills such that the fills maintain less than 2 percent organics by volume. Concrete and large rocks (greater than 12 inches in diameter) may be placed in windrows in accordance with the detail provided herein. Windrows should be maintained a minimum of 10 feet below finished grade and 10 from slope faces. Isolated boulders should be maintained a minimum of 20 feet below finish grade.

Survey bottom removals are required for canyon bottoms and keyways. Subdrains and backdrains, and windrows should also be surveyed.

### 4.1.2.1 Topsoil

Areas to receive fill, which are on slopes flatter than 5:1 (horizontal to vertical) and where normal benching would not completely remove the topsoil, should be stripped to suitable formational material prior to fill placement. Topsoil is expected to be generally 1 to 3 feet thick, although localized deeper accumulations may be encountered during grading.

### 4.1.2.2 Colluvium/Alluvium

Within the limits of grading, colluvial and alluvial materials should be completely removed to competent material. Alluvial depths have been observed up to 12 feet deep.

### 4.1.2.3 Landslide Deposits

The landslide deposits within the limits of the planned grading should be completely removed to competent material during site grading in order to remove the highly disturbed and weathered material. The actual depth of stripping or overexcavation should be determined during grading based on field observations by the geotechnical consultant. However, based on our review of previous data, the depth of removals for each slide is shown on the Geotechnical Maps, Plates 1A through 1E in areas of proposed fill.
(NOTE: The following landslide discussion represents estimated depths based on approximate cross section geometry, geomorphic expression, and some borehole data that may not be thoroughly representative.)

There are 28 landslides on site labelled as L1 through L28. A brief description of each landslide follows:

- L1 - Located mostly offsite on Tract 46018-11 (northwest portion of site), explored by B91, approximately 20-25 feet deep. Strong geomorphic expression and hummocky terrain. Complete removal of slide is recommended.
- $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{2}$ - Located in the northwestern portion of the site, explored by B26 and B54, approximately 31 to 60 feet deep. Geomorphic expression of the headscarp is clear. Partial removal of slide is recommended within the $1: 1$ (h:v) influence of the planned grading (see cross sections 11-11', 29-29' and 30-30'). Remaining portion of slide will be delineated as Restricted Use Area. Additionally, we recommend a remedial fill be placed in the canyon below the landslide as shown on the Geotechnical Map, Plate 1A in order to provide support for the landslide and inhibit reactivation. The remedial fill will not require removals of unsuitable materials prior to placement; however, a subdrain should be installed to one side within fairly competent material to inhibit bending of the pipe due to settlement. This subdrain will connect and provide outlets for proposed drains further up the canyon.
- $\mathbf{L 3}$ - Located east of L2, TP-102 indicates 2 feet deep at toe only. Weak geomorphic expression with offset drainage at toe. A working cross section indicates a possible depth of 15 feet. Complete removal is recommended.
- $\mathbf{L 4}$ - Located southeast of L3, weak geomorphic expression, explored by TP-104 and TP-105 (8.9 and 12+ feet deep, respectively), cross section 4-4' indicates a potential thickness of 20 feet. Complete removal is recommended.
- $\mathbf{L 5}$ - Small slide on the side of L28, minor geomorphic expression, no exploration, no sections, estimated depth 15-20 feet.
- L6 - No obvious geomorphic expression, no exploration (steep terrain), section 3-3' indicates nearly complete removal with planned cut grades.
- L7 - Large landslide, explored by B27, B85, and B86 (slide depths 21.5, 18 and 33.3 feet, respectively), section 4-4' and 9-9', within a
 planned cut area; however, additional removals of up to 20 feet may be required beneath planned cuts.
L8 - Large landslide, explored by B71 and B80 (slide depths 23 and 30 feet, respectively), sections 9-9' and 29-29' depict geometry. Along 9-9' estimate 10-40 feet of removals beneath cut areas. This slide will be remediated with a fill added to the canyon. Portion of slide will remain within a Restricted Use Area.
- L8a - Small feature between L7 and L8, not explored, section 9-9 indicates 15 removals required beneath planned grades.
- $\mathbf{L 9}$ - Outside grading limits to the north of the site. Slide will not impact proposed development; however, it will be placed in a Restricted Use Area.
- L10 - Large feature with good geomorphic expression, explored by B81 and B82 (depths of slide 25 and 27.1 feet, respectively), no sections were created through this feature. The upper portion of the slide will be excavated by planned cuts and the lower portion should be removed to depths of 25 feet.
- L10a - Small feature between L10 and L11, no exploration, will partially be removed by planned cuts and should partially require
removals on the order of L10 an L11 of 25 to 30 feet.
- L11 - Downslope of L10 and L10a, explored by B73, B51 and B83 (slide depths 44.5, 29.4 and 31.9 feet, respectively), depicted on section 27-27' and 28-28'. Situated mostly beneath proposed fill, removals are anticipated to be on the order of 32 feet.
- L12 - Located downslope of L11 and upslope of L13, no exploration
- L-13 - Located downslope of L11 and L12, explored by B75 and B84 (slide depths not identified to total depths of 28 and 53 feet, respectively), questionable slide.
- L14 - Located downslope of L11, explored by B74 (questionable slide to total depth of 27.5 feet, refusal on boulder), no sections.
- L15 - Small feature, not explored, no sections, estimated depth 10-15 feet.
- L16 - Small feature, explored at the toe by TP-164 and TP-165 (depth of slide 10 and 7 feet, respectively), no sections, estimated depth 15 feet.
- $\mathbf{L 1 7}$ - Smaller feature, located in the southeastern portion of the site, explored at the toe by TP-46 and TP-47 (both indicate depths greater than 8 feet), no cross sections, estimated depth 35 feet.
- L18 - Small feature in Mint Canyon Formation, explored at the toe by TP-93 and nearby TP-84 (do not indicate slide debris but describe material as Saugus), possible slopewash, estimated depth 4 to 12 feet.
- L19 - Similar to L18, no explored, nearby TP-85 indicates terrace deposits to 3 feet then Saugus Formation within an area mapped as Mint Canyon, weathered slopewash, possible depth 10 feet?
- $\mathbf{L 2 0}$ - Small feature, no exploration, estimated depth
- L21 - Outside proposed grading limits and will not impact the development. Will be delineated as a Restricted Use Area.
- L22 - Outside proposed grading limits and will not impact the development. Will be delineated as a Restricted Use Area.
- L23 - Small feature, south side of Whites Canyon drainage course along the edge of the proposed fill slope, not explored (steep terrain), section 33-33', estimated slide depth 10-15 feet.
- L24 - Outside proposed grading limits and will not impact the development. Will be delineated as a Restricted Use Area.
- L25 - Outside proposed grading limits and will not impact the development. Will be delineated as a Restricted Use Area.
L27 - Located partially on Tract 46626 (east of site) and Tract 46018-11 (northeast of site). A portion of the slide appears to have been buttressed by grading of Tract 46626. Removals of L27 will be contained inside the property boundary; therefore, a 1:1 cut from the property line will be made along the onsite boundary (TT 060922) and along the boundary of Tract 46018-11. Estimated depth is 20 feet per cross section $25 \mathrm{~b}-25 \mathrm{~b}$ '.
- L28 - Large feature, good geomorphic expression, explored by B88, B89 and B90 (slide depths 59, 51 and 67.5 feet, respectively), seepage noted above the slide plane, section 4-4' indicates 45 feet of removals beneath proposed cut areas.


### 4.1.2 4 Terrace Deposits

The weathered and desiccated surface of the Terrace deposits within the limits of the planned grading should be removed to a competent surface as approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. Depths should be anticipated to range from 1 to 4 feet.

### 4.1.2.5 Saugus Formation

The weathered and desiccated surface of the Saugus Formation bedrock within the limits of the planned grading should be removed to a competent surface as approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. Depths should be anticipated to range from 1 to 3 feet. Where clay beds are exposed near proposed pad grades, the pad overexcavation will be increased to 10 feet. Portions of the Saugus Formation consist of conglomerate and may be difficult to excavate and may also generate oversized materials which will require disposal in deeper fill areas.

### 4.1.2.6 Mint Canyon Formation

The weathered and desiccated surface of the Mint Canyon Formation bedrock within the limits of the planned grading should be removed to a competent surface as approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. Depths should be anticipated to range from 1 to 3 feet. The Mint Canyon Formation is more cemented than the Saugus Formation and may require difficult or heavy excavation techniques. This formation may also generate oversized materials that will require disposal in deeper fills. In cut pads and streets areas that will expose Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock, for ease of foundation and utility excavation, it is recommended that these areas be overexcavated a minimum of 5 feet below pad graded within lots areas, and to a depth of 2-feet below the lowest utilities within proposed street areas.

### 4.1.2.7 Water Reservoir Pad Overexcavations

Two water tank pads are planned within the proposed project site. The proposed water tank pads are anticipated to be within cut bedrock of the Saugus Formation or within cut/fill transition pad within the Mint Canyon Formation. Overexcavation of the tank pads within cut pads will only be necessary if lithologies of different expansion potential are encountered at pad grade, or if a cut/fill transition is encountered within the tank pad. As necessary, the cut portion of the tank pads should be overexcavated at least 7 feet below pad grade or to a depth to match the fill depths across the tank, to at least 10 feet beyond the tank perimeter. The engineered fill placed within this overexcavation and within 15 feet (horizontal) of tanks' footprints should be moistened to optimum moisture content and compacted to at least $95 \%$ relative compaction.

### 4.1.3 Cut/Fill Transition Conditions

In order to reduce the potential for differential settlement in areas of cut/fill transitions, we recommend the entire cut portion of the transition building pads be overexcavated and replaced with properly compacted fill to mitigate the transition condition beneath the proposed structure. For transitions less steep than a 2:1 (horizontal to vertical), the overexcavation of the cut portion of the building pad should be a minimum of 5 feet below the planned finish grade elevation of the pad. Lot overexcavations will be reviewed on a lot by lot basis during grading to determine if deeper overexcavations area required based on the exposed graded conditions.

For cut/fill transitions steeper than a $2: 1$ (horizontal to vertical), we recommend that native slopes be laid back to nearly a $2: 1$ slope angle, and that fill below future home sites have no greater than a $3: 1$ ratio of fill thickness across the pad in any direction to help reduce future potential differential settlement damage to homes and other structures. All overexcavations should extend across the entire lot or laterally at least 5 feet beyond the building perimeter or footprint. Details regarding cut/fill transitions are provided in the attached General Earthwork and Grading Specifications (Appendix E).

### 4.1.4 Cut Slope Stability/Replacement Fills

Geologic mapping of design cut slopes and fill over cut slopes should be performed by a geologist during grading operation to evaluate the slopes for potential slope instabilities. If unsuitable soils are present or if potential slope instabilities are found, we recommend that the unsuitable cut slopes on the site be replaced with stability fills.

We recommend that the stability/replacement fill have a minimum horizontal width of 15 feet from the backcut to the slope face. We also recommend that the stability/replacement fill key be excavated a minimum of 15 feet wide with a minimum depth of at least 2 to 3 feet below the toe-of-slope. The key bottom should be tilted a minimum of 2 percent into-the-slope. Benching of the backcut as the fill is placed, as well as, overbuilding the slope and trimming it back may be required. Keys for design fill over cut slopes are shown on the attached geotechnical maps, Plates 1A through 1G.

We also recommend that a subdrain be installed along the back bottom edge of the key and at mínimum 30 -foot vertical intervals if the replacement fill is greater than 30 feet in height. The outlet locations of the subdrains should be determined in the field during site grading. The subdrains should consist of a 4 -inch diameter perforated PVC pipe surrounded by 3 cubic feet (per linear foot) of crushed rock wrapped in filter fabric (Marifi 140 N or equivalent). The subdrain should have a minimum fall of 1-percent toward the outlet.

### 4.1.5 Side-Hill Shear Keys

Any side-hill daylight cut situations (i.e. the edge of the cut area will start right at the top edge of a descending natural slope). Due to potentially weathered soils along the edge of the descending relatively-steep natural slope and anticipated steep hillside soil creep conditions; we recommend that a side-hill shear key be constructed along the edge of the side-hill daylight cut.

The side-hill shear key should be excavated a minimum of 12 to 15 feet in horizontal width with the bottom at the outer edge (i.e. closest to the hillside) excavated to a depth of 5 feet or at least 2 feet into competent formational material, whichever is deeper. The key bottom should also have a fall of at least 2-percent into-the-slope.

### 4.1.6 Buttress Keys

Based on slope stability analysis performed as a part of this review, buttress keys have been designed for proposed site slopes, as necessary. The buttress widths and depths are variable based on the design slope heights and the geologic conditions at those locations. The buttress widths and depths and backcut angles are provided on the geotechnical maps and cross-sections included in this report.

Buttresses should have backdrains in accordance with oûr typical detail provided herein. Backcuts should be performed in accordance with the recommendations shown on the geotechnical maps and cross-sections provided herein.

### 4.1.7 Fill Slope Keys

Prior to the placement of fill slopes that will be placed above natural and/or cut areas on the site; a fill slope key should be constructed. The fill slope key should be excavated at least 2 feet into competent soil along the toe-of-slope and constructed approximately 15 feet wide with the key bottom angled a minimum of 2 percent into-the-slope.

### 4.1.8 Shrinkage/Bulking and Subsidence

Based on the previous evaluation and testing by GWV, both shrinkage and bulking is anticipated at the site. Prior values given by GWV, indicate mostly bulking across the site. The data from the borings onsite do not appear to be representative due to the method of sampling (Kelly bar) and the coarse-grained nature of the materials tested (i.e. conglomerates, cobbles and boulders). Our opinion regarding shrinkage and bulking onsite, based upon experience, is as follows:

Soil/Colluvium/Alluvium - Shrink 10-15\%
Landslide Debris - Shrink 0-15\% to 15 feet depth; 15 ' + bulk 0-2\%
Saugus Formation - Bulk 2-4\% 0-5 feet depth; 5’+ bulk 5\%
Mint Canyon Formation - Bulk 6\%
These are preliminary rough estimates which will vary with depth of removal, stripping losses, field conditions at the time of grading, etc. In addition, handling losses are not included in the estimates.

### 4.1.9 Temporary Stability of Removal Excavations

Temporary excavations maybe cut vertically up to five feet. Excavations over five feet should be slot-cut, shored, or cut to a $1: 1$ (h:v) slope gradient. Surface water should be diverted away from the exposed cut, and not be allowed to pond on top of the excavations. Temporary cuts should not be left open for an extended period of time. Planned temporary conditions should be reviewed by the geotechnical consultant of record in order to reduce the potential for sidewall failure. The geotechnical consultant may provide recommendations for controlling the length of sidewall exposed.

### 4.1.10 Fill Placement and Compaction

From a geotechnical perspective, the onsite soils are suitable for use as compacted fill, provided they are screened of rocks greater than 6 inches in maximum dimension, organic material, and construction debris. Areas prepared to receive structural fill and/or other surface improvements should be scarified to a minimum depth of 6 inches, brought to at least optimum-moisture content, and recompacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction (based on ASTM Test Method D1557). Fills greater than 40 feet deep should be compacted to at least 93percent relative compaction. The optimum lift thickness to produce a uniformly compacted fill will depend on the type and size of compaction equipment used. In general, fill should be placed in uniform lifts generally not exceeding 8 inches in loose thickness. Placement and compaction of fill should be performed in accordance with local grading ordinances under the observation and testing of the geotechnical consultant.

If possible, import soils to be used as fill shall be essentially free from organic matter and other deleterious substances, and should contain no materials over 6 inches in maximum dimension, have a very low to low expansion potential (i.e Expansion Index ranging from 0 to 50 ), and negligible sulfate content. Representative samples of the desired import source shall be given to the Geotechnical Consultant at least 48 hours ( 2 working days) before importing grading begins so that its suitability can be determined and appropriate tests performed.

Previous testing of the crushed rock (created from the oversize cobbles and boulders) by GWV on the site indicates that the on-site rock is of sufficient quality for use as rip rap, crushed aggregate base, and subdrain/backdrain rock. Periodic testing of any crushed rock product should be performed for verification purposes, should it be proposed for use as a construction material. We anticipate that utilizing oversize rock as crushed aggregate base for future streets would require coordination with the County of Los Angeles Public Works department.

### 4.1.11 Trench Backfill and Compaction

The onsite soils may generally be suitable as trench backfill provided they are screened of rocks and other material over 6 inches in diameter and organic matter. Trench backfill should be compacted in uniform lifts (generally not exceeding 8 inches in compacted thickness) by mechanical means to at least 90 percent relative compaction (per ASTM Test Method D1557).

If trenches are shallow and the use of conventional equipment may result in damage to the utilities; clean sand, having sand equivalent (SE) of 30 or greater, should be used to bed and shade the utilities. Sand backfill should be densified. The densification may be accomplished by jetting or flooding and then tamping to ensure adequate compaction. A representative from LGC should observe, probe, and test the backfill to verify compliance with the project specifications.

### 4.2 Control of Ground Water and Surface Waters

### 4.2.1 Canyon Subdrains

In order to help reduce the potential for ground water accumulation in the proposed fill areas, we recommend subdrains be installed in the bottoms of canyons fill areas prior to fill placement. The canyon subdrains should consist of a 4 to 10 -inch diameter PVC pipe surrounded by a minimum of 9 -cubic feet (per linear foot) of $3 / 4$-inch gravel wrapped in a filter fabric (Mirafi 140N or equivalent). Where the subdrain is placed on fill in order to outlet the subdrain, the subdrain should consist of solid PVC pipe. The subdrain should have a minimum fall of at least 1 percent.

Preliminary canyon subdrain locations are presented on the Geotechnical Maps (Plate 1 A through 1 K ). Details for subdrain construction are provided in the attached General Earthwork and Grading Specifications (Appendix E). The actual need and/or location of canyon subdrains should be based on the evaluation of the configuration of the canyon bottoms by the geotechnical consultant after the removal of compressible soils have been completed.

A representative of the project civil engineer should survey the installed subdrains for alignment and grade. Sufficient time should be allowed for the surveys prior to commencement of fill placement operations over the subdrain. The subdrain outlets should be installed to discharge water into positive drainage devices (e.g. storm drain boxes, natural canyon bottoms, etc.).

The following pipe diameter versus length of run should be planned for site construction:

4-inch diameter pipe up to 500 feet
6 -inch diameter pipe over 500 and up to 1000 feet
8 -inch diameter pipe up to 1,500 feet
10 -inch diameter pipe Greater than 1,500 feet
(or 28 -inch pipes)

### 4.2.2 Stability Fill Subdrains

Subdrains should be provided in the stability fills constructed on-site in order to minimize surficial slope instability. The subdrains should be placed along the heel of the stability fill key (across the entire length of the key) and along the backcut at approximately 30 -foot vertical intervals. The subdrains should be placed and constructed in accordance with the recommendations presented in Appendix E.

### 4.3 Settlement Monitoring

Settlement monuments should be installed in deep fill areas (greater than 50 feet in thickness) to record the fill settlement once design grades are achieved. Locations of these settlement monuments will be determined during grading based on the observed and final site conditions. A detail indicating the construction of the settlement monuments is shown on Figure 2.

The schedule for recording site settlement should be as follows:
Monuments should be surveyed immediately after installation, weekly for the first month, every two weeks for the next three months, and monthly after that. The monitoring should be performed until the survey data plots indicate that the estimated remaining settlement is no longer significant (i.e. three consecutive readings indicate relatively no change).

### 4.4 Surface Drainage and Lot Maintenance

Positive drainage of surface water away from structures is very important. No water should be allowed to pond adjacent to buildings or the top of slopes. Positive drainage may be accomplished by providing drainage away from buildings at a gradient of at least 2 percent for a distance of at least 5 feet, and further maintained by a swale of drainage path at a gradient of at least 1 percent. Where limited by 5 -foot side yards, drainage should be directed away from foundations for a minimum of 3 feet and into a collective swale or pipe system. Where necessary, drainage paths may be shortened by use of area drains and collector pipes. Eave gutters also help reduce water infiltration into the subgrade soils if the downspouts are properly connected to appropriate outlets.

Property owners should be reminded of the responsibilities of hillside maintenance practices (i.e., the maintenance of proper lot drainage; the undertaking of property improvements in accordance with sound engineering practices; and the proper maintenance of vegetation, including prudent lot and slope irrigation).

Planters with open bottoms adjacent to buildings should be avoided. Planters should not be designed adjacent to buildings unless provisions for drainage, such as catch basins, liners, and/or area drains, are made. Overwatering must be avoided.

### 4.5 Foundations

### 4.5.1 General

Preliminary recommendations for foundation design and foundation construction are presented herein. When the structural loads for the proposed structures are known they should be provided to our office to verify the recommendations presented herein.

The following foundation recommendations are provided. The three foundations recommended for the proposed structures are: (1) Conventional foundation for very low expansion potential and shallow fills; (2) Post-Tension foundations; or (3) Mat Slabs.

The information and recommendations presented in this section are not meant to supersede design by the project structural engineer or civil engineer specializing in the structural design nor impede those recommendations by a corrosion consultant. Should conflict arise, modifications to the foundation design provided herein can be provided.

### 4.5.2 Bearing Capacity

Shallow foundations may be designed for a maximum allowable bearing capacity of $1,500 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ (gross), for continuous footings a minimum of 12 inches wide and 12 inches deep, and spread footings 24 inches wide and 12 inches deep, into certified compacted fill. A factor of safety greater than 3 was used in evaluating the above bearing capacity value. This value maybe increased by 300 psf for each additional foot in depth and 100 psf for each additional foot of width to a maximum value of 3,000 psf.

Lateral forces on footings may be resisted by passive earth resistance and friction at the bottom of the footing. Foundations may be designed for a coefficient of friction of 0.35 , and a passive earth pressure of $250 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{ft}$. The passive earth pressure incorporates a factor of safety of greater than 1.5 .

All footing excavations should be cut square and level as much as possible, and should be free of sloughed materials including sand, rocks and gravel, and trash debris. Subgrade soils should be pre-moistened for the assumed low expansion potential (to be confirmed at the end of grading). These allowable bearing pressures are applicable for level (ground slope equal to or flatter than $5 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ ) conditions only.

Bearing values indicated above are for total dead loads and frequently applied live loads. The above vertical bearing may be increased by one-third for short durations of loading which will include the effect of wind or seismic forces.

### 4.5.3 Conventional Foundations

Conventional foundations may be used to support proposed structures underlain by very low expansive soils (i.e. Expansion Index less that 20 and Plasticity Index less than 15) and with less than 40 feet of fills.

Continuous footings should have minimum widths of 12 inches, 15 inches or 18 inches for one-story, two-story or three-story structures, respectively. Individual column footings should have a minimum width of 24 inches.

Footings for proposed two story structures should have minimum depths (below lowest adjacent finish grade) of 18 inches and 12 inches for exterior and interior footings, respectively for assumed very low expansion potential ( $0-20$ Expansion Index).

The subgrade should be moisture-conditioned and proof-rolled just prior to construction to provide a firm, relatively unyielding surface, especially if the surface has been loosened by the passage of construction traffic.

The underslab vapor/moisture retarder (i.e. an equivalent capillary break method) may consist of a minimum $15-\mathrm{mil}$ thick vapor/moisture retarder (or equivalent) in conformance with ASTM E 1745 Class A material, placed in general conformance with ASTM E1643, underlain by a minimum 2-inch of sand and overlain by 1-inch of sand, as needed. The sand layer requirements above the vapor barrier are the purview of the foundation engineer/structural engineer, and should be provided in accordance with ACI Publication 302 "Guide for Concrete Floor and Slab Construction". These recommendations must be confirmed (and/or altered) by the foundation engineer, based upon the performance expectations of the foundation. Ultimately, the design of the moisture retarder system and recommendations for concrete placement and concrete mix design, which will address bleeding, shrinkage, and curling are the purview of the foundation engineer, in consideration of the project requirements provided by the architect and developer. The underslab vapor/moisture retarder described above is considered a suitable alternative in accordance with the Capillary Break Section 4.505.2.1 of the CALGreen code.

Subgrade soils should be pre-saturated to optimum moisture content to a depth of 12 inches for a very low expansion potential. Expansion index testing should be performed at the end of grading for confirmation. The minimum thickness of the floor slabs should be at least 4.5 inches, and joints should be provided per usual practice.

### 4.5.4 Post-Tension Foundations

Based on the site geotechnical conditions and provided the remedial recommendations provided herein are implemented, the site may be considered suitable for the support of the anticipated structures using a post-tensioned slab-ongrade foundation system, for the anticipated low to high expansive soils and for deeper fill areas. The following section summaries our recommendations for the foundation system.

Table 2 contains the geotechnical recommendations for the construction of PT slab on grade foundations. The structural engineer should design the foundation system based on these parameters including the foundation settlement as indicated in the following section to the allowable deflection criteria determined by the structural engineer/architect.

TABLE 2
Preliminary Geotechnical Parameters for Post-Tensioned Foundation Design

| Parameter | Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expansion Classification the completion of grading) | Low and High Expansion |  |
| Moisture Index (From Figure 33): | -20 |  |
| Constant Soil Suction (From Figure 3.4): | PF 3.6 |  |
| Center Lift <br> Edge moisture variation distance (from Figure 3.6), e Center lift, $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{m}}$ : | Low <br> 9.0 feet $\frac{\text { Medium }}{9.0 \text { feet }}$ <br> 0.3 inches 0.47 inches | $\begin{gathered} \underline{\text { High }} \\ 9.0 \text { feet } \\ 0.66 \text { inches } \end{gathered}$ |
| Edge Lift <br> Edge moisture variation distance (from Figure 3.6), Edge lift, $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{m}}$ : | $\underline{\text { Low }}$ $\underline{\text { Medium }}$ <br> 5.2 feet 5.0 feet <br> 0.61 inches 1.1 inches | High 5.0 feet 1.6 inches |
| Soluble Sulfate Content for Design of Concrete Mix in Contact with Site Soils in Accordance with American Concrete Institute standard 318, Section 4.3: | Assume Negligible Exposure (to be confirmed at the completion of grading) |  |
| Corrosivity of Earth Materials to Ferrous Met | Severely Corrosi |  |
| Modulus of Subgrade Reaction, k (assuming presaturation as indicated below): | 100 pci (low) <br> 85 pci (medium to high) |  |
| Additional Recommendations: <br> 1. Presaturate slab subgrade to at least optimum-moisture content or to 1.2 times optimum moisture, to minimum depths of 12 and 18 inches below ground surface, respectively for low and medium expansion potentials and 1.3 times optimum moisture, to minimum depths of 24 inches for high expansion. <br> 2. Install a $15-\mathrm{mil}$ moisture/vapor barrier (or equivalent) moisture/vapor barrier in direct contact with the concrete (unless superseded by the Structural/Post-tension engineer*) with 1 to 2 inches of sand below the moisture/vapor barrier. <br> 3. Minimum perimeter foundation embedment below finish grade for moisture cut off should be 12 18 , and 24 inches, respectively for low, medium, and high expansion potentials. <br> 4. Minimum slab thickness should be 5 inches. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| * The above sand and Visqueen recommendations are traditionally included with geotechnical foundation recommendations although they are generally not a major factor influencing the geotechnical performance of the foundation. The sand and Visqueen requirements are the purview of the foundation engineer/corrosion engineer (in accordance with ACI Publication 302 "Guide for |  |  |
| Concrete Floor and Slab Construction") and the homebuilder to ensure that the concrete cures more evenly than it would otherwise, is protected from corrosive environments, and moisture penetration of through the floor is acceptable to future homeowners. Therefore, the above recommendations may be superseded by the requirements of the previously mentioned parties. |  |  |

### 4.5.5 Mat Foundations

A mat foundation can be used for support of proposed residential buildings. An allowable soil bearing pressure of $1,000 \mathrm{psf}$ may be used for the design of the mat at the surface under the slab area.

The allowable bearing value is for total dead loads and frequently applied live loads and may be increased by one-third for short durations of loading which will include the effect of wind or seismic forces. A coefficient of vertical subgrade reaction, $k$, of 85 pounds per cubic inch (pci) may be used to evaluate the pressure distribution beneath the mat foundation.

The magnitude of total and differential settlements of the mat foundation will be a function of the structural design and stiffness of the mat. Based on assumed structural loads, we estimate that total static settlement will be on the order of an inch at the center of the mat foundation. Post construction differential settlement can be taken as one-half of the maximum estimated settlement

Resistance to lateral loads can be provided by friction acting at the base of foundations and by passive earth pressure. Foundations may be designed for a coefficient of friction of 0.35 . Minimum perimeter footing embedment provided in the previous sections maybe reduced for the mat slab design.

Coordination with the structural engineer will be required in order to ensure structural loads are adequately distributed throughout the mat foundation to avoid localized stress concentrations resulting in potential settlement. The foundation plan should be reviewed by LGC to confirm preliminary estimated total and differential static settlements.

### 4.5.6 Foundation Settlement

Based on the site design relative to native grades and considering site remedial removals, fill at the site will range from approximately 5 to over 150 feet in thickness within the site. Surface settlement monuments are planned to be installed in the deep fill areas within the subject tract. It is anticipated that most of the consolidation will be complete by the time final design grades are achieved due to the sandy nature of site soils. To provide documentation that the settlement is complete and three consecutive readings indicate relatively no change approximately three to four months of readings should be anticipated from the time that grading is complete.

Based on a preliminary review of site grading plans major fill differentials are not anticipated across building pad areas. Once site development plans are finalized the anticipated fill thickness and differentials on a lot by lot basis can be determined and considered in future foundation designs.

Based on preliminary evaluations and following the geotechnical release for construction, the preliminary static post-construction settlements are estimated to be up to 1 -inch with a differential settlement of approximately of 0.75 -inches The above differential settlement value should be evaluated at the completion of grading based on the final fill conditions.

### 4.5.7 Building Clearance and Foundation Setbacks

All building foundation located close to slopes should have a minimum setback per Figure 1808.7.1 of the 2013 CBC. The setback distances should be measured from competent materials on the outer slope face, excluding any weathered and loose materials.

Per the 2013 CBC Section 1808.7.1 and Figure 1808.7.1, building clearance from the toe of an ascending slope should be equal one-half of the total slope height to a maximum setback of 15 feet. Retaining walls may be constructed at the base of the slope to achieve the required building clearances.

Per the 2013 CBC Section 1808.7.2 and Figure 1808.7.1, the building foundation constructed on or near a descending slope should be setback or deepened to provide a minimum footing setback equal to the total height of slope $(H)$ divided by $3(\mathrm{H} / 3)$. The footing setback should be a minimum of 5 feet for slopes up to 15 feet in height and vary up to 40 feet for slopes up to 120 feet in height. The footing setbacks should be measured from the edge of the footing to the competent materials on the outer slope face.

### 4.6 Lateral Earth Pressures and Retaining Wall Design

The following lateral earth pressures may be used for the design of any future site retaining walls. We recommend low expansive soils for retaining wall backfill if no onsite soils fit the required minimum parameters ( $\mathrm{SE}>30$ ). The recommended lateral pressures for approved soils (expansion index less than 30 per U.B.C. 18-I-B, less than 15 percent passing \#200 sieve, and PI less than 15) for level or sloping backfill are presented on the table below. The recommended lateral pressures for clean sand or approved select soils for level or sloping backfill are presented on the following Table 3.

Table 3
Lateral Earth Pressures for Retaining Walls

| Conditions | Level Backfill | $\mathbf{2 : 1}$ Backfill Sloping Upwards | Seismic Earth <br> Pressure (pcf) * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Approved Select <br> Material | Approved Select Material |  |
|  | 35 | 55 | 13 |
| Active | 50 | 75 | -- |
| At-Rest | 250 | -- | - |
| Passive |  |  |  |

* For walls with greater than 6 -feet in backfill height, the above seismic earth pressure should be added to the static pressures given in the table above. The seismic earth pressure should be considered as an inverted triangular distribution with the resultant acting at 0.6 H in relation to the base of the retaining wall footing (where H is the retained height).

Embedded structural walls should be designed for lateral earth pressures exerted on them. The magnitude of these pressures depends on the amount of deformation that the wall can yield under load. If the wall can yield enough to mobilize the full shear strength of the soil, it can be designed for "active" pressure. If the wall cannot yield under the applied load, the shear strength of the soil cannot be mobilized and the earth pressure will be higher. Such walls should be designed for "at-rest" conditions. If a structure moves toward the soils, the resulting resistance developed by the soil is the "passive" resistance.

For design purposes, the recommended equivalent fluid pressure for each case for walls founded above the static groundwater and backfilled with low expansive onsite or import soils is provided in the table above. The equivalent fluid pressure values assume free-draining conditions. The backfill soils should be compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. The walls should be constructed and backfilled as soon as possible after backcut excavation. Prolonged exposure of backcut slopes may result in some localized slope instability. If conditions other than those assumed above are anticipated, the equivalent fluid pressure values should be provided on an individual-case basis by the geotechnical engineer.

Surcharge loading effects from any adjacent structures should be evaluated by the geotechnical and structural engineers. Surcharge loading on retaining walls should be considered when any loads are located within a 1:1 (horizontal to vertical) projection from the base of the retaining wall and should be added to the applicable lateral earth pressures. Where applicable, a minimum uniform lateral pressure of 100 psf should be added to the appropriate lateral earth pressures to account for typical vehicle traffic loading.

All retaining wall structures should be provided with appropriate drainage and appropriately waterproofed. The outlet pipe should be sloped to drain to a suitable outlet. Typical wall drainage design is illustrated on the attached Figure 3. It should be noted that the recommended subdrain does not provide protection against seepage through the face of the wall and/or efflorescence. Efflorescence is generally a white crystalline powder (discoloration) that results when water, which contains soluble salts, migrates over a period of time through the face of a retaining wall and evaporates. If such seepage or efflorescence is undesirable, retaining walls should be waterproofed to reduce this potential.

For sliding resistance, the friction coefficient of 0.35 may be used at the concrete and soil interface. Wall footings should be designed in accordance with structural considerations. The passive resistance value may be increased by one-third when considering loads of short duration such as wind or seismic loads. For short term loading (i.e. seismic) the allowable bearing capacity may be increased by one-third for seismic loading.

Foundations for retaining walls in properly compacted fill should be embedded at least 18 inches below lowest adjacent grade. At this depth and a minimum of 12 inches in width, an allowable bearing capacity of $1,500 \mathrm{psf}$ may be assumed. A factor of safety greater than 3 was used in evaluating the above bearing capacity value. This value maybe increased by 300 psf for each additional foot in depth and 100 psf for each additional foot of width to a maximum value of $3,000 \mathrm{psf}$. All excavations should be made in accordance with Cal OSHA. Excavation safety is the sole responsibility of the contractor.

### 4.7 Slope Creep

Due to the potentially expansive nature of the fill soils within the site, the probability exists for development of a creep condition on the slopes within the site with the passage of time. Creep is a very slow nearly continuous downward and outward movement of slope soils. The movement is minimal under small shear stresses, however sufficient to produce permanent deformation but not large enough to produce a shear failure as occurs in a landslide. For the site slopes, the principal cause for development of a creep condition is a result of repeated cycles of swelling and contraction of expansive soils over a period of time due to seasonal variations in the moisture content and is an irreversible process resulting in a loss of shear strength and subsequent buildup of small shear stresses. Experience has shown that creep can affect surficial soils to vertical depths of several feet depending on the expansiveness of the soils and the slope height and inclination, as well as a number of other factors. Other factors which can contribute to development of a slope creep condition include overwatering and subsequent saturation of the slope soils, prolonged or intense rainfall, prolonged periods of drought, rodent activity, inadequate plant materials used for slope protection, inadequate drainage facilities, and/or lack of a proper slope maintenance program. Creep cannot be stopped or eliminated; however, proper foundation embedment and design can be provided such that the magnitude, depth and rate of creep movement can be mitigated for structures proposed on or near descending slopes. For slope heights greater than 10 feet, the slope creep will impact improvements within approximately 10 to 15 feet from the top of slope. Some settlement and tilting may occur in improvements located in this outer 10 to 15 feet of the pad.

### 4.8 Freestanding (Top-of-Slope) Walls

Freestanding wall footings should be founded a minimum of 18 inches below the lowest adjacent grade. To reduce the potential for unsightly cracks, we recommend inclusion of construction joints at 10 - to 20 -foot intervals.

Due to the potential creep of soils, where free standing walls are constructed close to top-ofslope, some tilt of the wall should be anticipated. To reduce the amount of tilt, a combination of grade beam and caisson foundations may be used to support the wall. The system should consist of minimum 12 -inch diameter caissons placed at 8 feet maximum on centers, and each 8 feet long and connected together at top with 12 -inch by 12 -inch grade beam. The geotechnical design parameters for the caisson are shown on the attached Figure 4.

### 4.9 Pavement Recommendations

Based on a preliminary assumed minimum R-value of 20 and an assumed Traffic Indices (TI's) of 6,7 , and 8.5 , we recommend the following minimum pavement sections (Table 4). The Rvalue should be determined during the concluding stages of grading, and the final pavement section should be designed accordingly. TI's for the streets within the subject project site should be obtained from the appropriate regulatory agency or calculated by a traffic engineer. Final pavement sections should be confirmed by the project civil engineer based upon the project traffic index and the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works minimum requirements.

TABLE 4

| Recommended Minimum Pavement Sections |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Index 6 7 8.5 <br> Asphalt Concrete (in.) 4 4 4 <br> Aggregate Base (in.) 10 12 17 |  |  |  |

The aggregate base material should conform to the specifications for Class 2 Aggregate Base (Caltrans) or Crushed Aggregate/Miscellaneous Base (Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction). The base material should be compacted to achieve a minimum relative compaction of 95 percent. The subgrade should achieve a minimum relative compaction of 90 percent through the upper 12 inches. Base and subgrade materials should be moistureconditioned to relatively uniform moisture content at or slightly over optimum.

### 4.10 Corrosivity to Concrete and Metal

The National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE) defines corrosion as "a deterioration of a substance or its properties because of a reaction with its environment." From a geotechnical viewpoint, the "environment" is the prevailing foundation soils and the "substances" are the reinforced concrete foundations or various buried metallic elements such as rebar, piles, pipes, etc., which are in direct contact with or within close vicinity of the foundation soil.

In general, soil environments that are detrimental to concrete have high concentrations of soluble sulfates and/or pH values of less than 5.5. ACI 318R-08 Table 4.3.1 provides specific guidelines for the concrete mix design when the soluble sulfate content of the soils exceeds 0.1 percent by weight or $1,000 \mathrm{ppm}$. The minimum amount of chloride ions in the soil environment that are corrosive to steel, either in the form of reinforcement protected by concrete cover, or plain steel substructures such as steel pipes or piles, is 500 ppm per California Test 532.

Based on previous site soil testing by others, the onsite soils are classified as having a negligible sulfate exposure condition with a potential for localized moderate to severe sulfate content in accordance with ACI 318R-08 Table 4.3.1. As a preliminary recommendation due to results of previous sulfate content testing, concrete in contact with onsite soils should be designed in accordance with ACI 318R-08 Table 4.3.1 for the negligible category. It is also our opinion that onsite soils should be considered severely corrosive to buried metals. Site grading will redistribute the materials, which may result in soils with different corrosion potentials. Therefore, the as-graded soil conditions should be verified with confirmatory sampling and testing during the grading phase of the project.

Despite the minimum recommendation above, LGC is not a corrosion-engineering firm. Therefore, we recommend that after site grading, consultation with a competent corrosion engineer be initiated to evaluate the actual corrosion potential of the site and to provide recommendations to reduce the corrosion potential with respect to the proposed improvements, as necessary. The recommendations of the corrosion engineer may supersede the above requirements.

### 4.11 Nonstructural Concrete Flatwork

Concrete flatwork (such as walkways, bicycle trails, etc.) have a high potential for cracking due to changes in soil volume related to soil-moisture fluctuations because these slabs are typically much thinner than foundation slabs and are not reinforced with the same dynamic as foundation elements. To reduce the potential for excessive cracking and lifting, concrete should be designed in accordance with the minimum guidelines outlined in Table 5. These guidelines will reduce the potential for irregular cracking and promote cracking along construction joints, but will not eliminate all cracking or lifting. Thickening the concrete and/or adding additional reinforcement will further reduce cosmetic distress.

TABLE 5
Nonstructural Concrete Flatwork

|  | Homeowner Sidewalks | Private Drives | Patios/Entryways | City Sidewalk Curb and Gutters |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Thickness (in.) | 4 | 5 |  | City/Agency Standard |
| Presaturation | Wet down prior to placing | Presoak to 12 inches | Presoak to 12 inches | City/Agency Standard |
| Reinforcement | - | No. 3 at 24 inches on centers | No. 3 at 24 inches on centers | City/Agency Standard |
| Thickened Edge | - | $8 " \times 8$ " |  | City/Agency Standard |
| Crack Control | Saw cut or deep tool joint to a minimum of $1 / 3$ the concrete thickness | Saw cut or deep tool joint to a minimum of $1 / 3$ the concrete thickness | Saw cut or deep tool joint to a minimum of $1 / 3$ the concrete thickness | City/Agency Standard |
| Maximum Joint Spacing | 5 feet | 10 feet or quarter cut whichever is closer | 6 feet | City/Agency Standard |
| Aggregate Base |  | 2 | $2$ | City/Agency Standard |

### 4.12 Slope Maintenance

To reduce the potential for erosion and slumping of graded slopes, all slopes should be planted with ground cover and deep-rooted vegetation as soon as practical upon completion of grading. Surface water runoff and standing water at the top-of-slopes should be avoided. Oversteepening of slopes should be avoided during construction activities and landscaping. Maintenance of proper lot drainage, undertaking of property improvements in accordance with sound engineering practice, and proper maintenance of vegetation, including regular pad and slope irrigation, should be performed. Trenches excavated on a slope face for utility of irrigation lines and/or for any purpose should be properly backfilled and compacted by a vibratory plate, or equivalent, in order to obtain a minimum 90 percent relative compaction, in accordance with ASTM Test Method D1557, to the slope face. Observation/testing and acceptance by the geotechnical consultant during trench backfill is recommended. A rodent control program should be established and maintained.

### 4.13 Construction Observation and Testing

The recommendations provided in this report are based on subsurface observations and geotechnical analysis by others. The interpolated subsurface conditions should be checked in the field during construction by a representative of LGC.

Construction observation and testing should also be performed by the geotechnical consultant during future grading, excavations, backfill of utility trenches, preparation of pavement subgrade and placement of aggregate base, foundation or retaining wall construction or when an unusual soil condition is encountered at the site. Grading plans, foundation plans, and final project drawings should be reviewed by this office prior to construction.

### 5.0 LIMITATIONS

Our services were performed using the degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable engineers and geologists practicing in this or similar localities. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the conclusions and professional advice included in this report. The samples taken and submitted for laboratory testing, the observations made and the in-situ field testing performed are believed representative of the entire project; however, soil and geologic conditions revealed by excavation may be different than our preliminary findings. If this occurs, the changed conditions must be evaluated by the project soils engineer and geologist and design(s) adjusted as required or alternate design(s) recommended.

This report is issued with the understanding that it is the responsibility of the owner, or of his/her representative, to ensure that the information and recommendations contained herein are brought to the attention of the architect and/or project engineer and incorporated into the plans, and the necessary steps are taken to see that the contractor and/or subcontractor properly implements the recommendations in the field. The contractor and/or subcontractor should notify the owner if they consider any of the recommendations presented herein to be unsafe.

The findings of this report are valid as of the present date. However, changes in the conditions of a property can and do occur with the passage of time, whether they be due to natural processes or the works of man on this or adjacent properties.

In addition, changes in applicable or appropriate standards may occur, whether they result from legislation or the broadening of knowledge. Accordingly, the findings of this report may be invalidated wholly or partially by changes outside our control.


Figure 2

## TYPICAL SURFACE SETTLEMENT aMONUMENT



Figure 3: Retaining Wall Detail, Sand Backfill

| Project Name | Pardee/Skyline |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project No. | $153035-01$ |
| Eng. / Geol. | BIH/SMB |
| Scale | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Date | March 2016 |
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## LGC Boring Logs

Borings B-LGC-1 through B-LGC-4






Geotechnical Boring Log B-LGC2









## APPENDIX B

## Excavation Logs By Others






LOG OF BORING B3













## Orientation Summary Table BIPS Features

Santa Clarita Project, Boring: \#7
September 10, 2002
ATTITUDES CORRECTED + 14 DEG. FOR MAGNETIC DECLINATION FEATURES IN BOLD CONSIDERED BEDDING-RELATED

|  | Feature No. | Depth <br> (meters) | Depth <br> (feet) | Strike and Dip Angle (degrees) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Feature } \\ \text { Rank } \\ (0 \text { to } 5) \end{gathered}$ | $1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FEATURE DESCRIPTION |  |  |  |  |  | CORRECTED ATTITUDE |
| Top of cobble | 1 | 494 | 162 | N 40W 47NE | 0 | N54W/ 47NE |
| Bottom of cobble | 2 | 526 | 173 | V 98 W 29 N | 0 | N78E/ 29NW |
| Gravel lense | 3 | 763 | 250 | N 30 E 3 N | 1 | N66E/37NW |
| Pebble brsected by core | 4 | 774 | 254 | N 27E 58E | 0 | N13E/ 58SE |
| Channel | 5 | 10.04 | 329 | V 10 W 36 SW | 2 | N54W/ 36SW |
| Top of sandstone | 6 | 1024 | 33.6 | N 31 El 10 S | 3 | N67El 10SE |
| ADPx bottom of sandstone | 7 | 1171 | 38.4 | N +0E 14SE | 0 | N26E/ 14SE |
| Bottom of cobble | 8 | 1198 | 39.3 | N 84 E 39 S | 0 | N70E/ 39SE |
| Pebbles | 9 | 1251 | 410 | N63W 29N | 0 | N7TW/ 29NE |
| Pebbles | 10 | 1266 | 415 | N $38 W 27 \mathrm{~S}$ | 0 | N78E/ 27SE |
| Pebbles | 11 | 1329 | 436 | v 53 W 24 S | 1 | N77WI 24SW |
| Pebbles | 12 | 1341 | 44.0 | - 51E 30NW | 0 | N37E/ 30NW |
| Top of pebble | 13 | 1386 | 455 | V 78 W 18N | $1)$ | N88E/ 18NW |
| Bottom of pebble | 14 | 1395 | 45.8 | N ${ }^{\text {dW }}$ 20N | 0 | N88W/ 20NW |
| Grave! lense | 15 | 1529 | 502 | V $30 W 275 W$ | 0 | N44WI 27SW |
| Top of cobble | 16 | 15.33 | 50.3 | V $33 E 17 \mathrm{NW}$ | 0 | N19E/ 17NW |
| Bottom of cobble | 17 | 1571 | 51.5 | V 4 W 45 W | 0 | N18W/ 45SW |
| Bottom of pebble | 18 | 1651 | 54.2 | $\therefore 56 \mathrm{E} 47 \mathrm{NW}$ | 1 | N42E/ 47NW |
| Top of cobble | 19 | 1695 | 556 | V 29 E 31 E | 0 | N15E; 31SE |
| Bottom of cobble | 20 | 1729 | 56.7 | V36E 18SE | 0 | N22E! 18SE |
| Top of cobble | 21 | 1841 | 60.4 | VS 44W | 0 | N14WI 44SW |
| Sottom of cobble | 22 | 1859 | 61.0 | V11W21E | 0 | N25W/ 21NE |
| Appx Channel | 23 | 1993 | 65.4 | N77W 415 | 1 | N89E/ 41SE |
| Appx Channel | 24 | 2017 | 662 | V 44W 35SW | 1 | N58W/ 35 SW |
| Appx Channel | 25 | 2024 | 664 | N 37W 45SW | 1 | N51W/ 45SW |
| Top of pebble | 26 | 2135 | 701 | N 53E 23SE | 1 | N39E/ 23SE |
| Too of cobble | 27 | 2157 | 708 | N62W 51N | 0 | N76W/ 51NE |
| Appx Channel | 28 | 2183 | 716 | N 19W 43W | 0 | N33W/ 43SW |
| Bottom of cobble | 29 | 2201 | 72.2 | N 51W 28SW | 0 | N65W/ 28SW |
| Appx Channel | 30 | 22.59 | 74.1 | N 26W 35W | 0 | N40W/ 35SW |
| Bottom of pebble | 31 | 2485 | 81.5 | N 2W 41W | 1 | N16W/41SW |
| Top of cobble | 32 | 25.03 | 82,1 | N 29E 23 W | 0 | N15E/ 23NW |
| Bottom of cobble | 33 | 25.16 | 82.5 | N 46W 29NE | 0 | N60W/ 29NE |
| Bottom of cobble | 34 | 2635 | 86.4 | N 87W 28N | 0 | N79E/ 28NW |
| Top of cobble | 35 | 27.19 | 8922 | N 56W 46NE | 0 | N70WI 46NE |
| Bottom of cobble | 36 | 27.33 | 89.68 | N 26E 19E | 0 | N12E/ 19SE |
| Tod of cobble | 37 | 2906 | 95.34 | N 9E 14W | 0 | N5WI 14SW |
| Top of cobble | 38 | 29623 | 97.19 | N 36E 48NW | 0 | N25E/ 48NW |
| Bottom of cobble | 39 | 29825 | 97.85 | N 43E 7SE | 0 | N29E/ 7SE |
| Pebbles | 40 | 30.357 | 9960 | N 14E29E | 0 | NS/ 29E |
| Btm of Cobble/Top of SS | 41 | 31.619 | 103.74 | N 6E 21W | 0 | N8W/ 21SW |
| Scour/Channel | 42 | 32.305 | 105.99 | N 26W 28E | 1 | N4OW/ 28NE |
| Top of sandstone | 43 | 32343 | 106.12 | N 17W 16W | 0 | N31W/ 16SW |

All directions are with respect to magnetic north

## Orientation Summary Table <br> RIPS Features

Santa Clarita Project, Boring: \# 7
September 10, 2002

| FEATURE DESCRIPTION | Feature <br> No. | Depth <br> (meters) | Depth <br> (feet) | Strike and Dip Angle (degrees) | Feature Rank $(0 \text { to } 5)$ | CORRECTED ATTITUDE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Channel? | 44 | 32768 | 10751 | N 25 W 31W | 0 | N39W/ 31SW |
| Too of cobble | 45 | 344 | 11286 | N 85 E 20 N | 0 | N71E/ 20NW |
| Top of sandstone | 46 | 34774 | 11409 | N 66W 22S | 1 | N80W/ 22SW |
| unknown | 47 | 34992 | 11481 | N 72W 18N | 0 | N86W/ 18NE |
| unknown | 48 | 35017 | 11489 | N 66E 46S | 0 | N52E/46SE |
| Channel? | 49 | 36.298 | 11909 | N 78 W 44 N | 2 | N88E/ 44NW |
| Channel? | 50 | 37.616 | 12342 | N 23E 27E | 0 | N9E/ 27SE |
| Top of cobble | 51 | 37.708 | 12372 | N 12E 29E | 0 | N2W/ 29NE |
| Tod of cobble | 52 | 38517 | 12637 | N 42E 29SE | 0 | N28E/ 29SE |
| Too of cobble | 53 | 38.893 | 12761 | N 42E 22NW | 0 | N28E/ 22NW |
| Graveily Sandstone/Fine SS | 54 | 41.221 | 13524 | N35W 13SW | 0 | N49W/ 13SW |
| Pebble | 55 | 41.641 | 13662 | N 32W 33NE | 0 | N46W/ 33NE |
| Appx. Top of Sandstone | 56 | $+172$ | 13688 | N 56W 13SW | 0 | N70W/ 13SW |
| Tco of Pebbles | 57 | 42.143 | 13827 | N 69 W 24 N | 0 | N83W/ 24NE |
| Bortom of Cobble | 58 | 43626 | 14313 | N 40W 35NE | 0 | N54WI 35NE |
| Tod of sandstone | 59 | 43964 | 14424 | N38W 24SW | 0 | N52W/ 24SW |
| Alopx Bottom of gravel lense | 60 | 44.422 | 14575 | N $37 W 35 \mathrm{SW}$ | 0 | N51W/ 35SW |
| unknown | 61 | 46059 | 151.12 | N 70 W 43 N | 0 | N84W/ 43NE |
| Too of cobble | 62 | 4692 | 15394 | N 77E42S | 0 | N63E/42SE |
| Bortom of cobble | 63 | 47.026 | 15429 | EW 17S | 0 | N76E/ 17SE |
| Too of cobble | 64 | 48323 | 15855 | N 54W 14SW | 0 | N68W/ 14SW |
| Sottom of Cobble | 65 | 48.517 | 15918 | N 88E 16S | 0 | N74E/16SE |
| Too of sandstone | 66 | 50466 | 16558 | N 36W 15SW | 0 | N50W/ 15SW |
| Too of cobble | 67 | 53126 | 17430 | N 39W 38SW | 0 | N53W/ 38SW |

ATTITUDES CORRECTED + 14 DEG FOR MAGNETIC DECLINATION
FEATURES IN BOLD CONSIDERED BEDDING-RELATED







## Orientation Summary Table

 BIPS FeaturesSanta Clarita Project, Boring 8 .
September 17, 2002
ATTITUDES CORRECTED + 14 DEG. FOR MAGNETIC DECLINATION FEATURES IN BOLD CONSIDERED BEDDING-RELATED

|  | FEATURES IN BOLD CONSIDERED BEDDINS-RELATED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Feature No. | Depth | Depth | Strike and Dip Angle | Feature Rank | $1$ |
| FEATURE DESCRIPTION |  | (meters) | (feer) | (degrees) | (0 to 5) | CORRECTED ATTITUDE |
| Gravei stringer | 1 | $4+4$ | 14.6 | N 54W 34SW | 0 | N68W/ 34SW |
| Aodrox Bedding | 2 | 457 | 15.0 | N 75 W 47 S | 0 | N89W/ 47SW |
| Cross Bedding | 3 | 519 | 17.0 | N 11W 54W | 0 | N25W/ 54SW |
| Gravel Lense | 4 | 606 | 199 | N 76E 26S | 0 | N62E! 26SE |
| Approx Bedding | 5 | 1095 | 359 | N63W33S | 0 | N7TWI 33SW |
| Unknown | 6 | 1377 | 452 | N 41 W 12NE | 0 | N55W/ 12NE |
| Bottom of Gravel | 7 | 1427 | 46.8 | N68E37N | 0 | N54E/37NW |
| Tod of Grave! Lense | 8 | 1587 | 52.1 | V28E18E | 0 | N14E/ 18SE |
| Top of Gravel Lense | 9 | 1685 | 553 | N $79 W 37 \mathrm{~N}$ | 0 | N87E/ 37NW |
| Too of Gravel Lense | 10 | 1953 | 64.1 | N 5 E 25 E | 0 | N9W/ 25NE |
| Bottom of Pebble | 11 | 1960 | 643 | N 3 E 30 E | 0 | N11W/ 30NE |
| Approx Top of Sandstone | 12 | 2057 | 675 | N 10W 25E | 0 | N24W/ 25NE |
| Ton of Boulder | 13 | 2138 | 70.1 | N SE 67W | 0 | N6W/ 67NE |
| Btm of Bouder | 14 | 2169 | 71.2 | V 24 W 25 W | 0 | N38W/ 25SW |
| Top of Sandstone | 15 | 2193 | 72.0 | N61W16S | 0 | N75W/ 16SW |
| Bottom of Pebble | 16 | 2210 | 72.5 | N H2W 21NE | 0 | N56W/ 21NE |
| Stained Sandstone Bed | 17 | 2363 | 77.5 | N 49 W l3SW | 1 | N63W/13SW |
| Fracture | 18 | 2874 | 943 | V 43 W 71 SW | 2 | N57W/ 12SW |
| Cobble | 19 | 3024 | 992 | v 27W 24W | 0 | N41W/ 245 W |
| Fracture | 20 | 3334 | 1094 | N13W37W | 0 | N27W/ 37SW |
| Unknown | 21 | 3347 | 1098 | V1+W 32W | 0 | N28W/ 32SW |
| Sancsione Lamination | 22 | 3407 | 111.8 | N +2W 12SW | 0 | N56W/ 12SW |
| Approx Sandstone Channel | 23 | 3456 | 1134 | N67W 285 | 0 | N81W/ 28SW |
| Boitom of Cobble | 24 | 3695 | 121 ? | N 48 W 38 SW | 0 | N62W/38SW |
| Bottom of Cobble | 25 | 3754 | 1232 | N68E 22N | 0 | N54E/22NW |
| Top of Cobble | 26 | 3948 | 1295 | N26E16E | 0 | N12E/ 16SE |
| Bottom of Cobble | 27 | 3978 | 1305 | N 74E7S | 0 | N60E/ 7SE |
| Bottom of Pebble | 28 | 43.53 | 1428 | N $48 W$ SSW | 0 | N62W/ 5SW |
| Aoprox Top of Sandstone | 29 | 4364 | 1432 | N 43 W 39 SW | 0 | N57W/ 39SW |
| Laminated Sandstone | 30 | 4431 | 145.4 | N 45 W 20 SW | 0 | N59W/ 20SW |
| Bottom of Sandstone | 31 | 4461 | 1464 | N 26W 35W | 0 | N40W/ 35SW |
| Bottom of Pebble | 32 | 4516 | 148.2 | N 15W 52W | 0 | N29W/ 52SW |
| Bottom of Pebble | 33 | 4852 | 159.2 | N 86W 22N | 0 | N80E/ 22NW |
| Unknown | 34 | 4970 | 1631 | N 77E 32S | 0 | N63E/32SE |
| Bottom of Sandstone | 35 | 5031 | 165.06 | N 58W 16SW | 0 | N72W/16SW |
| Top of Sandstone | 36 | 5341 | 175.23 | NS 18W | 0 | N14W/ 18SW |
| Laminated Sandstone | 37 | 53555 | 175.71 | N:7W 21 W | 0 | N41W/ 21SW |
| Laminated Sandstone | 38 | 53713 | 176.23 | N 29W 21 W | 0 | N43W/ 21SW |
| Bottom of Sandstone | 39 | 53872 | 176.75 | N 24W 43W | 0 | N38W/ 43SW |
| Apprx Gravelly Sandst. | 40 | 54384 | 178.43 | N 76E 22N | 0 | N62E/ 22NW |
| Bettom of Clayey Sandstone | 41 | 54616 | 17919 | N 16E16W | 0 | N2E/ 16NW |
| Unknown | 42 | 54.635 | 179.25 | N 64E 51N | 0 | N50E/51NW |
| Laminated Sandstone | 43 | 59384 | 194.84 | N 9W 16W | 0 | N25W/ 16SW |

## Orientation Summary Table <br> BIPS Features

Santa Clarita Project, Boring 8
September 17, 2002





















| DEPTH <br> (ft) | DIP DIRECTION <br> AZIMUTH <br> (MAGNETIC) | DIP DIRECTION AZIMUTH CORRECTED TO TRUE NORTH ${ }_{1}$ | STRIKE AZIMUTH2 | STRIKE AND DIP OF FEATURE | TYPE OF FEATURE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.9 | 337 | 323 | 233 | N53E/66NW | FRACTURE |
| 18.5 | 3 | -11 | -101 | N79E/46NW | FRACTURE |
| 23.8 | 138 | 124 | 34 | N34E\%65E | FRACTURE |
| 45.1 | 205 | 191 | 101 | N79W/43SW | APPX. BEDDING |
| 45.8 | 25 | 11 | -79 | N79W/38NE | APPX. CHANNEL |
| 48.7 | 338 | 324 | 234 | N54E/37NW | APPX. BEDDING |
| 50.6 | 33 | 19 | -71 | N71W/27NE | BEDDING |
| 56.7 | 178 | 164 | 74 | N74E/34SE | CLASTS |
| 58.5 | 180 | 166 | 76 | N76E/50SE | TOP OF CLAST |
| 60.3 | 301 | 287 | 197 | N17E/42NW | BOTTOM OF CLAST |
| 65.7 | 186 | 172 | 82 | N82E/17SE | TOP OF CLAST |
| 67.7 | 308 | 294 | 204 | N44E54NW | FRACTURE |
| 68.1 | 178 | 164 | 74 | N74E/39SE | APPX. CHANNEL |
| 72 | 85 | 71 | -19 | N19W/19NE | BEDDING |
| 75.3 | 12 | -2 | -92 | N88E/30NW | APPX. BEDDDING |
| 81.1 | 261 | 247 | 157 | N23WI14SW | APPX. BEDDING |
| 84.6 | 248 | 234 | 144 | N36W/21SW | APPX. BEDDING |
| 89 | 299 | 285 | 195 | N15E/13NW | APPX. BEDDING |
| 94.2 | 231 | 217 | 127 | N53W/48SW | MUD ON SIDEWALLS? |
| 94.4 | 30 | 16 | -74 | N74W/11NE | BEDDING |
| 100 | 36 | 22 | -68 | N68W/9NE | BEDDING |
| 104.7 | 250 | 236 | 146 | N34W/54SW | FRACTURE |
| 106.4 | 213 | 199 | 109 | N71W/23SW | BEDDING |
| 108.3 | 156 | 142 | 52 | N52E/28SE | BEDDING |
| 113 | 65 | 51 | -39 | N39W/19NE | BEDDING |
| 113.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | HORIZONTAL | BEDDING |
| 114.2 | 16 | 2 | -88 | N88W/28NE | APPX BEDDING |
| 1168 | 127 | 113 | 23 | N23E/6SE | APPX BEDDING |
| 1198 | 191 | 177 | 87 | N87E/2SE | BEDDING |
| 120.6 | 355 | 341 | 251 | N71E/16NW | BEDDING |
| 124 | 252 | 238 | 148 | N32W/14SW | BEDDING |
| 126.6 | 325 | 311 | 221 | N41E/20NW | BEDDING |
| 129 | 209 | 195 | 105 | N75W/4SW | BEDDING |


| 129.7 | 352 | 338 | 248 | N68E/20NW | BEDDING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 132.8 | 50 | 36 | -54 | N54W/3NE | APPX BEDDING |
| 134 | 354 | 340 | 250 | N70E/9NW | APPX. BEDDING |
| 142.7 | 232 | 218 | 128 | N52W/59SW | SCOUR |
| 145.3 | 233 | 219 | 129 | N51W/37SW | CLAST |
| 146 | 256 | 242 | 152 | N28W/62SW | CLAST |
| 146.3 | 98 | 84 | -6 | N6W/10NE | APPX. BEDDING |
| 153.4 | 196 | 182 | 92 | N88W/38SW | CHANNEL |
| 158.7 | 94 | 80 | -10 | N10W/7NE | BTM OF CLAST |
| 164.2 | 104 | 90 | 0 | DUE N/26E | BTM OF CLAST |
| 166.1 | 187 | 173 | 83 | N83E/23SE | TOP OF CLAST |
| 166.4 | 174 | 160 | 70 | N70E/12SE | BTM OF CLAST |
| 178.1 | 329 | 315 | 225 | N45E/43NW | CHANNEL |
| 180.6 | 12 | -2 | -92 | N88W/45NE | CHANNEL |
| 186.2 | 98 | 84 | -6 | N6W/17NE | TOP OF CLAST |
| 188 | 102 | 88 | -2 | N2W/19NE | BTM OF CLAST |

4. FEATURES IN BOLD CONSIDERED PERTINENT FOR PLOTTING ON GEOLOGIC MAP





\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { DEPTH } \\
(\mathrm{t})\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { DIP DIRECTION } \\
\text { AZIMUTH } \\
\text { (MAGNETIC) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { DIP DIRECTION AZIMUTH } \\
\text { CORRECTED TO TRUE NORTH }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { STRIKE } \\
\text { AZIMUTH2 }\end{array}
$$ \& \begin{array}{c}STRIKE AND <br>
DIP OF <br>

FEATURE\end{array} \& TYPE OF FEATURE\end{array}\right]\)| BEDDING |
| :---: |
| 6 |
| 260 |

4. FEATURES IN BOLD CONSIDERED PERTINENT FOR PLOTTING ON GEOLOGIC MAP














BORING 22
SKYLINE RANCH, VTTM 060922
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { DEPTH } \\
\text { (ft) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { DIP DIRECTION } \\
\text { AZIMUTH } \\
\text { (MAGNETIC) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { DIP DIRECTION AZIMUTH } \\
\text { CORRECTED TO TRUE NORTH1 }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { STRIKE } \\
\text { AZIMUTH } 2\end{array}
$$ \& \begin{array}{c}STRIKE AND <br>
DIP OF <br>

FEATURE\end{array} \& TYPE OF FEATURE\end{array}\right]\)| TOP OF COBBLE |
| :---: |
| 2.2 |

1. MAGNETIC DIP AZIMUTH CORRECTED 14 DEGREES TO TRUE NORTH
2. STRIKE AZIMUTH OF FEATURE OBTAINED FROM CORRECTED DIP AZIMUTH
3. OPTICAL LOG REVIEWED TO DETERMINE FEATURE TYPE
4. OPTICAL LOG REVIEWED TO DETERMINE FEATURE TYPE 4. FEATURES IN BOLD CONSIDERED PERTINENT FOR PLOTTING ON GEOLOGIC MAP
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SUBSURFACE DATA
LOG OF BORING B82

















SUBSURFACE DATA
LOG OF BORING B92


LOG OF BORING B92




















## PACIFIC SOILS ENGINEERING, INC.

Boring Log

PROJECT: WESTON - WHITES CANYON

| $\begin{aligned} & \underset{ \pm}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{5}{\Delta} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.0 \\ 0 . \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \text { in } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { s } \\ & \text { s } \\ & \text { s. } \\ & \text { 辰 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 5 \\ & 50 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Boring Date Sample Method:

B-115
11-16-88
W.O. 11143-A

Sheet ${ }^{1}$ OF 3 241By: M.M. /W.J. 2700 \# to $23 \%$ 1600\# to 45 800\# below 45'

## Description

SOIL: Silty Sand, tan, dry, loose.
BEDROCK, SAUGUS FORMATION (TQs): Silty Clayey Sandstone
dense, $10 \%$ redbbrown, medium coan and pebbles.
Cobble bed: attitude: N80E, 35NW.
Clayey sandstone, tan, coarse grained, pebbles and cobbles, slightly moist, dense.

Fault: attitude: NTOW, 60SW; SW side of hole up.

Claystone bed, red, 6 inch thick sheared and discontinuous around the hole. At the bottom of the bed; attitude: N35E, 15NW.

Cobble bed, attitude: N55E, 26 NW.
Claystone bed, red-brown randomly sheared, occasional caliche, about 1 inch thick, at the base: attitude: N5OE, 30NW.
$116.8 \quad 12.1$

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |


| cobble bed, attitude: N55E, 26 NW. |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | claystone bed, red-brown randomly sheared, <br> occasional caliche, about inch thick, at the <br> base: attitude: N50E, 30NW. |

W.O. 11143-A

Sheet 2 OF 3
By: M.M. W.J. 271 Bucket Auger
$2700 \#$ to 23',
1600\# to 45, 800\# below 45'

## Description

Sandstone bed, medium-grained. Northwest side of boring; attitude: N55E, 17NW.

Sandstone, medium to coarse grained, occasional pebbles, very pebbly at 35 feet.

Claystone, red to red-brown, attitude is very good and consistent around the boring: N10E, 16 NH . This bed is approximately 3 feet thick.

Claystone bed, 2 feet thick, attitude: N45E, 22NW.

Claystone contact very pebbly and coarse above, red
clay below; attitude N50E, 18 NW .

Sandstone, coarse-grained, pebbly, moist, well
cemented.

Gravelly Claystone, dark brown, moist, dense.

Clayey Sandstone, red-brown, moist, sheared.
Cobble bed, attitude: N2OE, 5NW.

Rocks, switched to 24 inch coring bucket.

Clayey Sandstone, tan, moist.
Clayey Sandstone tan with light grey streaks, dense with rocks 4 inch to 8 inch in diameter.


$\square$ chann


## 0-3

3-5
Total Depth - $5^{\prime}$ No caving
from 3'-4', grad
slightly moist.
No groundwater
Soil/Colluvium: Clayey gravelly fine to medium grat
$6^{\prime \prime}$ depth, sharp contact with underlying bedrock. subangular to subround clasts commonly $1^{\prime \prime}$ to $6^{\prime \prime}$ diameter, channel deposits, very dense, slightly dry, carbonate precipitation th light red brown clayey fine grained SANDSTONE, poorly indurated, very dense, $\qquad$
Comments
OHWM -
ordinary high
water mark
tly dry.


## 

Date Excavated:

Depth (ft)
0-2.5
2.5-6

Total Depth - 6'
No caving

## abundant root hairs.

Saugus Formation: s peu!es6 әu! доu!u $\square$ $\square$
.

## Comments OHWM - ordinary high water mark Shears: N55W/35NE N30W/2ONE

2




Date Excavated: 11/20/03 $\quad$ Client: Pardee Homes

Logged By: SBS

| LOG OF EXCAVATION |
| :--- |
| Trench No. TP12 |

Depth (it)
Depth (it)
$0-4.5$ Soil/Colluvium: ed, very dense, slightly dry.
Description

0-4.5
4.5-7

|  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Total Depth - 7' } \\ \text { No groundwater } \\ \text { No caving }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| S. |  |
| Mraphic Log |  |









| 0-15 Alluvium: Dark clayey silty SAND to silty sandy CLAY with abundant subrounded cobbles and boulders, porous, abundant roots |
| :--- | :--- |
| to 4', dry and loose. |
| 15-18 Mint Canyon Formation: Yellowish olive brown cobbly CONGLOMERATE, cemented, dry, very hard, massive. |








arse SAND
ense, massive.
$\square$

LOG OF EXCAVATION
Trench No. TP30
Logged By: AH
Client: Pardee Homes
Date Excavated: 3/2706
Description
Colluvium: Brown silty SAND with gravel, roots, very moist.
Depth ( ft )
$0-1$
$1-8.5$
Total Depth - $8.5^{\prime}$
No caving
Backfilled












| LOG OF EXCA | VATION | Logged By: NM | Date Excavated: | 5/23/06 | Client: | Pardee H |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth (ft) 0-4 <br> 4-6 <br> 6-7 | Description <br> Alluvium: Dark brown sandy silty CLAY with dispersed rounded and subrounded granitic boulders up to 3' diameter (approximately <br> $25 \%$ are greater than 12" diameter), very moist, medium stiff, rootlets. <br> Dark brown clayey fine to coarse grained SAND with gravels, cobbles, and lesser boulders (less than 10\%), well graded, moist, <br> dense. <br> Mint Canyon Formation: Sharp undulating contact with light grayish to yellowish brown medium grained SANDSTONE with occasional <br> coarse sand lenses, moderately graded, moist, very dense. <br> Total Depth - 7 \% <br> No groundwater <br> No caving <br> Backilled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|303raphic Log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |















Alluvium: Dark brown fine to coarse grained sandy CLAY with abundant gravels, cobbles and lesser boulders (approximately 30\% greater than $12^{\prime \prime}$ diameter), well graded, moist to very moist, medium stiff.
8-10 Mint Canyon Formation: Light gray fine to coarse grained gravel cobble CONGLOMERATE with occasional boulders approximately










0-3 slightly moist, medium dense.
Alluvium: Medium brown coarse grained gravelly SAND with abundant cobbles and boulders (approximately $25 \%$ greater than 12 " diameter), well graded, subangular to rounded clasts typically $6^{\prime \prime}$ to $18^{\prime \prime}$ diameter (up to $3^{\prime \prime}$ ), moist to wet at $8^{\prime}$, medium dense.
Mint Canyon Formation: Light gray gravel cobble CONGLOMERATE with sandstone supported matrix, very moist, very dense
Seep at $9^{\prime}$ (bottom of alluvium)
No caving
Description
ameter),
$n$
$\frac{2}{D}$
$E$
$E$
0
0










5-7 Mint Canvon Formation: Grayish green to greenish gray fine to medium grained SANDSTONE with occasional white calciun carbonate stringers, poorly graded, occasional blocky planar randomly oriented fractures, moist to very moist, very dense.
Description Alluvium: Medium brown silty fine to coarse grained gravelly SAND with abundant subangular to rounded cobbles and boulders (approximately $15 \%$ greater than 1 ' diameter), occasional pockets of clean gravelly SAND, well graded, clasts typically a few inches
Depth (ft)
$0-5$
Total Depth - $7^{\prime}$
No groundwater
No caving
Backfilled

```
5-7
```































| LOG OF EXCAVATION |
| :--- |
| Trench No. TP112 |



Total Depth $-6^{\prime}$ No groundwater No caving

## Depth (ft)

Description

## moist, very dense. Mint Canyon Form grains, poorly grad

grains, poorly graded, massive, moist, very dense.
Light greenish gray sandy CONGLOMERATE, irr
2.5-5
0-2.5
5-6



## Description

0-4.5 Alluvium: Medium brown silty fine to coarse grained gravelly SAND with cobbles and lesser boulders (approximately 15\%), several clasts up to approximately $2^{\prime}$ diameter (fractures when hit with bucket) but typically 1-3" diameter, well graded, slightly friable in bottom 1' (less fines), moist, medium dense.
4.5-6 Mint Canyon Formation?: Light gray gravel cobble CONGLOMERATE, moist, very dense, massive.
otal Depth - $6^{\prime}$ No groundwater
OG OF EXCAVATION Trench No. TP116
Depth (tt)
No caving
Backfilled
Backfilled






## Client: Pardee Homes <br> Date Excavated: 6/8/06

Colluvium: Dark brown sandy CLAY with scattered gravels and cobbles (approximately $5 \%$ are gravel to cobble clasts), rootlets, porous, moist, medium stiff.
Saugus Formation: Sharp contact with light brown fine grained SANDSTONE with occasional scattered gravels and lesser cobbles, massive, poorly graded, moist, very dense, color change to light reddish brown at $5.5^{\prime}$.

## 0-3

Total Depth - $\mathbf{6}^{\prime}$
No groundwater
No caving

## рә|щ>ея







































| LOG OF EXCÁVÁTIÓN |
| :--- |
| Trench No. TP162 |





Alluvium: Medium brown fine to coarse grained gravelly SAND with scattered cobbles and very sparse boulders up to 1.5 ' diameter (one at surface approximately 2 ' diameter), well graded, loose to medium dense, dry, rootiels.
Saugus Formation: Light brown sandy CONGLOMERATE with fine to coarse grained sandstone supported matrix, massive, moist, very dense.
Total Depth - 4' No groundwater
No caving
Depth (ft)
$0-1.5$
1.5-4












## Topsoil: Brown very clayey fine to coarse grained SAND, graded, dense, moist.

Saugus Formation: Yellowish brown clayey silty fine to coarse grained SANDSTONE, graded, dense to very dense, moist, weakly indurated, dry, white carbonate veins throughout, rootlets.

## Fine grained gravels in SANDSTONE.

Mottled appearance (brown, olive green, yellowish brown) in SANDSTONE, olive green colored material is finer grained (fine to medium grained sandy clayey SILTSTONE).
Grades to yellow brown fine to medium grained SANDSTONE, hard, moist.
, hard, most



| LOG OF EXCAVATION |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Trench No. TP180 | Logged By: RMP | Date Excavated: $8 / 4 / 06$ | Client: Pardee Homes |

Depth (ft)
$0-1.5$
1.5-3.5
3.5-4
Topsoil: Dark brown silty fine to coarse grained SAND with subangular fine gravel, graded, medium dense, moist, weakly cemented,
rootlets.
Colluvium: Yellowish brown very silty fine grained SAND, poorly graded, medium dense, moist, weakly cemented, pervasive
Description
Colluvium: Yellowish brown very silty fine grained SAND, poorly graded, medium dense, moist, weakly cemented, pervasive fracturing filled with white carbonate veins, rootlets.
 cemented. Saugus Formation; Mottled dark yellowish brown silty fine grained SANDSTONE to fine grained sandy SILTSTONE, poorly graded, very dense to hard, moist, weakly cemented, and olive green clayey silty fine to coarse grained SANDSTONE, graded, very dense. moist, weakly cemented.
3-4" thick discontinuous channel deposit, olive green fine gravel CONGLOMERATE with silty fine to coarse sand matrix, graded, weakly cemented, subangular to subrounded.

## Total Depth - $9^{\prime}$

 No groundwater No cavingBackfilled

## NH5E $\rightarrow$















| Comments |
| :--- |
|  |
| @4' B |
| N24W/16SW |









Client: Pardee Homes
rootlets.
Comments
$\square$
se, moist,











Colluvium: Brown cobbly SAND with clay and scattered subrounded boulders up to 24 " diameter, predominantly granitic lithologies, dry and medium dense.
Depth (ft)
$0-2$
2-4 Saugus Formation: Yellowish tan gravel CONGLOMERATE with scattered subrounded granitic cobbles up to $18^{\prime \prime}$ diameter, matrix supported, matrix consists of poorly sorted sand, moderately cemented, refusal at 4' due to cementation and boulder, massively bedded, dry and very dense.
$0-2$
$2-4$

## of sidewalls from 0-2 <br> 容

No groundwater
2.5-5 Saugus Formation: White to light gray sandy CONGLOMERATE, massive bedding, subrounded clasts from $1^{\prime \prime}$ to $18^{\prime \prime}$ diameter, predominantly granitic and monzonite composition, matrix supported with poorly sorted silty sand, dry and dense, poorly cemented, friable.
Total Depth - 5' Depth (ft)
0-2.5 Colluvium: Grayish brown sandy CLAY with gravel and lesser cobbles, clasts typically subrounded granitics, slightly dessicated Tontill No caving
$\qquad$
Description

Total Depth - $5^{\prime}$ No groundwater No caving
$s-\varepsilon$
$\varepsilon-0$
(H) पाईव
Comments

@4' Fracture
N33W/34SW
@5' Approx.
BN3E/20NW
BN2W/20SW


Comments

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Depth (ft) } \\ 0-18^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | Description <br> Slope Wash: Medium brown sandy CLAY, dry, loose, porous, desiccated rootlets throughout. |
| :---: | :---: |
| $18 \prime-6^{\prime}$ $6-8$ | Saugus Formation: Medium orange brown silty SAND, frequent subrounded coarse sands, small pebbles, carbonate nodules and veins, rootlets, dry, medium firm. <br> Light grey to brown fine to coarse SANDS and GRAVELS, dry, dense, well-graded, gravels subrounded to subangular, rootlets. |
| 8-9 | Medium orange brown, silty SAND, to sandy SILT, slightly moist, dense, carbonate nodules, occasional subrounded coarse sands and pebble. |
|  | NE SW |

0
0
0
1
0
等
0
0
0
0
5
530
Client: Pardee-Monarch Hills
comments
Date Excavated: 8/8/95
Mつ : Кq рәббол
LOG OF EXCAVATION
Trench No. 4

| Depth (ft) | Description <br> $0-3$ |
| :---: | :--- |
| Slope Wash: Dark brown clayey SILT, dry, loose, very <br> porous, cobbles at base of unit, rootlets, desiccation <br> cracks. |  |
| $3-5-7.5$ | Saugus Formation: Medium brown fine to coarse SAND, <br> well-bedded, some black mineral lineation, slightly <br> moist, loose. <br> Medium brown to reddish brown silty sAND, fine to <br> coarse gravels and cobbles, moist, dense, subangular <br> cobbles, moderately graded. |
|  | $W$ |

帾

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

PLATE T4



Date Excavated: $8 / 8 / 95 \quad$ Client: Pardee-Monarch Hills

\section*{Comments} | Depth (ft) | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Description } \\ 0-3\end{array} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}\text { Slope Wash: Medium to dark brown sandy clayey SILT, } \\ \text { dry, loose, porous, rootlets to l2", cobbles, gravels. }\end{array}\right.$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Saugus Formation: Mottled orange/white conGLoMERATE, } \\ \text { dry, dense, cemented, iron staining at contact and } \\ \text { around cobbles and gravels. }\end{array}$ |  |


Client: Pardee-Monarch Hills
8/8/95

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { to } \\
& \text { s. } \\
& \hline \text { on } \\
& \hline \underline{ } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

Comments

## Comments

## Comments

$\square$


$$
\bar{\square}
$$






Date Excavated: 8/9/95 Client:Pardee-Monarch Hills
Comments
Client: Pardee-Monarch Hills

Client: Pardee-Monarch Hills
Date Excavated: $8 / 9 / 95$

## Logged By: CW

LOG OF EXCAVATION
Trench NO. 18

## Comments


PLATE T18
Client: Pardee-Monarch Hills Comments
Depth (ft) Description



## APPENDIX C

## Laboratory Testing Results by Geolabs-Westlake Village



## APPENDIX C

## LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

| Atterberg Limits Results | .Plate AL. 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Consolidation Diagram . | .Plates C (boring).(depth) |
| Corrosivity Results.. | .HDR Engineering/Schiff |
| Laboratory Test Data | .Table |
| Particle Size Diagrams | .Plate PS.1-PS. 3 |
| Shear Test Diagrams .... | .Plates S(boring).(depth) |

Grading Plan Review
Phase 3 of Tract No. 60922, Skyline Ranch, Santa Clarita Area, County of Los Angeles, California
W.O. 8838

August 27, 2013

## LABORATORY TESTING

Undisturbed and bulk samples of soil and rock materials encountered at the site were collected during the course of our field work. Selected laboratory tests completed on the retrieved samples are described below:

## Moisture-Density

The field moisture content and dry unit weight were determined for each undisturbed sample. Dry unit weight is expressed in pounds per cubic foot and the moisture content represents a percentage of the dry unit weight. This test data is presented on the boring logs.

## Shear Test

Shear tests were performed in a Direct Shear Machine of the strain control type commensurate with ASTM D 3080. The rate of deformation is approximately 0.01 inches per minute. Selected samples, as noted in the shear test diagram, were sheared at reduced rates of deformation. Shearing occurred under a variety of confining loads in order to determine the Coulomb shear strength parameters. The test was performed on undisturbed and remolded (@ 90\% relative compaction) samples in an artificially saturated condition.

Stress-strain curves are presented in the page following the shear test diagram. It should be noted that for the case of undisturbed single-cycle shear tests the value at the end of the stress-strain curve were selected (residual value per LACDPW Manual for Preparation of Geotechnical Reports). The shear test diagrams have the descriptor of "Ultimate" to distinguish such single-cycle tests from multi-cycle shear tests.

## Consolidation Test

Settlement predictions of the soil's behavior under load are made on the basis of consolidation tests (ASTM D 2435). A one inch high sample is loaded in a geometric progression and the resulting deformation is recorded at selected time intervals. Porous stones are placed in contact with the sample (top and bottom) to permit addition and release of pore fluid. The sample is inundated at a selected load (typically near overburden pressure) during the progression. Results are plotted on the enclosed Consolidation-Pressure Curves.

## Compaction and Expansion Tests

To determine the compaction characteristics of the onsite materials, compaction tests are performed in accordance with ASTM D 1557. The maximum dry density is reported in pounds per cubic foot and the optimum moisture content as a percentage of the maximum dry density. Expansion index tests were performed in accordance with the criteria in U.B.C. 18-2. The results of these tests are included in Laboratory Test Data Table.

Table I Laboratory Test Data

| Sample | Description | Maximum Dry Density PCF | Optimum Moisture Content \% | Expansion Index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B2@11-15' | Tan silty SAND (Saugus Fm.) | 134 | 8 | 6 |
| B3@5' | Tan clayey silty SAND (Saugus Fm.) | 127 | 9 | 0 |
| B3@38' | Lt. gray silty SAND w/ grave. (Mint Cyn.Fm. | .) 132 | 10 | 0 |
| B9@15' | Lt. brown sandy SILT | 124 | 11 | 19 |
| B10@20' | Tan clayey med-cs SAND w/ gravel | 137 | 7 | 4 |
| B16@60' | Dark red sandy CLAY (TQs) |  |  | 56 |
| B19@15' | Tan silty f-cs SAND w/ gravel | 128 | 10 | 10 |
| B29@63' | Tan silty med.-coarse SAND (Saugus Fm.) | ) 130 | 9 |  |
| B39@0-5' | Dark brown silty clayey SAND w/ gravel | 133 | 10 | 2 |
| B50 @ 30' | Lt. gray silty SAND | 130 | 10 |  |
| B50 @ 67' | Lt. gray clayey silty SAND | 126 | 12 |  |
| B58 @ 80' | Tan fine-med. Grained SAND | 131 | 9 |  |
| B59 @ 25' | Tan silty SAND w/ gravel | 129 | 9 |  |
| B60 @ 28' | Light brown clayey SAND | 126 | 12 |  |
| B62 @ 5' | Light reddish brn. Clayey silty SAND |  |  |  |
| B77@15' | Tan silty SAND w/ gravel | 128 | 10 |  |


| B77@52' | Reddish brown sandy SILT | 123 | 12 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| T3@1.5' | Brown clayey silty f-med. SAND | 126 | 9.5 |
| TP168@3.5-5.5' | Brown sandy CLAY | 115 | 14 |
| B1(1995)@15' | Gray silty SAND w/ gravel | 133 | 7 |
| B1(1995)@35' | Lt gray silty med-cs SAND | 131 | 9 |
| B1(1995)@72' | Lt. gray clayey silty SAND | 125 | 10 |
| B11(1995)@40' | Lt. gray clayey SAND | 130 | 10 |

## Atterberg Limits and Particle Size Analyses

Selected fine-grained samples were subject to particle-size analyses (ASTM D 422), hydrometer analyses, and Atterberg Limit testing (ASTM D 4318). The results of this testing is presented in the following table. Particle size analyses are presented on Plate PS.1-PS. 3 of.

| Sample | Liquid Limit | Plastic <br> Limit | Plasticity <br> Index | \% Clay (finer than <br> $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 5 ~ m m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B5@12' (TQs) | $36.9 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ | 18 | $18 \%$ |
| B5@72' (Tmc) | $40 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ | 20 | $9 \%$ |
| B13@27' (Tmc) | $38.4 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | 21 | $25 \%$ |
| B16@60' (TQs) | $42.7 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | 27 | --- |
| B16@63' (TQs) | $57.5 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | 40 | --- |
| B16@80' (TQs) | $91.9 \%$ | $32.2 \%$ | 60 | $90 \%$ |
| B21@49' (TQs) | $57.9 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | 40 | $50 \%$ |
| B23@70' (TQs) | $84.3 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | 57 | $86 \%$ |
| B25@53' 'TQs) | $46.7 \%$ | $19.2 \%$ | 28 | $12 \%$ |
| B40@55' (Tmc) | $36.3 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ | 18 | $54.2 \%$ |
| B48@97' (TQs) | $63.9 \%$ | $19.6 \%$ | 45 | --- |
| B48@120' (TQs) | $71 \%$ | $21.3 \%$ | 50 | --- |
| B54@56.5' (TQs) | $65.7 \%$ | $17.9 \%$ | 48 | --- |

## Sand Equivalent

Selected samples were submitted for Sand Equivalent testing in accordance with California Test Method 217. The results of this testing is presented in the following table:

| Sample | Material | Sand Equivalent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B77@15' | TQs-silty sand w/clay | 17 |
| B77@52' | TQs-silty sand | 23 |


| Qal \#1 <br> (from terminus of <br> Canyon Crest Drive) | Alluvium-clean sand | 85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Qal \#2 <br> (from terminus of <br> Canyon Crest Drive) | Alluvium-sand | 64 |
| Tmc \#1 <br> (from terminus of <br> Canyon Crest Drive) | Mint Canyon Fm. - Silty <br> Sandstone | 30 |

## Durability, Specific Gravity, and Absorption Testing

Samples of the oversize rock present within the alluvium, Saugus Formation, and Mint Canyon Formation were collected and crushed into 1" diameter or less fragments for determination of their quality for various on-site construction material uses. The majority of these oversize rocks consisted of subrounded cobbles and boulders of granite, granodiorite, syenite, gabbro, and gneiss. The crushed material was submitted to BTC Laboratories for testing, the result of which is presented in the following table.

| Sample | ```Durability Index California Test Method No. 229``` | Percentage Wear ASTM C 131 |  | Apparent Specific Gravity ASTM C127 | Absorption California Test Method No. 206 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 100 Rev. | 500 Rev. |  |  |
| Alluvium Oversize Rock | 65 | 9.5 | 37 | 2.67 | 0.6\% |
| Saugus Fm. Oversize Rock | 70 | 14.1 | 50.5 | 2.65 | 1.1\% |
| Mint Cyn Fm. Oversize Rock | 75 | 11.9 | 44.7 | 2.64 | 0.9\% |
| 2006 Greenbook Criteria for Rip Rap | 52 Minimum | -- | 45 <br> Maximum | 2.5 Minimum | 4.20 Maximum |
| 2006 Greenbook Criteria for Crushed Aggregate Base | -- | $15$ <br> Maximum | $52$ <br> Maximum | -- | -- |

Based on these test results, the oversize rock from the alluvium and Mint Canyon Formation would pass the 2006 Standard Specification for Public Works Construction (Greenbook) criteria for Durability, Percentage Wear, Apparent Specific Gravity, and Absorption for use as rip rap. The durability results indicate that the rock from all three
geologic units is of adequate quality for use in crushed aggregate base. Of course, gradation, R-value, and Sand Equivalent criteria would be need to be met on materials crushed and screened for use as crushed aggregate base.

Crushed rock could be also utilized as subdrain/backdrain rock or simply entrained in engineered fills as a means of disposing of excess of oversize rock towards the end of rough grading.

## CHEMICAL TESTING

Selected samples were submitted to M.J. Schiff and Associates for chemical testing to evaluate their corrosion potential. Results presented in Appendix G are summarized herein.

## Sulfates

Preliminary testing of samples obtained from our borings indicate the on-site soils have low levels (< $0.10 \%$ by weight) of sulfates which indicates a low corrosion potential for concrete. Near the completion of grading additional testing should be performed to verify the corrosion potential of the soils.

| Sample | Sulfate \% by weight |
| :---: | :---: |
| B2@10-15' | None Detected |
| B9@15' | 0.061 |
| B39@0-3' | 0.037 |

Table 19-A-4 is reproduced for your reference with respect to concrete requirements for soils bearing soluble sulfates above $0.1 \%$ by weight.

TABLE 4.3.1- REQUIREMENTS FOR CONCRETE EXPOSED TO SULFATE-CONTAINING SOLUTIONS (ACI 318-05)

| SULFATE EXPOSURE | WATER-SOLUBLE SULFATE $\left(\mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ IN SOIL, \% by weight | SULFATE $\left(\mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ IN WATER, ppm | CEMENT TYPE | Maximum Water- <br> Cementitious Materials Ratio, by Weight, NormalWeight Aggregate Concrete | Minimum $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ Normal Weight and Lightweight Aggregate Concrete, psi ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Negligible | $0.00-0.10$ | $0-150$ | -- | -- | -- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moderate $^{2}$ | $0.10-0.20$ | $150-1,500$ | II, IP(MS), IS(MS), <br> P(MS), I(PM)(MS), <br> I(SM)(MS) | 0.50 |  |
| Severe | $0.20-2.00$ | $1,500-10,000$ | V | 0.45 | 4,000 |
| Very severe | Over 2.00 | Over 10,000 | V plus <br> pozzolan |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ When both Table 4.3.2 and Table 4.2.2 are considered, the lowest applicable maximum water-cementitious
material ratio and highest applicable minimum $f_{c}$ shall be used.
${ }^{2}$ Seawater
${ }^{3}$ Pozzolan that has been determined by test or service record to improve sulfate resistance when used in concrete containing Type V cement.

## Chlorides

Test results indicate that chloride levels (40 to 210 ppm ) are below levels of concern with respect to corrosion.

## pH levels

Test results presented in Appendix G indicate the on-site soils are typically neutral to slightly basic ( $\mathrm{pH} 7-8$ ).

## Soil Resistivity

Representative samples of the earth materials encountered at the site were tested for resistivity. Resistivity of soils is inversely proportional to corrosiveness. Thus, the analysis helps in determining whether the soils may have a deleterious affect on underground metallic structures. A generally accepted correlation between resistivity and soil corrosiveness toward metals is provided below:

| Resistivity <br> (Ohm-Centimeter) | Corrosiveness |
| :---: | :---: |
| $<1,000$ | Severely Corrosive |
| $1,000-2,000$ | Corrosive |
| $2,000-10,000$ | Increasingly Moderate |
| $>10,000$ | Increasingly Mild |

## Laboratory Test Results

|  | As-Received Resistivity | Saturated Resistivity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample | ohm-cm | ohm-cm |
| B2@10-15' | 930,000 | 1,700 |
| B9@15' | 7,400 | 690 |
| B39@0-3' | 6,300 | 3,500 |

Based on these test results, the on-site soils are considered moderately corrosive to severely corrosive to ferrous metals when saturated. Appropriate mitigation measures should be obtained from an experienced corrosion engineer.

## Atterberg Limits Test Results



| Location | Depth (ft) |  | LL | PI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classification |  |  |  |  |
| B5 (TQs) | 12 | 36.9 | 18.9 | CL |
| B5 (Tmc) | 72 | 40 | 20 | CL |
| B13 (Tmc) | 27 | 38.4 | 21 | CL |
| B16 (TQs) | 60 | 42.7 | 27 | CL |
| B16 (TQs) | 63 | 57.5 | 40 | CH |
| B16 (TQs) | 80 | 91.9 | 60 | CH |
| B17 (TQs) | 81.5 | 57.3 | 41 | CH |
| B17 (TQs) | 95 | 54.2 | 40 | CH |
| B17 (TQs) | 98 | 52.2 | 33 | CH |
| B21 (TQs) | 49 | 57.9 | 40 | CH |
| B23 (TQs) | 70 | 84.3 | 57 | CH |
| B25 (TQs) | 53 | 46.7 | 28 | CL |
| B40 (Tmc) | 55 | 36.3 | 18 | CL |
| B48 (TQs) | 97 | 63.9 | 45 | CH |
| B48 (TQs) | 120 | 71 | 50 | CH |
| B54 (TQs) | 56.5 | 65.7 | 48 | CH |



## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Project Skyline Ranch
Location B2(1995)
Depth 10 Feet

Material Alluvium
\% Consolidation

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Location | B2(1995) |
| Depth | 20 Feet |
| Material | Mint Canyon Formation |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Location | B2(1995) |
| Depth | 30 Feet |
| Material | Mint Canyon Fm. |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE






CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE


| roject | Skyline R |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location | B3(1995) |
| Depth | 25 Feet |
| Material | Alluvium |



## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE





Geolabs - Westlake Village

DATE _ BY DS
SCALE
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Monasabian Property |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | $\frac{\text { Boring } 1}{20 \text { Feet }}$ |
| Depth |  |
| Material | Saugus Fm. - Silty SANDS TONE |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE




Geolabs - Westlake Village
geolocy ano soll engineering

| DATE 8/02 | BY DS |
| :--- | :--- |
| SCALE | w. o. 8838 |

SCALE
w.o.

8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE




## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Monasabian Property |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Location |  |  |
| Depth | 30 Feet |  |
|  |  |  |

Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soll engineering
date 8/02 by_DS
SCALE $\qquad$ \%o 8838

Material Saugus Fm. - Sandy CONGLOM.

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



```
Project Monasabian Prop.
Location Boring 4
Depth 10.5 Feet
```

Material Saugus Fm. - Sandy Cong omerate

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Project Monasabian Prop.
Location Boring 4
Depth 20 Feet
Material

Saugus Fm. - Gravelly SAIIDSTONE

Geolabs - Westlake Village
GEOLOGY ANO SOIL ENGINEERING
date_ 9/02 By_DS
SCALE8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE


$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Project } & \text { Monosabian Prop. } \\ \text { Location } & \frac{\text { Boring } 5}{10 \text { Feet }} \\ \text { Depth } & \\ \text { Material } & \text { Saugus Fm. - Fine to med. SANDSTONE }\end{array}$
C5.10

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



## CONSOLIDATION RESULTS

## Undisturbed Sample



Sample Inundated At Normal Pressure of 2500 psf

Sample Location: B30
Sample Depth: 25 ft .
Initial Moisture: 5.6 \%
Init. Dry Density: 121.9 pcf

Geologic Unit: Alluvium
Material: gravelly SAND

PLATE C-B30.25

## CONSOLIDATION RESULTS

## Undisturbed Sample



Sample Inundated At Normal Pressure of 1000 psf

Sample Location: B35
Sample Depth: 8 ft .
Initial Moisture: 6.2 \%
Init. Dry Density: 119.5 pcf

Geologic Unit: Alluvium
Material: silty SAND w/gvl



## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B53 |
| Depth 20 Feet <br> Material Saugus Formation |  |



Saugus Formation


CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE


## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^4]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soll engineering

| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { date } \frac{9 / 4 / 07}{\text { NTS }} & \text { by } \begin{array}{l} \text { RMP } \\ \text { scale } \\ \hline \end{array} \text { w.o. } 8838 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |

PLATE C80.7.5

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Location | B80 |
| Depth | $14^{\prime}$ |
| Material | Landslide Debris - clayey SAND with silt and gvl |



Geolabs - Westlake Village

| 9/4/07 | RMP |
| :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{\text {date }}^{\text {dcale }}$ NTS | 8838 |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Location | B80 <br> Depth |
|  |  |
| Material | Landslide Debris - sandy SILT |

Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering

| ate 9/4/07 | RMP |
| :---: | :---: |
| scale NTS | 8838 |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^5]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 9/4/07 } \\ \text { Scale } & \text { BY } \\ \text { в.o. } & \text { RMP } \\ 8838\end{array}$

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE





Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering

| date 9/4/07 | MP |
| :---: | :---: |
| scale NTS | 8838 |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B81 |
| Depth | $15^{\prime}$ |
| Material | Landslide Debris - sandy GRAVEL |

Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering

| date 9/4/07 | RMP |
| :---: | :---: |
| scale NTS | 8838 |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B81 |
| Depth | $22^{\prime}$ |
| Material | Landslide Debris - sandy CLAY |



Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\frac{9 / 4 / 07}{\text { STS }}$ вy $\frac{\text { RMP }}{8838}$

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



$\qquad$ Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soll engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { NTS }}$ By RMP
scale NTS
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE




Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $9 / 5 / 07$
scale NTS By RMP
scale NTS w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE




Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soll engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { Scale }}$ вTS $\quad$ w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE





Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { NTS }}$ By RMP
scale NTS
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $9 / 5 / 0$
scale NTS By RMP
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B83 |
| Depth | $22^{\prime}$ |
| Material | Landslide Debris - silty CLAY and silty SAND |



Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
DAtE 9/5/07 By RMP
scale NTS
w. 0.8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^6]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { NTS }}$
scale NTS вy RMP
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE




Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soll engineering
date $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 9/5/07 } \\ \text { Scale } & \text { BTS } \\ \text { в.o. } 8838\end{array}$

PLATE C84.7

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE




Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soll engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { Scale }}$ ( $\quad$ вy $\frac{\text { RMP }}{8838}$

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^7]

Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date 9/5/07
scale NTS sy RMP
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE





Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { NTS }}$ By RMP
scale NTS
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE




Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soll engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { Scale }}$ ( $\quad$ вy $\frac{\text { RMP }}{8838}$

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^8]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $9 / 5 / 0$
scale NTS By RMP
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^9]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { NTS }}$ By $\frac{\text { RMP }}{8838}$
scale NTS
w.o. 8838

PLATE C86.7

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE





Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date 9/5/07
scale NTS вy RMP w. 0.8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Location | B86 |
| Depth | $22^{\prime}$ |
| Material | Landslide Debris - silty SAND and silty CLAY |

Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { NTS }}$ By RMP
scale NTS
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^10]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $9 / 5 / 07$
scale NTS By RMP
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Location | B86 |
| Depth | $35^{\prime}$ |
| Material | Saugus Formation - clayey SANDSTONE |

Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $9 / 5 / 0$
scale NTS

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE





Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date 9/5/07
scale NTS By RMP w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B88 |
| Depth | $20^{\prime}$ |
| Material | Landslide Debris - clayey SAND with gvl |



Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $9 / 5 / 07$
scale NTS

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^11]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $9 / 5 / 07$
scale NTS By RMP
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE





Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date 9/5/07 By RMP
scale NTS w. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^12]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\left.\begin{array}{ll}9 / 5 / 07 \\ \text { scale } & \text { BTS } \\ \text { By } & \text { R.o. } 8838\end{array}\right)$.

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE




Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { date } \\ \text { scale } & \text { 9/5/07 } \\ \text { NTS }\end{array}$ by RMP

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^13]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $9 / 5 / 0$
scale NTS By RMP
w.o. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^14]

Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date 9/5/07
scale NTS By RMP w. 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project Location | Skyline Ranch | 为 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B89 |  |
| Depth | $60^{\prime}$ |  |
| Material | Saugus Formation - gravelly SANDSTONE |  |

Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 9/5/07 } \\ \text { Scale } & \text { BTS } \\ \text { By } & \text { RMP } \\ 8838\end{array}$

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



[^15]Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
date $\frac{9 / 5 / 07}{\text { NTS }}$ BY RMP
scale NTS
By RMP

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering

| DATE |
| :--- |
| SCALE $\quad$ BY $\frac{\text { DS }}{}$ | BY- 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering

| DATE | BY $\frac{\text { DS }}{}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| SCALE | w.o. 8838 | 8 Y- 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering

| DATE | BY $\frac{\text { DS }}{}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| SCALE | w.o. 8838 | BY- 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering

| DATE | BY $\frac{\text { DS }}{}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| SCALE | w.o. 8838 | 8 Y- 8838

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project <br> Location <br> Depth <br> Material | Skyline Ranch T20 | S2 | Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOCY AND SOIL ENGINEERING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.5 Feet | - | DATE - BY DS |
|  | Terrace Deposits |  | vo. 8838 |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Project Skyline Ranch Location T21
Depth 3 Feet
Material Slopewash


Geolabs - Westlake Village
GEDLOCY AND SOL ENCWIERENG

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |

PLATE Ct21.3

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B 19 |
| Depth | 15 Feet |
| Material | Silty fine-coarse SAND (Saugus Fm.) |



Geolabs - Westlake Village

DATE
scale
geology and soll engineering

BY $\qquad$ 8838.00

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Geolabs - Westlake Village
Project

| $\frac{\text { Tr. } 060922 \text { Skyline Ranch }}{\text { B19 }}$ |
| :--- |
| 15 Feet |
| Silty fine-coarse SAND (Saugus Fm.) |



DATE
scale
geology and soil engineering

*Y $-\frac{\text { DS }}{8838.001}$

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Project
Location
Depth
Material

Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch B77 15 Feet
Silty SAND (Saugus Fm.)


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING


SCALE

| my.o. | DS |
| :---: | :---: |
| w. |  |

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Project
Location Depth
Material

Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch

Silty SAND (Saugus Fm.)


Geolabs - Westlake Village

scale

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE

| Project | Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B77 |
| Depth | 52 Feet |
| Material | Sandy SILT (Saugus Fm.) |


Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soll engineering
DATE
SCALE

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE

| Project | Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B77 |
| Depth | 52 Feet |
| Material | Sandy SILT (Saugus Fm.) |


Geolabs - Westlake Village
geology and soil engineering
DATE
SCALE By $\quad \frac{\text { DS }}{8838.0}$

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



| Project | Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | B77 |
| Depth | 52 Feet |
| Material | Sandy SILT (Saugus Fm.) |



Sandy SILT (Saugus Fm.)

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch
Location $\qquad$
Depth 3.5 to 5.5 Feet

Sandy CLAY (Alluvium)
Material


## CONSOLIDATION RESULTS

Bulk Sample Remolded to 92 Percent Relative Compaction


Sample Location: TP168
Sample Depth: 3.5 ft .
Initial Moisture: 16 \%
Init. Dry Density: 105.8 pcf

Geologic Unit: Alluvium Material:

## CONSOLIDATION RESULTS

## Bulk Sample Remolded to 95 Percent Relative Compaction



Sample Location: TP168
Sample Depth: 3.5 ft . Initial Moisture: 16 \%
Init. Dry Density: 109.25 pcf

Geologic Unit: Alluvium Material:

## CONSOLIDATION - PRESSURE CURVE



## CONSOLIDATION RESULTS

Bulk Sample Remolded to 95 Percent Relative Compaction


Sample Location: TP168
Sample Depth: 3.5 ft .
Initial Moisture: 16 \%
Init. Dry Density: 109.25 pcf

Geologic Unit: Alluvium
Material:


## TRANSMITTAL LETTER

DATE: December 4, 2002

ATTENTION: Dave

To:
Geolabs
31119 Via Colinas, Suite 502
Westlake Village, CA 91362

SUBJECT: Laboratory Test Data
Monosabian
Your \# 8838
Our \# 02-1161LAB

COMMENTS: Enclosed are the results for the subject project.


# Table 1 - Laboratory Tests on Soil Samples 

Monosabian<br>Your \#8838, MJS\&A \#02-1161LAB<br>22-Nov-02

## Sample ID

B2
@ $10-15^{\prime}$

Resistivity

$\quad$| as-rece |
| ---: |
| saturat |

pH
Electrical
Conductivit

Conductivity

## Units

ohm-cm 930,000
ohm-cm
1,700

Chemical Analyses

## Cations

calcium $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad 16$
magnesium $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad \mathrm{ND}$
sodium $\quad \mathrm{Na}^{1+} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad 47$
Anions
carbonate $\mathrm{CO}_{3}{ }^{2-} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad \mathrm{ND}$
bicarbonate $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{1 .} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad 104$
chloride $\mathrm{Cl}^{1 .} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad 40$
sulfate $\quad \mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2} \quad \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad \mathrm{ND}$
Other Tests
ammonium $\mathrm{NH}_{4}{ }^{1+} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad$ na
nitrate $\quad \mathrm{NO}_{3}{ }^{1-} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad$ na
sulfide $\mathrm{S}^{2 .}$ qual na
Redox mv na


Electrical conductivity in millisiemens/cm and chemical analysis were made on a $1: 5$ soil-to-water extract.
$\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}=$ milligrams per kilogram (parts per million) of dry soil.
Redox $=$ oxidation-reduction potential in millivolts
$\mathrm{ND}=$ not detected
na $=$ not analyzed

## TRANSMITTAL LETTER

DATE: December 3, 2003

ATTENTION: Dave Sakissian

| To: | Geolabs |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 31119 Via Colinas, Suite |
|  | Westlake Village, CA. 91 |
| SUBJECT: | Laboratory Test Data <br> Montasabian <br> Your \# 8838 <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  MJS\&A \# 03-1370LAB |

COMMENTS: Enclosed are the results for the subject project.


# Table 1 - Laboratory Tests on Soil Samples 

Montasabian<br>Your \#8838, MJS\&A \#03-1370LAB<br>20-Nov-03

Sample ID


Chemical Analyses
Cations

| calcium | $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | ND |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| magnesium | $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 19 |
| sodium | $\mathrm{Na}^{1+}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 159 |

Anions
carbonate $\mathrm{CO}_{3}{ }^{2-} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad \mathrm{ND}$
bicarbonate $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{1+} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad 82$
chloride $\quad \mathrm{Cl}^{1-} \quad \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad 210$
sulfate $\quad \mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \quad 61$
Other Tests

| ammonium | $\mathrm{NH}_{4}{ }^{1+}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | na |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| nitrate | $\mathrm{NO}_{3}{ }^{1-}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | na |
| sulfide | $\mathrm{S}^{2-}$ | qual | na |
| Redox |  | mv | na |

Electrical conductivity in millisiemens/cm and chemical analysis were made on a 1:5 soil-to-water extract.
$\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}=$ milligrams per kilogram (parts per million) of dry soil.
Redox $=$ oxidation-reduction potential in millivolts
$\mathrm{ND}=$ not detected
na $=$ not analyzed

## TRANSMITTAL LETTER

DATE: June 20, 2006

ATTENTION: Mr. Dave Sarkisian

To: Geolabs Westlake Village 3119 Via Colinas
Suite 502
Westlake Village, CA 91362
SUBJECT: Laboratory Test Data
Sklyline Ranch
Your \#8838
SA \#06-1003LAB

COMMENTS: Enclosed are the results for the subject project.


431 West Baseline Road Claremont, CA 91711
Phone: 909.626.0967 Fax: 909.626.3316
wnw．schiffassociates．com
Consulting Corrosion Engineers－Since 1959

## Table 1 －Laboratory Tests on Soil Samples

Geolabs Westlake Village<br>Skyline Ranch<br>Your \＃8838，MJS\＆A \＃06－1003LAB<br>7－Jun－06

## Sample ID

> B-39e 0-3
：

| Resistivity as－received saturated |  | Units ohm－cm ohm－cm | $\begin{aligned} & 6,300 \\ & 3,500 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pH |  |  | 7.4 |
| Electrical |  |  |  |
| Conductivity |  | $\mathrm{mS} / \mathrm{cm}$ | 0.13 |
| Chemical Analyses |  |  |  |
| Cations |  |  |  |
| calcium | $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 83 |
| magnesium | $\mathrm{Mg}^{2+}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 0.6 |
| sodium | $\mathrm{Na}^{\text {I＋}}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 34 |
| Anions |  |  |  |
| carbonate | $\mathrm{CO}_{3}{ }^{2-}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | ND |
| bicarbonate | $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{1+}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 278 |
| clloride | $\mathrm{Cl}^{1-}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 4.2 |
| sulfate | $\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{\text {－}}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 37 |
| Other Tests |  |  |  |
| ammonium | $\mathrm{NH}_{4}{ }^{\text {＋}}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | na |
| nitrate | $\mathrm{NO}_{3}{ }^{\text {－}}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | na |
| sulfide | $\mathrm{s}^{2-}$ | qual |  |
| Redox |  | mV | na |

Electrical conductivity in millisiemens／cm and chenical analysis were made on a $1: 5$ soil－to－water extract． $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}=$ milligrams per kilogram（parts per million）of dry soil．
Redox $=$ oxidation－reduction potential in millivolts
$\mathrm{ND}-$ not detected
$\mathrm{na}=$ not analyzed


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM











## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :---: | :---: |
| Excavation | B4(1995) |
| Depth | 20' |


| Si | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { By } & \text { SD } \\ \text { Date } 10 / 20 / 95 \\ \text { wo. } & 8838 \end{array}$ |
|  | PLATE S4(1995) |

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Excavation | $\frac{\text { B4 }}{}$ |
| Depth |  |


| Tr | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| A-658 | PLATE S4(1995) |

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch


| $B$ | Geolabs - Westlake Village ceology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { DATE } 10 / 20 / 95 \text { w. } \begin{gathered} \text { By } \\ \text { wD } \\ 8838 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch

| Excavation |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Depth |  |
|  | B8'(1995) |


|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village |
| :--- | :--- |



GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING
Date $10 / 20 / 95^{\text {By }}$ w. $\frac{\text { SD }}{8838}$

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :---: | :---: |
| Excavation | B10(1995) |
| Depth | 60' |


|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { Date } 10 / 25 / 95 & \text { w.o. } \frac{\text { SD }}{} 8838 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | PLATE S10(1995) |

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch Exacavation B1
Depth $\quad 30$


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING
date $7 / 26 / 02$ w. $\frac{\text { wD }}{} \quad 8838$


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :---: | :---: |
| Excavation | B2 |
| Depth | 19.5' |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation $\frac{\text { B3 }}{\text { Depth }}$ 61.5'


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING
date $8 / 14 / 02$ w. $\frac{\text { SD }}{8838}$


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation B4
Depth
30 Feet





Newshear0902.xls

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM


Project Skyline Ranch

| Exavation $\frac{B 5}{40}$ |
| :--- |
| Depth |


| BY | Geolabs - Westlake Village ceology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { Date } \quad 8 / 14 / 02 \text { wo }_{\text {wo. }}^{\text {wo }} \frac{\text { SD }}{8838}$ |

Excavation: B 5 at 40 ft


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline |  | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Excavation } \quad \text { B6 } \\ & \text { Depth } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Date $8 / 27 / 02{ }^{\text {w. }}$ \% $\frac{\text { SD }}{}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| 3.56 |  |  | PLATE S6.20u |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation
Depth
B6



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation B10
Depth 30 Feet




## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation B11
Depth
60 Feet

| $\square$ | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 / 12 / 04^{\text {wx }} \text { w. }-\frac{S D}{} \quad 8838$ |

Excavation: B11 at 60 ft


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- |
| Excavation $\frac{\text { Boring } 14}{15 \text { Feet }}$ |
| Depth |

|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | PLATE S14.15 |

Excavation: B14 at 15 ft


Shear Template.xls

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM


Project Skyline Ranch

| Excavation $\frac{B 21}{60^{\prime}}$ |
| :--- |
| Depth |


2.63


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM


Project Skyline Ranch

| Excavation | B 23 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Depth $45^{\prime}$ |  |


|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crezex | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Br } & \text { SD } \\ 1 / 12 / 04 & { }^{\text {svo }} \\ \text { wo. } & 8838 \end{array}$ |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM

Material: Saugus Fm. - Clayey gravelly SANDSTONE


Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation Boring 25
Depth
30 Feet


Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering
DATE $\qquad$ w. 8838


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM

Material: Landslide Debris - Clayey fine-med. SANDSTONE


Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation Boring 27
Depth 15 Feet

| BT | Geolabs - Westlake Village Geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | DАте $\quad$日Y <br> w.o. <br> DS <br> 8838 |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch. TTM 060922 Excavation Boring 29 Depth 30 Feet


Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch. TTM 060922 Excavation Boring 29 Depth


Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering

SCALE
Excavation: B29 at 90 ft



SHEARS
$1 \mathrm{~K}, 2 \mathrm{~K}, \& 3 \mathrm{~K}$ NORMAL LOADS
Undisturbed, Sat at $14.7 \%$

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation B40
Depth $\qquad$


Geolabs - Westlake Village

DATE
DATE
geology and soil engineering

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM


Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch
Excavation $\frac{\text { B41 }}{10 \text { Feet }}$
Depth

| $5$ | Geolabs - Westlake Village amology and soll enginemring |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 时 |

Excavation: B41 Depth: 10 ft



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM


Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch
Excavation $\frac{\text { B44 }}{50 \text { Feet }}$
Depth -


| Geolabs - Westlake Village <br> Geology and soil engineering |
| :---: |
| date <br> scale w.o. $\frac{\text { DS }}{8838}$ |
| PLATE S44.50u |

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation $\frac{\text { B46 }}{30 \text { Feet }}$


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING

Depth


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation B46
Depth
80 Feet


Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering

DATE
SCALE
нч $\frac{D S}{8838}$

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation B47
Depth $\qquad$


Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soll engineering
Excavation: B47 Depth: 40 ft
Displacement Rate: $0.0100 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation B47 Depth 100 Feet


2K, 4K, \& 6K NORMAL LOADS


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project Tr. 060922 Skyline RanchExcavation $\frac{\text { B48 }}{\text { Depth }} 51$ |  | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil enginerring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 过 |  |
|  |  | $\underset{\text { Datt }}{\text { scaie }}$ |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation B52
Depth
44 Feet



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch Tr. 060922
Excavation B52
Depth
61 Feet


Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering

| date |
| :--- |
| scale_ by |
| wo. |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation B54 Depth

| Tisessex | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { By } & \text { DS } \\ \hline \text { w.o } & 8838 \end{array}$ |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation $\qquad$


SHEARS
$1.5 \mathrm{~K}, 3.5 \mathrm{~K}, \& 5.5 \mathrm{~K}$ NOR 1.5K, 3.5K, \& 5.5K NORMAL LOADS Undisturbed, Sat at 18.2 \%


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation $\mathrm{B66}$ Depth

| NT | Geolabs - Westlake Village |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Bx } \\ \text { w.o } \quad 8838 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation $\qquad$ Depth 138 Feet

| No | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soll enaineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{lll} \hline \text { Date } \\ \text { scate_ } & \text { by } & \text { DS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation $\qquad$ Depth 31 Feet


| Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: |
| date - by DS |

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { SHEARS } \\
1 \mathrm{~K}, 2 \mathrm{~K}, \& 3 \mathrm{~K} \text { NORMAL LOADS }
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\text { Undisturbed, Sat at } 15.40 \%
$$




## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Pardee Homes - Skyline Ranch | Excavation | TP214 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Depth | 1.5 feet |



PLATE Stp214


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM


Project Pardee Homes - Skyline Ranch

| Excavation $\frac{\text { TP216 }}{}$ |
| :--- |
| Depth 1.5 feet |


|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village <br> GEOLOGY AND soIl EnGINEERING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE $07 / 20 / 07$ | wy Mario Linares |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Pardee Homes - Skyline Ranch Excavation TP219
Depth


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING

DATE $07 / 20 / 07$ BY Mario Linares
w.O 8838

PLATE Stp219


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch Excavation Boring 3
Depth $\qquad$
21 Feet

| S | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\pm \pm 3$ |  |
| A-745 |  |
|  | PLATE $\quad$ S3.21m |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation B16
Depth 60 Feet

|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | DATE $\quad$By <br> w. |
| -747 | PLATE $\mathrm{S16.60m}$ |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM




SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM

Material: Saugus Formation-CLAYSTONE Presoaked, Undisturbed


Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation B23
Depth

|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { re } \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { BY }-\frac{S D}{} / 14 / 04 \\ & \text { w. } 0 . \\ & 8838 \end{aligned}$ |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation Boring 26

|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village amoloay and soll minanmanca |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 05 \\ & 0.8858 \end{aligned}$ |



SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project TTM 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation Boring 28 Depth


Geolabs - Westlake Village
GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project TTM 60922 Skyline Ranch Excavation Boring 29
Depth

|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineerina |
| :---: | :---: |
| Etes | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { Bx } & \text { DS } \\ -w .0 & 8838 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch, TTM 060922 Excavation Boring 29 Depth 50 Feet


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project TTM 60922 Skyline Ranch Excavation Boring 38 Depth 80 Feet


## SHEARS 1K, 2K, \& 3K NORMAL LOADS Undisturbed, Sat at ? \%

0
0
0
Displacement Rate: $0.0025 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$
Yno
Yno

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 60922, Skyline Ranch
Excavation B39
Depth
89 Feet

| N | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { By } \quad \text { DS } \\ \text { w. } 0.8838 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |

Displacement Rate: $0.002500 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$

## SHEARS <br> 1K, 2K, \& 3K NORMAL LOADS Remolded, Sat at 23.8 \%



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation B 40 Depth


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING

Displacement Rate: $0.00250 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$

## SHEARS 1K, 2K, \& 3 K NORMAL LOADS Remolded, Sat at $\mathbf{2 0 . 0} \%$



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM


Displacement Rate: $0.00250 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$
Sample Description: Light reddish brown fine sandy silty clay


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 60922, Skyline Ranch Excavation B47
Depth
20 Feet


Displacement Rate: $0.0025 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| ject | Skyline Ranch |
| :---: | :---: |
| Excavation | B47 |
| Depth | 87.5' |


|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village <br> GEOLOGY AND soil ENGINERING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DATE |

Displacement Rate: $0,0025 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$

## SHEARS

 Remolded, Sat at $\mathbf{3 0 . 0} \%$

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Excavation | B48 |
|  | $96^{\prime}$ |
| Depth |  |


|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village <br> GEOLOGY AND soil ENGINEERING |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | DATE |

Displacement Rate： $0.0025 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$

## S甘VヨHS <br> 1K，3K，\＆5K NORMAL LOADS

Undisturbed，Sat at $\mathbf{2 6 . 5}$ \％


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Excavation |  |
| Depth |  |
|  |  |


|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village <br> GEOLOGY AND soil ENGINEERING |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | DATE |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM




## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Excavation | B49 |
|  | $50^{\prime}$ |
| Depth |  |


| 分 | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soll enginerring |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | AJH |
|  | 8838 |



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation B50 Depth


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING

DATE $\begin{array}{cc}\text { wy } & \text { DS } \\ \text { w.o } & 8838\end{array}$







## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Excavation | B54 |
|  | $56.5^{\prime}$ |
| Depth |  |


|  | Geolabs - Westlake Village <br> GEOLOGY AND SoIL ENGINERING |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | DATE |

SHEARS
1K, 2K, \& 3K NORMAL LOADS
Remolded, Sat at 27.9 \%


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Excavation | 862 |
|  |  |
| Depth | $50^{\prime}$ |


| 分 | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soll enginerring |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | AJH |
|  | 8838 |

Displacement Rate: $0.0025 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$

## SHEARS 1K, 2K, \& 3K NORMAL LOADS Undisturbed, Sat at $\mathbf{2 6 . 3}$ \%



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch
Excavation $\frac{\text { B66 }}{30 \text { Feet }}$
Depth
5000.00
> 4500.00
4000.00
> 4000.00
3500.00


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM


 SHEARS
$2 \mathrm{~K}, 4 \mathrm{~K}, \& 6 \mathrm{~K}$ NORMAL LOADS
Remolded, Sat at 20.9\%


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Tr. 060922 Skyline Ranch Excavation $\qquad$
Depth


## Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



## SHEARS $1 \mathrm{~K}, 3 \mathrm{~K}, \& 5 \mathrm{~K}$ NORMAL LOADS <br> Undisturbed, Sat at 16.0 \%

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :---: | :---: |
| Excavation | TP168 |
| Depth | 3.5-5.5' |


| Geolabs - Westlake Village |
| :---: | :---: |
| Geology and soil engineering |

Displacement Rate: $0.0025 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{min}$


## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch

| Excavation |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Depth | B1 (1995) |


| Geolabs - Westlake Village |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geology and soll engineering |

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project
Excavation Skyline Ranch

Depth $\qquad$ B1(1995)
72

## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



| Project | Skyline Ranch |
| :---: | :---: |
| Excavation | B11(1995) |
| Depth | 40' |


| S01 | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
| - | $\text { Date } 1 / 2 / 96 \quad \text { wy } \frac{S D}{8838}$ |




## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project Skyline Ranch
Excavation $\frac{B 3}{38}$

| T | Geolabs - Westlake Village geology and soil engineering |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\cdots \cdots$ | date $1 / 14 / 04$ wy $\frac{\text { wD }}{}$ |
| A-811 |  |
|  | PLATE S3.38r |





## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM

Material: Med. brown clayey silty SAND (TQs) Remolded


Project
TTM 060922
Excavation Boring 10
Depth


Geolabs - Westlake Village GEOLOGY AND SOIL ENGINEERING

DATE



## SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM



Project TTM 060922
Excavation Boring 19
Depth


SHEAR TEST DIAGRAM

SHEARS
$1 \mathrm{~K}, 2 \mathrm{~K}, \& 3 \mathrm{~K}$ NORMAL LOADS Remolded, Sat at 17.3 \%
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## APPENDIX D

## Slope Stability Analyses

### 1.0 Approach

- Slope stability analyses were conducted using the computer program Slope W. The Modified Bishop's Method was used to analyze rotational failure modes, and the Janbu and Spencer Method was used to analyze translational failure modes. A coefficient of horizontal acceleration of 0.15 g (FS of 1.1) was used to evaluate the pseudostatic stability analyses.
- After a review of the latest bulk grading plan and based on our supplemental investigation and review, twenty five cross-sections (1-1' through 3-3', 5-5', 7-7' through 15-15', 17-17' through 24-24', 28-28', 29-29', 32-32', and 34-34') were considered representative and critical with regards slope stability analysis.


## Design Shear Strength

As discussed within the text of this report, direct shear testing was previously performed and shear strength values for the onsite soils were previously determined during previous site investigations and reviews for the subject site by GWV. The direct shear testing and shear strength values utilized were previously reviewed and accepted by the county of Los Angeles GMED. The previous test results are included for reference in this report. The previous direct shear testing was utilized to previously develop composite plots to determine the appropriate shear strength values to use for the on site soils. Composite plots for residual strengths were developed for the artificial fills, Saugus Formation bedrock and Mint Canyon Formation Bedrock for coarse grained and fine grained bedding conditions. The parameters used in the slope stability analysis are presented in Table D-1.

TABLE D-1
Design Shear Strength Parameters for Slope Stability Analyses

| Material Type | Cohesion <br> $(\mathbf{p s f})$ | Angle of Internal <br> Friction (degrees) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Engineered Fill | 200 | 33 |
| Alluvium/Colluvium | 0 | 30 |
| Landslide Debris | 0 | 20 |
| Landslide Slide Plane | 150 | 9 |
| Mint Canyon and Saugus Fm Along-Bedding Strength, <br> Coarse-grained Lithologies | 100 | 40 |
| Saugus Formation Along-Bedding, <br> Fine-grained Unsheared | 150 | 25 |
| Saugus Formation Along-Bedding, <br> Fine-grained | 150 | 17 |
| Mint Canyon Formation Across-Bedding Strength. | 200 | 11 |
| Mint Canyon Formation Along-Bedding, <br> Fine-grained Unsheared | 150 | 40 |
| Rormation Across-Bedding Strength | 17 |  |

TABLE D-2
Summary of Slope Stability Analyses

| No | Cross- <br> Section | Reference | Condition | Factor of <br> Safety | Remarks |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure Static

eport generated using Geostudio 2012. Coopright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International LIt

## File Information
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Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
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Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
nit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Static
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant

## dvanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Qs150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $3-10^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bedding 3-10
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
TQs 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcif
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $11^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150 psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: 0

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (211.0268, 1,971.6364) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(303,1,993)$ ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(353,2,017) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(517,2,035) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 8

Slip Surface Limits

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Static

Left Coordinate: ( $-146,1,800.0439$ ) ft
Right Coordinate: $(680,1,800) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $17^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
TQs $11^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.275)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: (10.1, 1)
TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Points

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 1 | -145.2287 | 1,950.7886 |
| Point 2 | -111.3064 | 1,951.8013 |
| Point 3 | -22.9567 | 1,969.775 |
| Point 4 | 41.3437 | 1,971.547 |
| Point 5 | 68.1778 | 1,984.9641 |
| Point 6 | 97.5433 | 1,970.5344 |
| Point 7 | 178.0454 | 1,971.547 |
| Point 8 | 232.4729 | 1,971.547 |
| Point 9 | 259 | 1,983 |
| Point 10 | 267 | 1,982 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 1,993 |
| Point 12 | 303 | 1,993 |
| Point 13 | 322 | 2,006 |
| Point 14 | 328 | 2,006 |
| Point 15 | 343 | 2,017 |
| Point 16 | 353 | 2,017 |
| Point 17 | 364 | 2,022 |
| Point 18 | 375 | 2,022 |
| Point 19 | 398 | 2,035 |
| Point 20 | 404 | 2,035 |
| Point 21 | 426 | 2,044 |
| Point 22 | 477 | 2,043 |
| Point 23 | 492 | 2,040 |
| Point 24 | 552 | 2,028 |
| Point 25 | 680 | 1,800 |
| Point 26 | -146 | 1,800.0439 |
| Point 27 | 677 | 1,992 |
| Point 28 | 608 | 2,022.624 |
| Point 29 | 636.787 | 2,019.9606 |
| Point 30 | 676.6631 | 2,016.0286 |
| Point 31 | -145.6611 | 1,845.0183 |
| Point 32 | 210.9608 | 1,971.6367 |
| Point 33 | 232 | 1,952 |
| Point 34 | 272 | 1,952 |
| Point 35 | 401.1176 | 2,016.6763 |
| Point 36 | 455.0038 | 2,043.5159 |
| Point 37 | 463 | 2,043.2745 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150 psf-17 <br> bedding $3-10^{\circ}$ | $1,26,31,27,30,29,28,24,23,22,37,36,35,34,33,32,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 58,736 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ <br> bedding $3-10^{\circ}$ | $27,31,26,25$ | 97,770 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $32,33,34,35,36,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8$ | $5,214.9$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 22,954
F of S: 2.10
Volume: $371.63793 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $44,596.551 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 2,328,266.1 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $1,107,249.6 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 23,409 slip surfaces
Fof S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: ( $303,1,993$ ) ft
Entry: $(353,2,017) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 60.246339 ft
Center: $(304.85548,2,053.2178) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{ft})$ | PWPP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 303.86364 | $1,992.9858$ | 0 | 74.55838 | 48.418778 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 305.59091 | $1,992.9821$ | 0 | 212.91373 | 138.26779 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 307.31818 | $1,993.028$ | 0 | 342.97346 | 222.72957 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 309.04545 | $1,993.1235$ | 0 | 464.91976 | 301.92242 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 310.77273 | $1,993.269$ | 0 | 578.90446 | 375.94495 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 312.5 | $1,993.4647$ | 0 | 685.0512 | 444.87745 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 314.22727 | $1,993.7112$ | 0 | 783.45705 | 508.78295 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 315.95455 | $1,994.0091$ | 0 | 874.19372 | 567.70804 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 317.68182 | $1,994.3592$ | 0 | 957.30844 | 621.68337 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 319.40909 | $1,994.7625$ | 0 | $1,032.8244$ | 670.72401 | 200 |
| Slice |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 11 | 321.13636 | $1,995.2199$ | 0 | $1,100.7409$ | 714.82947 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 12 | 322.75 | $1,995.6957$ | 0 | $1,101.3087$ | 715.19823 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 324.25 | $1,996.184$ | 0 | $1,036.8746$ | 673.35424 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 325.75 | $1,996.7164$ | 0 | 968.45093 | 628.91939 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 327.25 | $1,997.2941$ | 0 | 896.01174 | 581.87683 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 328.83333 | $1,997.956$ | 0 | 879.68058 | 571.27125 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 330.5 | $1,998.7097$ | 0 | 917.08595 | 595.56258 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 332.16667 | $1,999.5256$ | 0 | 946.75549 | 614.8302 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 333.83333 | $2,000.4068$ | 0 | 968.5074 | 628.95606 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 335.5 | $2,001.3564$ | 0 | 982.12499 | 637.79942 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 337.16667 | $2,002.3785$ | 0 | 987.35215 | 641.19398 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 338.83333 | $2,003.4774$ | 0 | 983.88772 | 638.94416 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 340.5 | $2,004.6583$ | 0 | 971.37841 | 630.82052 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 342.16667 | $2,005.9275$ | 0 | 949.40982 | 616.55395 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 343.83333 | $2,007.2922$ | 0 | 859.37479 | 558.08452 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 345.5 | $2,008.7614$ | 0 | 703.44824 | 456.82463 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 347.16667 | $2,010.3457$ | 0 | 540.31814 | 350.8867 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 348.83333 | $2,012.0585$ | 0 | 369.67235 | 240.06803 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 350.5 | $2,013.9168$ | 0 | 191.19188 | 124.16146 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 352.16667 | $2,015.9423$ | 0 | 4.5775828 | 2.972717 | 200 |

## Section 1 SSA for Skyline Ranch Development project.gsz

Section 1 SSA for Skyline Ranch Development project.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/18/2016 7:21:35 PM
Name: TQs 150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$

Model: Anisotropic Fn. Seismic Load
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bedding 3-10
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Name: TQs $150 \mathrm{psf}-11^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $11^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bedding $3-10^{\circ}$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$ Horizontal: 0.15 Vertical: 0.0

Pseudostatic - Circular

## Materials

$\square$ TQs150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$ $\square$ Fill
$\square$ TQs 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10
Key 40 Feet Wide by 20 feet Deep 2H:1V Backcut
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## Skyline Ranch

Development project, Tract 60922
Los Angeles CA
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Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
ressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
nit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $3-10^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bedding 3-10
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150 psf A-bedding 3-10º
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
TQs 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $11^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150 psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: 0

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (211.0268, 1,971.6364) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(303,1,993)$ ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(353,2,017) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(517,2,035) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 8

Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: ( $-146,1,800.0439$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(680,1,800) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $17^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1 )
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
TQs $11^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.275)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: (10.1, 1)
TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -145.2287 | $1,950.7886$ |
| Point 2 | -111.3064 | $1,951.8013$ |
| Point 3 | -22.9567 | $1,969.775$ |
| Point 4 | 41.3437 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 5 | 68.1778 | $1,984.9641$ |
| Point 6 | 97.5433 | $1,970.5344$ |
| Point 7 | 178.0454 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 8 | 232.4729 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 9 | 259 | 1,983 |
| Point 10 | 267 | 1,982 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 1,993 |
| Point 12 | 303 | 1,993 |
| Point 13 | 322 | 2,006 |
| Point 14 | 328 | 2,006 |
| Point 15 | 343 | 2,017 |
| Point 16 | 353 | 2,017 |
| Point 17 | 364 | 2,022 |
| Point 18 | 375 | 2,022 |
| Point 19 | 398 | 2,035 |
| Point 20 | 404 | 2,035 |
| Point 21 | 426 | 2,044 |
| Point 22 | 477 | 2,043 |
| Point 23 | 492 | 2,040 |
| Point 24 | 552 | 2,028 |
| Point 25 | 680 | 1,800 |
| Point 26 | -146 | $1,800.0439$ |
| Point 27 | 677 | 1,992 |
| Point 28 | 608 | $2,022.624$ |
| Point 29 | 636.787 | $2,019.9606$ |
| Point 30 | 676.6631 | $2,016.0286$ |
| Point 31 | -145.6611 | $1,845.0183$ |
| Point 32 | 210.9608 | $1,971.6367$ |
| Point 33 | 232 | 1,952 |
| Point 34 | 272 | 1,952 |
| Point 35 | 401.1176 | $2,016.6763$ |
| Point 36 | 455.0038 | $2,043.5159$ |
| Point 37 | 463 | $2,043.2745$ |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150 psf-17 <br> bedding 3-10 | $1,26,31,27,30,29,28,24,23,22,37,36,35,34,33,32,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 58,736 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs 150 psf-11 <br> bedding 3-10 | $27,31,26,25$ | 97,770 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $32,33,34,35,36,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8$ | $5,214.9$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 5,277
Fof S: 1.51
Volume: $3,086.1029 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $370,332.35 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 74,997,061 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: 49,709,909 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 23,409 slip surface
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (232.32332, 1,971.5476) ft
Entry: (432.26416, 2,043.8954) ft
Entry: (432.26416,
Radius: 285.7636 ft
Center: $(242.04047,2,257.146) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 232.39811 $1,971.5451$ 0 4.8038766 3.1196739 200 <br> Slice <br> 2 235.78879 $1,971.47$ 0 185.67664 120.57982 200 <br> Slice <br> 3 242.42056 $1,971.4019$ 0 532.32194 345.69391 200 <br> Slice <br> 4 249.05234 $1,971.4877$ 0 853.83964 554.48994 200 <br> Slice <br> 5 255.68411 $1,971.7276$ 0 $1,150.9264$ 747.42036 200 <br> Slice <br> 6 263 $1,972.1803$ 0 $1,190.9856$ 773.4351 200 <br> Slice <br> 7 270 $1,972.7694$ 0 $1,208.5872$ 784.8657 200 <br> Slice <br> 8 276 $1,973.4235$ 0 $1,434.5486$ 931.60676 200 <br> Slice <br> 9 282 $1,974.2062$ 0 $1,641.9022$ $1,066.2638$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 10 288 $1,975.1188$ 0 $1,830.9429$ $1,189.0282$ 200 <br> Slice       |


| 11 | 294 | $1,976.1625$ | 0 | $1,849.0788$ | $1,200.8058$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 12 | 300 | $1,977.3386$ | 0 | $1,700.5592$ | $1,104.356$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 306.16667 | $1,978.6893$ | 0 | $1,771.4753$ | $1,150.4095$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 312.5 | $1,980.2243$ | 0 | $2,054.7249$ | $1,334.354$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 318.83333 | $1,981.9135$ | 0 | $2,315.7619$ | $1,503.8734$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 325 | $1,983.7073$ | 0 | $2,331.0314$ | $1,513.7895$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 331.75 | $1,985.8575$ | 0 | $2,366.9524$ | $1,537.1169$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 339.25 | $1,988.4542$ | 0 | $2,637.5113$ | $1,712.8198$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 345.5 | $1,990.782$ | 0 | $2,652.0503$ | $1,722.2616$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 350.5 | $1,992.7787$ | 0 | $2,424.7357$ | $1,574.6418$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 355.75 | $1,994.9972$ | 0 | $2,303.5164$ | $1,495.9211$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 361.25 | $1,997.4524$ | 0 | $2,284.3097$ | $1,483.4481$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 366.75 | $2,000.0487$ | 0 | $2,126.6283$ | $1,381.0485$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 372.25 | $2,002.7904$ | 0 | $1,833.9241$ | $1,190.9642$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 378.83333 | $2,006.2885$ | 0 | $1,679.5919$ | $1,090.7397$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 386.5 | $2,010.6251$ | 0 | $1,651.5099$ | $1,072.5031$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 394.16667 | $2,015.2825$ | 0 | $1,592.4049$ | $1,034.1198$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 401 | $2,019.7019$ | 0 | $1,356.7933$ | 881.11185 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 407.66667 | $2,024.3187$ | 0 | $1,047.3923$ | 680.1845 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 415 | $2,029.7155$ | 0 | 809.05486 | 525.40637 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 422.33333 | $2,035.4864$ | 0 | 543.86506 | 353.1901 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 429.13208 | $2,041.1821$ | 0 | 158.28261 | 102.78993 | 200 |
|  | 000 |  |  |  |  |  |
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Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: Yes
Critical Slip Surface Optimizations

Maximum Iterations: 2,000
Convergence Tolerance: 1e-007
Starting Points: 8
Ending Points: 16
Complete Passes per Insertion: 1

## Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $17^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150 psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $11^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-146, 1,800.0439) ft
Right Coordinate: $(680,1,800) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Surface Block
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## Left Grid

Upper Left: (172.7791, 1,959.785) ft
Lower Left: $(180.8055,1,835.8451) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (334.4512, 1,849.3658) ft
X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (353.639, 1,999.7263) ft Lower Left: (348.7613, 1,881.1947) ft Lower Right: (555.0728, 1,905.9035) ft X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: 65

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.:
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $17^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## TQs $11^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $3,0.275$

2-Translational Static

Data Point: (10, 0.275$)$
Data Point: (10.1, 1)
TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -145.2287 | $1,950.7886$ |
| Point 2 | -111.3064 | $1,951.8013$ |
| Point 3 | -22.9567 | $1,969.775$ |
| Point 4 | 41.3437 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 5 | 68.1778 | $1,984.9641$ |
| Point 6 | 97.5433 | $1,970.5344$ |
| Point 7 | 178.0454 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 8 | 232.4729 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 9 | 259 | 1,983 |
| Point 10 | 267 | 1,982 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 1,993 |
| Point 12 | 303 | 1,993 |
| Point 13 | 322 | 2,006 |
| Point 14 | 328 | 2,006 |
| Point 15 | 343 | 2,017 |
| Point 16 | 353 | 2,017 |
| Point 17 | 364 | 2,022 |
| Point 18 | 375 | 2,022 |
| Point 19 | 398 | 2,035 |
| Point 20 | 404 | 2,035 |
| Point 21 | 426 | 2,044 |
| Point 22 | 477 | 2,043 |
| Point 23 | 492 | 2,040 |
| Point 24 | 552 | 2,028 |
| Point 25 | 680 | 1,800 |
| Point 26 | -146 | $1,800.0439$ |
| Point 27 | 677 | 1,992 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 28 | 608 | $2,022.624$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 29 | 636.787 | $2,019.9606$ |
| Point 30 | 676.6631 | $2,016.0286$ |
| Point 31 | -145.6611 | $1,845.0183$ |
| Point 32 | 210.9608 | $1,971.6367$ |
| Point 33 | 232 | 1,952 |
| Point 34 | 272 | 1,952 |
| Point 35 | 401.1176 | $2,016.6763$ |
| Point 36 | 455.0038 | $2,043.5159$ |
| Point 37 | 463 | $2,043.2745$ |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150 psf-17 <br> bedding 3-10 | $1,26,31,27,30,29,28,24,23,22,37,36,35,34,33,32,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 58,736 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs 150 psf-11 <br> bedding 3-10 | $27,31,26,25$ | 97,770 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $32,33,34,35,36,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8$ | $5,214.9$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 589,825
F of S: 1.82
Volume: 8,033.6946 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $964,043.36 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 408,149.68 lbs
Activating Force: $224,373.76 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 589,825 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (217.1762, 1,971.6108) ft
Entry: (443.07401, 2,043.715) ft
Radius: 121.28783 ft
Center: (312.86392, 2,061.7411) ft

## Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 221.00038 | $1,970.0268$ | 0 | 274.47961 | 178.24915 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 228.64873 | $1,966.8587$ | 0 | 716.28741 | 465.16248 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 235.78879 | $1,963.9012$ | 0 | $1,332.3626$ | 865.2464 | 200 |
| Slice |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 4 | 242.42056 | $1,961.1542$ | 0 | $2,122.7053$ | $1,378.5009$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 5 | 249.05234 | $1,958.4073$ | 0 | $2,913.0479$ | $1,891.7554$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 255.68411 | $1,955.6603$ | 0 | $3,703.3905$ | $2,405.0099$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 261.76041 | $1,953.1434$ | 0 | $4,211.0296$ | $2,734.6746$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 265.27876 | $1,951.6861$ | 0 | $4,594.5443$ | $3,855.2804$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 266.51835 | $1,951.454$ | 0 | $3,556.8443$ | $1,087.4364$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 268.36498 | $1,951.7679$ | 0 | $3,586.1793$ | $1,096.405$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 271.44815 | $1,952.2921$ | 0 | $3,573.515$ | $2,320.6678$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 277.62475 | $1,953.3422$ | 0 | $3,897.6348$ | $1,191.6266$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 286.54158 | $1,954.8582$ | 0 | $4,197.5552$ | $1,283.3214$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 294 | $1,956.1262$ | 0 | $4,288.0144$ | $1,310.9776$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 300 | $1,957.1463$ | 0 | $4,169.0125$ | $1,274.595$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 306.16667 | $1,958.1947$ | 0 | $4,299.4673$ | $1,314.4791$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 312.5 | $1,959.2715$ | 0 | $4,679.379$ | $1,430.6297$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 318.83333 | $1,960.3482$ | 0 | $5,059.2906$ | $1,546.7804$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 325 | $1,961.3966$ | 0 | $5,189.7455$ | $1,586.6644$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 331.75 | $1,962.5442$ | 0 | $5,376.6821$ | $1,643.8167$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 339.25 | $1,963.8193$ | 0 | $5,869.5573$ | $1,794.5038$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 348 | $1,965.3069$ | 0 | $6,016.8266$ | $1,839.5285$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 358.5 | $1,967.0921$ | 0 | $6,100.2222$ | $1,865.0251$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 369.5 | $1,968.9622$ | 0 | $6,173.7008$ | $1,887.4898$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 379.65015 | $1,970.6879$ | 0 | $6,279.0077$ | $1,919.6853$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 388.95044 | $1,972.269$ | 0 | $6,707.7916$ | $2,050.7777$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 395.80029 | $1,976.2011$ | 0 | $4,053.6249$ | $3,401.3952$ | 225 |
|  | 259 |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice <br> 28 | 399.5588 | $1,981.5689$ | 0 | $3,755.5039$ | $3,151.2419$ | 225 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 29 | 402.5588 | $1,985.8533$ | 0 | $3,445.814$ | $2,891.3813$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 407.66667 | $1,993.1481$ | 0 | $3,026.9528$ | $2,539.915$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 415 | $2,003.6212$ | 0 | $2,486.7804$ | $2,086.6565$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 422.33333 | $2,014.0943$ | 0 | $1,946.608$ | $1,633.398$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 431.23558 | $2,026.808$ | 0 | $1,129.7361$ | 947.96114 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 439.77259 | $2,039.0001$ | 0 | 274.70357 | 178.39458 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: Yes
Critical Slip Surface Optimizations

Maximum Iterations: 2,000
Convergence Tolerance: 1e-007
Starting Points: 8
Ending Points: 16
Complete Passes per Insertion: 1

## Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $17^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150 psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $11^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150 psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-146, 1,800.0439) ft
Right Coordinate: $(680,1,800) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Surface Block
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## Left Grid

Upper Left: (172.7791, 1,959.785) ft
Lower Left: $(180.8055,1,835.8451) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (334.4512, 1,849.3658) ft
X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (353.639, 1,999.7263) ft Lower Left: (348.7613, 1,881.1947) ft Lower Right: (555.0728, 1,905.9035) ft X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Anding Angle. 65

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $17^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Qs $11^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $3,0.275$
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Data Point: (10, 0.275$)$ Data Point: (10.1, 1)

TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -145.2287 | $1,950.7886$ |
| Point 2 | -111.3064 | $1,951.8013$ |
| Point 3 | -22.9567 | $1,969.775$ |
| Point 4 | 41.3437 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 5 | 68.1778 | $1,984.9641$ |
| Point 6 | 97.5433 | $1,970.5344$ |
| Point 7 | 178.0454 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 8 | 232.4729 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 9 | 259 | 1,983 |
| Point 10 | 267 | 1,982 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 1,993 |
| Point 12 | 303 | 1,993 |
| Point 13 | 322 | 2,006 |
| Point 14 | 328 | 2,006 |
| Point 15 | 343 | 2,017 |
| Point 16 | 353 | 2,017 |
| Point 17 | 364 | 2,022 |
| Point 18 | 375 | 2,022 |
| Point 19 | 398 | 2,035 |
| Point 20 | 404 | 2,035 |
| Point 21 | 426 | 2,044 |
| Point 22 | 477 | 2,043 |
| Point 23 | 492 | 2,040 |
| Point 24 | 552 | 2,028 |
| Point 25 | 680 | 1,800 |
| Point 26 | -146 | $1,800.0439$ |
| Point 27 | 677 | 1,992 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 28 | 608 | $2,022.624$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 29 | 636.787 | $2,019.9606$ |
| Point 30 | 676.6631 | $2,016.0286$ |
| Point 31 | -145.6611 | $1,845.0183$ |
| Point 32 | 210.9608 | $1,971.6367$ |
| Point 33 | 232 | 1,952 |
| Point 34 | 272 | 1,952 |
| Point 35 | 401.1176 | $2,016.6763$ |
| Point 36 | 455.0038 | $2,043.5159$ |
| Point 37 | 463 | $2,043.2745$ |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150 psf-17 <br> bedding 3-10 | $1,26,31,27,30,29,28,24,23,22,37,36,35,34,33,32,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 58,736 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs 150 psf-11 <br> bedding 3-10 | $27,31,26,25$ | 97,770 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $32,33,34,35,36,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8$ | $5,214.9$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 589,825
Fof S: 1.15
Volume: $9,608.0564 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,152,966.8 lbs
Resisting Force: 445,071.18 lbs
Activating Force: $387,160.56 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 589,825 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (222.57809, 1,971.5883) ft
Entry: (462.00622, 2,043.3045) ft
Radius: 124.67095 ft
Center: (327.21648, 2,061.0703) ft

## Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 227.52549 | $1,969.0876$ | 0 | 538.25891 | 349.54942 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 235.8569 | $1,964.8765$ | 0 | $1,485.9458$ | 964.98447 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 242.46355 | $1,962.1795$ | 0 | $2,047.4326$ | $1,329.6183$ | 200 |
| Slice |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 4 | 248.90885 | $1,960.2063$ | 0 | $2,736.9081$ | $1,777.3689$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 5 | 255.56575 | $1,958.3889$ | 0 | $3,261.221$ | $2,117.8617$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 263 | $1,956.5904$ | 0 | $3,647.5504$ | $2,368.7469$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 271.0835 | $1,954.6349$ | 0 | $4,109.7149$ | $2,668.8801$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 278.93486 | $1,953.8491$ | 0 | $3,971.1117$ | $1,214.0907$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 286.40281 | $1,954.2498$ | 0 | $4,328.6894$ | $1,323.4132$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 290.55145 | $1,954.5027$ | 0 | $4,436.6505$ | $1,356.4202$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 294 | $1,954.9211$ | 0 | $4,411.9093$ | $1,348.856$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 300 | $1,955.649$ | 0 | $4,327.2766$ | $1,322.9812$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 306.3637 | $1,956.4211$ | 0 | $4,505.0923$ | $1,377.3449$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 312.79555 | $1,957.3661$ | 0 | $4,833.5532$ | $1,477.7655$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 318.93185 | $1,958.4398$ | 0 | $5,191.9174$ | $1,587.3285$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 325 | $1,959.5016$ | 0 | $5,310.8968$ | $1,623.7041$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 329.7626 | $1,960.335$ | 0 | $5,363.5609$ | $1,639.8051$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 337.2626 | $1,961.6505$ | 0 | $5,842.5533$ | $1,786.2478$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 348 | $1,963.5354$ | 0 | $6,108.8792$ | $1,867.6718$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 355.7575 | $1,964.8971$ | 0 | $6,096.4554$ | $1,863.8735$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 361.2575 | $1,965.8572$ | 0 | $6,276.4255$ | $1,918.8958$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 365.8371 | $1,966.652$ | 0 | $6,328.2517$ | $1,934.7407$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 371.3371 | $1,967.6155$ | 0 | $6,213.5901$ | $1,899.6851$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 379.8241 | $1,969.1092$ | 0 | $6,354.962$ | $1,942.9069$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 389.4723 | $1,970.8072$ | 0 | $6,785.5288$ | $2,074.5443$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 396.1482 | $1,971.9824$ | 0 | $7,083.079$ | $2,165.5146$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 399.5588 | $1,972.5833$ | 0 | $7,134.1938$ | $2,181.1419$ | 150.075 |
|  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice <br> 28 | 402.5588 | $1,973.1118$ | 0 | $7,073.6011$ | $2,162.6169$ | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 29 | 407.85307 | $1,974.0444$ | 0 | $7,147.3875$ | $2,185.1757$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 415.55923 | $1,975.402$ | 0 | $7,353.1779$ | $2,248.0921$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 422.70615 | $1,981.1723$ | 0 | $3,331.9642$ | $2,795.8499$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 427.54145 | $1,988.6466$ | 0 | $2,984.3264$ | $2,504.1472$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 433.2698 | $1,997.6163$ | 0 | $2,446.5865$ | $2,052.9298$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 442.2522 | $2,011.8137$ | 0 | $1,634.576$ | $1,371.5722$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 451.02575 | $2,025.6884$ | 0 | 858.03091 | 719.97342 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 455.5827 | $2,032.8642$ | 0 | 451.85408 | 379.15059 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 37 | 459.08391 | $2,038.5402$ | 0 | 121.0361 | 101.56135 | 225 |
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## Section 1 SSA for Skyline Ranch Development project.gsz

Section 1 SSA for Skyline Ranch Development project.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/18/2016 7:21:35 PM



## Temp analysis

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 60
Date: 3/18/2016
Time: 7:21:35 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 1 SSA for Skyline Ranch Development project.gsz
Directory: P: \FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 1-1 results\Latest Update 3-
18-16
Last Solved Date: 3/18/2016
Last Solved Time: 7:27:52 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

Temp analysis
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: Yes
Critical Slip Surface Optimizations

Maximum Iterations: 2,000
Convergence Tolerance: 1e-007
Starting Points: 8
Ending Points: 16
Complete Passes per Insertion: 1

## Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-10
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: TQs $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bedding 3-10 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $3-10^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $11^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150 psf A-bedding 3-10
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: ( $-146,1,800.0439$ ) ft
Right Coordinate: $(680,1,800)$ ft

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (186.8493, 1,990.3033) ft
Lower Left: (194.8757, 1,866.3634) ft
Lower Right: (348.5214, 1,879.8841) ft
X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$

Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (374.0506, 2,012.4093) ft
Lower Left: (369.1729, 1,893.8777) ft
Lower Right: (575.4844, 1,918.5865) ft
X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## TQs $17^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(10,0.425)$
Data Point: (10.1, 1)
TQs $11^{\circ}$ A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.275)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
TQs 150psf A-bedding 3-10
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -145.2287 | $1,950.7886$ |
| Point 2 | -111.3064 | $1,951.8013$ |
| Point 3 | -22.9567 | $1,969.775$ |
| Point 4 | 41.3437 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 5 | 68.1778 | $1,984.9641$ |
| Point 6 | 97.5433 | $1,970.5344$ |
| Point 7 | 178.0454 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 8 | 232.4729 | $1,971.547$ |
| Point 9 | 259 | 1,983 |
| Point 10 | 267 | 1,982 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 1,993 |
| Point 12 | 303 | 1,993 |
| Point 13 | 322 | 2,006 |
| Point 14 | 328 | 2,006 |
| Point 15 | 343 | 2,017 |
| Point 16 | 353 | 2,017 |
| Point 17 | 364 | 2,022 |
| Point 18 | 375 | 2,022 |
| Point 19 | 398 | 2,035 |
| Point 20 | 404 | 2,035 |
| Point 21 | 426 | 2,044 |
| Point 22 | 477 | 2,043 |
| Point 23 | 492 | 2,040 |
| Point 24 | 552 | 2,028 |
| Point 25 | 680 | 1,800 |
| Point 26 | -146 | $1,800.0439$ |
| Point 27 | 677 | 1,992 |
| Point 28 | 608 | $2,022.624$ |
| Point 29 | 636.787 | $2,019.9606$ |
| Point 30 | 676.6631 | $2,016.0286$ |
| Point 31 | -145.6611 | $1,845.0183$ |
| Point 32 | 210.9608 | $1,971.6367$ |
| Point 33 | 232 | 1,952 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 34 | 272 | 1,952 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 35 | 401.1176 | $2,016.6763$ |
| Point 36 | 455.0038 | $2,043.5159$ |
| Point 37 | 463 | $2,043.2745$ |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150 psf-17 <br> bedding 3-10 | $1,26,31,27,30,29,28,24,23,22,37,36,35,34,33,32,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 58,736 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs 150 psf-11 <br> bedding 3-10 | $27,31,26,25$ | 97,770 |
| Region <br> 3 |  | $32,33,34,35,36,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8$ | $5,214.9$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 589,825
F of S: 1.27
Volume: $5,059.0396 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 607,084.75 Ibs
Resisting Force: $218,933.38 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $172,505.5 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 589,825 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (275.89795, 1,953.9525) ft
Entry: (466.08324, 2,043.214) ft
Radius: 119.43656 ft
Center: (341.63839, 2,065.7323) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 280.20112 | $1,954.1799$ | 0 | 222.33282 | 67.973963 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 287.75215 | $1,954.9383$ | 0 | 553.25236 | 169.14622 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 294 | $1,955.9601$ | 0 | 796.64195 | 243.55789 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 300 | $1,956.9412$ | 0 | $1,030.3764$ | 315.01767 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 303.91375 | $1,957.5813$ | 0 | $1,182.8394$ | 361.63028 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 307.68958 | $1,958.2219$ | 0 | $1,323.8508$ | 404.7418 | 150.075 |
| Slice | 313.41375 | $1,959.2044$ | 0 | $1,541.074$ | 471.15359 | 150.075 |


| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 8 | 319.13792 | $1,960.1869$ | 0 | $1,758.2971$ | 537.56538 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 325 | $1,961.1931$ | 0 | $1,980.754$ | 605.57727 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 329.2863 | $1,961.9288$ | 0 | $2,143.4124$ | 655.30693 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 333.38405 | $1,962.6438$ | 0 | $2,294.8967$ | 701.62033 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 339.00695 | $1,963.6324$ | 0 | $2,505.3802$ | 765.97159 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 342.4092 | $1,964.2307$ | 0 | $2,632.4166$ | 804.81051 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 345.5 | $1,964.7753$ | 0 | $2,747.9594$ | 840.1355 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 350.5 | $1,965.6564$ | 0 | $2,934.8736$ | 897.28089 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 353.2898 | $1,966.1479$ | 0 | $3,039.1642$ | 929.16574 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 356.1847 | $1,966.6397$ | 0 | $3,155.4235$ | 964.70976 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 361.3949 | $1,967.521$ | 0 | $3,354.7501$ | $1,025.65$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 366.59758 | $1,968.401$ | 0 | $3,553.7889$ | $1,086.5023$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 371.79273 | $1,969.2798$ | 0 | $3,752.5398$ | $1,147.2666$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 374.69515 | $1,969.7677$ | 0 | $3,874.1769$ | $1,184.4547$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 377.1457 | $1,970.1573$ | 0 | $3,971.0284$ | $1,214.0652$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 382.11708 | $1,970.992$ | 0 | $4,145.5471$ | $1,267.4209$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 387.76842 | $1,971.9792$ | 0 | $4,357.8757$ | $1,332.3363$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 394.29705 | $1,973.1246$ | 0 | $4,601.0263$ | $1,406.6749$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 399.5588 | $1,974.0508$ | 0 | $4,797.8466$ | $1,466.8489$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 402.5588 | $1,974.5788$ | 0 | $4,909.5944$ | $1,501.0136$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 407.6021 | $1,975.4666$ | 0 | $5,096.5996$ | $1,558.1869$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 414.90315 | $1,976.7497$ | 0 | $5,368.2739$ | $1,641.246$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 422.30105 | $1,978.0479$ | 0 | $5,643.0781$ | $1,725.2621$ | 150.075 |
|  | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice <br> 31 | 426.8846 | $1,978.8523$ | 0 | $5,813.3397$ | $1,777.3163$ | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 32 | 430.24115 | $1,982.7815$ | 0 | $2,760.7432$ | $2,316.5386$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 436.57968 | $1,992.7561$ | 0 | $2,288.3586$ | $1,920.1608$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 444.31282 | $2,005.1572$ | 0 | $1,789.5532$ | $1,501.6134$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 450.409 | $2,015.1574$ | 0 | $1,331.6835$ | $1,117.4151$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 453.8212 | $2,021.0908$ | 0 | $1,051.4295$ | 882.2541 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 37 | 459.0019 | $2,030.4379$ | 0 | 564.68967 | 473.83089 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 38 | 464.54162 | $2,040.4327$ | 0 | 8.4914039 | 7.1251339 | 225 |



## 4 - Circular Mode of Failure Static

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 91
Date: 3/19/2016
Time: 1:57:45 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 2-2 SSA for Skyline Ranch3to1.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 2-2 results\Latest Update 3-19-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 1:59:52 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: $p$
Strength Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

4 - Circular Mode of Failure Static
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs ( $150 \mathrm{psf} / 17^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6-11^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion
Phi':
$40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf - A-Bed $6-1^{\circ}$ (TQs
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $100 \mathrm{psf} / \mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4-\mathbf{8}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf - A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Along Bedding Shear
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $150 \mathrm{psf} / \mathbf{1 7}^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf - A-Bed 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $31.8656,1,952.6222$ ) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(252.5368,2,006.1221) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 20
Right Projection: Rang
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(304,2,031) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $629.4414,2,096.335$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 20

4-Circular Mode of Failure Static

Radius Increments: 20

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-165,1,897) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(770,2,100) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
100 psf - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (3.9, 1
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)

150 psf - A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
$Y$-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.75$ )
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.425$ )
Data Point: (11, 0.425)
Data Point: (11.1, 1)
150 psf - A-Bed 6-110 (TQs)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (5.9, 1)
Data Point: ( $6,0.667$ )
Data Point: $(11,0.667)$
Data Point: $(11.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -164 | 1,952 |
| Point 2 | -88 | 1,953 |
| Point 3 | 16 | 1,952 |
| Point 4 | 67 | 1,954 |
| Point 5 | 119 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 169 | 1,979 |
| Point 7 | 222 | 1,998 |
| Point 8 | 239 | 1,998 |
| Point 9 | 294 | 2,031 |
| Point 10 | 304 | 2,031 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 11 | 355 | 2,057 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 12 | 376 | 2,057 |
| Point 13 | 428 | 2,083 |
| Point 14 | 437 | 2,083 |
| Point 15 | 493 | 2,110 |
| Point 16 | 545 | 2,119 |
| Point 17 | 666.7794 | $2,082.2835$ |
| Point 18 | 678 | 2,078 |
| Point 19 | 691 | 2,075 |
| Point 20 | 734 | 2,093 |
| Point 21 | 770 | 2,100 |
| Point 22 | 770 | 2,070 |
| Point 23 | 769 | 2,033 |
| Point 24 | 768.9132 | $1,700.0035$ |
| Point 25 | -164 | 1,700 |
| Point 26 | -165 | 1,897 |
| Point 27 | 123 | 1,926 |
| Point 28 | 339 | 1,949 |
| Point 29 | 516 | 1,968 |
| Point 30 | 636 | 1,981 |
| Point 31 | 769 | 1,995 |
| Point 32 | 769 | 1,807 |
| Point 33 | -164 | 1,808 |
| Point 34 | -145.1146 | 1,807 |
| Point 35 | 94.3981 | $1,804.0495$ |
| Point 36 | 767.2671 | $1,804.0495$ |
| Point 37 | 178 | 1,980 |
| Point 38 | 769 | 1,935 |
| Point 39 | -164.3258 | 1,837 |
| Point 40 | 770 | 2,085 |
| Point 41 | 770 | 2,084 |
| Point 42 | 769.5405 | 2,053 |
| Point 43 | 769.5135 | 2,052 |
| Point 44 | 769.0811 | 2,036 |
| Point 45 | 769.0541 | 2,035 |
| Point 46 | 89 | $1,954.8462$ |
| Point 47 | 197 | 1,926 |
| Point 48 | 230.4185 | $1,937.6441$ |
| Point 49 | 410.1571 | $1,996.9191$ |
| Point 50 | 412.2316 | $1,997.8289$ |
| Point 51 | 462.5895 | $2,014.3399$ |
| Point 52 | 467.0781 | $2,015.9473$ |
| Point 53 | 544.2511 | $2,041.6026$ |
| Point 54 | 550.5628 | $2,043.7746$ |
| Point 55 | 566.1504 | $2,048.8086$ |
| Point 56 | 489.5416 | $2,023.5144$ |
| Point 57 | 579.8545 | $2,111.4639$ |
| Point 58 | 609.9957 | $2,103.2729$ |
| $-\quad-1$ |  |  |
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|  | 648.9076 | $2,089.3897$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Regions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Material | Points | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc $(100$ psf/25 A-Bed 4- $\left.8^{\circ}\right)$ | 26,39,38,31,30,29,28,48,47,27 | 55,091 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc <br> (150 psf $/ 17^{\circ}$ -A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 33,34,35,36,32,38,39 | 76,059 |
| Region $3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs (150 } \\ & \text { psf/17 } \\ & \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ & \left.11^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 40,21,20,19,18,17,55,54 | 2,168.2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}$ -A-Bed 611 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 43,51,50,44 | 4,432.1 |
| Region <br> 5 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs }(150 \\ \text { psf/170 } \\ \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ \left.11^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 22,41,53,56,52,42 | 5,946.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 46,27,47,48,49,50,51,52,56,53,54,55,17,59,58,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,37,6,5 | 34,644 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | Along Bedding Shear | 45,44,50,49 | 301.67 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | Along Bedding Shear | 43,42,52,51 | 312.89 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | Along Bedding Shear | 41,40,54,53 | 221.08 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TQs (150 } \\ & \text { psf/170 - } \\ & \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ & \left.11^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 4,3,2,1,26,27,46 | 11,437 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs (150 } \\ & \text { psf/17 } \\ & \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ & \left.11^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 28,29,30,31,23,45,49,48 | 18,001 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 7,946
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.832$
Volume: $543.16781 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $65,180.137 \mathrm{lbs}$

Resisting Moment: 4,799,852.3 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $2,619,923.8 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 9,261 slip surface
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (239.1067, 1,998.064) ft
Entry: $(304,2,031) \mathrm{ft}$
Center: $(234.60159,2,087.3375) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice 1 | 240.20456 | 1,998.133 | 0 | 62.539406 | 40.613565 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 242.40029 | 1,998.2981 | 0 | 193.51301 | 125.66882 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 244.59603 | 1,998.5178 | 0 | 315.94516 | 205.17719 | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 246.79176 | 1,998.7925 | 0 | 429.97298 | 279.22772 | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 248.98749 | 1,999.1227 | 0 | 535.71219 | 347.89556 | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 251.18322 | 1,999.509 | 0 | 633.2582 | 411.24268 | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 253.37896 | 1,999.9521 | 0 | 722.68698 | 469.31841 | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 255.57469 | 2,000.4531 | 0 | 804.0557 | 522.15988 | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 257.77042 | 2,001.0127 | 0 | 877.40319 | 569.79229 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 259.96615 | 2,001.6323 | 0 | 942.75018 | 612.22913 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | 262.16188 | 2,002.3131 | 0 | 1,000.0994 | 649.47215 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 264.35762 | 2,003.0566 | 0 | 1,049.4355 | 681.51136 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 266.55335 | 2,003.8644 | 0 | 1,090.7245 | 708.32477 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | 268.74908 | 2,004.7385 | 0 | 1,123.9137 | 729.87809 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 270.94481 | 2,005.681 | 0 | 1,148.9306 | 746.12423 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 273.14054 | 2,006.6943 | 0 | 1,165.6819 | 757.00269 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 275.33628 | 2,007.7811 | 0 | 1,174.0526 | 762.4387 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 277.53201 | 2,008.9445 | 0 | 1,173.9042 | 762.34231 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 279.72774 | 2,010.1879 | 0 | 1,165.0727 | 756.60709 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 281.92347 | 2,011.5152 | 0 | 1,147.3667 | 745.10867 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 284.11921 | 2,012.9311 | 0 | 1,120.5643 | 727.70297 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | 286.31494 | 2,014.4405 | 0 | 1,084.41 | 704.22409 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | 288.51067 | 2,016.0496 | 0 | 1,038.6108 | 674.48171 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 290.7064 | 2,017.7651 | 0 | 982.83131 | 638.25812 | 200 |
| Slice |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 25 | 292.90213 | $2,019.5953$ | 0 | 916.68871 | 595.30461 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 26 | 295 | $2,021.457$ | 0 | 789.31563 | 512.58756 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 297 | $2,023.3489$ | 0 | 603.66807 | 392.02663 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 299 | $2,025.3632$ | 0 | 411.83945 | 267.45167 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 301 | $2,027.5122$ | 0 | 213.72464 | 138.7944 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 303 | $2,029.811$ | 0 | 9.2567889 | 6.011429 | 200 |
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Section 2-2 SSA for Skyline Ranch3to1.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/19/2016 1:57:45 PM
 Name: TQs (150 pst/170 - A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Mode: Anisotropic
Unit Weight
Chonesiont: 222 post
Phil: 40 pst
 Name: Tmc ( 100 pst/25 - A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ ) Model: Anistotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pf
Cohesion:: 200 pst Cohenion:
Phi:
40




Keyway 75 ' wide by 30 ' deep 3H:1V Backcut
1.321

Seismic Load Horizontal: 0.15 Vertical: 0.00

## Materials

$\square$ TQs (150 psf/ $\left.17^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 6-11^{\circ}\right)$
$\square \operatorname{Tmc}\left(100 \mathrm{psf} / 25^{\circ}-\right.$ A-Bed 4-8$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$

## $\square$ Fill

$\square$ Along Bedding Shear
Tmc (150 pst/ $17^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4-8^{\circ}$ )

## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 91
Date: 3/19/2016
Time: 1:57:45 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 2-2 SSA for Skyline Ranch3to1.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 2-2 results\Latest Update 3-19-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 2:00:20 PM

Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: $p$
Strength Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1-Circular Mode of Failure Seismic Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 4-Circular Mode of Failure Static
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30

F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}-$ A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf - A-Bed 6-11 (TQs)
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $\mathbf{1 0 0} \mathrm{psf} / \mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$.
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Along Bedding Shear
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$.
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $150 \mathrm{psf} / 17^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf - A-Bed 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-165, 1,897) ft
Right Coordinate: $(770,2,100) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
100 psf - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$ Data Point: $(3.9,1)$ Data Point: $(4,0.5)$ Data Point: $(8,0.5)$ Data Point: (8.1,
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$ Data Point: $(3.9,1)$ Data Point: $(4,0.425)$ Data Point: $(8,0.425)$ Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Intercept: 1
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$ Data Point: $(4,0.75)$

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

## Data Point: $(8,0.75)$

Data Point: (8.1, 1)
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $11,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(11.1,1)$
150 psf - A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (TQs)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Stercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.667$ )
Data Point: $(11.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -164 | 1,952 |
| Point 2 | -88 | 1,953 |
| Point 3 | 16 | 1,952 |
| Point 4 | 67 | 1,954 |
| Point 5 | 119 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 169 | 1,979 |
| Point 7 | 222 | 1,998 |
| Point 8 | 239 | 1,998 |
| Point 9 | 294 | 2,031 |
| Point 10 | 304 | 2,031 |
| Point 11 | 355 | 2,057 |
| Point 12 | 376 | 2,057 |
| Point 13 | 428 | 2,083 |
| Point 14 | 437 | 2,083 |
| Point 15 | 493 | 2,110 |
| Point 16 | 545 | 2,119 |
| Point 17 | 666.7794 | $2,082.2835$ |
| Point 18 | 678 | 2,078 |
| Point 19 | 691 | 2,075 |
| Point 20 | 734 | 2,093 |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

| Point 21 | 770 | 2,100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 22 | 770 | 2,070 |
| Point 23 | 769 | 2,033 |
| Point 24 | 768.9132 | $1,700.0035$ |
| Point 25 | -164 | 1,700 |
| Point 26 | -165 | 1,897 |
| Point 27 | 123 | 1,926 |
| Point 28 | 339 | 1,949 |
| Point 29 | 516 | 1,968 |
| Point 30 | 636 | 1,981 |
| Point 31 | 769 | 1,995 |
| Point 32 | 769 | 1,807 |
| Point 33 | -164 | 1,808 |
| Point 34 | -145.1146 | 1,807 |
| Point 35 | 94.3981 | $1,804.0495$ |
| Point 36 | 767.2671 | $1,804.0495$ |
| Point 37 | 178 | 1,980 |
| Point 38 | 769 | 1,935 |
| Point 39 | -164.3258 | 1,837 |
| Point 40 | 770 | 2,085 |
| Point 41 | 770 | 2,084 |
| Point 42 | 769.5405 | 2,053 |
| Point 43 | 769.5135 | 2,052 |
| Point 44 | 769.0811 | 2,036 |
| Point 45 | 769.0541 | 2,035 |
| Point 46 | 89 | $1,954.8462$ |
| Point 47 | 197 | 1,926 |
| Point 48 | 230.4185 | $1,937.6441$ |
| Point 49 | 410.1571 | $1,996.9191$ |
| Point 50 | 412.2316 | $1,997.8289$ |
| Point 51 | 462.5895 | $2,014.3399$ |
| Point 52 | 467.0781 | $2,015.9473$ |
| Point 53 | 544.2511 | $2,041.6026$ |
| Point 54 | 550.5628 | $2,043.7746$ |
| Point 55 | 566.1504 | $2,048.8086$ |
| Point 56 | 489.5416 | $2,023.5144$ |
| Point 57 | 579.8545 | $2,111.4639$ |
| Point 58 | 609.9957 | $2,103.2729$ |
| Point 59 | 648.9076 | $2,089.3897$ |
|  |  |  |

Regions

|  | Material |  | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc <br> $(100$ <br> psf $/ 25^{\circ}-$ <br> A-Bed 4- <br> $\left.8^{\circ}\right)$ | $26,39,38,31,30,29,28,48,47,27$ |  | 55,091 |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
Page 6 of 8

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc <br> (150 <br> psf/ $17^{\circ}$ - <br> A-Bed 4- <br> $8^{\circ}$ ) | 33,34,35,36,32,38,39 | 76,059 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}$ -A-Bed 6$11^{\circ}$ ) | 40,21,20,19,18,17,55,54 | 2,168.2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}$. $11^{\circ}$ ) | 43,51,50,44 | 4,432.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}$ -A-Bed 6 11 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 22,41,53,56,52,42 | 5,946.6 |
| Region <br> 6 | Fill | 46,27,47,48,49,50,51,52,56,53,54,55,17,59,58,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,37,6,5 | 34,644 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | Along Bedding Shear | 45,44,50,49 | 301.67 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | Along Bedding Shear | 43,42,52,51 | 312.89 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | Along <br> Bedding <br> Shear | 41,40,54,53 | 221.08 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}$ 11告) | 4,3,2,1,26,27,46 | 11,437 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf/170. A-Bed 6- <br> $11^{\circ}$ ) | 28,29,30,31,23,45,49,48 | 18,001 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 2
F of $S$ : 1.321
Volume: $1,851.0584 \mathrm{ft}$
Weight: 222,127.01 lbs
Resisting Moment: $28,600,673 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $21,649,163$ lbs-1
F of S Rank (Anals): 1 of 10 slip surface
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (239.21672, 1,998.13) ft
Entry: ( $367.32804,2,0$
Radius: 184.08184 ft
Center: (232.26902, 2,182.0807) ft

## Slip Slices

|  |  |  | (psf) | (psf) | (psf) | (psf) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice 1 | 241.32377 | 1,998.2338 | 0 | 128.70966 | 83.585032 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 245.53787 | 1,998.4899 | 0 | 387.30497 | 251.51879 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 249.75196 | 1,998.8432 | 0 | 629.12239 | 408.55685 | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 253.96606 | 1,999.2943 | 0 | 854.57794 | 554.9694 | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 258.18016 | 1,999.844 | 0 | 1,064.0426 | 690.99734 | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 262.39426 | 2,000.4932 | 0 | 1,257.8436 | 816.85318 | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 266.60836 | 2,001.2428 | 0 | 1,436.2692 | 932.72414 | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 270.82246 | 2,002.0943 | 0 | 1,599.5702 | 1,038.7731 | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 275.03656 | 2,003.049 | 0 | 1,747.9625 | 1,135.1401 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 279.25065 | 2,004.1085 | 0 | 1,881.6283 | 1,221.9437 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 283.46475 | 2,005.2749 | 0 | 2,000.7189 | 1,299.282 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | 287.67885 | 2,006.5501 | 0 | 2,105.3534 | 1,367.2325 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 291.89295 | 2,007.9367 | 0 | 2,195.6224 | 1,425.8539 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 296.5 | 2,009.589 | 0 | 2,125.1111 | 1,380.0633 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 301.5 | 2,011.5348 | 0 | 1,896.9811 | 1,231.9139 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 306.125 | 2,013.4805 | 0 | 1,783.2109 | 1,158.0307 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 310.375 | 2,015.4072 | 0 | 1,781.1482 | 1,156.6911 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 314.625 | 2,017.4661 | 0 | 1,765.4727 | 1,146.5114 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 318.875 | 2,019.6623 | 0 | 1,736.1197 | 1,127.4493 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 323.125 | 2,022.0015 | 0 | 1,692.9992 | 1,099.4465 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 327.375 | 2,024.4901 | 0 | 1,635.9933 | 1,062.4265 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | 331.625 | 2,027.1351 | 0 | 1,564.9579 | 1,016.2955 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 23 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 335.875 | 2,029.9449 | 0 | 1,479.7193 | 960.94094 | 200 |
| Slice | 340.125 | 2,032.9287 | 0 | 1,380.076 | 896.23183 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 344.375 | 2,036.0972 | 0 | 1,265.7974 | 822.01843 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ | 348.625 | 2,039.4627 | 0 | 1,136.6235 | 738.13195 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 352.875 | 2,043.0397 | 0 | 992.26701 | 644.38573 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 28 \end{aligned}$ | 357.05467 | 2,046.7779 | 0 | 748.80095 | 486.27702 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | 361.16402 | 2,050.6885 | 0 | 411.38932 | 267.15935 | 200 |
| Slice | 365.27337 | 2,054.8521 | 0 | 66.049525 | 42.893063 | 200 |
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LGC Valley, Inc
GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING
28532 Constellation Road, Valencia, CA 9135 Phone 661-702-8474, Fax 661-702-8475

## Development project, Tract 60922 <br> Los Angeles CA

| Project No: | 153035-01 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Engineer: | BAS |
| Date: | March $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ |

Project No: 153035-01
Date: March 2016

## 3 - Translational Static

## eport generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 91
Date: 3/19/2016
Time: 1:57:45 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 2-2 SSA for Skyline Ranch3to1.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 2-2 results\Latest Update 3-19-16
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 1:59:57 PM

Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: p
Strength Units: psf
of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

3 - Translational Static
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: Yes
Critical Slip Surface Optimizations
Maximum Iterations: 2,000
Convergence Tolerance: 1e-007
Starting Points: 8
Ending Points: 16
Complete Passes per Insertion: 1
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6-11^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf - A-Bed 6-11 (TQs)
Phi-B: 0
Tmc ( $100 \mathrm{psf} / 25^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-$ Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf-A-Bed 4-8
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33

Along Bedding Shear
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $150 \mathrm{psf} / 17^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-$ Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf - A-Bed 4-8 C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-165,1,897) \mathrm{ft}$

3-Translational Static

Right Coordinate: $(770,2,100) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(125.0302,2,023.3206) f t$
Lower Left: $(129.0839,1,862.0217) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (349.907, 1,892.6963) ft
Y Increments: 15
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(355.4686,2,054.561) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $376.786,1,896.4962$ ) ft
Lower Right: (586.6277, 1,913.5323) ft
X Increments: 15
Yincrements: 15
Ending Angle: 65
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$

Model. Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclinatio
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Sercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1) Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
100 psf - A-Bed 4-8
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$

3 - Translational Static

## Data Point: ( $8,0.5$

Data Point: (8.1, 1)
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segmen
tercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
150 psf - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

## Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclinatio
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

## Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(11,0.425)$
Data Point: $(11.1,1)$
150 psf - A-Bed 6-11 (TQs)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
a Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: (11.1, 1)
Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Point 1 | -164 | 1,952 |  |  |
| Point 2 | -88 | 1,953 |  |  |
| Point 3 | 16 | 1,952 |  |  |
| Point 4 | 67 | 1,954 |  |  |
| Point 5 | 119 | 1,956 |  |  |
| Point 6 | 169 | 1,979 |  |  |
| Point 7 | 222 | 1,998 |  |  |
| Point 8 | 239 | 1,998 |  |  |
| Point 9 | 294 | 2,031 |  |  |
| Point 10 | 304 | 2,031 |  |  |
| Point 11 | 355 | 2,057 |  |  |
| Point 12 | 376 | 2,057 |  |  |
| Point 13 | 428 | 2,083 |  |  |
| Point 14 | 437 | 2,083 |  |  |
| Point 15 | 493 | 2,110 |  |  |
| Point 16 | 545 | 2,119 |  |  |
| Point 17 | 666.7794 | $2,082.2835$ |  |  |
| Point 18 | 678 | 2,078 |  |  |
| Point 19 | 691 | 2,075 |  |  |
| Point 20 | 734 | 2,093 |  |  |
| Point 21 | 770 | 2,100 |  |  |
| Point 22 | 770 | 2,070 |  |  |
| Point 23 | 769 | 2,033 |  |  |
| Point 24 | 768.9132 | $1,700.0035$ |  |  |
| Point 25 | -164 | 1,700 |  |  |
| Point 26 | -165 | 1,897 |  |  |
| Point 27 | 123 | 1,926 |  |  |
| Point 28 | 339 | 1,949 |  |  |
| Point 29 | 516 | 1,968 |  |  |
| Point 30 | 636 | 1,981 |  |  |
| Point 31 | 769 | 1,995 |  |  |
| Point 32 | 769 | 1,807 |  |  |
| Point 33 | -164 | 1,808 |  |  |
| Point 34 | -145.1146 | 1,807 |  |  |
| Point 35 | 94.3981 | $1,804.0495$ |  |  |
| Point 36 | 767.2671 | $1,804.0495$ |  |  |
| Point 37 | 178 | 1,980 |  |  |
| Point 38 | 769 | 1,935 |  |  |
| Point 39 | -164.3258 | 1,837 |  |  |
| Point 40 | 770 | 2,085 |  |  |
| Point 41 | 770 | 2,084 |  |  |
| Point 42 | 769.5405 | 2,053 |  |  |
| Point 43 | 769.5135 | 2,052 |  |  |
| Point 44 | 769.0811 | 2,036 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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| Point 45 | 769.0541 | 2,035 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 46 | 89 | $1,954.8462$ |
| Point 47 | 197 | 1,926 |
| Point 48 | 230.4185 | $1,937.6441$ |
| Point 49 | 410.1571 | $1,996.9191$ |
| Point 50 | 412.2316 | $1,997.8289$ |
| Point 51 | 462.5895 | $2,014.3399$ |
| Point 52 | 467.0781 | $2,015.9473$ |
| Point 53 | 544.2511 | $2,041.6026$ |
| Point 54 | 550.5628 | $2,043.7746$ |
| Point 55 | 566.1504 | $2,048.8086$ |
| Point 56 | 489.5416 | $2,023.5144$ |
| Point 57 | 579.8545 | $2,111.4639$ |
| Point 58 | 609.9957 | $2,103.2729$ |
| Point 59 | 648.9076 | $2,089.3897$ |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc (100 psf $/ 25^{\circ}$ -A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 26,39,38,31,30,29,28,48,47,27 | 55,091 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc <br> (150 <br> psf/ $17^{\circ}$ - <br> A-Bed 4- <br> $8^{\circ}$ ) | 33,34,35,36,32,38,39 | 76,059 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}$ -A-Bed 6$11^{\circ}$ ) | 40,21,20,19,18,17,55,54 | 2,168.2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs }(150 \\ \text { psf/170 } \\ \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ \left.11^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 43,51,50,44 | 4,432.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}$ -A-Bed 611 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 22,41,53,56,52,42 | 5,946.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 46,27,47,48,49,50,51,52,56,53,54,55,17,59,58,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,37,6,5 | 34,644 |
| Region $7$ | Along Bedding Shear | 45,44,50,49 | 301.67 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | Along Bedding Shear | 43,42,52,51 | 312.89 |
| Region | Along <br> Bedding | 41,40,54,53 | 221.08 |
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| 9 | Shear |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 10 | TQs $(150$ <br> psf/17 - <br> A-Bed 6- <br> $\left.11^{\circ}\right)$ | $4,3,2,1,26,27,46$ | 11,437 |
| Region <br> 11 | TQs $(150$ <br> psf/170 |  |  |
| A-Bed $6-$ <br> $\left.11^{\circ}\right)$ | $28,29,30,31,23,45,49,48$ | 18,001 |  |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 589,825
F of S : 1.531
Weime: $24,302.696 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $2,916,323.5 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $1,276,401.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $833,720.78 \mathrm{lbs}$
Fof $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 589,825 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: $(118.50469,1,955.9809) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (535.60985, 2,117.3748) ft
Entry: (535.60985, 2,17
Radius: 239.92928 ft
Center: (310.4629, 2,152.4703) ft
Slip Slices

| Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) Y (ft) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) Frictional Strength <br> (psf) Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) <br> Slice 1 118.75234 $1,955.8812$ 0 79.006332 51.307312 200 <br> Slice 2 122.93465 $1,954.1958$ 0 585.88929 380.48096 200 <br> Slice 3 135.2265 $1,951.4429$ 0 $1,552.3394$ $1,008.101$ 200 <br> Slice 4 149.937777 $1,950.3077$ 0 $2,385.1008$ $1,548.9026$ 200 <br> Slice 5 162.64593 $1,950.3718$ 0 $3,077.4165$ $1,998.4976$ 200 <br> Slice 6 172.1009 $1,950.4195$ 0 $3,462.9574$ $2,248.8708$ 200 <br> Slice 7 176.6009 $1,950.4119$ 0 $3,559.1833$ $2,311.3607$ 200 <br> Slice 8 186.93385 $1,950.2395$ 0 $4,040.4897$ $2,623.9247$ 200 <br> Slice 9 202.40078 $1,950.18$ 0 $4,746.9814$ $3,082.7258$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 10 215.46693 $1,950.3591$ 0 $5,363.3454$ $3,482.9972$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 11 224.52565 $1,950.4833$ 0 $5,667.3964$ $3,680.4503$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 12 233.02565 $1,950.2899$ 0 $5,824.1048$ $3,782.2179$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 13 245.51421 $1,949.8132$ 0 $6,358.9534$ $4,129.5526$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 14 258.58301 $1,949.3144$ 0 $7,376.1692$ $4,790.1403$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 15 272.3532 $1,950.398$ 0 $7,808.5001$ $2,387.298$ 150.075 <br> Slice <br> 16 286.7844 $1,953.0657$ 0 $8,501.9262$ $2,599.2997$ 150.075 <br> Slice 297.1771 $1,954.9869$ 0 $8,780.662$ $2,684.5178$ 150.075 |


| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 18 | 302.1771 | $1,955.9102$ | 0 | $8,674.7067$ | $2,652.124$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 312.2465 | $1,957.7664$ | 0 | $8,946.4951$ | $2,735.218$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 329.11975 | $1,960.9288$ | 0 | $9,564.5257$ | $2,924.169$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 346.37325 | $1,964.2133$ | 0 | $10,201.76$ | $3,118.9911$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 356.6918 | $1,966.1776$ | 0 | $10,483.14$ | $3,205.0174$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 367.1918 | $1,968.1923$ | 0 | $10,246.52$ | $3,132.6755$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 384.53927 | $1,971.5257$ | 0 | $10,354.724$ | $3,165.7567$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 401.61782 | $1,974.8075$ | 0 | $10,962.394$ | $3,351.5403$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 411.19435 | $1,976.6478$ | 0 | $11,303.136$ | $3,455.7155$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 414.8498 | $1,977.3502$ | 0 | $11,433.2$ | $3,495.4802$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 422.734 | $1,984.3333$ | 0 | $6,785.5505$ | $5,693.7529$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 429.38355 | $1,992.5158$ | 0 | $6,387.2073$ | $5,359.5033$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 433.31329 | $1,996.9323$ | 0 | $6,430.3184$ | $5,395.6778$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 436.22971 | $2,000.0409$ | 0 | $8,680.9026$ | $1,687.3965$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 436.79997 | $2,000.6487$ | 0 | $6,148.3956$ | $5,159.1165$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 440.44695 | $2,004.536$ | 0 | $5,979.5817$ | $5,017.4648$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 451.28935 | $2,016.0929$ | 0 | $6,010.2067$ | $3,903.0739$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 465.39438 | $2,031.196$ | 0 | $5,306.5622$ | $3,446.1218$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 478.81353 | $2,045.6365$ | 0 | $4,649.0419$ | $3,019.1231$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 37 | 489.26155 | $2,057.7149$ | 0 | $3,801.5812$ | $2,468.7757$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 38 | 499.0757 | $2,070.4684$ | 0 | $3,034.7025$ | $1,970.7589$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 39 | 511.2271 | $2,086.2591$ | 0 | $1,974.367$ | $1,282.1689$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 40 | 526.45632 | $2,105.7646$ | 0 | 675.869 | 438.91446 | 200 |
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## 2 - Translational Seismic

## Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 91
Date: 3/19/2016
Time: 1:57:45 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 2-2 SSA for Skyline Ranch3to1.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 2-2 results\Latest Update 3-19-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 2:00:22 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 3 - Translational Static
Method: Sp
Settings
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: Yes
Critical Slip Surface Optimizations
Maximum Iterations: 2,000
Convergence Tolerance: 1e-007
Starting Points: 8
Ending Points: 16
Complete Passes per Insertion: 1

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft
Search Method: Root Finder
Tolerable difference between starting and converged F of $\mathrm{S}: 3$
Maximum iterations to calculate converged lambda: 20
Max Absolute Lambda: 2

## Materials

TQs ( $150 \mathrm{psf} / \mathbf{1 7}^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \mathbf{6 - 1 1 ^ { \circ }}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-A-Bed $6-11^{\circ}$ (TQs)
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc (100 psf/25 ${ }^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion':
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $25^{\circ}-$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf - A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Chi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Along Bedding Shear
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $150 \mathrm{psf} / 17^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf - A-Bed 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8

2-Translational Seismic

Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-165, 1,897) ft
Right Coordinate: $(770,2,100) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.1
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## $25^{\circ}-$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: ( $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $4,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
100 psf - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

| Segment |
| :--- |

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$

150 psf - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: (4, 0.75)
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: (6, 0.425 )
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(11,1,1)$
150 psf - A-Bed 6-11º (TQs)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{( }$), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.667$ )
Data Point: $(11,0.667)$
Data Point: $(11.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -164 | 1,952 |
| Point 2 | -88 | 1,953 |
| Point 3 | 16 | 1,952 |
| Point 4 | 67 | 1,954 |
| Point 5 | 119 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 169 | 1,979 |
| Point 7 | 222 | 1,998 |
| Point 8 | 239 | 1,998 |
| Point 9 | 294 | 2,031 |
| Point 10 | 304 | 2,031 |
|  |  |  |

2-Translational Seismic

| Point 11 | 355 | 2,057 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 12 | 376 | 2,057 |
| Point 13 | 428 | 2,083 |
| Point 14 | 437 | 2,083 |
| Point 15 | 493 | 2,110 |
| Point 16 | 545 | 2,119 |
| Point 17 | 666.7794 | $2,082.2835$ |
| Point 18 | 678 | 2,078 |
| Point 19 | 691 | 2,075 |
| Point 20 | 734 | 2,093 |
| Point 21 | 770 | 2,100 |
| Point 22 | 770 | 2,070 |
| Point 23 | 769 | 2,033 |
| Point 24 | 768.9132 | $1,700.0035$ |
| Point 25 | -164 | 1,700 |
| Point 26 | -165 | 1,897 |
| Point 27 | 123 | 1,926 |
| Point 28 | 339 | 1,949 |
| Point 29 | 516 | 1,968 |
| Point 30 | 636 | 1,981 |
| Point 31 | 769 | 1,995 |
| Point 32 | 769 | 1,807 |
| Point 33 | -164 | 1,808 |
| Point 34 | -145.1146 | 1,807 |
| Point 35 | 94.3981 | $1,804.0495$ |
| Point 36 | 767.2671 | $1,804.0495$ |
| Point 37 | 178 | 1,980 |
| Point 38 | 769 | 1,935 |
| Point 39 | -164.3258 | 1,837 |
| Point 40 | 770 | 2,085 |
| Point 41 | 770 | 2,084 |
| Point 42 | 769.5405 | 2,053 |
| Point 43 | 769.5135 | 2,052 |
| Point 44 | 769.0811 | 2,036 |
| Point 45 | 769.0541 | 2,035 |
| Point 46 | 89 | $1,954.8462$ |
| Point 47 | 197 | 1,926 |
| Point 48 | 230.4185 | $1,937.6441$ |
| Point 49 | 410.1571 | $1,996.9191$ |
| Point 50 | 412.2316 | $1,997.8289$ |
| Point 51 | 462.5895 | $2,014.3399$ |
| Point 52 | 467.0781 | $2,015.9473$ |
| Point 53 | 544.2511 | $2,041.6026$ |
| Point 54 | 550.5628 | $2,043.7746$ |
| Point 55 | 566.1504 | $2,048.8086$ |
| Point 56 | 489.5416 | $2,023.5144$ |
| Point 57 | 579.8545 | $2,111.4639$ |
| Point 58 | 609.9957 | $2,103.2729$ |
| $-\quad-1$ |  |  |
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|  | 648.9076 | $2,089.3897$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Regions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Material | Points | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Region $1$ | Tmc <br> (100 <br> psf/ $25^{\circ}$ - <br> A-Bed 4- <br> $8^{\circ}$ ) | 26,39,38,31,30,29,28,48,47,27 | 55,091 |
| Region $2$ | Tmc <br> (150 <br> psf/ $17^{\circ}$ - <br> A-Bed 4- <br> $8^{\circ}$ ) | 33,34,35,36,32,38,39 | 76,059 |
| Region $3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs (150 } \\ & \text { psf/17 } \\ & \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ & \left.11^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 40,21,20,19,18,17,55,54 | 2,168.2 |
| Region <br> 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs (150 } \\ & \text { psf/170 } \\ & \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ & \left.11^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 43,51,50,44 | 4,432.1 |
| Region <br> 5 | TQs (150 psf/ $17^{\circ}$ -A-Bed 611) | 22,41,53,56,52,42 | 5,946.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 46,27,47,48,49,50,51,52,56,53,54,55,17,59,58,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,37,6,5 | 34,644 |
| Region $7$ | Along Bedding Shear | 45,44,50,49 | 301.67 |
| Region <br> 8 | Along Bedding Shear | 43,42,52,51 | 312.89 |
| Region $9$ | Along Bedding Shear | 41,40,54,53 | 221.08 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs (150 } \\ \text { psf/170 } \\ \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ \left.11^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4,3,2,1,26,27,46 | 11,437 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs (150 } \\ & \text { psf/17 }- \\ & \text { A-Bed 6- } \\ & \left.11^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 28,29,30,31,23,45,49,48 | 18,001 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 3
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.169$
Volume: $24,302.696 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $2,916,323.5 \mathrm{lbs}$

Resisting Moment: 2.8664325e+008 lbs-ft Activating Moment: $2.461686 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$ Resisting Force: $1,289,478.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $1,099,408.3 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 3 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 3 slip surfaces
Exit: (118.50469, 1,955.9809) ft
Extry: (535.60985, 2,117.3748) f
Radius: 239.92928 ft
Center: $(310.4629,2,152.4703) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 1 | 118.75234 | $1,955.8811$ | 0 | 406.7871 | 264.17063 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 122.93465 | $1,954.1958$ | 0 | $1,456.1212$ | 945.61619 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 135.2265 | $1,951.4429$ | 0 | $2,392.984$ | $1,554.022$ | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 149.93777 | $1,950.3077$ | 0 | $3,088.6657$ | $2,005.8029$ | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 162.64593 | $1,950.3718$ | 0 | $3,954.1748$ | $2,567.8711$ | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 172.1009 | $1,950.4195$ | 0 | $4,436.1651$ | $2,880.8793$ | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 176.6009 | $1,950.4119$ | 0 | $4,652.8257$ | $3,021.5804$ | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 186.93385 | $1,950.2395$ | 0 | $5,266.9634$ | $3,420.406$ | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 202.40078 | $1,950.18$ | 0 | $5,992.5673$ | $3,891.6187$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 215.46693 | $1,950.3591$ | 0 | $6,757.0076$ | $4,388.052$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 224.52565 | $1,950.4833$ | 0 | $7,134.1034$ | $4,632.9409$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 233.02565 | $1,950.2899$ | 0 | $7,703.9564$ | $5,003.0078$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 245.51421 | $1,949.8132$ | 0 | $8,400.7856$ | $5,455.5339$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 258.58301 | $1,949.3144$ | 0 | $9,726.0687$ | $6,316.1829$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 272.3532 | $1,950.398$ | 0 | $7,483.0193$ | $2,287.7886$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 286.7844 | $1,953.0657$ | 0 | $8,142.8478$ | $2,489.5184$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 297.1771 | $1,954.9869$ | 0 | $8,408.0784$ | $2,570.6075$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 302.1771 | $1,955.9102$ | 0 | $8,309.5904$ | $2,540.4967$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 312.2465 | $1,957.7664$ | 0 | $8,568.2817$ | $2,619.5866$ | 150.075 |
| Slice | 329.11975 | $1,960.9288$ | 0 | $9,126.865$ | $2,790.3627$ | 150.075 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 25 | 401.61782 | $1,974.8075$ | 0 | $10,443.095$ | $3,192.7747$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 411.19435 | $1,976.6478$ | 0 | $10,766.07$ | $3,291.5179$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 414.8498 | $1,977.3502$ | 0 | $10,889.354$ | $3,329.2095$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 422.734 | $1,984.3333$ | 0 | $4,983.9929$ | $4,182.0666$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 429.38355 | $1,992.5158$ | 0 | $4,692.0303$ | $3,937.0809$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 433.31329 | $1,996.9323$ | 0 | $4,922.4232$ | $4,130.4035$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 436.22971 | $2,000.0409$ | 0 | $5,824.6994$ | $1,132.2069$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 436.79997 | $2,000.6487$ | 0 | $4,707.3255$ | $3,949.9151$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 440.44695 | $2,004.536$ | 0 | $4,578.5221$ | $3,841.8362$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 451.28935 | $2,016.0929$ | 0 | $4,445.4702$ | $2,886.9221$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 465.39438 | $2,031.196$ | 0 | $3,916.2068$ | $2,543.2145$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 478.81353 | $2,045.6365$ | 0 | $3,432.8164$ | $2,229.297$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 37 | 489.26155 | $2,057.7149$ | 0 | $2,663.6924$ | $1,729.8221$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 38 | 499.0757 | $2,070.4684$ | 0 | $2,128.0008$ | $1,381.9399$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 39 | 511.2271 | $2,086.2591$ | 0 | $1,387.3195$ | 900.93583 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 40 | 526.45632 | $2,105.7646$ | 0 | 484.18537 | 314.43365 | 200 |
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Section 2-2
Materials
$\square$ TQs (150 psf $/ 17^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 6-11^{\circ}$ )
$\square$ Tmc ( $100 \mathrm{psf} / 25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Along Bedding Shear
Tmc (150 psf/17 ${ }^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
$0^{1.388}$

Name: $\operatorname{Tmc}\left(100\right.$ pst/ $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed $\left.4-8^{\circ}\right)$
Moode : Ansortopic er
Unit Weight: 220 pet



$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\partial}$


Tmc (150 psf/17 $\left.-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4-8^{\circ}\right)$


Distance (ft)
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## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 94
Date: 3/19/2016
Time: 2:13:34 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 2-2 SSA for Skyline Ranch3to1.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 2-2 results\Latest Update 3-19-16
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 2:15:32 PM

Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: $p$
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

5 - Translational Temporary
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: Yes
Critical Slip Surface Optimizations
Maximum Iterations: 2,000
Convergence Tolerance: 1e-007
Starting Points: 8
Ending Points: 16
Complete Passes per Insertion: 1 Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none) F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.0
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

```
TQs (150 psf/17 }\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\mathrm{ - A-Bed 6-11 )
    Model: Anisotropic Fn
    Unit Weight:120 pcf
    Cohesion': 225 psf
    Phi': 40 }\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ
    Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 170}- A-Bed 6-11* *
    C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: }150\mathrm{ psf - A-Bed 6-110}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}(TQs
```

    Phi-B: 0
    Tmc ( $\left.100 \mathrm{psf} / 25^{\circ}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4-8^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf - A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Along Bedding Shear
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': 11
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $150 \mathrm{psf} / \mathbf{1 7}^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf - A-Bed 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8
Phi-B: 0
Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: (-165, 1,897) ft
Right Coordinate: $(770,2,100)$ ft

Slip Surface Block
Left Grid
Upper Left: (375.131, 2,080.4026) ft

Lower Left: (391.5828, 1,949.63) ft
Lower Right: (574.0478, 1,976.1582) ft
X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Starting Angle: $135{ }^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(574.5182,2,103.0179) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Left: (592.2047, 1,972.2456) ft Lower Right: (759.7473, 1,982.8533) ft
X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## $25^{\circ}$ - A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $4,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
100 psf - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $4,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(8,0.42)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf - A-Bed 4-8
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclinatio
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1
$17^{\circ}$ - A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
$Y$-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (5.9, 1)
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(11,0.425)$
Data Point: $(11.1,1)$
150 psf - A-Bed 6-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (TQs)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclinatio
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (6, 0.667)
Data Point: (11, 0.667)
Data Point: (11.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -164 | 1,952 |
| Point 2 | -88 | 1,953 |
| Point 3 | 16 | 1,952 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 4 | 67 | 1,954 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 5 | 119 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 169 | 1,979 |
| Point 7 | 222 | 1,998 |
| Point 8 | 239 | 1,998 |
| Point 9 | 294 | 2,031 |
| Point 10 | 304 | 2,031 |
| Point 11 | 355 | 2,057 |
| Point 12 | 376 | 2,057 |
| Point 13 | 428 | 2,083 |
| Point 14 | 437 | 2,083 |
| Point 15 | 493 | 2,110 |
| Point 16 | 545 | 2,119 |
| Point 17 | 666.7794 | $2,082.2835$ |
| Point 18 | 678 | 2,078 |
| Point 19 | 691 | 2,075 |
| Point 20 | 734 | 2,093 |
| Point 21 | 770 | 2,100 |
| Point 22 | 770 | 2,070 |
| Point 23 | 769 | 2,033 |
| Point 24 | 768.9132 | $1,700.0035$ |
| Point 25 | -164 | 1,700 |
| Point 26 | -165 | 1,897 |
| Point 27 | 123 | 1,926 |
| Point 28 | 339 | 1,949 |
| Point 29 | 516 | 1,968 |
| Point 30 | 636 | 1,981 |
| Point 31 | 769 | 1,995 |
| Point 32 | 769 | 1,807 |
| Point 33 | -164 | 1,808 |
| Point 34 | -145.1146 | 1,807 |
| Point 35 | 94.3981 | $1,804.0495$ |
| Point 36 | 767.2671 | $1,804.0495$ |
| Point 37 | 178 | 1,980 |
| Point 38 | 769 | 1,935 |
| Point 39 | -164.3258 | 1,837 |
| Point 40 | 770 | 2,085 |
| Point 41 | 770 | 2,084 |
| Point 42 | 769.5405 | 2,053 |
| Point 43 | 769.5135 | 2,052 |
| Point 44 | 769.0811 | 2,036 |
| Point 45 | 769.0541 | 2,035 |
| Point 46 | 89 | $1,954.8462$ |
| Point 47 | 197 | 1,926 |
| Point 48 | 230.4185 | $1,937.6441$ |
| Point 49 | 410.1571 | $1,996.9191$ |
| Point 50 | 412.2316 | $1,997.8289$ |
| Point 51 | 462.5895 | $2,014.3399$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 |
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|  | 467.0781 | $2,015.9473$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 53 | 544.2511 | $2,041.6026$ |
| Point 54 | 550.5628 | $2,043.7746$ |
| Point 55 | 566.1504 | $2,048.8086$ |
| Point 56 | 489.5416 | $2,023.5144$ |
| Point 57 | 579.8545 | $2,111.4639$ |
| Point 58 | 609.9957 | $2,103.2729$ |
| Point 59 | 648.9076 | $2,089.3897$ |
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$\qquad$
Current Slip Surface
Slip Surface: 589,825
F of S: 1.388
Volume: $4,095.293 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $491,435.16 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $143,521.09 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $103,406.68 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 589,825 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Entry: (617 00763, 2,065.7266) ft
Radius: 10408933 ft -66)
Radius: 104.08933 ft
Center: ( $503.9407,2,084.4457$ ) ft

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) Y (ft) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) Frictional Strength <br> (psf) Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) <br> Slice 1 417.32814 $1,998.8137$ 0 155.68729 130.63715 225 <br> Slice 2 419.01703 $1,998.3293$ 0 247.78936 48.165373 150 <br> Slice 3 423.79475 $1,998.553$ 0 353.54758 68.722687 150 <br> Slice 4 432.0779 $1,999.3171$ 0 584.77313 113.66838 150 <br> Slice 5 436.5779 $1,999.7374$ 0 707.29512 137.48424 150 <br> Slice 6 440.44925 $2,000.1417$ 0 809.60325 157.37093 150 <br> Slice 7 447.60312 $2,000.9009$ 0 996.42984 193.68634 150 <br> Slice 8 455.01238 $2,001.6989$ 0 $1,189.2822$ 231.17303 150 <br> Slice 9 460.65325 $2,002.3022$ 0 $1,337.2345$ 259.93205 150 <br> Slice <br> 10 464.8338 $2,002.7434$ 0 $1,455.1793$ 282.8582 150 <br> Slice <br> 11 470.22625 $2,003.3125$ 0 $1,608.3354$ 312.62874 150 <br> Slice <br> 12 477.4162 $2,004.072$ 0 $1,804.8717$ 350.83152 150 <br> Slice <br> 13 485.4998 $2,004.9265$ 0 $2,025.8265$ 393.78078 150 <br> Slice <br> 14 491.2708 $2,005.5366$ 0 $2,182.2935$ 424.19488 150 <br> Slice <br> 15 494.20165 $2,005.8465$ 0 $2,260.242$ 439.34655 150 <br> Slice <br> 16 499.07477 $2,006.3616$ 0 $2,389.8465$ 464.5391 150 <br> Slice <br> 17 506.4177 $2,007.1379$ 0 $2,585.1379$ 502.4999 150 <br> Slice <br> 18 513.76063 $2,007.9142$ 0 $2,780.4293$ 540.46071 150 <br> Slice <br> 19 520.39385 $2,008.6166$ 0 $2,956.5112$ 574.68757 150 <br> Slice <br> 20 526.31735 $2,009.2451$ 0 $3,113.7724$ 605.25605 150 <br> Slice       |


| 21 | 532.2352 | $2,009.8737$ | 0 | $3,270.6692$ | 635.75368 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 22 | 539.7212 | $2,010.6708$ | 0 | $3,468.9172$ | 674.28921 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 544.62555 | $2,011.1936$ | 0 | $3,599.4283$ | 699.65799 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 547.7814 | $2,011.53$ | 0 | $3,688.0625$ | 716.88672 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 554.07528 | $2,012.2008$ | 0 | $3,856.0364$ | 749.53755 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 561.10023 | $2,012.9496$ | 0 | $4,035.7494$ | 784.47021 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 565.38155 | $2,013.4063$ | 0 | $4,144.964$ | 805.69939 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 570.0094 | $2,013.9014$ | 0 | $4,267.5554$ | 829.52874 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 576.86145 | $2,014.869$ | 0 | $4,367.2022$ | 848.89811 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 581.77095 | $2,015.779$ | 0 | $4,451.7981$ | 865.3419 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 586.32661 | $2,019.7328$ | 0 | $2,235.1996$ | $1,875.5552$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 591.59119 | $2,026.9111$ | 0 | $1,877.8913$ | $1,575.7379$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 594.63212 | $2,031.0574$ | 0 | $2,620.6467$ | 509.40211 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 595.53539 | $2,032.289$ | 0 | $1,610.1971$ | $1,351.1158$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 599.51625 | $2,038.0847$ | 0 | $1,262.453$ | $1,059.3238$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 606.50255 | $2,048.3462$ | 0 | 757.45992 | 635.58434 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 37 | 610.18033 | $2,053.7481$ | 0 | 491.6179 | 412.51639 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 38 | 610.7515 | $2,054.587$ | 0 | 770.44213 | 149.75878 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 39 | 611.52332 | $2,055.7207$ | 0 | 394.54208 | 331.06012 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 40 | 614.45811 | $2,061.0066$ | 0 | 78.002255 | 65.451663 | 225 |
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## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

## eport generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.
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    Date: 3/19/2016
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness:

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 5-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 ps
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 17 degres A-Bed 5-17
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed 4-8웅
Phi-B: 0
TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 11 degres A-Bed 13-17
Phi-Anisotropic Strength fn.: 11 degres A-bed $13-17^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed 13-17
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-b. 0
Tmc ( 150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 17 degres A-Bed 4-8ㅇ (Tmc)
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(96.0789,1,960.6335)$ ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(239,2,016.8421) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 20
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(278.8077,2,035)$ ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(711.9752,2,122.4976) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 20
Radius Increments: 20
Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: (-200, 1,891) ft
Right Coordinate: $(810.0186,2,043.084) \mathrm{ft}$

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Seismic Coefficients
Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

17 degres A-Bed 5-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## tercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
150 psf A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
tegment 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (3.9, 1)
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.75$ )
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
11 degres A-Bed 13-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.275)$
Data Point: $(17,0.275)$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)
150 psf A-Bed 13-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: $(17,0.667)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
17 degres A-Bed 4-8º (Tmc)
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 1,945 |
| Point 2 | -60 | 1,952 |
| Point 3 | -8 | 1,953 |
| Point 4 | 50 | 1,956 |
| Point 5 | 91 | 1,958 |
| Point 6 | 145 | 1,986 |
| Point 7 | 155 | 1,986 |
| Point 8 | 206 | 2,010 |
| Point 9 | 224 | 2,010 |
| Point 10 | 281 | 2,036 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 2,036 |
| Point 12 | 347 | 2,057 |
| Point 13 | 356 | 2,059 |
| Point 14 | 408 | 2,083 |
| Point 15 | 420 | 2,083 |
| Point 16 | 454 | 2,097 |
| Point 17 | 482 | 2,096 |
| Point 18 | 810 | 2,134 |
| Point 19 | 810 | 2,130 |
| Point 20 | 810 | 1,998 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,801 |
| Point 22 | -200 | 1,891 |
| Point 23 | 499 | 1,965 |
| Point 24 | -200 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | 89.9947 | $1,921.9873$ |
| Point 26 | 490.0406 | $2,009.3202$ |
| Point 27 | 810.0186 | $2,043.084$ |
| Point 28 | 113 | $1,969.4074$ |
| Point 29 | 60 | $1,956.4878$ |
| Point 30 | 91 | 1,928 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Point 31 | 191 | 1,928 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 32 | 149.5 | 1,928 |
| Point 33 | 198.129 | $1,930.307$ |
| Point 34 | 398.5487 | $1,997.0656$ |
| Point 35 | 532 | 2,096 |
| Point 36 | 582.4244 | $2,110.0118$ |
| Point 37 | 632.8615 | $2,116.9809$ |
| Point 38 | 674.6211 | $2,119.9729$ |
| Point 39 | 749 | 2,125 |
| Point 40 | 759 | 2,129 |
| Point 41 | 810 | 2,151 |



## Current Slip Surface <br> Slip Surface: 194

Fof S : 2.06
Volume: $10,364.018 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,243,682.1 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $5.37939 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
Activating Moment: $2.6067294 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 9,261 slip surfaces
Fxit: (96.078899, 1,960.6335) ft
Entry: (468.13688, 2,096.4951) ft
Radius: 631.47933 ft
Center: (76.432745, 2,591.8071) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice 1 | 104.53945 | $1,961.0105$ | 0 | 470.29476 | 305.41299 | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice 2 | 118.33333 | $1,961.7421$ | 0 | $1,219.7448$ | 792.11152 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 3 | 129 | $1,962.5424$ | 0 | $1,764.9248$ | $1,146.1555$ | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 139.66667 | $1,963.5247$ | 0 | $2,283.2049$ | $1,482.7306$ | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 150 | $1,964.648$ | 0 | $2,460.1684$ | $1,597.652$ | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 161.375 | $1,966.0999$ | 0 | $2,622.9322$ | $1,703.3521$ | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 174.125 | $1,967.9636$ | 0 | $3,077.6916$ | $1,998.6763$ | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 186.875 | $1,970.0944$ | 0 | $3,496.2271$ | $2,270.4764$ | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 199.625 | $1,972.495$ | 0 | $3,878.7919$ | $2,518.9169$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 215 | $1,975.7875$ | 0 | $3,814.0161$ | $2,476.851$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 229.7 | $1,979.2382$ | 0 | $3,689.0343$ | $2,395.6869$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 241.1 | $1,982.204$ | 0 | $3,913.0786$ | $2,541.183$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 252.5 | $1,985.3987$ | 0 | $4,109.0028$ | $2,668.4176$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 263.9 | $1,988.8258$ | 0 | $4,276.8074$ | $2,777.3912$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 275.3 | $1,992.4893$ | 0 | $4,416.4619$ | $2,868.0839$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 286 | $1,996.1398$ | 0 | $4,276.2159$ | $2,777.007$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 296.6 | $1,999.9822$ | 0 | $4,062.9669$ | $2,638.5216$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 307.8 | $2,004.2707$ | 0 | $4,026.887$ | $2,615.091$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 319 | $2,008.8059$ | 0 | $3,964.4719$ | $2,574.5581$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 330.2 | $2,013.5936$ | 0 | $3,875.5695$ | $2,516.8242$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 341.4 | $2,018.6401$ | 0 | $3,759.9991$ | $2,441.772$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 351.5 | $2,023.4066$ | 0 | $3,562.3993$ | $2,313.4491$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 362.5 | $2,028.8875$ | 0 | $3,383.727$ | $2,197.418$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 375.5 | $2,035.6863$ | 0 | $3,272.3663$ | $2,125.0995$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 388.5 | $2,042.877$ | 0 | $3,121.797$ | $2,027.3187$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 401.5 | $2,050.4755$ | 0 | $2,931.4212$ | $1,903.6872$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 414 | $2,058.1742$ | 0 | $2,433.8469$ | $1,580.5586$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 425.66667 | $2,065.7315$ | 0 | $1,892.9113$ | $1,229.271$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 437 | $2,073.4349$ | 0 | $1,575.8757$ | $1,023.3856$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 448.33333 | $2,081.5063$ | 0 | $1,227.4638$ | 797.12432 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 461.06844 | $2,091.0656$ | 0 | 489.3096 | 317.76137 | 200 |
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## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness:

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Diving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01

Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Materials
TQs ( 150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed $5-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 p
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 17 degres A-Bed 5-17
Phi-B: 0
TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 11 degres A-Bed 13-17
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed 13-170
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( 150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 17 degres A-Bed 4-80 (Tma)
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,891) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: ( $810.0186,2,043.084$ ) ft

Seismic Coefficients
Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

17 degres A-Bed 5-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Dants: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (5, 0.425 )
Data Point: (17, 0.425)
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
150 psf A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $4,0.75$ )
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
11 degres A-Bed 13-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.275)$
Data Point: $(13,0.275)$
Data Point: $(17,0.275)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
150 psf A-Bed 13-17
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination (
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: ( $13,0.667$ )
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
17 degres A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)

```
Data Point: \((3.9,1)\)
Data Point: ( \(4,0.425\) )
Data Point: ( \(8,0.425\) )
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
```


## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 1,945 |
| Point 2 | -60 | 1,952 |
| Point 3 | -8 | 1,953 |
| Point 4 | 50 | 1,956 |
| Point 5 | 91 | 1,958 |
| Point 6 | 145 | 1,986 |
| Point 7 | 155 | 1,986 |
| Point 8 | 206 | 2,010 |
| Point 9 | 224 | 2,010 |
| Point 10 | 281 | 2,036 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 2,036 |
| Point 12 | 347 | 2,007 |
| Point 13 | 356 | 2,059 |
| Point 14 | 408 | 2,083 |
| Point 15 | 420 | 2,083 |
| Point 16 | 454 | 2,097 |
| Point 17 | 482 | 2,096 |
| Point 18 | 810 | 2,134 |
| Point 19 | 810 | 2,130 |
| Point 20 | 810 | 1,998 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,801 |
| Point 22 | -200 | 1,891 |
| Point 23 | 499 | 1,965 |
| Point 24 | -200 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | 89.9947 | $1,921.9873$ |
| Point 26 | 490.0406 | $2,009.3202$ |
| Point 27 | 810.0186 | $2,043.084$ |
| Point 28 | 113 | $1,969.4074$ |
| Point 29 | 60 | $1,956.4878$ |
| Point 30 | 91 | 1,928 |
| Point 31 | 191 | 1,928 |
| Point 32 | 149.5 | 1,928 |
| Point 33 | 198.129 | $1,930.307$ |
| Point 34 | 398.5487 | $1,997.0656$ |
| Point 35 | 532 | 2,096 |
| Point 36 | 582.4244 | $2,110.0118$ |
| Point 37 | 6328615 | $2,116.9809$ |
| Point 38 | 674.6211 | $2,119.9729$ |
| Point 39 | 749 | 2,125 |
| Point 40 | 759 | 2,129 |
| Point 41 | 810 | 2,151 |
|  |  |  |


| Regions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 517") | 18,34,26,27,19 | 18,289 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,33,31,32,22,24,21 | $1.4487 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 29,30,32,31,33,34,18,41,40,39,38,37,36,35,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,28,5 | 40,344 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $13-17^{\circ}$ ) | 26,34,33,23,20,27 | 22,901 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $13-17^{\circ}$ ) | 4,3,2,1,22,32,30,29 | 12,840 |

Current Slip Surface
Slip Surface: 1
F of $S: 1.40$

Volume: $10,364.018 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,243,682.1 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 5.1344587e+008 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $3.674462 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Entry (46813688 2,096.4951) ft
Radius: 631.47933 ft
Center: $(76.432745,2,591.8071) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Slices

| X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 1 | 104.53945 | $1,961.0105$ | 0 | 465.2146 | 302.1139 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 118.33333 | $1,961.7421$ | 0 | $1,205.0082$ | 782.54146 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 129 | $1,962.5424$ | 0 | $1,739.9983$ | $1,129.9681$ | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 139.66667 | $1,963.5247$ | 0 | $2,245.9495$ | $1,458.5367$ | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 150 | $1,964.648$ | 0 | $2,414.1218$ | $1,567.749$ | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 161.375 | $1,966.0999$ | 0 | $2,566.9636$ | $1,667.0056$ | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 174.125 | $1,967.9636$ | 0 | $3,003.7843$ | $1,950.6803$ | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 186.875 | $1,970.0944$ | 0 | $3,402.8733$ | $2,209.8518$ | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 199.625 | $1,972.495$ | 0 | $3,764.7843$ | $2,444.8795$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 215 | $1,975.7875$ | 0 | $3,688.4764$ | $2,395.3246$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 229.7 | $1,979.2382$ | 0 | $3,555.0502$ | $2,308.6766$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 12 | 241.1 | $1,982.204$ | 0 | $3,761.5749$ | $2,442.7953$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 13 | 252.5 | $1,985.3987$ | 0 | $3,940.0069$ | $2,558.6704$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 263.9 | $1,988.8258$ | 0 | $4,090.5374$ | $2,656.4261$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 275.3 | $1,992.4893$ | 0 | $4,213.324$ | $2,736.1646$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 286 | $1,996.1398$ | 0 | $4,068.8967$ | $2,642.3724$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 296.6 | $1,999.9822$ | 0 | $3,855.6149$ | $2,503.8656$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 307.8 | $2,004.2707$ | 0 | $3,811.0677$ | $2,474.9363$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 319 | $2,008.8059$ | 0 | $3,741.6749$ | $2,429.8721$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 330.2 | $2,013.5936$ | 0 | $3,647.4692$ | $2,368.6942$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 341.4 | $2,018.6401$ | 0 | $3,528.4607$ | $2,291.4092$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 351.5 | $2,023.4066$ | 0 | $3,333.6839$ | $2,164.9196$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 362.5 | $2,028.8875$ | 0 | $3,156.7226$ | $2,049.9996$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 375.5 | $2,035.6863$ | 0 | $3,041.9503$ | $1,975.4656$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 388.5 | $2,042.877$ | 0 | $2,891.0912$ | $1,877.4966$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 401.5 | $2,050.4755$ | 0 | $2,703.9297$ | $1,755.9525$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 414 | $2,058.1742$ | 0 | $2,233.3438$ | $1,450.3504$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 425.66667 | $2,065.7315$ | 0 | $1,725.884$ | $1,120.8022$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 437 | $2,073.4349$ | 0 | $1,427.7424$ | 927.18675 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 448.33333 | $2,081.5063$ | 0 | $1,102.4191$ | 715.91934 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 461.06844 | $2,091.0656$ | 0 | 421.7951 | 273.91694 | 200 |
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$\stackrel{\text { Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd. }}{\text { It }}$

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 8
Date. 3/19/2016
Time: 4:54:49 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 3 SSA A for Skyline Ranch Development project.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 3-3 results\Latest update 3-19-16\
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 4:58:31 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Spencer
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Search Method: Root Finder
Tolerable difference between starting and converged F of $\mathrm{S}: 3$
Maximum iterations to calculate converged lambda: 20
Max Absolute Lambda: 2

Materials
TQs (150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $5-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 17 degres A-Bed 5-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed 4-80 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $\left.13-17^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion':
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 11 degres A-Bed 13-170
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed 13-17
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( 150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
: 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 17 degres A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed 4-80 (Tmc)
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,891) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810.0186,2,043.084) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: ( $60.7191,1,971.3745$ ) ft
Lower Left: ( $80.0568,1,871.0374$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

2-Translational

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Upper Left: (379.9024, 2,062.6097) ft
Lower Left: (377.6595, 1,898.3154) ft
Lower Right: (657.6469, 1,932.9766) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

Seismic Coefficients
Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

17 degres A-Bed 5-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Intercept: 1
Y-Intercept. 1 Intination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425 )
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)
150 psf A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (4, 0.75)
Data Point: ( $8,0.75$ )
Data Point: ( $(8.1,1)$
11 degres A-Bed 13-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$

2 - Translational

> Data Point: $(13,0.275)$
> Data Point: $(17,0.275)$
> Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

150 psf A-Bed 13-17
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: (17 1 1)
17 degres A-Bed 4-8ㅇ ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segept:1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.425$ )
Data Point: (8.1, 1)

Points
Oints

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 1,945 |
| Poont 2 | -60 | 1,952 |
| Point 3 | -8 | 1,953 |
| Point 4 | 50 | 1,956 |
| Point 5 | 91 | 1,958 |
| Point 6 | 145 | 1,986 |
| Point 7 | 155 | 1,986 |
| Point 8 | 206 | 2,010 |
| Point 9 | 224 | 2,010 |
| Point 10 | 281 | 2,036 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 2,036 |
| Point 12 | 347 | 2,057 |
| Point 13 | 356 | 2,059 |
| Point 14 | 408 | 2,083 |
| Point 15 | 420 | 2,083 |
| Point 16 | 454 | 2,097 |
| Point 17 | 482 | 2,096 |
| Point 18 | 810 | 2,134 |
| Point 19 | 810 | 2,130 |
| Point 20 | 810 | 1,998 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 21 | 810 | 1,801 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 22 | -200 | 1,891 |
| Point 23 | 499 | 1,965 |
| Point 24 | -200 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | 89.9947 | $1,921.9873$ |
| Point 26 | 490.0406 | $2,009.3202$ |
| Point 27 | 810.0186 | $2,043.084$ |
| Point 28 | 113 | $1,969.4074$ |
| Point 29 | 60 | $1,956.4878$ |
| Point 30 | 91 | 1,928 |
| Point 31 | 191 | 1,928 |
| Point 32 | 149.5 | 1,928 |
| Point 33 | 198.129 | $1,930.307$ |
| Point 34 | 398.5487 | $1,997.0656$ |
| Point 35 | 532 | 2,096 |
| Point 36 | 582.4244 | $2,110.0118$ |
| Point 37 | 632.8615 | $2,116.9809$ |
| Point 38 | 674.6211 | $2,119.9729$ |
| Point 39 | 749 | 2,125 |
| Point 40 | 759 | 2,129 |
| Point 41 | 810 | 2,151 |


| Regions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| Region | TQs (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 517잉 | 18,34,26,27,19 | 18,289 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,33,31,32,22,24,21 | $1.4487 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 29,30,32,31,33,34,18,41,40,39,38,37,36,35,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,28,5 | 40,344 |
| Region <br> 4 | TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $\qquad$ | 26,34,33,23,20,27 | 22,901 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs }(150 \\ \text { psf } 11^{\circ} \\ \text { A-Bed } \\ \left.13-17^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4,3,2,1,22,32,30,29 | 12,840 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 65,924
F of S: 1.60
Weight: $4,691.303 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Resisting Moment: $3.4365662 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $2.1520809 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
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Resisting Force: $1,409,139.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating force: $88,137.8511,5$
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(118.84895,1,972.4402) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: ( $642.58224,2,117.6774$ ) ft
Radius: 256.67241 ft
Center: $(350.50865,2,153.9867) \mathrm{ft}$
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| Slice <br> 26 | 500.53045 | $2,003.5202$ | 0 | $10,556.016$ | $2,051.8816$ | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 27 | 521.51015 | $2,008.4885$ | 0 | $9,988.6981$ | $1,941.6062$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 542.56809 | $2,013.4753$ | 0 | $9,754.5912$ | $1,896.1005$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 564.0663 | $2,018.5664$ | 0 | $9,824.1554$ | $3,003.5457$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 578.71041 | $2,026.4589$ | 0 | $5,050.9362$ | $4,238.2387$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 594.52014 | $2,049.0376$ | 0 | $3,812.5537$ | $3,199.1124$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 613.17728 | $2,075.6827$ | 0 | $2,514.9824$ | $1,633.2487$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 626.30009 | $2,094.4241$ | 0 | $1,373.0777$ | 891.68705 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 637.72187 | $2,110.736$ | 0 | 357.38028 | 232.08547 | 200 |
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## 2 - Translational Seismic

## keport tenerated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 8
Date: 3/19/2016
Time: 4:54:49 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 3 SSA A for Skyline Ranch Development project.gsz
Directory: P:\IFINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 3-3 results\Latest update 3-19-16\
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 5:02:01 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 2 -Translational
Method: Spencer
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01

## Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Minimum Slip Surface Depth:
Search Method: Root Finder
Tolerable difference between starting and converged F of $\mathrm{S}: 3$
Maximum iterations to calculate converged lambda: 20
Max Absolute Lambda: 2

Materials
TQs (150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $5-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 17 degres A-Bed 5-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs ( 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $13-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 11 degres A-Bed 13-17
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed $13-17^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( 150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 17 degres A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}(\mathrm{Tmc}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,891)$ ft
Right Coordinate: ( $810.0186,2,043.084$ ) ft

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

2-Translational Seismic

17 degres A-Bed 5-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $5,0.425$ )
Data Point: ( $17,0.425$ Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

150 psf A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
11 degres A-Bed 13-17
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $13,0.275$ )
Data Point: $(17,0.275)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
150 psf A-Bed 13-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667$
Data Point: ( $17,0.667$ )
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
17 degres A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ (Tmc)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 1,945 |
| Point 2 | -60 | 1,952 |
| Point 3 | -8 | 1,953 |
| Point 4 | 50 | 1,956 |
| Point 5 | 91 | 1,958 |
| Point 6 | 145 | 1,986 |
| Point 7 | 155 | 1,986 |
| Point 8 | 206 | 2,010 |
| Point 9 | 224 | 2,010 |
| Point 10 | 281 | 2,036 |
| Point 11 | 291 | 2,036 |
| Point 12 | 347 | 2,057 |
| Point 13 | 356 | 2,059 |
| Point 14 | 408 | 2,083 |
| Point 15 | 420 | 2,083 |
| Point 16 | 454 | 2,097 |
| Point 17 | 482 | 2,096 |
| Point 18 | 810 | 2,134 |
| Point 19 | 810 | 2,130 |
| Point 20 | 810 | 1,998 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,801 |
| Point 22 | -200 | 1,891 |
| Point 23 | 499 | 1,965 |
| Point 24 | -200 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | 89.9947 | $1,921.9873$ |
| Point 26 | 490.0406 | $2,009.3202$ |
| Point 27 | 810.0186 | $2,043.084$ |
| Point 28 | 113 | $1,969.4074$ |
| Point 29 | 60 | $1,956.4878$ |
| Point 30 | 91 | 1,928 |
| Point 31 | 191 | 1,928 |
| Point 32 | 149.5 | 1,928 |
| Point 33 | 198.129 | $1,930.307$ |
| Point 34 | 398.5487 | $1,997.0656$ |
| Point 35 | 532 | 2,096 |
| Point 36 | 582.4244 | $2,110.0118$ |
| Point 37 | 632.8615 | $2,116.9809$ |
| Point 38 | 674.6211 | $2,119.9729$ |
|  |  |  |



## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs }(150 \\ \text { psf } 17^{\circ} \\ \text { A-Bed 5- } \\ \hline \end{array}$ $\left.17^{\circ}\right)$ | 18,34,26,27,19 | 18,289 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,33,31,32,22,24,21 | $1.4487 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 29,30,32,31,33,34,18,41,40,39,38,37,36,35,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,28,5 | 40,344 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs }(150 \\ \text { psf } 11^{\circ} \\ \text { A-Bed } \\ \left.13-17^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 26,34,33,23,20,27 | 22,901 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs }(150 \\ \text { psf } 11^{\circ} \\ \text { A-Bed } \\ \left.13-17^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4,3,2,1,22,32,30,29 | 12,840 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 1
Slip Surface: 1
F of S: 1.11
Volume: $39,094.946 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $4,691,393.5 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $3.7213436 e+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: 3.3508753e+008 lbs-ft
Resisting Force: $1,517,288.4 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $1,378,623.5 \mathrm{lbs}$
Fof $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Exit: $(118.84895,1,972.4402)$ ft
Entry: $(642.552244,2,117.6774)$ ft
Radius. 256.67241
Slip Slices
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 1 | 131.92447 | $1,967.0241$ | 0 | $3,345.9507$ | $2,172.8858$ | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 150 | $1,959.537$ | 0 | $6,925.0032$ | $4,497.1497$ | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 163.5 | $1,953.9451$ | 0 | $9,331.2413$ | $6,059.779$ | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 180.5 | $1,946.9035$ | 0 | $13,104.612$ | $8,510.2344$ | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 197.5 | $1,939.8619$ | 0 | $16,877.98$ | $10,960.689$ | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 207.97385 | $1,935.5234$ | 0 | $18,969.771$ | $12,319.113$ | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 212.34756 | $1,935.2742$ | 0 | $8,298.0992$ | $5,388.8487$ | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice 8 | 219.37371 | $1,936.9381$ | 0 | $7,907.8903$ | $1,537.1382$ | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 9 | 233.5 | $1,940.2834$ | 0 | $8,014.7195$ | $1,557.9036$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 252.5 | $1,944.7829$ | 0 | $8,465.2959$ | $1,645.4868$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 271.5 | $1,949.2824$ | 0 | $8,915.8719$ | $1,733.0699$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 286 | $1,952.7162$ | 0 | $9,013.132$ | $1,751.9754$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 300.33333 | $1,956.1105$ | 0 | $9,024.556$ | $1,754.196$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 319 | $1,960.5311$ | 0 | $9,303.459$ | $1,808.4092$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 337.66667 | $1,964.9516$ | 0 | $9,582.3625$ | $1,862.6226$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 351.5 | $1,968.2275$ | 0 | $9,714.7138$ | $1,888.3491$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 366.63718 | $1,971.8122$ | 0 | $9,966.0777$ | $1,937.2093$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 387.91152 | $1,976.8503$ | 0 | $10,483.006$ | $2,037.69$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 403.27435 | $1,980.4885$ | 0 | $10,856.296$ | $2,110.2501$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 414 | $1,983.0285$ | 0 | $10,817.487$ | $2,102.7064$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 428.5 | $1,986.4623$ | 0 | $10,824.643$ | $2,104.0974$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 445.5 | $1,990.4881$ | 0 | $11,146.222$ | $2,166.6061$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 461 | $1,994.1588$ | 0 | $11,100.742$ | $2,157.7656$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 475 | $1,997.4742$ | 0 | $10,688.201$ | $2,077.5758$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 486.0203 | $2,000.084$ | 0 | $10,378.989$ | $2,017.4711$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 500.53045 | $2,003.5202$ | 0 | $10,007.448$ | $1,945.2508$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 521.51015 | $2,008.4885$ | 0 | $9,470.2506$ | $1,840.8302$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 542.56809 | $2,013.4753$ | 0 | $9,248.5731$ | $1,797.7405$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 564.0663 | $2,018.5664$ | 0 | $9,405.108$ | $2,875.4301$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 578.71041 | $2,026.4589$ | 0 | $4,061.2097$ | $3,407.7595$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 594.52014 | $2,049.0376$ | 0 | $3,059.0368$ | $2,566.8367$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 613.17728 | $2,075.6827$ | 0 | $2,032.5286$ | $1,319.9395$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 626.30009 | $2,094.4241$ | 0 | $1,098.302$ | 713.24566 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 637.72187 | $2,110.736$ | 0 | 267.32964 | 173.6059 | 200 |
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Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
nit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant

## dvance

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
ohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6-7^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}-$ Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc ( 150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(38,2,101) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $118,2,125.1481$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (127, 2,130.4815) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: (249.7424, 2,171.4472) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-200, 2,099) ft
Right Coordinate: $(687,2,139) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.425$ )
Data Point: (8.1, 1)

## 150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.275)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$

## 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $6-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(7,0.625)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $6-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: ( $7,0.444$
Data Point: (7.1, 1
(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(1,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (0.9, 1)
Data Point: $(1,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 2,099 |
| Point 2 | -115 | 2,101 |
| Point 3 | -28 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 42 | 2,101 |
| Point 5 | 78 | 2,101 |
| Point 6 | 138 | 2,137 |
| Point 7 | 150 | 2,137 |
| Point 8 | 210 | 2,169 |
| Point 9 | 232 | 2,169 |
| Point 10 | 261 | 2,173 |
| Point 11 | 290 | 2,180 |
| Point 12 | 329 | 2,189 |
|  |  |  |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

| Point 13 | 347 | 2,193 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 14 | 412 | 2,198 |
| Point 15 | 444 | 2,194 |
| Point 16 | 472 | 2,188 |
| Point 17 | 502 | 2,176 |
| Point 18 | 523 | 2,171 |
| Point 19 | 556 | 2,160 |
| Point 20 | 572 | 2,157 |
| Point 21 | 645 | 2,145 |
| Point 22 | 687 | 2,139 |
| Point 23 | 685 | 2,041 |
| Point 24 | 685 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point 26 | -200 | 1,994 |
| Point 27 | 111 | 2,121 |
| Point 28 | 687 | 2,133 |
| Point 29 | 109 | 2,120 |
| Point 30 | -200 | 2,033 |
| Point 31 | 199 | 2,076 |
| Point 32 | 687 | 2,128 |
| Point 33 | 88 | 2,101 |
| Point 34 | 121 | 2,101 |
| Point 35 | 272 | 2,177 |
| Point 36 | 163 | 2,122 |
| Point 37 | 165 | 2,123 |
| Point 38 | 687 | 2,134 |
| Point 39 | 73 | 2,101 |
| Point 40 | 78 | 2,096 |
| Point 41 | 111 | 2,096 |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region $1$ | Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 23,24,25,26 | $1.9205 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6$7^{\circ}$ ) | 1,30,31,32,28,36,34,41,40,39,4,3,2 | 32,105 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 113 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 22,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,35,37,38 | 21,235 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 30,26,23,32,31 | 55,865 |
| Region <br> 5 | Fill | 5,33,34,36,37,35,10,9,8,7,6,27,29 | 3,254.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 36,28,38,37 | 512 |


| Region <br> 7 | Fill | $39,40,41,34,33,5$ | 202.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 60,201
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.77$
Volume: $573.74016 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $68,848.819 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $4,609,078.4 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $2,604,068.2$ lbs-ft
Fof S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: $(78.004122,2,101.0025) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(143.79119,2,137) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 81.751002 ft
Center: $(76.026676,2,182.7296) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 79.111118 $2,101.0443$ 0 71.160582 46.212222 200 <br> Slice <br> 2 81.325109 $2,101.158$ 0 213.19928 138.45323 200 <br> Slice <br> 3 83.539101 $2,101.3321$ 0 345.46092 224.34494 200 <br> Slice <br> 4 85.753092 $2,101.5669$ 0 468.14495 304.01689 200 <br> Slice <br> 5 87.967083 $2,101.863$ 0 581.41951 377.57824 200 <br> Slice <br> 6 90.181074 $2,102.2211$ 0 685.42338 445.11915 200 <br> Slice <br> 7 92.395066 $2,102.642$ 0 780.26764 506.71173 200 <br> Slice <br> 8 94.609057 $2,103.1267$ 0 866.03685 562.41091 200 <br> Slice <br> 9 96.823048 $2,103.6763$ 0 942.78987 612.2549 200 <br> Slice <br> 10 99.037039 $2,104.2923$ 0 $1,010.5604$ 656.26563 200 <br> Slice <br> 11 101.25103 $2,104.9761$ 0 $1,069.3573$ 694.44877 200 <br> Slice <br> 12 103.46502 $2,105.7297$ 0 $1,119.1642$ 726.79374 200 <br> Slice <br> 13 105.67901 $2,106.5551$ 0 $1,159.9392$ 753.27334 200 <br> Slice       |


| 14 | 107.893 | $2,107.4547$ | 0 | $1,191.6141$ | 773.84327 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 15 | 110 | $2,108.3802$ | 0 | $1,201.8071$ | 780.46265 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 112.125 | $2,109.3909$ | 0 | $1,201.1479$ | 780.03459 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 114.375 | $2,110.5423$ | 0 | $1,201.3795$ | 780.185 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 116.625 | $2,111.7837$ | 0 | $1,191.7637$ | 773.9404 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 118.875 | $2,113.12$ | 0 | $1,172.0707$ | 761.15162 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 121.125 | $2,114.5567$ | 0 | $1,142.0285$ | 741.64195 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 123.375 | $2,116.1004$ | 0 | $1,101.3173$ | 715.20382 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 125.625 | $2,117.7586$ | 0 | $1,049.5638$ | 681.59472 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 127.875 | $2,119.5405$ | 0 | 986.33329 | 640.53233 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 130.125 | $2,121.4569$ | 0 | 911.1203 | 591.68844 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 132.375 | $2,123.5208$ | 0 | 823.33774 | 534.68178 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 134.625 | $2,125.7484$ | 0 | 722.30347 | 469.06936 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 136.875 | $2,128.1598$ | 0 | 607.22521 | 394.33666 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 138.9652 | $2,130.5791$ | 0 | 440.0239 | 285.75486 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 140.89559 | $2,133.003$ | 0 | 225.06637 | 146.15981 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 142.82599 | $2,135.6311$ | 0 | 2.8704439 | 1.8640881 | 200 |
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Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
nit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant

## dvance

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
ohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6-7^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc ( 150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(38,2,101) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $118,2,125.1481$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (127, 2,130.4815) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: (249.7424, 2,171.4472) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-200, 2,099) ft
Right Coordinate: $(687,2,139) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.425$ )
Data Point: (8.1, 1)

## 150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
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Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.275)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$

## 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $6-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(7,0.625$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $6-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: ( $7,0.444$
Data Point: (7.1, 1
(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(1,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (0.9, 1)
Data Point: $(1,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 2,099 |
| Point 2 | -115 | 2,101 |
| Point 3 | -28 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 42 | 2,101 |
| Point 5 | 78 | 2,101 |
| Point 6 | 138 | 2,137 |
| Point 7 | 150 | 2,137 |
| Point 8 | 210 | 2,169 |
| Point 9 | 232 | 2,169 |
| Point 10 | 261 | 2,173 |
| Point 11 | 290 | 2,180 |
| Point 12 | 329 | 2,189 |
|  |  |  |
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| Point 13 | 347 | 2,193 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 14 | 412 | 2,198 |
| Point 15 | 444 | 2,194 |
| Point 16 | 472 | 2,188 |
| Point 17 | 502 | 2,176 |
| Point 18 | 523 | 2,171 |
| Point 19 | 556 | 2,160 |
| Point 20 | 572 | 2,157 |
| Point 21 | 645 | 2,145 |
| Point 22 | 687 | 2,139 |
| Point 23 | 685 | 2,041 |
| Point 24 | 685 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point 26 | -200 | 1,994 |
| Point 27 | 111 | 2,121 |
| Point 28 | 687 | 2,133 |
| Point 29 | 109 | 2,120 |
| Point 30 | -200 | 2,033 |
| Point 31 | 199 | 2,076 |
| Point 32 | 687 | 2,128 |
| Point 33 | 88 | 2,101 |
| Point 34 | 121 | 2,101 |
| Point 35 | 272 | 2,177 |
| Point 36 | 163 | 2,122 |
| Point 37 | 165 | 2,123 |
| Point 38 | 687 | 2,134 |
| Point 39 | 73 | 2,101 |
| Point 40 | 78 | 2,096 |
| Point 41 | 111 | 2,096 |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region $1$ | Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 23,24,25,26 | $1.9205 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6$7^{\circ}$ ) | 1,30,31,32,28,36,34,41,40,39,4,3,2 | 32,105 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 113 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 22,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,35,37,38 | 21,235 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 30,26,23,32,31 | 55,865 |
| Region <br> 5 | Fill | 5,33,34,36,37,35,10,9,8,7,6,27,29 | 3,254.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 36,28,38,37 | 512 |


| Region <br> 7 | Fill | $39,40,41,34,33,5$ | 202.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 61,877
Fof S: 1.28
Volume: $2,166.4005 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
olume: 2,166.4005 ft
Neight: 259,968.07 lbs
esisting Moment: 41,153,120 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $32,138,520 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (78.015509, 2,101.0095) ft
Entry: $(223.37103,2,169) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 229.37058 ft
Center: $(59.650312,2,329.6437) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 80.59755 $2,101.2463$ 0 140.6808 91.35918 200 <br> Slice <br> 2 85.761632 $2,101.779$ 0 434.36064 282.0771 200 <br> Slice <br> 3 90.925714 $2,102.4303$ 0 708.29406 459.97154 200 <br> Slice <br> 4 96.089796 $2,103.2012$ 0 962.91445 625.32396 200 <br> Slice <br> 5 101.25388 $2,104.093$ 0 $1,198.6059$ 778.38377 200 <br> Slice <br> 6 106.41796 $2,105.1071$ 0 $1,415.7065$ 919.37055 200 <br> Slice <br> 7 110 $2,105.8699$ 0 $1,544.8146$ $1,003.2144$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 8 113.25 $2,106.6356$ 0 $1,646.2184$ $1,069.0667$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 9 117.75 $2,107.7656$ 0 $1,790.2954$ $1,162.6314$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 10 122.25 $2,108.9931$ 0 $1,921.0518$ $1,247.5456$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 11 126.75 $2,110.3198$ 0 $2,038.6021$ $1,323.8837$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 12 131.25 $2,111.7475$ 0 $2,143.0405$ $1,391.7068$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 13 135.75 $2,113.2782$ 0 $2,234.4417$ $1,451.0634$ 200 <br> Slice       |


| 14 | 141 | $2,115.2077$ | 0 | $2,144.5972$ | $1,392.7177$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 15 | 147 | $2,117.5815$ | 0 | $1,875.4445$ | $1,217.9279$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 152.5 | $2,119.924$ | 0 | $1,748.6825$ | $1,135.6077$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 157.5 | $2,122.2102$ | 0 | $1,761.2162$ | $1,143.7472$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 162.5 | $2,124.6437$ | 0 | $1,758.4998$ | $1,141.9831$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 167.5 | $2,127.23$ | 0 | $1,740.4854$ | $1,130.2845$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 172.5 | $2,129.975$ | 0 | $1,707.0996$ | $1,108.6034$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 177.5 | $2,132.8854$ | 0 | $1,658.2426$ | $1,076.8754$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 182.5 | $2,135.9686$ | 0 | $1,593.7887$ | $1,035.0185$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 187.5 | $2,139.2329$ | 0 | $1,513.5852$ | 982.93375 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 192.5 | $2,142.688$ | 0 | $1,417.453$ | 920.50477 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 197.5 | $2,146.3446$ | 0 | $1,305.1861$ | 847.59774 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 202.5 | $2,150.2151$ | 0 | $1,176.552$ | 764.0618 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 207.5 | $2,154.3136$ | 0 | $1,031.2934$ | 669.72979 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 212.2285 | $2,158.4074$ | 0 | 780.62226 | 506.94202 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 216.68551 | $2,162.4867$ | 0 | 430.69626 | 279.69742 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 221.14252 | $2,166.7901$ | 0 | 73.766475 | 47.904509 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs ( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $6-7^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 6-7${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Shear Layer

Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc ( $150 \mathrm{psf} 17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
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C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 $)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,2,099) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(687,2,139) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(132.724,2,155.9869) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (147.2387, 2,075.9597) ft
Lower Right: (218.8751, 2,089.9995) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (261.4184, 2,199.03) ft
Lower Left: ( $279.2153,2,088.405$ ) ft Lower Right: (351.5514, 2,099.3522) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 45
Ending Angle: $65{ }^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

[^18]Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.275)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.275$ )
Data Point: (8.1, 1)

## 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: (7, 0.625
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $6-7^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(7,0.444)$
Data Point: (7.1, 1)
(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Data Point: (1, 0.444)
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(1,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 2,099 |
| Point 2 | -115 | 2,101 |
| Point 3 | -28 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 42 | 2,101 |
| Point 5 | 78 | 2,101 |
| Point 6 | 138 | 2,137 |
| Point 7 | 150 | 2,137 |
| Point 8 | 210 | 2,169 |
| Point 9 | 232 | 2,169 |
| Point 10 | 261 | 2,173 |
| Point 11 | 290 | 2,180 |
| Point 12 | 329 | 2,189 |
| Point 13 | 347 | 2,193 |
| Point 14 | 412 | 2,198 |
| Point 15 | 444 | 2,194 |
| Point 16 | 472 | 2,188 |
| Point 17 | 502 | 2,176 |
| Point 18 | 523 | 2,171 |
| Point 19 | 556 | 2,160 |
| Point 20 | 572 | 2,157 |
| Point 21 | 645 | 2,145 |
| Point 22 | 687 | 2,139 |
| Point 23 | 685 | 2,041 |
| Point 24 | 685 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point 26 | -200 | 1,994 |
| Point 27 | 111 | 2,121 |
| Point 28 | 687 | 2,133 |
| Point 29 | 109 | 2,120 |
| Point 30 | -200 | 2,033 |
| Point 31 | 199 | 2,076 |
| Point 32 | 687 | 2,128 |
| Point 33 | 88 | 2,101 |
| Point 34 | 121 | 2,101 |
| Point 35 | 272 | 2,177 |
| Point 36 | 163 | 2,122 |
| Point 37 | 165 | 2,123 |
| Point 38 | 687 | 2,134 |
| Point 39 | 73 | 2,101 |
| Point 40 | 78 | 2,096 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 41 | 111 | 2,096 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 23,24,25,26 | $1.9205 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6$7^{\circ}$ ) | 1,30,31,32,28,36,34,41,40,39,4,3,2 | 32,105 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1$13^{\circ}$ ) | 22,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,35,37,38 | 21,235 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 30,26,23,32,31 | 55,865 |
| Region $5$ | Fill | 5,33,34,36,37,35,10,9,8,7,6,27,29 | 3,254.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Shear Layer | 36,28,38,37 | 512 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 39,40,41,34,33,5 | 202.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 66,399
F of S: 1.94
Volume: 1,752.2519 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: $210,270.23 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $130,112.76 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $67,221.054 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (114.36353, 2,122.9932) ft
Entry: $(227.60406,2,169) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 67.44354 ft
Center: (156.96523, 2,180.5017) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 116.33323 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | 140.068 | 90.961223 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 120.27264 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | 420.204 | 272.88367 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 124.21206 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | 700.34 | 454.80611 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 128.15147 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | 980.476 | 636.72856 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 132.09088 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,260.612$ | 818.651 | 200 |


| Slice <br> 6 | 136.03029 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,540.748$ | $1,000.5735$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 7 | 140 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,680.816$ | $1,091.5347$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 144 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,680.816$ | $1,091.5347$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 148 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,680.816$ | $1,091.5347$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 151.8733 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,800.7072$ | $1,169.3929$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 155.6199 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $2,040.4896$ | $1,325.1094$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 159.3665 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $2,280.272$ | $1,480.826$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 163.1131 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $2,520.0544$ | $1,636.5425$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 166.79313 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $2,755.576$ | 535.62971 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 170.39978 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $2,986.4016$ | 580.49767 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 173.99963 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $3,216.792$ | 625.28102 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 175.93471 | $2,123.1132$ | 0 | $2,990.4133$ | 581.27746 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 177.81519 | $2,124.7833$ | 0 | $2,268.662$ | $1,903.6334$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 181.30582 | $2,127.8832$ | 0 | $2,161.3979$ | $1,813.6282$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 184.79645 | $2,130.9832$ | 0 | $2,054.1338$ | $1,723.6229$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 188.28708 | $2,134.0832$ | 0 | $1,946.8697$ | $1,633.6176$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 192.02915 | $2,137.4065$ | 0 | $1,963.6416$ | $1,275.2038$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 196.02267 | $2,140.953$ | 0 | $1,832.6896$ | $1,190.1626$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 200.01619 | $2,144.4996$ | 0 | $1,701.7376$ | $1,105.1213$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 204.00972 | $2,148.0462$ | 0 | $1,570.7856$ | $1,020.0801$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 208.00324 | $2,151.5928$ | 0 | $1,439.8337$ | 935.03891 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 211.76041 | $2,154.9295$ | 0 | $1,229.8472$ | 798.67214 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 215.28122 | $2,158.0563$ | 0 | 940.82641 | 610.97982 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 218.80203 | $2,161.1831$ | 0 | 651.80558 | 423.28749 | 200 |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ | 222.32284 | 2,164.3098 | 0 | 362.78475 | 235.59517 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 31 \end{aligned}$ | 225.84366 | 2,167.4366 | 0 | 73.763924 | 47.902853 | 200 |
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## File Version: 8.15
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs ( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $6-7^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 6-7${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Shear Layer

Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc ( $150 \mathrm{psf} 17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$

2-Translational

C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 $)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,2,099) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(687,2,139) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (132.724, 2,155.9869) ft
Lower Left: (147.2387, 2,075.9597) ft
Lower Right: (218.8751, 2,089.9995) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(261.4184,2,199.03) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $279.2153,2,088.405$ ) ft Lower Right: (351.5514, 2,099.3522) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65{ }^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

[^19]Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: ( $8.1,1$ )
TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: (4, 0.275 )
Data Point: ( $8,0.275$ )
Data Point: (8.1, 1)

## 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: (7, 0.625
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $6-7^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(7,0.444)$
Data Point: (7.1, 1)
(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Data Point: (1, 0.444)
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(1,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 2,099 |
| Point 2 | -115 | 2,101 |
| Point 3 | -28 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 42 | 2,101 |
| Point 5 | 78 | 2,101 |
| Point 6 | 138 | 2,137 |
| Point 7 | 150 | 2,137 |
| Point 8 | 210 | 2,169 |
| Point 9 | 232 | 2,169 |
| Point 10 | 261 | 2,173 |
| Point 11 | 290 | 2,180 |
| Point 12 | 329 | 2,189 |
| Point 13 | 347 | 2,193 |
| Point 14 | 412 | 2,198 |
| Point 15 | 444 | 2,194 |
| Point 16 | 472 | 2,188 |
| Point 17 | 502 | 2,176 |
| Point 18 | 523 | 2,171 |
| Point 19 | 556 | 2,160 |
| Point 20 | 572 | 2,157 |
| Point 21 | 645 | 2,145 |
| Point 22 | 687 | 2,139 |
| Point 23 | 685 | 2,041 |
| Point 24 | 685 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point 26 | -200 | 1,994 |
| Point 27 | 111 | 2,121 |
| Point 28 | 687 | 2,133 |
| Point 29 | 109 | 2,120 |
| Point 30 | -200 | 2,033 |
| Point 31 | 199 | 2,076 |
| Point 32 | 687 | 2,128 |
| Point 33 | 88 | 2,101 |
| Point 34 | 121 | 2,101 |
| Point 35 | 272 | 2,177 |
| Point 36 | 163 | 2,122 |
| Point 37 | 165 | 2,123 |
| Point 38 | 687 | 2,134 |
| Point 39 | 73 | 2,101 |
| Point 40 | 78 | 2,096 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 41 | 111 | 2,096 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 23,24,25,26 | $1.9205 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6$7^{\circ}$ ) | 1,30,31,32,28,36,34,41,40,39,4,3,2 | 32,105 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1$13^{\circ}$ ) | 22,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,35,37,38 | 21,235 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4$8^{\circ}$ ) | 30,26,23,32,31 | 55,865 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 5,33,34,36,37,35,10,9,8,7,6,27,29 | 3,254.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Shear Layer | 36,28,38,37 | 512 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 39,40,41,34,33,5 | 202.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 66,176
Fof S: 1.11
Volume: 7,646.2846 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: $917,554.15 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 278,153.03 lbs
Activating Force: $250,094.99 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: $(114.36353,2,122.9932) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(342.59158,2,192.0204) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 116.23557 ft
Center: (212.8197, 2,209.2771) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 118.30294 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | 280.136 | 181.92245 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 126.18176 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | 840.408 | 545.76734 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 134.06059 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,400.68$ | 909.61223 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 141 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,680.816$ | $1,091.5347$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 147 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,680.816$ | $1,091.5347$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 6 | 153.7466 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $1,920.5984$ | $1,247.2512$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 7 | 161.2466 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $2,400.5984$ | $1,558.9668$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 170.39978 | $2,122.9932$ | 0 | $2,986.4016$ | 580.49767 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 180.07461 | $2,123.0604$ | 0 | $3,585.5716$ | 696.96452 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 188.62472 | $2,123.1949$ | 0 | $4,115.1923$ | 799.91236 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 197.17483 | $2,123.3293$ | 0 | $4,644.813$ | 902.86019 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 205.72494 | $2,123.4638$ | 0 | $5,174.4337$ | $1,005.808$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 213.66667 | $2,123.5886$ | 0 | $5,432.3441$ | $1,055.9407$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 221 | $2,123.704$ | 0 | $5,418.5443$ | $1,053.2583$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 228.33333 | $2,123.8193$ | 0 | $5,404.7445$ | $1,050.5759$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 235.625 | $2,123.9339$ | 0 | $5,450.8589$ | $1,059.5396$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 242.875 | $2,124.0479$ | 0 | $5,556.8876$ | $1,080.1495$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 250.125 | $2,124.1619$ | 0 | $5,662.9163$ | $1,100.7594$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 257.375 | $2,124.2759$ | 0 | $5,768.945$ | $1,121.3693$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 266.5 | $2,124.4194$ | 0 | $6,050.9529$ | $1,176.1861$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 276.5 | $2,124.5767$ | 0 | $6,361.2322$ | $1,236.4983$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 285.5 | $2,124.7182$ | 0 | $6,523.8037$ | $1,268.099$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 292.78853 | $2,124.8328$ | 0 | $6,676.8515$ | $1,297.8485$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 295.88798 | $2,125.3207$ | 0 | $5,229.4801$ | $1,016.508$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 300.29903 | $2,131.6203$ | 0 | $2,795.7163$ | $2,345.8846$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 308.49931 | $2,143.3315$ | 0 | $2,228.0047$ | $1,869.5179$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 316.69958 | $2,155.0428$ | 0 | $1,660.2931$ | $1,393.1513$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 324.89986 | $2,166.754$ | 0 | $1,092.5815$ | 916.78469 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 332.39789 | $2,177.4623$ | 0 | 571.80756 | 479.80351 | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs ( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $6-7^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: ( $100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 6-7${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Shear Layer

Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc ( $150 \mathrm{psf} 17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 1-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
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C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: ( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-200, 2,099) ft
Right Coordinate: $(687,2,139) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (132.724, 2,155.9869) ft
Lower Left: (147.2387, 2,075.9597) ft
Lower Right: (218.8751, 2,089.9995) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (261.4184, 2,199.03) ft
Lower Left: (279.2153, 2,088.405) ft
Lower Right: (351.5514, 2,099.3522) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed $4-8^{\circ}$ ) <br> Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$

Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: (8, 0.75)
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
TQs (150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8ㅇ)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.275)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf $11^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8
Model: Spline Data Point Function
function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.667$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
TQs (100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1 Data Point: (5.9, 1

2-Translational

Data Point: ( $6,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(7,0.625)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
( 100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-7 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(7,0.444)$
Data Point: (7.1, 1)
(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(1,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)
TQs(100 psf $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed $1-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(1,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 2,099 |
| Point 2 | -115 | 2,101 |
| Point 3 | -28 | 2,101 |
|  |  |  |

2 - Translational

| Point 4 | 42 | 2,101 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 5 | 290 | 2,180 |
| Point 6 | 329 | 2,189 |
| Point 7 | 347 | 2,193 |
| Point 8 | 412 | 2,198 |
| Point 9 | 444 | 2,194 |
| Point 10 | 472 | 2,188 |
| Point 11 | 502 | 2,176 |
| Point 12 | 523 | 2,171 |
| Point 13 | 556 | 2,160 |
| Point 14 | 572 | 2,157 |
| Point 15 | 645 | 2,145 |
| Point 16 | 687 | 2,139 |
| Point 17 | 685 | 2,041 |
| Point 18 | 685 | 1,800 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point 20 | -200 | 1,994 |
| Point 21 | 687 | 2,133 |
| Point 22 | -200 | 2,033 |
| Point 23 | 199 | 2,076 |
| Point 24 | 687 | 2,128 |
| Point 25 | 121 | 2,101 |
| Point 26 | 272 | 2,177 |
| Point 27 | 163 | 2,122 |
| Point 28 | 165 | 2,123 |
| Point 29 | 687 | 2,134 |
| Point 30 | 73 | 2,101 |
| Point 31 | 78 | 2,096 |
| Point 32 | 111 | 2,096 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | $\operatorname{Tmc}\left(150 \mathrm{psf} 17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.4-8^{\circ}\right)$ | $17,18,19,20$ | $1.9205 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | TQs $\left(100 \mathrm{psf} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.6-7^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,22,23,24,21,27,25,32,31,30,4,3,2$ | 32,105 |
| Region 3 | TQs $\left(100 \mathrm{psf} \mathrm{25} 5^{\circ} \mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.1-13^{\circ}\right)$ | $16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5,26,28,29$ | 21,235 |
| Region 4 | TQs $\left(150 \mathrm{psf} 11^{\circ} \mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.4-8^{\circ}\right)$ | $22,20,17,24,23$ | 55,865 |
| Region 5 | Shear Layer | $27,21,29,28$ | 512 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 66,176
F of S: 1.51
Volume: $5,425.5653 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$

Weight: $651,067.84 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $194,122.75 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $128,297.82 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating force: $128,297.82 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (164.9864, 2,122.9932) ft
Entry: $(342.59158,2,192.0204) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 102.6563 ft
Center: $(233.66818,2,209.2771) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ Y (ft) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 164.9932 $2,122.9932$ 0 0.408 0.079307166 150 <br> Slice <br> 2 167.69989 $2,122.9932$ 0 164.32321 31.941196 150 <br> Slice <br> 3 173.09966 $2,122.9932$ 0 491.33762 95.506358 150 <br> Slice <br> 4 178.80581 $2,123.0405$ 0 827.99585 160.94609 150 <br> Slice <br> 5 184.81834 $2,123.135$ 0 $1,180.0611$ 229.38063 150 <br> Slice <br> 6 190.83087 $2,123.2296$ 0 $1,532.1263$ 297.81518 150 <br> Slice <br> 7 196.8434 $2,123.3241$ 0 $1,884.1915$ 366.24972 150 <br> Slice <br> 8 202.85593 $2,123.4187$ 0 $2,236.2567$ 434.68426 150 <br> Slice <br> 9 208.86845 $2,123.5132$ 0 $2,588.3219$ 503.1188 150 <br> Slice <br> 10 214.88098 $2,123.6077$ 0 $2,940.3871$ 571.55335 150 <br> Slice <br> 11 220.89351 $2,123.7023$ 0 $3,292.4523$ 639.98789 150 <br> Slice <br> 12 226.90604 $2,123.7968$ 0 $3,644.5175$ 708.42243 150 <br> Slice <br> 13 232.91857 $2,123.8914$ 0 $3,996.5827$ 776.85697 150 <br> Slice <br> 14 238.9311 $2,123.9859$ 0 $4,348.6479$ 845.29152 150 <br> Slice <br> 15 244.94362 $2,124.0805$ 0 $4,700.7131$ 913.72606 150 <br> Slice <br> 16 250.95615 $2,124.175$ 0 $5,052.7783$ 982.1606 150 <br> Slice <br> 17 256.96868 $2,124.2696$ 0 $5,404.8435$ $1,050.5951$ 150 <br> Slice 262.98121 $2,124.3641$ 0 $5,756.9087$ $1,119.0297$ 150$\|$ |


| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 19 | 268.99374 | $2,124.4586$ | 0 | $6,108.9739$ | $1,187.4642$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 275 | $2,124.5531$ | 0 | $6,339.2358$ | $1,232.2226$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 281 | $2,124.6474$ | 0 | $6,447.6945$ | $1,253.3049$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 287 | $2,124.7418$ | 0 | $6,556.1533$ | $1,274.3871$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 292.78853 | $2,124.8328$ | 0 | $6,682.1963$ | $1,298.8874$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 295.88798 | $2,125.3207$ | 0 | $5,560.5139$ | $1,080.8544$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 298.93232 | $2,129.6685$ | 0 | $3,386.7557$ | $2,841.8255$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 304.39917 | $2,137.4759$ | 0 | $2,948.7961$ | $2,474.3338$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 309.86602 | $2,145.2834$ | 0 | $2,510.8366$ | $2,106.8421$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 315.33287 | $2,153.0909$ | 0 | $2,072.877$ | $1,739.3504$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 320.79972 | $2,160.8984$ | 0 | $1,634.9175$ | $1,371.8587$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 326.26657 | $2,168.7058$ | 0 | $1,196.958$ | $1,004.367$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 332.39789 | $2,177.4623$ | 0 | 703.82351 | 590.57804 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 339.19368 | $2,187.1677$ | 0 | 155.51415 | 130.49187 | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Lef
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-17º bedding 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(180,1,879) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(270,1,908.4375) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (280, 1,909.5714) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $460,1,951.3889$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Left Coordinate: $(-177.5082,1,801) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(550,1,953) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs150psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf- $-17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.275)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$

150 psf- $-11^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
segment Curvature: 0\%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,890 |
| Point 2 | -151 | 1,906 |
| Point 3 | -37 | 1,898 |
| Point 4 | 56 | 1,894 |
| Point 5 | 76 | 1,891 |
| Point 6 | 101 | 1,890 |
| Point 7 | 123 | 1,887 |
| Point 8 | 157 | 1,879 |
| Point 9 | 181 | 1,879 |
| Point 10 | 207 | 1,880 |
| Point 11 | 263 | 1,908 |
| Point 12 | 279 | 1,909 |
| Point 13 | 349 | 1,949 |
| Point 14 | 371 | 1,950 |
| Point 15 | 406 | 1,950 |
| Point 16 | 446 | 1,951 |
| Point 17 | 482 | 1,952 |
| Point 18 | 506 | 1,952 |
| Point 19 | 550 | 1,953 |
| Point 20 | 550 | 1,910 |
| Point 21 | 550 | 1,857 |
| Point 22 | 550 | 1,833 |
| Point 23 | 550 | 1,801 |
| Point 24 | 433 | 1,801 |
| Point 25 | 271 | 1,801 |
| Point 26 | -177.5082 | 1,801 |
| Point 27 | -200 | $1,800.4977$ |
| Point 28 | 217 | 1,870 |
| Point 29 | 247 | 1,870 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 30 | -85 | 1,801 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 31 | 550 | 1,893 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150psf-17 <br> bedding 4-8 | $1,26,30,31,20,19,18,17,16,15,29,28,10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 48,206 |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $10,28,29,15,14,13,12,11$ | 4,229 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs150psf-11 <br> bedding 4-8 |  |  |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 131,245
F of S: 1.82
Volume: $841.81909 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 101,018.29 lbs
Resisting Moment: 7,722,657.4 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $4,236,948.8$ lbs-lt
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
Fof S Rank (Query): 1 of 20 slip surface
Exit: ( $270,1,908.4375$ ) ft
Entry: (357.15601, 1,949.3707) ft
Radius: 95.097239 ft
Center: (278.71534, 2,003.1345) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 271.5 | $1,908.3233$ | 0 | 34.210662 | 22.216663 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 274.5 | $1,908.1426$ | 0 | 75.182007 | 48.823766 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 277.5 | $1,908.0569$ | 0 | 103.79506 | 67.405298 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 280.45833 | $1,908.0645$ | 0 | 208.89492 | 135.65794 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 283.375 | $1,908.1627$ | 0 | 388.31985 | 252.17786 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 286.29167 | $1,908.3509$ | 0 | 553.40693 | 359.38666 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 289.20833 | $1,908.6294$ | 0 | 704.4939 | 457.50369 | 200 |


| Slice <br> 8 | 292.125 | $1,908.999$ | 0 | 841.86 | 546.71028 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 9 | 295.04167 | $1,909.4609$ | 0 | 965.7303 | 627.15259 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 297.95833 | $1,910.0165$ | 0 | $1,076.279$ | 698.94376 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 300.875 | $1,910.6673$ | 0 | $1,173.6319$ | 762.16549 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 303.79167 | $1,911.4155$ | 0 | $1,257.8681$ | 816.86907 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 306.70833 | $1,912.2635$ | 0 | $1,329.0204$ | 863.07595 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 309.625 | $1,913.214$ | 0 | $1,387.0762$ | 900.77782 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 312.54167 | $1,914.2704$ | 0 | $1,431.976$ | 929.9361 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 315.45833 | $1,915.4365$ | 0 | $1,463.6126$ | 950.48111 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 318.375 | $1,916.7168$ | 0 | $1,481.8282$ | 962.31047 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 321.29167 | $1,918.1164$ | 0 | $1,486.4117$ | 965.28702 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 324.20833 | $1,919.6413$ | 0 | $1,477.0939$ | 959.23597 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 327.125 | $1,921.2986$ | 0 | $1,453.542$ | 943.9412 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 330.04167 | $1,923.0965$ | 0 | $1,415.3524$ | 919.14058 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 332.95833 | $1,925.0446$ | 0 | $1,362.0415$ | 884.52007 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 335.875 | $1,927.1547$ | 0 | $1,293.0342$ | 839.70626 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 338.79167 | $1,929.4407$ | 0 | $1,207.6502$ | 784.25719 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 341.70833 | $1,931.9195$ | 0 | $1,105.0854$ | 717.65082 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 344.625 | $1,934.6122$ | 0 | 984.3908 | 639.27086 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 347.54167 | $1,937.5453$ | 0 | 844.44603 | 548.38966 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 350.35933 | $1,940.6338$ | 0 | 629.24686 | 408.63769 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 353.078 | $1,943.8984$ | 0 | 343.5332 | 223.09307 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 355.79667 | $1,947.4878$ | 0 | 44.75417 | 29.063698 | 200 |
|  | 00 |  |  |  |  |  |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Renotenader

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Lef
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-17º bedding 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(180,1,879) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(270,1,908.4375) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (280, 1,909.5714) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $460,1,951.3889$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Left Coordinate: (-177.5082, 1,801) ft
Right Coordinate: $(550,1,953) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs150psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf- $-17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.275)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.275$ )
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$150 \mathrm{psf}-11^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
segment Curvature: 0\%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,890 |
| Point 2 | -151 | 1,906 |
| Point 3 | -37 | 1,898 |
| Point 4 | 56 | 1,894 |
| Point 5 | 76 | 1,891 |
| Point 6 | 101 | 1,890 |
| Point 7 | 123 | 1,887 |
| Point 8 | 157 | 1,879 |
| Point 9 | 181 | 1,879 |
| Point 10 | 207 | 1,880 |
| Point 11 | 263 | 1,908 |
| Point 12 | 279 | 1,909 |
| Point 13 | 349 | 1,949 |
| Point 14 | 371 | 1,950 |
| Point 15 | 406 | 1,950 |
| Point 16 | 446 | 1,951 |
| Point 17 | 482 | 1,952 |
| Point 18 | 506 | 1,952 |
| Point 19 | 550 | 1,953 |
| Point 20 | 550 | 1,910 |
| Point 21 | 550 | 1,857 |
| Point 22 | 550 | 1,833 |
| Point 23 | 550 | 1,801 |
| Point 24 | 433 | 1,801 |
| Point 25 | 271 | 1,801 |
| Point 26 | -177.5082 | 1,801 |
| Point 27 | -200 | $1,800.4977$ |
| Point 28 | 217 | 1,870 |
| Point 29 | 247 | 1,870 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 30 | -85 | 1,801 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 31 | 550 | 1,893 |

Regions
Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150psf-17 <br> bedding 4-8 | $1,26,30,31,20,19,18,17,16,15,29,28,10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 48,206 |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $10,28,29,15,14,13,12,11$ | 4,229 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs150psf-11 <br> bedding 4-8 | $30,25,24,23,22,21,31$ | 29,210 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 37,755
F of S: 1.33
Volume: $2,445.3315 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 293,439.78 lbs
Resisting Moment: 47,114,303 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $35,344,421 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 20 slip surfaces
Exit: (207.03645, 1,880.0182) ft
Entry: (368.5749, 1,949.8898) ft
Radius: 230.49199 ft
Center: $(203.23372,2,110.4788) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 209.83463 | $1,880.0984$ | 0 | 151.8663 | 98.623131 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 215.43099 | $1,880.3269$ | 0 | 447.1842 | 290.40481 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 221.02734 | $1,880.6918$ | 0 | 719.93456 | 467.53097 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 226.62369 | $1,881.194$ | 0 | 970.74694 | 630.41043 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 232.22005 | $1,881.8342$ | 0 | $1,200.1804$ | 779.40625 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 237.8164 | $1,882.6136$ | 0 | $1,408.7294$ | 914.83954 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 243.41276 | $1,883.5336$ | 0 | $1,596.829$ | $1,036.9929$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 8 | 249.00911 | $1,884.5961$ | 0 | $1,764.8594$ | $1,146.1131$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 9 | 254.60547 | $1,885.8029$ | 0 | $1,913.1492$ | $1,242.4136$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 260.20182 | $1,887.1565$ | 0 | $2,041.9789$ | $1,326.0766$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 265.66667 | $1,888.6208$ | 0 | $2,026.2575$ | $1,315.867$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 271 | $1,890.1915$ | 0 | $1,871.2051$ | $1,215.1748$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 276.33333 | $1,891.9037$ | 0 | $1,704.4537$ | $1,106.8852$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 281.69231 | $1,893.7703$ | 0 | $1,665.0158$ | $1,081.2739$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 287.07692 | $1,895.7965$ | 0 | $1,748.0189$ | $1,135.1767$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 292.46154 | $1,897.9784$ | 0 | $1,812.8562$ | $1,177.2826$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 297.84615 | $1,900.321$ | 0 | $1,859.5331$ | $1,207.5949$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 303.23077 | $1,902.8296$ | 0 | $1,888.0188$ | $1,226.0937$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 308.61538 | $1,905.5103$ | 0 | $1,898.2453$ | $1,232.7349$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 314 | $1,908.3701$ | 0 | $1,890.1074$ | $1,227.4501$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 319.38462 | $1,911.4165$ | 0 | $1,863.4615$ | $1,210.146$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 324.76923 | $1,914.6584$ | 0 | $1,818.1243$ | $1,180.7038$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 330.15385 | $1,918.1057$ | 0 | $1,753.8722$ | $1,138.978$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 335.53846 | $1,921.7695$ | 0 | $1,670.4392$ | $1,084.7959$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 340.92308 | $1,925.6629$ | 0 | $1,567.5158$ | $1,017.9567$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 346.30769 | $1,929.8007$ | 0 | $1,444.7477$ | 938.23016 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 351.44686 | $1,933.9874$ | 0 | $1,199.5612$ | 779.00412 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 356.34059 | $1,938.217$ | 0 | 838.67409 | 544.64132 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 361.23432 | $1,942.696$ | 0 | 468.0426 | 303.95042 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 366.12804 | $1,947.445$ | 0 | 87.825777 | 57.034726 | 200 |
|  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: ( $-177.5082,1,801$ ) ft
Right Coordinate: $(550,1,953) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (187.968, 1,876.0315) ft
Lower Left: (197.2912, 1,806.9576) ft
Lower Right: (269.9924, 1,838.286) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

2-Translational

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (333.3485, 1,910.6689) ft
Lower Left: $(339.0092,1,860.8593) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (415.9794, 1,896.8331) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs150psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8웅
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs150psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.275)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.275$ )
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$150 \mathrm{psf}-11^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,890 |
| Point 2 | -151 | 1,906 |
| Point 3 | -37 | 1,898 |
| Point 4 | 56 | 1,894 |
| Point 5 | 76 | 1,891 |
| Point 6 | 101 | 1,890 |
| Point 7 | 123 | 1,887 |
| Point 8 | 157 | 1,879 |
| Point 9 | 181 | 1,879 |
| Point 10 | 207 | 1,880 |
| Point 11 | 263 | 1,908 |
| Point 12 | 279 | 1,909 |
| Point 13 | 349 | 1,949 |
| Point 14 | 371 | 1,950 |
| Point 15 | 406 | 1,950 |
| Point 16 | 446 | 1,951 |
| Point 17 | 482 | 1,952 |
| Point 18 | 506 | 1,952 |
| Point 19 | 550 | 1,953 |
| Point 20 | 550 | 1,910 |
| Point 21 | 550 | 1,857 |

2-Translational

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150psf-17 <br> bedding 4-8 | $1,26,30,31,20,19,18,17,16,15,29,28,10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 48,206 |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $10,28,29,15,14,13,12,11$ | 4,229 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs150psf-11 <br> bedding 4-8 | $30,25,24,23,22,21,31$ | 29,210 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 87,617
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.62$
Volume: 6,644.417 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 797,330.04 lbs
Resisting Force: $332,180.03 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $205,264.76 \mathrm{lbs}$
Fof S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 20 slip surfaces
Exit: $(178.07102,1,879) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(385.21109,1,950) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 114.02385 ft
Center: $(263.38891,1,967.75) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 179.53551 | $1,878.3934$ | 0 | 166.26136 | 139.50985 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 184.25 | $1,876.4406$ | 0 | 483.9536 | 406.08528 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 190.75 | $1,873.7482$ | 0 | 933.83861 | 783.58363 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 197.25 | $1,871.0558$ | 0 | $1,383.7236$ | $1,161.082$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 203.75 | $1,868.3634$ | 0 | $1,833.6086$ | $1,538.5803$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 209.78766 | $1,865.8625$ | 0 | $2,448.214$ | $2,054.2955$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 214.78766 | $1,864.9943$ | 0 | $2,201.9664$ | 673.20867 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 220.75 | $1,865.7662$ | 0 | $2,460.7383$ | 752.32321 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 228.25 | $1,866.7371$ | 0 | $2,786.2464$ | 851.84102 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 235.75 | $1,867.7081$ | 0 | $3,111.7545$ | 951.35883 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 243.25 | $1,868.6791$ | 0 | $3,437.2626$ | $1,050.8766$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 251 | $1,869.6824$ | 0 | $3,773.621$ | $1,153.7117$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 259 | $1,870.7181$ | 0 | $4,120.8296$ | $1,259.864$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 267 | $1,871.7538$ | 0 | $4,263.0607$ | $1,303.3485$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 275 | $1,872.7895$ | 0 | $4,200.3143$ | $1,284.1649$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 282.60906 | $1,873.7746$ | 0 | $4,355.773$ | $1,331.6934$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 289.82717 | $1,874.7091$ | 0 | $4,729.4368$ | $1,445.9339$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 297.04529 | $1,875.6435$ | 0 | $5,103.1006$ | $1,560.1744$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 304.2634 | $1,876.578$ | 0 | $5,476.7645$ | $1,674.4149$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 311.48152 | $1,877.5125$ | 0 | $5,850.4283$ | $1,788.6554$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 318.69963 | $1,878.447$ | 0 | $6,224.0921$ | $1,902.8959$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 325.91775 | $1,879.3814$ | 0 | $6,597.756$ | $2,017.1364$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 333.13586 | $1,880.3159$ | 0 | $6,971.4198$ | $2,131.3769$ | 150.075 |
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| Slice <br> 24 | 339.80869 | $1,885.1587$ | 0 | $3,922.1401$ | $3,291.0663$ | 225 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 25 | 345.93623 | $1,893.9097$ | 0 | $3,560.4843$ | $2,987.601$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 352.66667 | $1,903.5218$ | 0 | $3,030.381$ | $2,542.7916$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 360 | $1,913.9948$ | 0 | $2,331.8302$ | $1,956.6378$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 367.33333 | $1,924.4679$ | 0 | $1,633.2794$ | $1,370.4841$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 372.4516 | $1,931.7776$ | 0 | $1,141.1832$ | 957.5664 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 376.73017 | $1,937.888$ | 0 | 810.99373 | 526.66549 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 382.38412 | $1,945.9627$ | 0 | 195.44588 | 126.92404 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: ( $-177.5082,1,801$ ) ft
Right Coordinate: $(550,1,953) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: ( $187.968,1,876.0315$ ) ft
Lower Left: (197.2912, 1,806.9576) ft
Lower Right: (269.9924, 1,838.286) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

2-Translational

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (333.3485, 1,910.6689) ft
Lower Left: $(339.0092,1,860.8593) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (415.9794, 1,896.8331) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs150psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.275)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.275$ )
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$150 \mathrm{psf}-11^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,890 |
| Point 2 | -151 | 1,906 |
| Point 3 | -37 | 1,898 |
| Point 4 | 56 | 1,894 |
| Point 5 | 76 | 1,891 |
| Point 6 | 101 | 1,890 |
| Point 7 | 123 | 1,887 |
| Point 8 | 157 | 1,879 |
| Point 9 | 181 | 1,879 |
| Point 10 | 207 | 1,880 |
| Point 11 | 263 | 1,908 |
| Point 12 | 279 | 1,909 |
| Point 13 | 349 | 1,949 |
| Point 14 | 371 | 1,950 |
| Point 15 | 406 | 1,950 |
| Point 16 | 446 | 1,951 |
| Point 17 | 482 | 1,952 |
| Point 18 | 506 | 1,952 |
| Point 19 | 550 | 1,953 |
| Point 20 | 550 | 1,910 |
| Point 21 | 550 | 1,857 |

2-Translational

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150psf-17 <br> bedding 4-8 | $1,26,30,31,20,19,18,17,16,15,29,28,10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 48,206 |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $10,28,29,15,14,13,12,11$ | 4,229 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs150psf-11 <br> bedding 4-8 | $30,25,24,23,22,21,31$ | 29,210 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 87,617
Fof S: 1.10
Volume: $6,644.417 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 797,330.04 lbs
Resisting Force: $320,432.74 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: 292,595.3 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 20 slip surfaces
Exit: $(178.07102,1,879) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(385.21109,1,950) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 114.02385 ft
Center: (263.38891, 1,967.75) ft

## Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 179.53551 | $1,878.3934$ | 0 | 230.20495 | 193.16489 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 184.25 | $1,876.4406$ | 0 | 594.66078 | 498.97964 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 190.75 | $1,873.7482$ | 0 | $1,110.7679$ | 932.04491 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 197.25 | $1,871.0558$ | 0 | $1,626.875$ | $1,365.1102$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 203.75 | $1,868.3634$ | 0 | $2,142.982$ | $1,798.1754$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 209.78766 | $1,865.8625$ | 0 | $2,848.056$ | $2,389.8027$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 214.78766 | $1,864.9943$ | 0 | $2,172.1571$ | 664.09509 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 220.75 | $1,865.7662$ | 0 | $2,428.0646$ | 742.33384 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 228.25 | $1,866.7371$ | 0 | $2,749.9694$ | 840.75001 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 235.75 | $1,867.7081$ | 0 | $3,071.8741$ | 939.16617 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 243.25 | $1,868.6791$ | 0 | $3,393.7789$ | $1,037.5823$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 251 | $1,869.6824$ | 0 | $3,726.4139$ | $1,139.279$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 259 | $1,870.7181$ | 0 | $4,069.779$ | $1,244.2563$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 267 | $1,871.7538$ | 0 | $4,210.4356$ | $1,287.2593$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 275 | $1,872.7895$ | 0 | $4,148.3838$ | $1,268.2882$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 282.60906 | $1,873.7746$ | 0 | $4,302.1216$ | $1,315.2906$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 289.82717 | $1,874.7091$ | 0 | $4,671.649$ | $1,428.2664$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 297.04529 | $1,875.6435$ | 0 | $5,041.1764$ | $1,541.2423$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 304.2634 | $1,876.578$ | 0 | $5,410.7039$ | $1,654.2182$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 311.48152 | $1,877.5125$ | 0 | $5,780.2313$ | $1,767.1941$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 318.69963 | $1,878.447$ | 0 | $6,149.7588$ | $1,880.1699$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 325.91775 | $1,879.3814$ | 0 | $6,519.2862$ | $1,993.1458$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 333.13586 | $1,880.3159$ | 0 | $6,888.8137$ | $2,106.1217$ | 150.075 |
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| Slice <br> 24 | 339.80869 | $1,885.1587$ | 0 | $3,225.6989$ | $2,706.6828$ | 225 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 25 | 345.93623 | $1,893.9097$ | 0 | $2,924.1517$ | $2,453.6546$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 352.66667 | $1,903.5218$ | 0 | $2,482.1536$ | $2,082.7741$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 360 | $1,913.9948$ | 0 | $1,899.7045$ | $1,594.0414$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 367.33333 | $1,924.4679$ | 0 | $1,317.2555$ | $1,105.3086$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 372.4516 | $1,931.7776$ | 0 | 906.9476 | 761.0194 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 376.73017 | $1,937.888$ | 0 | 647.83123 | 420.70652 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 382.38412 | $1,945.9627$ | 0 | 122.03969 | 79.253504 | 200 |



## 2 - Translational

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 10
Date: 3/21/2016
Time: 3:16:19 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 7-7 Static Temporary Final without keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 7-7 results\updated 3-21-2016\}
Last Solved Date: 3/21/2016
Last Solved Time: 3:17:08 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs150psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-177.5082,1,801) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: (550, 1,953) ft

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(187.968,1,876.0315) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (197.2912, 1,806.9576) ft
Lower Right: (269.9924, 1,838.286) ft
X Increments: 10
Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 135
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: (333.3485, 1,910.6689) ft
Lower Left: (339.0092, 1,860.8593) ft
Lower Right: (415.9794, 1,896.8331) ft

2-Translational

X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs150psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs150psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 4-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: (4, 0.275)

Data Point: ( $8,0.275$ )
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
150 psf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $4-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,890 |
| Point 2 | -151 | 1,906 |
| Point 3 | -37 | 1,898 |
| Point 4 | 56 | 1,894 |
| Point 5 | 76 | 1,891 |
| Point 6 | 101 | 1,890 |
| Point 7 | 123 | 1,887 |
| Point 8 | 157 | 1,879 |
| Point 9 | 181 | 1,879 |
| Point 10 | 207 | 1,880 |
| Point 11 | 406 | 1,950 |
| Point 12 | 446 | 1,951 |
| Point 13 | 482 | 1,952 |
| Point 14 | 506 | 1,952 |
| Point 15 | 550 | 1,953 |
| Point 16 | 550 | 1,910 |
| Point 17 | 550 | 1,857 |
| Point 18 | 550 | 1,833 |
| Point 19 | 550 | 1,801 |
| Point 20 | 433 | 1,801 |
| Point 21 | 271 | 1,801 |
| Point 22 | -177.5082 | 1,801 |
| Point 23 | -200 | $1,800.4977$ |
| Point 24 | 217 | 1,870 |
| Point 25 | 247 | 1,870 |
| Point 26 | -85 | 1,801 |
| Point 27 | 550 | 1,893 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs150psf-17 <br> bedding 4-8 | $1,22,26,27,16,15,14,13,12,11,25,24,10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 48,206 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs150psf-11 <br> bedding 4-8 | $26,21,20,19,18,17,27$ | 29,210 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 80,306
Slip Surface
F of $\mathrm{S}: 1.35$
Volume: $4,025.9453 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $483,113.44 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $186,246.05 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $138,339.21 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 20 slip surfaces
Exit: (249.57834, 1,871.2973) ft
Entry: (419.44452, 1,950.3361) ft
Radius: 106.60257 ft
Center: $(306.92882,1,970.0958) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 252.45979 | $1,871.6953$ | 0 | 107.51923 | 32.871927 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 258.22269 | $1,872.4912$ | 0 | 352.30531 | 107.71054 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 263.9856 | $1,873.2871$ | 0 | 597.0914 | 182.54916 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 269.7485 | $1,874.0831$ | 0 | 841.87749 | 257.38778 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 275.5114 | $1,874.879$ | 0 | $1,086.6636$ | 332.22639 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 281.2743 | $1,875.675$ | 0 | $1,331.4497$ | 407.06501 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 287.0372 | $1,876.4709$ | 0 | $1,576.2357$ | 481.90363 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 292.8001 | $1,877.2669$ | 0 | $1,821.0218$ | 556.74224 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 298.563 | $1,878.0628$ | 0 | $2,065.8079$ | 631.58086 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 304.3259 | $1,878.8588$ | 0 | $2,310.594$ | 706.41948 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 310.0888 | $1,879.6547$ | 0 | $2,555.3801$ | 781.2581 | 150.075 |


| Slice <br> 12 | 315.8517 | $1,880.4507$ | 0 | $2,800.1662$ | 856.09671 | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 13 | 321.6146 | $1,881.2466$ | 0 | $3,044.9523$ | 930.93533 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 327.3775 | $1,882.0426$ | 0 | $3,289.7383$ | $1,005.7739$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 333.1404 | $1,882.8385$ | 0 | $3,534.5244$ | $1,080.6126$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 338.90331 | $1,883.6345$ | 0 | $3,779.3105$ | $1,155.4512$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 344.66621 | $1,884.4304$ | 0 | $4,024.0966$ | $1,230.2898$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 350.42911 | $1,885.2264$ | 0 | $4,268.8827$ | $1,305.1284$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 356.19201 | $1,886.0223$ | 0 | $4,513.6688$ | $1,379.967$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 361.95491 | $1,886.8183$ | 0 | $4,758.4549$ | $1,454.8056$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 367.71781 | $1,887.6142$ | 0 | $5,003.2409$ | $1,529.6443$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 373.48071 | $1,888.4101$ | 0 | $5,248.027$ | $1,604.4829$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 379.32594 | $1,893.0408$ | 0 | $2,643.0094$ | $2,217.7482$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 385.25351 | $1,901.5063$ | 0 | $2,294.2888$ | $1,925.1368$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 391.18108 | $1,909.9717$ | 0 | $1,945.5681$ | $1,632.5255$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 397.10865 | $1,918.4372$ | 0 | $1,596.8474$ | $1,339.9141$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 403.03622 | $1,926.9026$ | 0 | $1,248.1268$ | $1,047.3027$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 409.36113 | $1,935.9355$ | 0 | 773.81792 | 649.31033 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 416.08339 | $1,945.5359$ | 0 | 173.92083 | 145.93691 | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Lef
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 pcf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 13-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17º bedding 13-17 C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$ Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Model: Mohr-Coulomb

Mode: : Mohr-Coulom
Unit Weight: 120 p
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: $100 \mathrm{psf-} 25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $31.8663,1,894.4016$ ) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(167,1,935) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(180.1299,1,941.5649) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $432.5595,2,006.8366$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-201, 1,843) ft
Right Coordinate: $(550,2,009) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $15,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $3-14^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $3,0.444$ )
Data Point: $(14,0.444)$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: (15.1, 1
TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(14,0.625)$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: (17, 0.425
Data Point: (17.1, 1)
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

## Points

|  | f <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 1 | -200 | 1,890 |
| Point <br> 2 | -135 | 1,890 |
| Point <br> 3 | -27 | 1,893 |
| Point <br> 4 | 57 | 1,895 |
| Point <br> 5 | 107 | 1,910 |
| Point <br> 6 | 117 | 1,910 |
| Point <br> 7 | 185 | 1,944 |
| Point <br> 8 | 201 | 1,944 |
| Point <br> 9 | 220 | 1,954 |
| Point <br> 10 | 550 | 1,996 |
| Point <br> 11 | 550 | 1,919 |
| Point <br> 12 | 268 | 1,892 |
| Point <br> 13 | 36 | 1,868 |
| Point <br> 14 | -201 | 1,843 |
| Point <br> 15 | -200 | $1,800.4977$ |
| Point <br> 16 | 550 | 1,799 |
| Point <br> 17 | 550 | 1,929 |
| Point <br> 18 | 98 | 1,874 |
| Point <br> 19 | 128 | 1,878 |
| Point <br> 20 | 146 | 1,900 |
| Point <br> 21 | 256 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 22 | 78 | 1,896 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200 | 1,878 |


| Point <br> 24 | 245 | 1,955 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 25 | 294 | 1,977 |
| Point <br> 26 | 304 | 1,977 |
| Point <br> 27 | 360 | $2,005.5$ |
| Point <br> 28 | 550 | 2,009 |
| Point <br> 29 | 83 | 1,891 |
| Point <br> 30 | 128 | 1,891 |
| Point <br> 31 | 140 | 1,897 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc150-17 bedding $13-17^{\circ}$ | $11,12,19,18,13,14,15,16$ | 61,653 |
| Region 2 | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | $12,11,17,20,19$ | 6,209 |
| Region 3 | TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 | $1,23,22,4,3,2$ | $1,447.5$ |
| Region 4 | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | $23,14,13,18,29,22$ | 8,396 |
| Region 5 | TQs100-25 $5^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 | $20,21,10,17$ | 19,364 |
| Region 6 | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-15 | $18,19,20,31,30,29$ | 694.5 |
| Region 7 | Fill | $22,5,6,7,8,9,24,25,26,27,28,10,21,20,31$ | 9,516 |
| Region 8 | Fill | $22,29,30,31$ | 292.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 80,754
F of S: 2.06
Volume: 648.41255 ft
Volume: $648.41255 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $77,809.507 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $5,233,028.6 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
Resisting Moment: $5,233,028.6 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $2,546,265.3 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $2,546,265.3 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip su
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip s
Exit: (117.96558, 1,910.4828) ft
Entry: (190.23724, 1,944) ft
Radius: 81.288567 ft
Center: ( $124.28877,1,991.5251$ ) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| Slice <br> 1 | 119.16263 | $1,910.4071$ | 0 | 88.81307 | 57.675882 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 2 | 121.55671 | $1,910.2912$ | 0 | 244.3156 | 158.6604 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 123.9508 | $1,910.246$ | 0 | 388.44124 | 252.25669 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 126.34489 | $1,910.2713$ | 0 | 521.51091 | 338.67315 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 128.73897 | $1,910.3672$ | 0 | 643.79862 | 418.08771 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 131.13306 | $1,910.534$ | 0 | 755.53575 | 490.65065 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 133.52714 | $1,910.7721$ | 0 | 856.91453 | 556.4868 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 135.92123 | $1,911.0822$ | 0 | 948.0908 | 615.69736 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 138.31532 | $1,911.465$ | 0 | $1,029.1861$ | 668.36129 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 140.7094 | $1,911.9217$ | 0 | $1,100.2894$ | 714.53632 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 143.10349 | $1,912.4534$ | 0 | $1,161.4581$ | 754.2597 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 145.49758 | $1,913.0618$ | 0 | $1,212.7185$ | 787.5486 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 147.89166 | $1,913.7486$ | 0 | $1,254.0663$ | 814.40021 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 150.28575 | $1,914.516$ | 0 | $1,285.4663$ | 834.79156 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 152.67983 | $1,915.3664$ | 0 | $1,306.8511$ | 848.67906 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 155.07392 | $1,916.3025$ | 0 | $1,318.1208$ | 855.99768 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 157.46801 | $1,917.3277$ | 0 | $1,319.1404$ | 856.65979 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 159.86209 | $1,918.4457$ | 0 | $1,309.7378$ | 850.55364 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 162.25618 | $1,919.6608$ | 0 | $1,289.7005$ | 837.54133 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 164.65027 | $1,920.9781$ | 0 | $1,258.7722$ | 817.45625 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 167.04435 | $1,922.4033$ | 0 | $1,216.6473$ | 790.09998 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 169.43844 | $1,923.9435$ | 0 | $1,162.965$ | 755.23831 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 171.83253 | $1,925.6066$ | 0 | $1,097.3023$ | 712.59642 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 174.22661 | $1,927.4022$ | 0 | $1,019.1641$ | 661.85291 | 200 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Repotenatedura

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 155
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 9:28:29 AM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 8-8 Seismic Final with keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 8-8 results\Latest updated 3-21-2016
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 9:28:45 AM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Lef
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 pcf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 13-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17º bedding 13-17 C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$ Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Model: Mohr-Coulomb

Mode: : Mohr-Coulom
Unit Weight: 120 p
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: $100 \mathrm{psf-} 25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $31.8663,1,894.4016$ ) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(167,1,935) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(180.1299,1,941.5649) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $432.5595,2,006.8366$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-201, 1,843) ft
Right Coordinate: $(550,2,009) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $3-14^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $3,0.444$ )
Data Point: $(14,0.444)$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: (15.1, 1
TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(14,0.625)$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: $(17,0.425$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

## Points

|  | f <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 1 | -200 | 1,890 |
| Point <br> 2 | -135 | 1,890 |
| Point <br> 3 | -27 | 1,893 |
| Point <br> 4 | 57 | 1,895 |
| Point <br> 5 | 107 | 1,910 |
| Point <br> 6 | 117 | 1,910 |
| Point <br> 7 | 185 | 1,944 |
| Point <br> 8 | 201 | 1,944 |
| Point <br> 9 | 220 | 1,954 |
| Point <br> 10 | 550 | 1,996 |
| Point <br> 11 | 550 | 1,919 |
| Point <br> 12 | 268 | 1,892 |
| Point <br> 13 | 36 | 1,868 |
| Point <br> 14 | -201 | 1,843 |
| Point <br> 15 | -200 | $1,800.4977$ |
| Point <br> 16 | 550 | 1,799 |
| Point <br> 17 | 550 | 1,929 |
| Point <br> 18 | 98 | 1,874 |
| Point <br> 19 | 128 | 1,878 |
| Point <br> 20 | 146 | 1,900 |
| Point <br> 21 | 256 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 22 | 78 | 1,896 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200 | 1,878 |


| Point <br> 24 | 245 | 1,955 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 25 | 294 | 1,977 |
| Point <br> 26 | 304 | 1,977 |
| Point <br> 27 | 360 | $2,005.5$ |
| Point <br> 28 | 550 | 2,009 |
| Point <br> 29 | 83 | 1,891 |
| Point <br> 30 | 128 | 1,891 |
| Point <br> 31 | 140 | 1,897 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc150-17 bedding $13-17^{\circ}$ | $11,12,19,18,13,14,15,16$ | 61,653 |
| Region 2 | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | $12,11,17,20,19$ | 6,209 |
| Region 3 | TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 | $1,23,22,4,3,2$ | $1,447.5$ |
| Region 4 | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | $23,14,13,18,29,22$ | 8,396 |
| Region 5 | TQs100-25 $5^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 | $20,21,10,17$ | 19,364 |
| Region 6 | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-15 | $18,19,20,31,30,29$ | 694.5 |
| Region 7 | Fill | $22,5,6,7,8,9,24,25,26,27,28,10,21,20,31$ | 9,516 |
| Region 8 | Fill | $22,29,30,31$ | 292.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 42,140
F of S: 1.48
Volume: $2,129.5156 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weiume: 2,129.5156 It
Weight: $255,541.87 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $39,750,707 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Resisting Moment: $39,750,707 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $26,865,927 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $26,865,927 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip su
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip s
Exit: ( $78.001259,1,896.0006$ ) ft
Exit: $(78.001259,1,896.0006) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(230.48674,1,954.4195) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (230.48674, 1,
Radius: 216.9753 ft
Radius: 216.9753 ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| Slice <br> 1 | 78.009414 | $1,896.0004$ | 0 | 3.2043685 | 2.0809412 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 2 | 80.61912 | $1,895.9798$ | 0 | 155.74732 | 101.14349 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 85.822221 | $1,896.0013$ | 0 | 447.65659 | 290.71159 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 91.025322 | $1,896.1476$ | 0 | 718.79949 | 466.79385 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 95.855727 | $1,896.3913$ | 0 | 952.92412 | 618.83616 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 100.31344 | $1,896.716$ | 0 | $1,153.4495$ | 749.05883 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 104.77115 | $1,897.1333$ | 0 | $1,339.7967$ | 870.07412 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 109.5 | $1,897.6807$ | 0 | $1,384.6889$ | 899.2275 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 114.5 | $1,898.3712$ | 0 | $1,290.4376$ | 838.01995 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 119.61538 | $1,899.2024$ | 0 | $1,327.6056$ | 862.15715 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 124.84615 | $1,900.1814$ | 0 | $1,491.429$ | 968.54535 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 130.07692 | $1,901.2943$ | 0 | $1,637.0297$ | $1,063.0995$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 135.30769 | $1,902.543$ | 0 | $1,764.6215$ | $1,145.9586$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 140.53846 | $1,903.9301$ | 0 | $1,874.3786$ | $1,217.2357$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 145.76923 | $1,905.4583$ | 0 | $1,966.4365$ | $1,277.0188$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 151 | $1,907.1308$ | 0 | $2,040.8934$ | $1,325.3716$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 156.23077 | $1,908.9511$ | 0 | $2,097.8105$ | $1,362.3341$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 161.46154 | $1,910.9233$ | 0 | $2,137.2134$ | $1,387.9226$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 166.69231 | $1,913.0518$ | 0 | $2,159.091$ | $1,402.1301$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 171.92308 | $1,915.3416$ | 0 | $2,163.3964$ | $1,404.9261$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 177.15385 | $1,917.7986$ | 0 | $2,150.0457$ | $1,396.256$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 182.38462 | $1,920.429$ | 0 | $2,118.9177$ | $1,376.0413$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 187.66667 | $1,923.2695$ | 0 | $1,940.5046$ | $1,260.1784$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 193 | $1,926.3322$ | 0 | $1,619.3073$ | $1,051.5905$ | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## Fof S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constan
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100pcf-25 bedding 3-14
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17º bedding 13-17
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-1^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 bedding 0-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,843)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(550,2,009) \mathrm{ft}$
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## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(76.8746,1,925.8506) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (110.8805, 1,850.7649) ft
Lower Right: (236.0227, 1,856.3268) ft
X Increments: 10
XIncrements: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Starting Angle: $135{ }^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Right Grid
Upper Left: (244.9639, 1,985.7845) ft
Lower Left: $(275.7545,1,865.054) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (416.7433, 1,877.9566) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $3-14^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.444)$
Data Point: $(14,0.444)$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: (15.1,1)
TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(14,0.625$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: (13, 0.425
Data Point: $(17,0.425$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)
150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
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Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1$
Data Point: $(13,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,890 |
| Point 2 | -135 | 1,890 |
| Point 3 | -27 | 1,893 |
| Point 4 | 57 | 1,895 |
| Point 5 | 107 | 1,910 |
| Point 6 | 117 | 1,910 |
| Point 7 | 185 | 1,944 |
| Point 8 | 201 | 1,944 |
| Point 9 | 220 | 1,954 |
| Point 10 | 550 | 1,996 |
| Point 11 | 550 | 1,919 |
| Point 12 | 268 | 1,892 |
| Point 13 | 36 | 1,868 |
| Point 14 | -201 | 1,843 |
| Point 15 | -200 | $1,800.4977$ |
| Point 16 | 550 | 1,799 |
| Point 17 | 550 | 1,929 |
| Point 18 | 98 | 1,874 |
| Point 19 | 128 | 1,878 |
| Point 20 | 146 | 1,900 |
| Point 21 | 256 | 1,955 |
| Point 22 | 78 | 1,896 |
| Point 23 | -200 | 1,878 |
| Point 24 | 245 | 1,955 |
| Point 25 | 294 | 1,977 |
| Point 26 | 304 | 1,977 |
| Point 27 | 360 | $2,005.5$ |
| Point 28 | 550 | 2,009 |
| Point 29 | 83 | 1,891 |
| Point 30 | 128 | 1,891 |
| Point 31 | 140 | 1,897 |
|  |  |  |

## Regions <br> <br> gions

 <br> <br> gions}| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-$ $17^{\circ}$ | 11,12,19,18,13,14,15,16 | 61,653 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | 12,11,17,20,19 | 6,209 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs100-25 }{ }^{\circ} \text { bedding } \\ 3-14^{\circ} \end{array}$ | 1,23,22,4,3,2 | 1,447.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | 23,14,13,18,29,22 | 8,396 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs100-25 } 5^{\circ} \text { bedding } \\ & 3-14^{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | 20,21,10,17 | 19,364 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | 18,19,20,31,30,29 | 694.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 22,5,6,7,8,9,24,25,26,27,28,10,21,20,31 | 9,516 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 22,29,30,31 | 292.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 78,263
Fof S: 1.73
Volume: $9,473.1768 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,136,781.2 lbs
Resisting Force: 556,949.79 lbs
Activating Force: $321,328.2 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 2 of 131,769 slip surfaces
of S Rank (Query): 2 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: $(83.380059,1,898.5973) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (384.38678, 2,005.9492) ft
Radius: 160.07064 ft
Center: $(205.16867,2,032.7872) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 89.285044 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | 342.0819 | 222.15058 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 101.09501 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $1,026.2457$ | 666.45175 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 112 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $1,368.3276$ | 888.60233 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 121.36576 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $1,630.273$ | $1,058.7117$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 130.09727 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $2,154.1638$ | $1,398.9303$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 138.82878 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $2,678.0546$ | $1,739.149$ | 200 |
|  | 144.02343 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $2,989.7332$ | $1,394.1355$ | 100 |
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| Slice <br> 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 8 | 145.42616 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $3,073.897$ | $1,433.3817$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 149.52403 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $3,319.7694$ | $1,548.0339$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 158.49512 | $1,899.9426$ | 0 | $3,453.2084$ | $1,610.2575$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 169.20664 | $1,902.5882$ | 0 | $3,758.2068$ | $1,752.4806$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 179.73555 | $1,905.1886$ | 0 | $4,057.9925$ | $1,892.273$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 189 | $1,907.4768$ | 0 | $4,096.7113$ | $1,910.3278$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 197 | $1,909.4526$ | 0 | $3,874.363$ | $1,806.6451$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 205.75 | $1,911.6137$ | 0 | $3,912.5004$ | $1,824.4289$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 215.25 | $1,913.9601$ | 0 | $4,211.1235$ | $1,963.6791$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 226.25 | $1,916.6769$ | 0 | $4,214.8585$ | $1,965.4208$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 238.75 | $1,919.7642$ | 0 | $3,923.7055$ | $1,829.6539$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 250.5 | $1,922.6662$ | 0 | $3,903.1505$ | $1,820.069$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 260.75 | $1,925.1978$ | 0 | $4,136.1451$ | $1,928.7161$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 270.25 | $1,927.5441$ | 0 | $4,352.0914$ | $2,029.4135$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 279.75 | $1,929.8905$ | 0 | $4,568.0376$ | $2,130.1109$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 289.25 | $1,932.2368$ | 0 | $4,783.9839$ | $2,230.8083$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 299 | $1,934.6449$ | 0 | $4,752.9893$ | $2,216.3553$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 308.73418 | $1,937.049$ | 0 | $4,753.5728$ | $2,216.6274$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 318.20253 | $1,939.3876$ | 0 | $5,032.6751$ | $2,346.775$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 327.67089 | $1,941.7261$ | 0 | $5,311.7775$ | $2,476.9225$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 337.13924 | $1,944.0646$ | 0 | $5,590.8798$ | $2,607.0701$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 346.0912 | $1,951.2575$ | 0 | $3,238.4279$ | $2,717.3637$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 354.52676 | $1,963.3047$ | 0 | $2,687.9975$ | $2,255.4977$ | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 po
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## Fof S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constan
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100pcf-25 bedding 3-14
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17º bedding 13-17
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-1^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 bedding 0-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,843)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(550,2,009) \mathrm{ft}$
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## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(76.8746,1,925.8506) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (110.8805, 1,850.7649) ft
Lower Right: (236.0227, 1,856.3268) ft
X Increments: 10
XIncrements: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Starting Angle: $135{ }^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(244.9639,1,985.7845) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(275.7545,1,865.054) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (416.7433, 1,877.9566) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $3-14^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.444)$
Data Point: $(14,0.444)$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: (15.1,1)
TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(14,0.625$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: (13, 0.425
Data Point: $(17,0.425$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)
150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
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Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,890 |
| Point 2 | -135 | 1,890 |
| Point 3 | -27 | 1,893 |
| Point 4 | 57 | 1,895 |
| Point 5 | 107 | 1,910 |
| Point 6 | 117 | 1,910 |
| Point 7 | 185 | 1,944 |
| Point 8 | 201 | 1,944 |
| Point 9 | 220 | 1,954 |
| Point 10 | 550 | 1,996 |
| Point 11 | 550 | 1,919 |
| Point 12 | 268 | 1,892 |
| Point 13 | 36 | 1,868 |
| Point 14 | -201 | 1,843 |
| Point 15 | -200 | $1,800.4977$ |
| Point 16 | 550 | 1,799 |
| Point 17 | 550 | 1,929 |
| Point 18 | 98 | 1,874 |
| Point 19 | 128 | 1,878 |
| Point 20 | 146 | 1,900 |
| Point 21 | 256 | 1,955 |
| Point 22 | 78 | 1,896 |
| Point 23 | -200 | 1,878 |
| Point 24 | 245 | 1,955 |
| Point 25 | 294 | 1,977 |
| Point 26 | 304 | 1,977 |
| Point 27 | 360 | $2,005.5$ |
| Point 28 | 550 | 2,009 |
| Point 29 | 83 | 1,891 |
| Point 30 | 128 | 1,891 |
| Point 31 | 140 | 1,897 |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-$ $17^{\circ}$ | 11,12,19,18,13,14,15,16 | 61,653 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | 12,11,17,20,19 | 6,209 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs100-25 }{ }^{\circ} \text { bedding } \\ 3-14^{\circ} \end{array}$ | 1,23,22,4,3,2 | 1,447.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | 23,14,13,18,29,22 | 8,396 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs100-25 } 5^{\circ} \text { bedding } \\ & 3-14^{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | 20,21,10,17 | 19,364 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$ | 18,19,20,31,30,29 | 694.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 22,5,6,7,8,9,24,25,26,27,28,10,21,20,31 | 9,516 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 22,29,30,31 | 292.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 78,263
Fof S: 1.15
Volume: $9,473.1768 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,136,781.2 lbs
Resisting Force: $532,408.49 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $462,664.31 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: $(83.380059,1,898.5973) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (384.38678, 2,005.9492) ft
Entry: ( $384.38678,2,0$
Center: (205.16867, 2,032.7872) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 89.285044 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | 342.0819 | 222.15058 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 101.09501 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $1,026.2457$ | 666.45175 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 112 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $1,368.3276$ | 888.60233 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 121.36576 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $1,630.273$ | $1,058.7117$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 130.09727 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $2,154.1638$ | $1,398.9303$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 138.82878 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $2,678.0546$ | $1,739.149$ | 200 |
|  | 144.02343 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $2,989.7332$ | $1,394.1355$ | 100 |
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| Slice <br> 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 8 | 145.42616 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $3,073.897$ | $1,433.3817$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 149.52403 | $1,898.5973$ | 0 | $3,319.7694$ | $1,548.0339$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 158.49512 | $1,899.9426$ | 0 | $3,338.9706$ | $1,556.9876$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 169.20664 | $1,902.5882$ | 0 | $3,634.4758$ | $1,694.7839$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 179.73555 | $1,905.1886$ | 0 | $3,924.924$ | $1,830.2221$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 189 | $1,907.4768$ | 0 | $3,962.4367$ | $1,847.7146$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 197 | $1,909.4526$ | 0 | $3,747.014$ | $1,747.2613$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 205.75 | $1,911.6137$ | 0 | $3,783.9635$ | $1,764.4912$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 215.25 | $1,913.9601$ | 0 | $4,073.2853$ | $1,899.4041$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 226.25 | $1,916.6769$ | 0 | $4,076.904$ | $1,901.0915$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 238.75 | $1,919.7642$ | 0 | $3,794.8196$ | $1,769.5534$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 250.5 | $1,922.6662$ | 0 | $3,774.9049$ | $1,760.267$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 260.75 | $1,925.1978$ | 0 | $4,000.6423$ | $1,865.5302$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 270.25 | $1,927.5441$ | 0 | $4,209.8624$ | $1,963.0911$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 279.75 | $1,929.8905$ | 0 | $4,419.0825$ | $2,060.652$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 289.25 | $1,932.2368$ | 0 | $4,628.3026$ | $2,158.213$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 299 | $1,934.6449$ | 0 | $4,598.2735$ | $2,144.2101$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 308.73418 | $1,937.049$ | 0 | $4,598.8388$ | $2,144.4738$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 318.20253 | $1,939.3876$ | 0 | $4,869.2478$ | $2,270.5676$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 327.67089 | $1,941.7261$ | 0 | $5,139.6569$ | $2,396.6614$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 337.13924 | $1,944.0646$ | 0 | $5,410.0659$ | $2,522.7552$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 346.0912 | $1,951.2575$ | 0 | $2,627.4325$ | $2,204.6776$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 354.52676 | $1,963.3047$ | 0 | $2,172.9106$ | $1,823.2885$ | 225 |


| Slice <br> 31 | 359.37227 | $1,970.2248$ | 0 | $2,179.0503$ | $1,415.0918$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 32 | 366.0967 | $1,979.8283$ | 0 | $1,571.137$ | $1,020.3083$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 378.29008 | $1,997.2422$ | 0 | 431.80198 | 280.41549 | 200 |



## 2 - Translational

Report generated using Geostudio 2012 Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Lto

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 15
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 9:06:34 AM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 8-8 Static Temporary Final without keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 8-8 results \Latest updated 3-21-2016
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 9:06:55 AM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 po
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100pcf-25 bedding 3-14
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17º bedding 13-17
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-170 bedding $13-17^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 bedding 0-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-201, 1,843) ft
Right Coordinate: $(550,1,996) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

## Left Grid

Upper Left: (92.8893, 1,918.8506) ft
Lower Left: (113.9754, 1,843.7649) ft
Lower Right: (191.5725, 1,849.3268) ft

X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: (199.961, 1,950.2414) ft
Lower Left: (217.5045, 1,860.0503) ft
Lower Right: (297.8353, 1,869.6891) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc100-25 bedding 0-15
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15,0.625$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
$100 p c f-25^{\circ}$ bedding $3-14^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.444)$
Data Point: $(14,0.444)$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $0-15^{\circ}$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: (15.1, 1
TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(14,0.625)$
Data Point: $(14.1,1)$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 13-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: (13, 0.425
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)

## 150pst-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 13-17

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

$$
\text { Curve Fit to Data: } 100 \%
$$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(12.9,1)$
Data Point: $(13,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17,0.75)$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,890 |
| Point 2 | -135 | 1,890 |
| Point 3 | -27 | 1,893 |
| Point 4 | 57 | 1,895 |
| Point 5 | 550 | 1,996 |
| Point 6 | 550 | 1,919 |
| Point 7 | 268 | 1,892 |
| Point 8 | 36 | 1,868 |
| Point 9 | -201 | 1,843 |
| Point 10 | -200 | $1,800.4977$ |
| Point 11 | 550 | 1,799 |
| Point 12 | 550 | 1,929 |
| Point 13 | 98 | 1,874 |
| Point 14 | 128 | 1,878 |
| Point 15 | 146 | 1,900 |
| Point 16 | 256 | 1,955 |
| Point 17 | 78 | 1,896 |
| Point 18 | -200 | 1,878 |
| Point 19 | 83 | 1,891 |
| Point 20 | 128 | 1,891 |
| Point 21 | 140 | 1,897 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 13-170 | 6,7,14,13,8,9,10,11 | 61,653 |
| Region 2 | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-15 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 7,6,12,15,14 | 6,209 |
| Region 3 | TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 1,18,17,4,3,2 | 1,447.5 |
| Region 4 | Tmc100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-15 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 18,9,8,13,19,17 | 8,396 |
| Region 5 | TQs100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 3-14 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 15,16,5,12 | 19,364 |
| Region 6 | Tmc100psf-25 bedding 0-15 | 13,14,15,21,20,19 | 694.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 76,07
Fof S: 1.54
Volume: $1,982.3892 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $237,886.7 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $118,932.65 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $77,235.118 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces

Exit: $(129.16285,1,891.5814) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (265.97843, 1,956.3916) ft
Radius: 84.753865 ft
Center: (174.54501, 1,972.5941) ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 131.87213 | $1,892.2329$ | 0 | 64.140147 | 29.909042 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 137.29071 | $1,893.5359$ | 0 | 221.46642 | 103.27149 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 140.77451 | $1,894.3737$ | 0 | 322.61716 | 150.43885 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 143.77451 | $1,895.0951$ | 0 | 409.72099 | 191.05603 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 148.15872 | $1,896.1493$ | 0 | 537.01468 | 250.41406 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 152.47615 | $1,897.1876$ | 0 | 662.36961 | 308.86802 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 156.79358 | $1,898.2258$ | 0 | 787.72455 | 367.32199 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 161.11101 | $1,899.264$ | 0 | 913.07949 | 425.77596 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 165.42844 | $1,900.3022$ | 0 | $1,038.4344$ | 484.22993 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 169.74587 | $1,901.3404$ | 0 | $1,163.7894$ | 542.68389 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 174.14479 | $1,902.3982$ | 0 | $1,291.5248$ | 602.24791 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 178.6252 | $1,903.4756$ | 0 | $1,421.6117$ | 662.90844 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 183.10561 | $1,904.553$ | 0 | $1,551.6986$ | 723.56896 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 187.58602 | $1,905.6304$ | 0 | $1,681.7856$ | 784.22949 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 192.06643 | $1,906.7078$ | 0 | $1,811.8725$ | 844.89001 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 196.54684 | $1,907.7852$ | 0 | $1,941.9594$ | 905.55054 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 201.02725 | $1,908.8626$ | 0 | $2,072.0463$ | 966.21107 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 205.50765 | $1,909.94$ | 0 | $2,202.1332$ | $1,026.8716$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 209.98806 | $1,911.0174$ | 0 | $2,332.2202$ | $1,087.5321$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 214.46847 | $1,912.0948$ | 0 | $2,462.3071$ | $1,148.1926$ | 99.9 |
| 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 21 | 218.94888 | $1,913.1722$ | 0 | $2,592.394$ | $1,208.8532$ | 99.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 22 | 223.42929 | $1,914.2496$ | 0 | $2,722.4809$ | $1,269.5137$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 227.9097 | $1,915.327$ | 0 | $2,852.5678$ | $1,330.1742$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 232.39011 | $1,916.4044$ | 0 | $2,982.6547$ | $1,390.8347$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 236.87052 | $1,917.4818$ | 0 | $3,112.7417$ | $1,451.4953$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 241.22188 | $1,921.0355$ | 0 | $1,678.1283$ | $1,408.1168$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 245.4442 | $1,927.0656$ | 0 | $1,413.3821$ | $1,185.9684$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 249.66652 | $1,933.0957$ | 0 | $1,148.636$ | 963.82006 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 253.88884 | $1,939.1258$ | 0 | 883.88989 | 741.67168 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 258.49461 | $1,945.7035$ | 0 | 534.34036 | 448.3648 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 263.48382 | $1,952.8289$ | 0 | 99.987422 | 83.899409 | 225 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Repotenatedura

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 97
Date: 3/19/2016
Time: 7:19:51 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 10-10 Static Final with keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: C:\Users\Alexander\Desktop\LGC valley\original sections\}
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 7:20:14 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
Phi-B: 0
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $114.0248,1,897.657$ ) ft Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $333.4764,1,956.7205$ ) ft Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $350.425,1,966.4569$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $525.4812,2,021.6692$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,800) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(612,1,969) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $0,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$

| Points |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | Y (f) |
| Point 1 | -175 | 1,893 |
| Point 2 | -105 | 1,893 |
| Point 3 | -94 | 1,899 |
| Point 4 | -2 | 1,895 |
| Point 5 | 129 | 1,898 |
| Point 6 | 173 | 1,898 |
| Point 7 | 180 | 1,905 |
| Point 8 | 220 | 1,909 |
| Point 9 | 253 | 1,925 |
| Point 10 | 263 | 1,925 |
| Point 11 | 315 | 1,951 |
| Point 12 | 327 | 1,953 |
| Point 13 | 374 | 1,980 |
| Point 14 | 388 | 1,980 |
| Point 15 | 432 | 2,005 |
| Point 16 | 477 | 2,014 |
| Point 17 | 550 | 2,014 |
| Point 18 | 573 | 1,996 |
| Point 19 | 612 | 1,969 |
| Point 20 | 612 | 1,878 |
| Point 21 | 612 | 1,802 |
| Point 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point 24 | -175 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | -200 | 1,800 |
| Point 26 | -175.1684 | 1,877 |
| Point 27 | -122 | 1,833 |
| Point 28 | -95 | 1,826 |
| Point 29 | 53 | 1,896.2595 |
| Point 30 | 13 | 1,877.2704 |
| Point 31 | -30 | 1,800 |
| Point 32 | 612 | 1,862 |
| Point 33 | -199 | 1,893 |
| Point 34 | 193 | 1,878 |
| Point 35 | 253 | 1,878 |
| Point 36 | 508 | 2,024 |
| Point 37 | 538 | 2,020 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  |  | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Fill | $26,27,28,30,29,4,3,2,1$ | 8,996 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ <br> bedding $0-6^{\circ}$ | $31,23,22,21,32$ | 19,589 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ <br> bedding $0-6^{\circ}$ | $31,32,20,19,18,17,37,35,34,6,5,29,30,28,27,26,1,33,25,24$ | 70,166 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $6,34,35,37,36,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7$ | 11,889 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 87,378
F of S: 1.83
Volume: $3,220.1592 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 386,419.11 lbs
Resisting Moment: 76,374,330 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: 41,799,057 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: (263.09824, 1,925.0491) ft
Entry: (452.53556, 2,009.1071) ft
Radius: 275.23527 ft
Center: (254.39858, 2,200.1469) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 266.3421 | $1,925.19$ | 0 | 170.35033 | 110.6268 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 272.82982 | $1,925.5487$ | 0 | 504.59684 | 327.68902 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 279.31754 | $1,926.0613$ | 0 | 815.45248 | 529.56103 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 285.80526 | $1,926.7289$ | 0 | $1,103.3308$ | 716.51143 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 292.29298 | $1,927.5524$ | 0 | $1,368.5909$ | 888.7733 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 298.7807 | $1,928.5334$ | 0 | $1,611.54$ | $1,046.5463$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 305.26842 | $1,929.6735$ | 0 | $1,832.437$ | $1,189.9985$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 311.75614 | $1,930.9749$ | 0 | $2,031.4938$ | $1,319.2675$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 318 | $1,932.3787$ | 0 | $2,092.263$ | $1,358.7315$ | 200 |
|  | 324 | $1,933.8754$ | 0 | $2,019.1095$ | $1,311.225$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 11 | 330.35714 | $1,935.6236$ | 0 | $2,073.9016$ | $1,346.8074$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 337.07143 | $1,937.6449$ | 0 | $2,250.9306$ | $1,461.7715$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 343.78571 | $1,939.8551$ | 0 | $2,404.0566$ | $1,561.2126$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 350.5 | $1,942.259$ | 0 | $2,533.2287$ | $1,645.0979$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 357.21429 | $1,944.8622$ | 0 | $2,638.3431$ | $1,713.36$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 363.92857 | $1,947.6706$ | 0 | $2,719.2418$ | $1,765.8962$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 370.64286 | $1,950.6915$ | 0 | $2,775.71$ | $1,802.5672$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 377.5 | $1,954.0063$ | 0 | $2,602.7087$ | $1,690.2188$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 384.5 | $1,957.6344$ | 0 | $2,205.4244$ | $1,432.2193$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 391.14286 | $1,961.3115$ | 0 | $1,990.0447$ | $1,292.3501$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 397.42857 | $1,965.0228$ | 0 | $1,952.2516$ | $1,267.807$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 403.71429 | $1,968.9645$ | 0 | $1,891.59$ | $1,228.4129$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 410 | $1,973.1488$ | 0 | $1,807.5807$ | $1,173.8566$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 416.28571 | $1,977.5892$ | 0 | $1,699.6805$ | $1,103.7854$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 422.57143 | $1,982.3016$ | 0 | $1,567.277$ | $1,017.8016$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 428.85714 | $1,987.3039$ | 0 | $1,409.6837$ | 915.45932 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 435.42259 | $1,992.869$ | 0 | $1,101.178$ | 715.11335 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 442.26778 | $1,999.0557$ | 0 | 644.12484 | 418.29956 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 449.11297 | $2,005.6802$ | 0 | 162.08651 | 105.26021 | 200 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 92
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (114.0248, 1,897.657) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: (333.4764, 1,956.7205) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (350.425, 1,966.4569) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(525.4812,2,021.6692) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,800) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(612,1,969) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: (0, 0.425)
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
150pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: (0, 0.667)
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$

## Points

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 1 | -175 | 1,893 |
| Point 2 | -105 | 1,893 |
| Point 3 | -94 | 1,899 |
| Point 4 | -2 | 1,895 |
| Point 5 | 129 | 1,898 |
| Point 6 | 173 | 1,898 |
| Point 7 | 180 | 1,905 |
| Point 8 | 220 | 1,909 |
| Point 9 | 253 | 1,925 |
| Point 10 | 263 | 1,925 |
| Point 11 | 315 | 1,951 |
| Point 12 | 327 | 1,953 |
| Point 13 | 374 | 1,980 |
| Point 14 | 388 | 1,980 |
| Point 15 | 432 | 2,005 |
| Point 16 | 477 | 2,014 |
| Point 17 | 550 | 2,014 |
| Point 18 | 573 | 1,996 |
| Point 19 | 612 | 1,969 |
| Point 20 | 612 | 1,878 |
| Point 21 | 612 | 1,802 |
| Point 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point 24 | -175 | 1,800 |
| Point 25 | -200 | 1,800 |
| Point 26 | -175.1684 | 1,877 |
| Point 27 | -122 | 1,833 |
| Point 28 | -95 | 1,826 |
| Point 29 | 53 | 1,896.2595 |
| Point 30 | 13 | 1,877.2704 |
| Point 31 | -30 | 1,800 |
| Point 32 | 612 | 1,862 |
| Point 33 | -199 | 1,893 |
| Point 34 | 193 | 1,878 |
| Point 35 | 253 | 1,878 |
| Point 36 | 508 | 2,024 |
| Point 37 | 538 | 2,020 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  |  | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Fill | $26,27,28,30,29,4,3,2,1$ | 8,996 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs 150-11 <br> bedding 0-6 | $31,23,22,21,32$ | 19,589 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs 150-17 <br>  <br> bedding 0-6 | $31,32,20,19,18,17,37,35,34,6,5,29,30,28,27,26,1,33,25,24$ | 70,166 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $6,34,35,37,36,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7$ | 11,889 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 61,570
F of S: 1.29
Volume: $4,845.2894 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 581,434.73 lbs
Resisting Moment: $1.5192364 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $1.1738992 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: (218.35144, 1,908.8351) ft
Entry: $(467.27523,2,012.055) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 391.16783 ft
Center: (202.14986, 2,299.6673) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 219.17572 | $1,908.8711$ | 0 | -1.1093562 | -0.72042433 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 224.125 | $1,909.1391$ | 0 | 208.75719 | 135.5685 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 232.375 | $1,909.6909$ | 0 | 601.79972 | 390.81331 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 240.625 | $1,910.4183$ | 0 | 966.73558 | 627.80542 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 248.875 | $1,911.3224$ | 0 | $1,304.2256$ | 846.974 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 258 | $1,912.5401$ | 0 | $1,373.7608$ | 892.1307 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 267.33333 | $1,913.9938$ | 0 | $1,433.4381$ | 930.88557 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 276 | $1,915.5593$ | 0 | $1,717.9318$ | $1,115.638$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 284.66667 | $1,917.3277$ | 0 | $1,974.1637$ | $1,282.0369$ | 200 |
|  | 293.33333 | $1,919.3017$ | 0 | $2,202.5694$ | $1,430.3653$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 11 | 302 | $1,921.4846$ | 0 | $2,403.5279$ | $1,560.8693$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 310.66667 | $1,923.8801$ | 0 | $2,577.3648$ | $1,673.7603$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 321 | $1,927.0452$ | 0 | $2,539.9395$ | $1,649.456$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 330.91667 | $1,930.3244$ | 0 | $2,500.9306$ | $1,624.1233$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 338.75 | $1,933.1496$ | 0 | $2,641.8007$ | $1,715.6054$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 346.58333 | $1,936.1656$ | 0 | $2,759.997$ | $1,792.363$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 354.41667 | $1,939.3771$ | 0 | $2,855.5741$ | $1,854.4315$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 362.25 | $1,942.7895$ | 0 | $2,928.5539$ | $1,901.8252$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 370.08333 | $1,946.4085$ | 0 | $2,978.9251$ | $1,934.5366$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 377.5 | $1,950.0257$ | 0 | $2,813.4162$ | $1,827.0539$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 384.5 | $1,953.6253$ | 0 | $2,440.1515$ | $1,584.6529$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 392.4 | $1,957.9192$ | 0 | $2,239.8111$ | $1,454.5503$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 401.2 | $1,962.9698$ | 0 | $2,201.1826$ | $1,429.4647$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 410 | $1,968.3312$ | 0 | $2,133.6531$ | $1,385.6105$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 418.8 | $1,974.0186$ | 0 | $2,036.95$ | $1,322.8108$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 427.6 | $1,980.0495$ | 0 | $1,910.748$ | $1,240.8543$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 436.4094 | $1,986.4511$ | 0 | $1,612.7149$ | $1,047.3093$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 445.22821 | $1,993.2468$ | 0 | $1,149.2693$ | 746.3442 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 454.04702 | $2,000.4569$ | 0 | 664.5264 | 431.54849 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 462.86582 | $2,008.112$ | 0 | 158.5394 | 102.95669 | 200 |

## A-973
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B:
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,800)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(612,1,969) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(207,1,894) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(229,1,828) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (353, 1,872) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

2-Translational

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (373.9817, 1,953.006) ft
Lower Left: (411.6124, 1,862.1107) ft Lower Right: $(574.679,1,945.8768)$ ft $X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
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Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$

| Points |
| :--- |
| $\qquad$ $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> Point 1 -175 1,893 <br> Point 2 -105 1,893 <br> Point 3 -94 1,899 <br> Point 4 -2 1,895 <br> Point 5 129 1,898 <br> Point 6 173 1,898 <br> Point 7 180 1,905 <br> Point 8 220 1,909 <br> Point 9 253 1,925 <br> Point 10 263 1,925 <br> Point 11 315 1,951 <br> Point 12 327 1,953 <br> Point 13 374 1,980 <br> Point 14 388 1,980 <br> Point 15 432 2,005 <br> Point 16 477 2,014 <br> Point 17 550 2,014 <br> Point 18 573 1,996 <br> Point 19 612 1,969 <br> Point 20 612 1,878 <br> Point 21 612 1,802 <br> Point 22 299 1,800 <br> Point 23 51 1,800 <br> Point 24 -175 1,800 <br> Point 25 -200 1,800 <br> Point 26 -175.1684 1,877 <br> Point 27 -122 1,833 <br> Point 28 -95 1,826 <br> Point 29 53 $1,896.2595$ <br> Point 30 13 $1,877.2704$ <br> Point 31 -30 1,800 <br> Point 32 612 1,862 <br>    <br>    |


| Point <br> 33 | -199 | 1,893 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 34 | 193 | 1,878 |
| Point <br> 35 | 253 | 1,878 |
| Point <br> 36 | 508 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 37 | 538 | 2,020 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Region <br> 1 | Fill | $26,27,28,30,29,4,3,2,1$ | 8,996 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ <br> bedding $0-6^{\circ}$ | $31,23,22,21,32$ | 19,589 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ <br> bedding $0-6^{\circ}$ | $31,32,20,19,18,17,37,35,34,6,5,29,30,28,27,26,1,33,25,24$ | 70,166 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $6,34,35,37,36,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7$ | 11,889 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 88,709
F of $S$ : 1.68
Volume: $13,456.281 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,614,753.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $682,879.44 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $406,970.26 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: $(220.77194,1,909.3743) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (491.07679, 2,018.5409) ft
Radius: 163.0926 ft
Center: (322.85795, 2,045.8326) ft

## Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 224.80045 | 1,907.7056 | 0 | 576.96079 | 374.68272 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 232.85747 | 1,904.3683 | 0 | 1,612.8226 | 1,047.3793 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 240.91448 | 1,901.031 | 0 | 2,648.6845 | 1,720.0758 | 200 |

[^20]| Slice <br> 4 | 248.97149 | $1,897.6936$ | 0 | $3,684.5464$ | $2,392.7724$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 5 | 258 | $1,893.9539$ | 0 | $4,498.6414$ | $2,921.4519$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 268.57993 | $1,892.3923$ | 0 | $4,091.7363$ | $2,657.2046$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 279.63978 | $1,893.4526$ | 0 | $4,592.7697$ | $2,982.5795$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 290.09976 | $1,894.5041$ | 0 | $5,181.2522$ | $1,584.0678$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 300.05986 | $1,895.5054$ | 0 | $5,650.092$ | $1,727.4065$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 310.01995 | $1,896.5066$ | 0 | $6,118.9318$ | $1,870.7452$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 321 | $1,897.6104$ | 0 | $6,400.1135$ | $1,956.7111$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 331.7 | $1,898.686$ | 0 | $6,709.3549$ | $2,051.2556$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 341.1 | $1,899.631$ | 0 | $7,234.3141$ | $2,211.7518$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 350.5 | $1,900.5759$ | 0 | $7,759.2733$ | $2,372.2479$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 359.9 | $1,901.5209$ | 0 | $8,284.2325$ | $2,532.744$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 369.3 | $1,902.4658$ | 0 | $8,809.1917$ | $2,693.2402$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 377.5 | $1,903.2901$ | 0 | $9,030.2122$ | $2,760.8129$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 384.5 | $1,903.9938$ | 0 | $8,947.294$ | $2,735.4623$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 392.14446 | $1,904.7623$ | 0 | $9,134.2196$ | $2,792.6112$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 400.43339 | $1,905.5955$ | 0 | $9,590.9891$ | $2,932.2596$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 408.72232 | $1,906.4288$ | 0 | $10,047.759$ | $3,071.9081$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 417.65008 | $1,913.6767$ | 0 | $5,702.2777$ | $4,784.7791$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 427.2167 | $1,927.3392$ | 0 | $5,127.1506$ | $4,302.1902$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 436.43803 | $1,940.5087$ | 0 | $4,458.5518$ | $3,741.1692$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 445.31408 | $1,953.185$ | 0 | $3,696.4813$ | $3,101.7161$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 454.19014 | $1,965.8613$ | 0 | $2,934.4107$ | $2,462.263$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 463.0662 | $1,978.5376$ | 0 | $2,172.3402$ | $1,822.8099$ | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 28 | 472.25211 | $1,991.6565$ | 0 | $1,541.5795$ | $1,001.1134$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 29 | 480.5192 | $2,003.4631$ | 0 | 791.13205 | 513.76716 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 487.55759 | $2,013.515$ | 0 | 190.46801 | 123.69137 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B:
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,800)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(612,1,969) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(207,1,894) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(229,1,828) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (353, 1,872) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

2-Translational

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (373.9817, 1,953.006) ft
Lower Left: (411.6124, 1,862.1107) ft Lower Right: $(574.679,1,945.8768)$ ft $X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
150 pcf- $-17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
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Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$

| Points |
| :--- |
| $\qquad$ $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> Point 1 -175 1,893 <br> Point 2 -105 1,893 <br> Point 3 -94 1,899 <br> Point 4 -2 1,895 <br> Point 5 129 1,898 <br> Point 6 173 1,898 <br> Point 7 180 1,905 <br> Point 8 220 1,909 <br> Point 9 253 1,925 <br> Point 10 263 1,925 <br> Point 11 315 1,951 <br> Point 12 327 1,953 <br> Point 13 374 1,980 <br> Point 14 388 1,980 <br> Point 15 432 2,005 <br> Point 16 477 2,014 <br> Point 17 550 2,014 <br> Point 18 573 1,996 <br> Point 19 612 1,969 <br> Point 20 612 1,878 <br> Point 21 612 1,802 <br> Point 22 299 1,800 <br> Point 23 51 1,800 <br> Point 24 -175 1,800 <br> Point 25 -200 1,800 <br> Point 26 -175.1684 1,877 <br> Point 27 -122 1,833 <br> Point 28 -95 1,826 <br> Point 29 53 $1,896.2595$ <br> Point 30 13 $1,877.2704$ <br> Point 31 -30 1,800 <br> Point 32 612 1,862 <br>    |


| Point <br> 33 | -199 | 1,893 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 34 | 193 | 1,878 |
| Point <br> 35 | 253 | 1,878 |
| Point <br> 36 | 508 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 37 | 538 | 2,020 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Region <br> 1 | Fill | $26,27,28,30,29,4,3,2,1$ | 8,996 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ <br> bedding $0-6^{\circ}$ | $31,23,22,21,32$ | 19,589 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ <br> bedding $0-6^{\circ}$ | $31,32,20,19,18,17,37,35,34,6,5,29,30,28,27,26,1,33,25,24$ | 70,166 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $6,34,35,37,36,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7$ | 11,889 |

## Current Slip Surface

## Slip Surface: 99,572

F of S: 1.11
Volume: 16,392.944 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: $1,967,153.3 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 770,188.39 lbs
Activating Force: 696,251.3 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: $(213.86735,1,908.3867) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(524.38023,2,021.816) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 174.70961 ft
Radius: 174.70961 ft
Center: $(338.04733,2,050.1733) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 216.93367 | $1,907.1166$ | 0 | 348.42727 | 226.27131 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 224.76667 | $1,903.8721$ | 0 | $1,277.1805$ | 829.41072 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 234.3 | $1,899.9233$ | 0 | $2,635.083$ | $1,711.2429$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 4 | 243.83333 | $1,895.9744$ | 0 | $3,992.9855$ | $2,593.0751$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 5 | 250.8 | $1,894.2249$ | 0 | $3,346.2791$ | $2,173.0991$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 258 | $1,894.9608$ | 0 | $3,383.7224$ | $2,197.415$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 268.25613 | $1,896.0092$ | 0 | $3,562.582$ | $2,313.5678$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 278.76839 | $1,897.0837$ | 0 | $4,036.034$ | $2,621.0311$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 289.28064 | $1,898.1582$ | 0 | $4,509.486$ | $2,928.4944$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 299.65258 | $1,899.2184$ | 0 | $5,134.421$ | $1,569.75$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 309.88419 | $1,900.2643$ | 0 | $5,609.4308$ | $1,714.9751$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 321 | $1,901.4005$ | 0 | $5,892.0677$ | $1,801.3859$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 331.7 | $1,902.4942$ | 0 | $6,196.2494$ | $1,894.3835$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 341.1 | $1,903.4551$ | 0 | $6,714.3486$ | $2,052.7824$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 350.5 | $1,904.4159$ | 0 | $7,232.4479$ | $2,211.1812$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 359.9 | $1,905.3767$ | 0 | $7,750.5471$ | $2,369.5801$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 369.3 | $1,906.3376$ | 0 | $8,268.6464$ | $2,527.9789$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 381 | $1,907.5335$ | 0 | $8,444.1871$ | $2,581.6471$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 393.5 | $1,908.8112$ | 0 | $8,659.7862$ | $2,647.5623$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 404.5 | $1,909.9356$ | 0 | $9,258.0021$ | $2,830.4553$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 415.5 | $1,911.06$ | 0 | $9,856.218$ | $3,013.3483$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 426.5 | $1,912.1844$ | 0 | $10,454.434$ | $3,196.2412$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 436.31079 | $1,913.1872$ | 0 | $10,802.738$ | $3,302.7285$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 444.93238 | $1,914.0685$ | 0 | $10,901.131$ | $3,332.8102$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 453.86931 | $1,921.1159$ | 0 | $4,951.0517$ | $4,154.4256$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 463.12158 | $1,934.3296$ | 0 | $4,295.6757$ | $3,604.4999$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 472.37386 | $1,947.5432$ | 0 | $3,640.2998$ | $3,054.5742$ | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 28 | 482.16667 | $1,961.5287$ | 0 | $2,983.1638$ | $2,503.1717$ | 225 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 29 | 492.5 | $1,976.2863$ | 0 | $2,324.2679$ | $1,950.2923$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 502.83333 | $1,991.0438$ | 0 | $1,665.3719$ | $1,397.413$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 511.56492 | $2,003.5138$ | 0 | $1,014.8699$ | 851.57692 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 519.75504 | $2,015.2105$ | 0 | 331.69356 | 215.40432 | 200 |
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Report generated using GeoStudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 100
Date: 3/19/2016
Time: 7:32:52 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 10-10 Static Final Temporary without keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: C:\Users\Alexander\Desktop\LGC valley\original sections\}
Last Solved Date: 3/19/2016
Last Solved Time: 7:33:40 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 0-6 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,800) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(612,1,969) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(207,1,894)$ ft
Lower Left: $(229,1,828) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (353, 1,872) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

2-Translational

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (373.9817, 1,953.006) ft
Lower Left: (411.6124, 1,862.1107) ft
Lower Right: (574.679, 1,945.8768) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $0-6^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
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## Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% <br> Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 0.667
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6,0.667)$
Data Point: $(6.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -175 | 1,893 |
| Point 2 | -105 | 1,893 |
| Point 3 | -94 | 1,899 |
| Point 4 | -2 | 1,895 |
| Point 5 | 129 | 1,898 |
| Point 6 | 173 | 1,898 |
| Point 7 | 550 | 2,014 |
| Point 8 | 573 | 1,996 |
| Point 9 | 612 | 1,969 |
| Point 10 | 612 | 1,878 |
| Point 11 | 612 | 1,802 |
| Point 12 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point 13 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point 14 | -175 | 1,800 |
| Point 15 | -200 | 1,800 |
| Point 16 | -175.1684 | 1,877 |
| Point 17 | -122 | 1,833 |
| Point 18 | -95 | 1,826 |
| Point 19 | 53 | $1,896.2595$ |
| Point 20 | 13 | $1,877.2704$ |
| Point 21 | -30 | 1,800 |
| Point 22 | 612 | 1,862 |
| Point 23 | -199 | 1,893 |
| Point 24 | 193 | 1,878 |
| Point 25 | 253 | 1,878 |
| Point 26 | 538 | 2,020 |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

$\left.$|  | Material |  | Points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | | Area |
| :---: |
| $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | \right\rvert\, | 8,996 |
| :--- | :--- |


| Region <br> 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs 150-11 <br> bedding 0-6 | $21,13,12,11,22$ | 19,589 |
| Region <br> 3 | TQs 150-17 <br> bedding 0-6 | $21,22,10,9,8,7,26,25,24,6,5,19,20,18,17,16,1,23,15,14$ | 70,166 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 65,021
Fof $S$ : 1.32
Volume: $12,250.598 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,470,071.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $542,715.93 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $411,405.32 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: (254.20423, 1,878.6) ft
Entry: (541.97298, 2,018.0135) ft
Radius: 188.34833 ft
Center: $(347.43302,2,052.8669) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 260.90211 | $1,878.6$ | 0 | 400.46316 | 122.43387 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 272.32923 | $1,879.0433$ | 0 | 998.29944 | 305.21077 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 281.7877 | $1,879.9298$ | 0 | $1,447.7196$ | 442.61228 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 291.24616 | $1,880.8163$ | 0 | $1,897.1397$ | 580.0138 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 300.70463 | $1,881.7028$ | 0 | $2,346.5598$ | 717.41532 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 310.16309 | $1,882.5893$ | 0 | $2,795.9799$ | 854.81684 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 319.62156 | $1,883.4758$ | 0 | $3,245.4$ | 992.21836 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 329.08003 | $1,884.3623$ | 0 | $3,694.8201$ | $1,129.6199$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 338.53849 | $1,885.2488$ | 0 | $4,144.2402$ | $1,267.0214$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 347.99696 | $1,886.1353$ | 0 | $4,593.6604$ | $1,404.4229$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 357.45542 | $1,887.0218$ | 0 | $5,043.0805$ | $1,541.8244$ | 150.075 |
|  | 366.91389 | $1,887.9083$ | 0 | $5,492.5006$ | $1,679.2259$ | 150.075 |


| Slice <br> 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 13 | 376.37235 | $1,888.7948$ | 0 | $5,941.9207$ | $1,816.6275$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 385.83082 | $1,889.6813$ | 0 | $6,391.3408$ | $1,954.029$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 395.28928 | $1,890.5678$ | 0 | $6,840.7609$ | $2,091.4305$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 404.74775 | $1,891.4543$ | 0 | $7,290.1811$ | $2,228.832$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 414.20622 | $1,892.3408$ | 0 | $7,739.6012$ | $2,366.2335$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 423.66468 | $1,893.2273$ | 0 | $8,189.0213$ | $2,503.6351$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 433.12315 | $1,894.1138$ | 0 | $8,638.4414$ | $2,641.0366$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 442.58161 | $1,895.0003$ | 0 | $9,087.8615$ | $2,778.4381$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 452.04008 | $1,895.8868$ | 0 | $9,537.2816$ | $2,915.8396$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 461.84623 | $1,903.5807$ | 0 | $4,818.3043$ | $4,043.0374$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 472.00006 | $1,918.0818$ | 0 | $4,223.2569$ | $3,543.7333$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 482.1539 | $1,932.583$ | 0 | $3,628.2094$ | $3,044.4292$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 492.30774 | $1,947.0842$ | 0 | $3,033.1619$ | $2,545.1251$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 502.46157 | $1,961.5854$ | 0 | $2,438.1145$ | $2,045.821$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 512.61541 | $1,976.0866$ | 0 | $1,843.067$ | $1,546.5169$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 522.76925 | $1,990.5877$ | 0 | $1,248.0196$ | $1,047.2128$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 532.92308 | $2,005.0889$ | 0 | 652.97212 | 547.90866 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 539.98649 | $2,015.1765$ | 0 | 114.06313 | 95.71033 | 225 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
ast Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 13
Date: 3/20/2016
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 11-11 Static Final with 250' keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gs
Directory: C:\Users\Alexander\Desktop\LGC valley\original sections\}
Last Solved Date: 3/20/2016
Last Solved Time: 5:13:41 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: p
Strength Units: ps
of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
se Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit

esisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
ension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30

F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 ps
hi': 20
Phi-B: 0
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $17-23^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TOS $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 17-23
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 17-23
Phi-B: 0
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}:$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $5-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 5-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(130.2939,1,841)$ ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $255.214,1,870.1495$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $371.9441,1,906.4136$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: (760.9121, 2,017.6352) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-270,1,825) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(815,1,994) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $\mathbf{1 5 0 - 1 7}{ }^{\circ}$ bedding $\mathbf{1 7 - 2 3}{ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
ata Point: $(16.9,1)$
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: (23, 0.425
Data Point: $(23.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $17-23^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(16.9,1)$
Data Point: $(17,0.667)$
Data Point: $(23,0.667)$
Data Point: $(23.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $5-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: $(15,0.667)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$ -Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( $)$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(10.9,1)$
Data Point: $(11,0.275)$
Data Point: $(17,0.275)$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)
150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## -Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: (111, 0.667
Data Point. (11, 0.667 )
Da Point $(15.1,1)$

## Points

ints

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -266 | 1,662 |
| Point 2 | 815 | 1,994 |
| Point 3 | 815 | 1,614 |
| Point 4 | -267 | 1,613 |
| Point 5 | -267 | 1,786 |
| Point 6 | -270 | 1,825 |


| Point <br> 7 -233 <br> Point <br> 8 -210 1,842 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 9 | -179 | 1,856 |
| Point <br> 10 | -147 | 1,859 |
| Point <br> 11 | -89 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 12 | -103 | 1,870 |
| Point <br> 13 | -26 | 1,872 |
| Point <br> 14 | 25 | 1,855 |
| Point <br> 15 | 67 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 16 | 115 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 17 | 74 | 1,829 |
| Point <br> 18 | 14 | 1,818 |
| Point <br> 19 | -41 | 1,809 |
| Point <br> 20 | 169 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 21 | 222 | 1,860 |
| Point <br> 22 | 236 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 23 | 278 | 1,881 |
| Point <br> 24 | 290 | 1,881 |
| Point <br> 25 | 335 | 1,907 |
| Point <br> 26 | 398 | 1,906 |
| Point <br> 27 | 436 | 1,928 |
| Point <br> 28 | 450 | 1,928 |
| Point <br> 29 | 498 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 524 | 1,956 |
| 375 | 1,986 |  |
| 590 | 1,986 |  |


| Point <br> 32 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 33 | 641 | 2,016 |
| Point <br> 34 | 678 | 2,022 |
| Point <br> 35 | 712 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 36 | 741 | 2,025 |
| Point <br> 37 | 760 | 2,018 |
| Point <br> 38 | 790 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 39 | 194 | 1,816 |
| Point <br> 40 | 454 | 1,816 |
| Point <br> 41 | 813 | 1,994 |
| Point <br> 42 | 300 | 1,816 |
| Point <br> 43 | 639 | 1,907 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region $1$ | TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 11-15 | 1,4,3,2,43,40,42 | $2.0743 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Qls | 5,6,7,8,9,10,11 | 8,715 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 10,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,11 | 9,960 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TQs } \\ & 150-17^{\circ} \\ & \text { bedding } \\ & 17-23^{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 16,17,18,19,11,5,1,42,39,20 | 41,895 |
| Region $5$ | TQs 150-17 bedding 5-15 | 2,41,43 | 87 |
| Region <br> 6 | Fill | 20,39,42,40,43,41,38,37,36,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21 | 52,185 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 111,395
F of S: 2.08

Volume: $13,457.952 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,614,954.2 lbs
Resisting Moment: $8.4519605 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: 4.0620067 008 los-ft
Activating Moment: $4.0620062 \mathrm{e}+008$ libs-t
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: (236.38743, 1,861.1845) ft
Entry: (694.99917, 2,022.5) ft
Radius: 765.84149 ft
Center: $(224.71301,2,626.937) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) Y (ft) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) Frictional Strength <br> (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice 1 243.32286 $1,861.3531$ 0 370.93407 240.8874 200 <br> Slice 2 257.19372 $1,861.8161$ 0 $1,094.5741$ 710.82476 200 <br> Slice 3 271.06457 $1,862.5311$ 0 $1,780.4771$ $1,156.2554$ 200 <br> Slice 4 284 $1,863.4175$ 0 $2,052.7439$ $1,333.0675$ 200 <br> Slice 5 297.5 $1,864.5995$ 0 $2,407.2284$ $1,563.2724$ 200 <br> Slice 6 312.5 $1,866.181$ 0 $3,211.6387$ $2,085.6626$ 200 <br> Slice 7 327.5 $1,868.0623$ 0 $3,971.7733$ $2,579.2997$ 200 <br> Slice 8 342.875 $1,870.308$ 0 $4,169.9869$ $2,708.0212$ 200 <br> Slice 9 358.625 $1,872.9365$ 0 $3,814.3422$ $2,477.0628$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 10 374.375 $1,875.9044$ 0 $3,424.5553$ $2,223.9322$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 11 390.125 $1,879.2158$ 0 $3,000.8693$ $1,948.7873$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 12 407.5 $1,883.293$ 0 $3,121.9662$ $2,027.4285$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 13 426.5 $1,888.2231$ 0 $3,766.2189$ $2,445.8111$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 14 443 $1,892.8998$ 0 $3,828.4792$ $2,486.2435$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 15 458 $1,897.5401$ 0 $3,805.0151$ $2,471.0057$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 16 474 $1,902.853$ 0 $4,212.387$ $2,735.5561$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 17 490 $1,908.5616$ 0 $4,570.8406$ $2,968.3386$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 18 504.5 $1,914.067$ 0 $4,449.7307$ $2,889.6889$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 19 517.5 $1,919.3075$ 0 $3,864.7675$ $2,509.8094$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 20 532.5 $1,925.7279$ 0 $3,686.0226$ $2,393.7311$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 21 549.5 $1,933.4397$ 0 $3,893.678$ $2,528.584$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 22 566.5 $1,941.66$ 0 $4,044.0082$ $2,626.2096$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 23 582.5 $1,949.8626$ 0 $3,679.4836$ $2,389.4846$ 200 <br> 23  0     |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: p
Strength Units: ps
of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
se Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
位
硅
riving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30

F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 ps
hi': 20
Phi-B: 0
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $17-23^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TOS $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 17-23
C-Anisotropic Strength $\mathrm{Fn} .: 150$ pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 17-23
Phi-B: 0
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$.
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $5-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 5-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(130.2939,1,841)$ ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: (255.214, 1,870.1495) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $371.9441,1,906.4136$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $760.9121,2,017.6352$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-270,1,825) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(815,1,994) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $\mathbf{1 5 0 - 1 7 ^ { \circ }}$ bedding $\mathbf{1 7 - 2 3 ^ { \circ }}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
ata Point: $(16.9,1)$
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: $(23,0.425)$
Data Point: $(23.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $17-23^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(16.9,1)$
Data Point: $(17,0.667)$
Data Point: $(23,0.667)$
Data Point: $(23.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 5-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $5,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: $(15,0.667)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$ -Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( $)$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(10.9,1)$
Data Point: $(11,0.275)$
Data Point: $(17,0.275)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Y-Intercept:1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11,0.667)$
Data Point. (11, 0.667 )
Daint: $115.1,1$ )

## Points

ints

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -266 | 1,662 |
| Point 2 | 815 | 1,994 |
| Point 3 | 815 | 1,614 |
| Point 4 | -267 | 1,613 |
| Point 5 | -267 | 1,786 |
| Point 6 | -270 | 1,825 |


| Point <br> 7 | -233 | 1,842 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 8 | -210 | 1,852 |
| Point <br> 9 | -179 | 1,856 |
| Point <br> 10 | -147 | 1,859 |
| Point <br> 11 | -89 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 12 | -103 | 1,870 |
| Point <br> 13 | -26 | 1,872 |
| Point <br> 14 | 25 | 1,855 |
| Point <br> 15 | 67 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 16 | 115 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 17 | 74 | 1,829 |
| Point <br> 18 | 14 | 1,818 |
| Point <br> 19 | -41 | 1,809 |
| Point <br> 20 | 169 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 21 | 222 | 1,860 |
| Point <br> 22 | 236 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 23 | 278 | 1,881 |
| Point <br> 24 | 290 | 1,881 |
| Point <br> 25 | 335 | 1,907 |
| Point <br> 26 | 398 | 1,906 |
| Point <br> 27 | 436 | 1,928 |
| Point <br> 28 | 450 | 1,928 |
| Point <br> 29 | 498 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 524 | 1,956 |
| 375 | 1,986 |  |
| 1,986 |  |  |
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| Point <br> 32  <br> Point <br> 33 641 <br> Point <br> 34 678 <br> Point <br> 35 712 22,022 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 36 | 741 | 2,025 |
| Point <br> 37 | 760 | 2,018 |
| Point <br> 38 | 790 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 39 | 194 | 1,816 |
| Point <br> 40 | 454 | 1,816 |
| Point <br> 41 | 813 | 1,994 |
| Point <br> 42 | 300 | 1,816 |
| Point <br> 43 | 639 | 1,907 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$ | 1,4,3,2,43,40,42 | $2.0743 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Qls | 5,6,7,8,9,10,11 | 8,715 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 10,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,11 | 9,960 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 17-23 | 16,17,18,19,11,5,1,42,39,20 | 41,895 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 5-15 | 2,41,43 | 87 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 20,39,42,40,43,41, 38,37,36,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21 | 52,185 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 111,445
F of S: 1.40

Volume: $13,525.903 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,623,108.4 lbs
Resisting Moment: $8.8568221 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $6.319232 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: ( $236.38743,1,861.1845$ ) ft
Entry: (703.40902, 2,022.7473) ft
Radius: 836.89711 ft
Center: (208.48626, 2,697.6164) ft

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice 1 | 243.32286 | 1,861.4734 | 0 | 348.97626 | 226.62783 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 257.19372 | 1,862.1667 | 0 | 1,034.8511 | 672.04019 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 271.06457 | 1,863.0911 | 0 | 1,683.6765 | 1,093.3923 | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 284 | 1,864.1548 | 0 | 1,927.733 | 1,251.8844 | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 297.5 | 1,865.5007 | 0 | 2,253.1932 | 1,463.2408 | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 312.5 | 1,867.2425 | 0 | 3,018.1974 | 1,960.0403 | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 327.5 | 1,869.2595 | 0 | 3,739.8716 | 2,428.701 | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 342.875 | 1,871.6183 | 0 | 3,913.1576 | 2,541.2343 | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 358.625 | 1,874.3357 | 0 | 3,549.3584 | 2,304.9803 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 374.375 | 1,877.3645 | 0 | 3,157.1346 | 2,050.2672 | 200 |
| Slice $11$ | 390.125 | 1,880.7081 | 0 | 2,736.8888 | 1,777.3564 | 200 |
| Slice $12$ | 407.5 | 1,884.7851 | 0 | 2,848.3543 | 1,849.7429 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 426.5 | 1,889.6746 | 0 | 3,467.8152 | 2,252.0255 | 200 |
| Slice $14$ | 443 | 1,894.2815 | 0 | 3,528.2505 | 2,291.2727 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 458 | 1,898.8239 | 0 | 3,509.5952 | 2,279.1578 | 200 |
| Slice $16$ | 474 | 1,903.9993 | 0 | 3,907.743 | 2,537.718 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 490 | 1,909.5335 | 0 | 4,261.0923 | 2,767.1857 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 504.5 | 1,914.8493 | 0 | 4,157.114 | 2,699.6614 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 517.5 | 1,919.89 | 0 | 3,612.6961 | 2,346.1123 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 532.5 | 1,926.0421 | 0 | 3,462.5969 | 2,248.6367 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | 549.5 | 1,933.4045 | 0 | 3,686.9516 | 2,394.3344 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 22 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 566.5 | 1,941.2206 | 0 | 3,860.8905 | 2,507.2916 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | 582.5 | 1,948.9908 | 0 | 3,549.6951 | 2,305.199 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: p
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janb
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
lip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 ps
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
$150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 17-23
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 pst
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 17-23*
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf-17 bedding 17-23 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $5-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 5-15 ${ }^{\circ}$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$ Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-270,1,825)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(815,1,994) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (462.0176, 1,878.9172) ft
Lower Left: (475.6569, 1,750.9259) ft
Lower Right: (571.9684, 1,795.6298) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: ( $674.1719,1,984.603$ ) ft
Lower Left: (701.0288, 1,838.0786) ft
Lower Right: ( $808.478,1,875.8575$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45{ }^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $\mathbf{1 7 - 2 3}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(16.9,1)$
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: $(23,0.425)$
Data Point: $(23.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $17-23^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(16.9,1)$
Data Point: $(17,0.667)$
Data Point: $(23,0.66)$
Data Point: $(23.1,1)$

TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $5-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment
V-Intercept: 1
Vata Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1
Data Point. (4.9, $)$
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: $(5,0.667)$
Data Point: $(15,0.667)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding 11-15
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(10.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $11,0.275$ )
Data Point: ( $17,0.275$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
150 pcf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(10.9,1)$
ata Point: $(11,0.667$
Data Point: $(15,0.667)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

Points

2-Translational

|  | X <br> (ft) | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 1 | -266 | 1,662 |
| Point <br> 2 | 815 | 1,994 |
| Point <br> 3 | 815 | 1,614 |
| Point <br> 4 | -267 | 1,613 |
| Point <br> 5 | -267 | 1,786 |
| Point <br> 6 | -270 | 1,825 |
| Point <br> 7 | -233 | 1,842 |
| Point <br> 8 | -210 | 1,852 |
| Point <br> 9 | -179 | 1,856 |
| Point <br> 10 | -147 | 1,859 |
| Point <br> 11 | -89 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 12 | -103 | 1,870 |
| Point <br> 13 | -26 | 1,872 |
| Point <br> 14 | 25 | 1,855 |
| Point <br> 15 | 67 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 16 | 115 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 17 | 74 | 1,829 |
| Point <br> 18 | 14 | 1,818 |
| Point <br> 19 | -41 | 1,809 |
| Point <br> 20 | 169 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 21 | 222 | 1,860 |
| Point <br> 22 | 236 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 23 | 278 | 1,881 |
| Point <br> 24 | 290 | 1,881 |
|  | 335 | 1,907 |

## Regions

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs <br> $150-11^{\circ}$ <br> bedding <br> $11-15^{\circ}$ | $1,4,3,2,43,40,42$ | $2.0743 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Qls | $5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ | 8,715 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $10,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,11$ | 9,960 |
|  |  | $16,17,18,19,11,5,1,42,39,20$ | 41,895 |


| Region <br> 4 | TQs <br> $150-17^{\circ}$ <br> bedding <br> $17-23^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 5 | TQs <br> $150-17^{\circ}$ <br> bedding <br> $5-15^{\circ}$ | $2,41,43$ | 87 |
| Region <br> 6 | Fill | $20,39,42,40,43,41,38,37,36,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21$ | 52,185 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 76,011
Fof $S$ : 1.82
Volume: $47,947.893 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 5,753,747.1 lbs
Resisting Force: $2,380,689.2 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: 1,311,665.4 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
Fof S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Ext. ( ( 771.367793 , $1,841.1319$ ) ft
Radry: ( $771.6343,2,013$
Center: $(433.5683,2,056.3999) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 1 | 178.13983 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | 377.363 | 245.0624 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 195.6839 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $1,132.089$ | 735.18719 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 213.22797 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $1,886.815$ | $1,225.312$ | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 229 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $2,324.178$ | $1,509.3388$ | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 246.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $2,984.178$ | $1,937.9479$ | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 267.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $4,184.178$ | $2,717.237$ | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 284 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $4,784.178$ | $3,106.8815$ | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 301.25 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $5,564.178$ | $3,613.4194$ | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 323.75 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $7,124.178$ | $4,626.4953$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 345.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $7,884.178$ | $5,120.0451$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 366.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $7,844.178$ | $5,094.0688$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 387.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $7,804.178$ | $5,068.0925$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 407.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $8,444.178$ | $5,483.7133$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 426.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $9,764.178$ | $6,340.9313$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 443 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $10,424.178$ | $6,769.5403$ | 200 |
|  | 461.59169 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $11,235.596$ | $7,296.4817$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> l6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 17 | 484.77508 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $12,858.433$ | $8,350.3643$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 497.18338 | $1,841.3734$ | 0 | $12,359.615$ | $8,026.4281$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 508.12566 | $1,844.6098$ | 0 | $12,060.058$ | $7,831.8931$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 521.12566 | $1,848.4549$ | 0 | $12,474.31$ | $2,424.7602$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 532.5 | $1,851.8191$ | 0 | $12,664.586$ | $2,461.7461$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 549.5 | $1,856.8472$ | 0 | $13,242.92$ | $2,574.1628$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 566.5 | $1,861.8753$ | 0 | $13,821.254$ | $2,686.5795$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 582.5 | $1,866.6077$ | 0 | $13,852.385$ | $2,692.631$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 602.25 | $1,872.4492$ | 0 | $14,011.091$ | $2,723.4802$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 626.75 | $1,879.6956$ | 0 | $14,844.572$ | $2,885.4925$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 640 | $1,883.6146$ | 0 | $15,295.332$ | $2,973.1115$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 650.25 | $1,886.6463$ | 0 | $15,185.591$ | $2,951.7799$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 668.75 | $1,892.1181$ | 0 | $14,898.069$ | $2,895.8912$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 686.5 | $1,897.3681$ | 0 | $14,490.948$ | $2,816.755$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 703.5 | $1,902.3962$ | 0 | $13,964.229$ | $2,714.3712$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 717.2604 | $1,906.4661$ | 0 | $13,562.087$ | $2,636.2027$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 731.7604 | $1,927.8364$ | 0 | $5,687.7821$ | $4,772.6159$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 743.96016 | $1,953.9989$ | 0 | $4,082.6731$ | $3,425.7695$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 753.46016 | $1,974.3717$ | 0 | $2,994.5629$ | $1,944.6919$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 765.81715 | $2,000.8714$ | 0 | 872.1564 | 566.38499 | 200 |
|  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |



## 2 - Translational

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
ast Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 132
Date: 3/20/2016
Time: 5:04:15 PM
Tool Version: 815111236
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Directory: C:\Users\Alexander\Desktop\LGC valley\original sections\}
last Solved Date: 3/20/2016
last Solved Time: 5:04:30 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: p
Strength Units: psf
of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janb
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
se Passive Mode: No
ip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
esisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 ps
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
$150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $17-23^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 pst
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 17-23*
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf-17 bedding 17-23 ${ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 pcf- $11^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $5-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 5-15 ${ }^{\circ}$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf-17
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$ Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-270,1,825)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(815,1,994) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (462.0176, 1,878.9172) ft
Lower Left: (475.6569, 1,750.9259) ft
Lower Right: (571.9684, 1,795.6298) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: ( $674.1719,1,984.603$ ) ft
Lower Left: ( $701.0288,1,838.0786$ ) ft
Lower Right: ( $808.478,1,875.8575$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45{ }^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $\mathbf{1 7 - 2 3 ^ { \circ }}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(16.9,1)$
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: $(23,0.425)$
Data Point: $(23.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $17-23^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(16.9,1)$
Data Point: $(17,0.667)$
Data Point: $(23,0.66)$
Data Point: $(23.1,1)$

TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $5-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment
V-Intercept: 1
Vata Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point. (4.9, $)$
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
150 pcf- $17^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(4.9,1)$
Data Point: $(15,0.667)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ bedding 11-15
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(10.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $11,0.275$ )
Data Point: ( $17,0.275$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
150 pcf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $11-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(10.9,1)$
ata Point: $(11,0.667$
Data Point: $(15,0.667)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

Points

2-Translational

|  | X <br> (ft) | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 1 | -266 | 1,662 |
| Point <br> 2 | 815 | 1,994 |
| Point <br> 3 | 815 | 1,614 |
| Point <br> 4 | -267 | 1,613 |
| Point <br> 5 | -267 | 1,786 |
| Point <br> 6 | -270 | 1,825 |
| Point <br> 7 | -233 | 1,842 |
| Point <br> 8 | -210 | 1,852 |
| Point <br> 9 | -179 | 1,856 |
| Point <br> 10 | -147 | 1,859 |
| Point <br> 11 | -89 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 12 | -103 | 1,870 |
| Point <br> 13 | -26 | 1,872 |
| Point <br> 14 | 25 | 1,855 |
| Point <br> 15 | 67 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 16 | 115 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 17 | 74 | 1,829 |
| Point <br> 18 | 14 | 1,818 |
| Point <br> 19 | -41 | 1,809 |
| Point <br> 20 | 169 | 1,841 |
| Point <br> 21 | 222 | 1,860 |
| Point <br> 22 | 236 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 23 | 278 | 1,881 |
| Point <br> 24 | 290 | 1,881 |
|  | 335 | 1,907 |

## Regions

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs <br> $150-11^{\circ}$ <br> bedding <br> $11-15^{\circ}$ | $1,4,3,2,43,40,42$ | $2.0743 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Qls | $5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ | 8,715 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $10,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,11$ | 9,960 |
|  |  | $16,17,18,19,11,5,1,42,39,20$ | 41,895 |


| Region <br> 4 | TQs <br> $150-17^{\circ}$ <br> bedding <br> $17-23^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 5 | TQs <br> $150-17^{\circ}$ <br> bedding <br> $5-15^{\circ}$ | $2,41,43$ | 87 |
| Region <br> 6 | Fill | $20,39,42,40,43,41,38,37,36,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21$ | 52,185 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 76,023
Fof S : 1.11
Volume: $50,963.807 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 6,115,656.9 lbs
Resisting Force: $2,382,251.1 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $2149,311.1 \mathrm{lb}$
Activating Force: 2,149,311.8 lbs
of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Entry: (80137403, 2,000.0655) ft
Entry: $(801.37443,2,0$
Center: ( $455.39526,2,039.7989$ ) ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 1 | 182.52584 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | 566.0445 | 367.5936 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 208.84195 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $1,698.1335$ | $1,102.7808$ | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 229 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $2,324.178$ | $1,509.3388$ | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 246.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $2,984.178$ | $1,937.9479$ | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 267.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $4,184.178$ | $2,717.237$ | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 284 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $4,784.178$ | $3,106.8815$ | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 301.25 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $5,564.178$ | $3,613.4194$ | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 323.75 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $7,124.178$ | $4,626.4953$ | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 345.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $7,884.178$ | $5,120.0451$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 366.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $7,844.178$ | $5,094.0688$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 387.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $7,804.178$ | $5,068.0925$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 407.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $8,444.178$ | $5,483.7133$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 426.5 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $9,764.178$ | $6,340.9313$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 443 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $10,424.178$ | $6,769.5403$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 461.59169 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $11,235.596$ | $7,296.4817$ | 200 |
|  | 484.77508 | $1,841.1319$ | 0 | $12,858.433$ | $8,350.3643$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> l6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 17 | 497.18338 | $1,841.3807$ | 0 | $11,562.202$ | $7,508.5817$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 508.64675 | $1,844.8734$ | 0 | $11,255.414$ | $7,309.3512$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 521.64675 | $1,848.8344$ | 0 | $12,143.798$ | $2,360.5152$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 536.75 | $1,853.4361$ | 0 | $12,473.818$ | $2,424.6647$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 562.25 | $1,861.2057$ | 0 | $13,297.15$ | $2,584.7041$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 582.5 | $1,867.3756$ | 0 | $13,448.605$ | $2,614.144$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 602.25 | $1,873.3932$ | 0 | $13,583.916$ | $2,640.4459$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 626.75 | $1,880.858$ | 0 | $14,374.96$ | $2,794.2092$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 640 | $1,884.8951$ | 0 | $14,802.77$ | $2,877.3669$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 650.25 | $1,888.0182$ | 0 | $14,684.936$ | $2,854.4623$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 668.75 | $1,893.6549$ | 0 | $14,384.692$ | $2,796.101$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 686.5 | $1,899.0631$ | 0 | $13,968.133$ | $2,715.13$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 703.5 | $1,904.2428$ | 0 | $13,435.258$ | $2,611.5495$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 726.5 | $1,911.2506$ | 0 | $12,779.616$ | $2,484.1057$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 750.5 | $1,918.5631$ | 0 | $11,662.268$ | $2,266.9153$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 762.75024 | $1,922.2956$ | 0 | $10,713.437$ | $2,082.4813$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 777.75024 | $1,949.4033$ | 0 | $2,633.4659$ | $2,209.7403$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 791.8086 | $1,979.5515$ | 0 | 994.79949 | 834.73589 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 793.88431 | $1,984.0029$ | 0 | 742.82708 | 623.30593 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 797.76292 | $1,992.3206$ | 0 | 337.8916 | 219.42937 | 200 |
|  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Reporterated
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File Version: 8.15
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Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 118
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100pcf-25 bedding 8-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $-14.6024,2,116.523$ ) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $256.0584,2,207.5292$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(304,2,225)$ ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $617.5728,2,317.479$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-240,2,108) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,288) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(15,0.75)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: (15.1, 1)
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

Tmc100pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -240 | 2,108 |
| Point 2 | -107 | 2,112 |
| Point 3 | 36 | 2,119 |
| Point 4 | 78 | 2,139 |
| Point 5 | 87 | 2,139 |
| Point 6 | 141 | 2,164 |
| Point 7 | 159 | 2,164 |
| Point 8 | 221 | 2,195 |
| Point 9 | 231 | 2,195 |
| Point 10 | 291 | 2,225 |
| Point 11 | 304 | 2,225 |
| Point 12 | 364 | 2,255 |
| Point 13 | 375 | 2,255 |
| Point 14 | 442 | 2,288 |
| Point 15 | 530 | 2,308 |
| Point 16 | 591 | 2,318 |
| Point 17 | 642 | 2,317 |
| Point 18 | 693 | 2,313 |
| Point 19 | 764 | 2,300 |
| Point 20 | 811 | 2,288 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,910 |
| Point 22 | -240 | 1,910 |
| Point 23 | -200 | 1,965 |
| Point 24 | 450 | 2,139 |
| Point 25 | 810.8624 | 2,236 |
| Point 26 | -240 | 1,957 |
| Point 27 | 51 | 2,104 |
| Point 28 | 121 | 2,104 |
| Point 29 | 517 | 2,305 |
|  |  |  |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 | 1,26,23,24,25,20,19,18,17,16,15,29,28,27,3,2 | $1.1206 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 23,26,22,21,25,24 | $1.9434 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 3,27,28,29,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5,4 | 14,105 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 74,165
F of S : 1.85
Volume: $5,764.7121 \mathrm{ft}$
Weight: 691,765.45 lbs
Resisting Moment: $2.7811601 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $1.5014612 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: $(160.87368,2,164.9368) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (461.07827, 2,292.3244) ft
Radius: 572.22348 ft
Center: $(96.719459,2,733.5527) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 165.8842 | $2,165.547$ | 0 | 205.53098 | 133.47338 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 175.90526 | $2,166.8572$ | 0 | 625.78062 | 406.38669 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 185.92631 | $2,168.3482$ | 0 | $1,020.4134$ | 662.66418 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 195.94737 | $2,170.0212$ | 0 | $1,389.6628$ | 902.45758 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 205.96842 | $2,171.8781$ | 0 | $1,733.7329$ | $1,125.8993$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 215.98947 | $2,173.9205$ | 0 | $2,052.799$ | $1,333.1032$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 226 | $2,176.148$ | 0 | $2,069.249$ | $1,343.786$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 236 | $2,178.5625$ | 0 | $2,064.1304$ | $1,340.4619$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 246 | $2,181.1685$ | 0 | $2,311.9497$ | $1,501.3977$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 256 | $2,183.9689$ | 0 | $2,535.3026$ | $1,646.4447$ | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 11 | 266 | $2,186.9665$ | 0 | $2,734.233$ | $1,775.6317$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 12 | 276 | $2,190.1647$ | 0 | $2,908.7593$ | $1,888.9704$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 286 | $2,193.567$ | 0 | $3,058.8739$ | $1,986.4559$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 297.5 | $2,197.7554$ | 0 | $2,854.5432$ | $1,853.762$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 309 | $2,202.1887$ | 0 | $2,626.9576$ | $1,705.9662$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 319 | $2,206.2941$ | 0 | $2,700.7433$ | $1,753.8832$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 329 | $2,210.6229$ | 0 | $2,749.8355$ | $1,785.7641$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 339 | $2,215.1808$ | 0 | $2,774.0927$ | $1,801.5169$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 349 | $2,219.9738$ | 0 | $2,773.3453$ | $1,801.0315$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 359 | $2,225.0087$ | 0 | $2,747.3953$ | $1,784.1794$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 369.5 | $2,230.5702$ | 0 | $2,414.7349$ | $1,568.1472$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 379.78571 | $2,236.2772$ | 0 | $2,058.1562$ | $1,336.5823$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 389.35714 | $2,241.8496$ | 0 | $1,955.1699$ | $1,269.7022$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 398.92857 | $2,247.6745$ | 0 | $1,828.2705$ | $1,187.2927$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 408.5 | $2,253.761$ | 0 | $1,677.157$ | $1,089.1585$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 418.07143 | $2,260.1193$ | 0 | $1,501.5003$ | 975.08571 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 427.64286 | $2,266.7604$ | 0 | $1,300.9421$ | 844.84165 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 437.21429 | $2,273.6967$ | 0 | $1,075.094$ | 698.17421 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 446.76957 | $2,280.9289$ | 0 | 704.25619 | 457.34932 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 456.30871 | $2,288.471$ | 0 | 191.44756 | 124.3275 | 200 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Lef
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100pcf-25 bedding 8-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $-14.6024,2,116.523$ ) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $256.0584,2,207.5292$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(304,2,225)$ ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $617.5728,2,317.479$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-240,2,108) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,288) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(15,0.75)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: (15.1, 1
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

Tmc100pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -240 | 2,108 |
| Point 2 | -107 | 2,112 |
| Point 3 | 36 | 2,119 |
| Point 4 | 78 | 2,139 |
| Point 5 | 87 | 2,139 |
| Point 6 | 141 | 2,164 |
| Point 7 | 159 | 2,164 |
| Point 8 | 221 | 2,195 |
| Point 9 | 231 | 2,195 |
| Point 10 | 291 | 2,225 |
| Point 11 | 304 | 2,225 |
| Point 12 | 364 | 2,255 |
| Point 13 | 375 | 2,255 |
| Point 14 | 442 | 2,288 |
| Point 15 | 530 | 2,308 |
| Point 16 | 591 | 2,318 |
| Point 17 | 642 | 2,317 |
| Point 18 | 693 | 2,313 |
| Point 19 | 764 | 2,300 |
| Point 20 | 811 | 2,288 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,910 |
| Point 22 | -240 | 1,910 |
| Point 23 | -200 | 1,965 |
| Point 24 | 450 | 2,139 |
| Point 25 | 810.8624 | 2,236 |
| Point 26 | -240 | 1,957 |
| Point 27 | 51 | 2,104 |
| Point 28 | 121 | 2,104 |
| Point 29 | 517 | 2,305 |
|  |  |  |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 | 1,26,23,24,25,20,19,18,17,16,15,29,28,27,3,2 | $1.1206 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 23,26,22,21,25,24 | $1.9434 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 3,27,28,29,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5,4 | 14,105 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 79,417
F of S: 1.30
Volume: $5,827.6236 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 699,314.83 lbs
Resisting Moment: $2.8656071 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
Activating Moment: $2.2089541 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: $(161.71733,2,165.3587) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (467.54239, 2,293.7896) ft
Radius: 614.64467 ft
Center: $(85.471326,2,775.2559) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 166.65755 | $2,166.017$ | 0 | 184.64344 | 119.90885 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 176.538 | $2,167.4155$ | 0 | 576.28907 | 374.2465 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 186.41844 | $2,168.9782$ | 0 | 943.68835 | 612.83838 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 196.29889 | $2,170.7064$ | 0 | $1,287.1841$ | 835.90712 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 206.17933 | $2,172.6015$ | 0 | $1,607.091$ | $1,043.6571$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 216.05978 | $2,174.6652$ | 0 | $1,903.6972$ | $1,236.2754$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 226 | $2,176.9137$ | 0 | $1,910.2766$ | $1,240.5481$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 236 | $2,179.351$ | 0 | $1,899.5067$ | $1,233.5541$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 246 | $2,181.9669$ | 0 | $2,134.1089$ | $1,385.9065$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 256 | $2,184.7638$ | 0 | $2,345.7677$ | $1,523.3593$ | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 11 | 266 | $2,187.7441$ | 0 | $2,534.662$ | $1,646.0288$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 12 | 276 | $2,190.9107$ | 0 | $2,700.9487$ | $1,754.0166$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 286 | $2,194.2668$ | 0 | $2,844.763$ | $1,847.4107$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 297.5 | $2,198.3816$ | 0 | $2,651.2432$ | $1,721.7375$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 309 | $2,202.7227$ | 0 | $2,438.0634$ | $1,583.2969$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 319 | $2,206.7287$ | 0 | $2,513.917$ | $1,632.5568$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 329 | $2,210.9402$ | 0 | $2,567.6705$ | $1,667.4647$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 339 | $2,215.362$ | 0 | $2,599.3578$ | $1,688.0427$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 349 | $2,219.9991$ | 0 | $2,608.9941$ | $1,694.3006$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 359 | $2,224.857$ | 0 | $2,596.5757$ | $1,686.2359$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 369.5 | $2,230.2079$ | 0 | $2,297.3103$ | $1,491.8907$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 379.78571 | $2,235.6844$ | 0 | $1,978.2067$ | $1,284.6624$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 389.35714 | $2,241.017$ | 0 | $1,899.6515$ | $1,233.6481$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 398.92857 | $2,246.5767$ | 0 | $1,800.8901$ | $1,169.5117$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 408.5 | $2,252.3707$ | 0 | $1,681.8489$ | $1,092.2054$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 418.07143 | $2,258.4069$ | 0 | $1,542.441$ | $1,001.6729$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 427.64286 | $2,264.6939$ | 0 | $1,382.5664$ | 897.84912 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 437.21429 | $2,271.2411$ | 0 | $1,202.113$ | 780.66129 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 446.25706 | $2,277.6676$ | 0 | 913.53729 | 593.25806 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 454.77119 | $2,283.9542$ | 0 | 521.58308 | 338.72001 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 463.28532 | $2,290.4719$ | 0 | 116.99713 | 75.978824 | 200 |
|  | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 118
Date: 3/20/2016
Time: 1:48:15 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 12-12 Static Final with keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
File Name: Sectors
Directory: C:\Users\Alexander\Desktop\LGC valley\original sections\Final Results for Section $12 \backslash$

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

## 2 - Translational

Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100pcf-25 bedding 8-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 pcf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-240,2,108) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,288)$ ft

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (-3, 2,120.9992) ft
Lower Left: (34, 1,927.9128) ft
Lower Right: (259, 2,001.527) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$

Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(358,2,253)$ ft
Lower Left: $(402,2,095) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(667,2,189) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(15,0.75)$
Data Point: (15.1, 1)
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15,0.425)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
Tmc100pcf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -240 | 2,108 |
| Point 2 | -107 | 2,112 |
| Point 3 | 36 | 2,119 |
| Point 4 | 78 | 2,139 |
| Point 5 | 87 | 2,139 |
| Point 6 | 141 | 2,164 |
| Point 7 | 159 | 2,164 |
| Point 8 | 221 | 2,195 |
| Point 9 | 231 | 2,195 |
| Point 10 | 291 | 2,225 |
| Point 11 | 304 | 2,225 |
| Point 12 | 364 | 2,255 |
| Point 13 | 375 | 2,255 |
| Point 14 | 442 | 2,288 |
| Point 15 | 530 | 2,308 |
| Point 16 | 591 | 2,318 |
| Point 17 | 642 | 2,317 |
| Point 18 | 693 | 2,313 |
| Point 19 | 764 | 2,300 |
| Point 20 | 811 | 2,288 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,910 |
| Point 22 | -240 | 1,910 |
|  |  |  |
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| Point <br> 23 | -200 | 1,965 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 24 | 450 | 2,139 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810.8624 | 2,236 |
| Point <br> 26 | -240 | 1,957 |
| Point <br> 27 | 51 | 2,104 |
| Point <br> 28 | 121 | 2,104 |
| Point <br> 29 | 517 | 2,305 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100-25 bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 1,26,23,24,25,20,19,18,17,16,15,29,28,27,3,2 | 1.1206e+005 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 23,26,22,21,25,24 | $1.9434 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 3,27,28,29,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5,4 | 14,105 |
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File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 113
Date: 3/20/2016
Time: 1:28:21 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 12-12 Seismic Final with keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: C:\Users\Alexander\Desktop\LGC valley\original sections\}
Last Solved Date: 3/20/2016
Last Solved Time: 1:28:37 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100pcf-25 bedding 8-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulom
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-240,2,108)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,288) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (-3, 2,120.9992) ft
ower Left: (34, 1,927.9128) ft
Lower Right: (259, 2,001.527) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

Starting Angle: 135
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(358,2,253) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(402,2,095) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(667,2,189)$ ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.75$ )
Data Point: ( $15,0.75$ )
Data Point: (15.1, 1)
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(15,0.5)$
Data Point: (15.1, 1)
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $15,0.425$
Data Point: (15.1, 1)
Tmc100pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15,0.625)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Point 1 | -240 | 2,108 |
| Point 2 | -107 | 2,112 |
| Point 3 | 36 | 2,119 |
| Point 4 | 78 | 2,139 |
| Point 5 | 87 | 2,139 |
| Point 6 | 141 | 2,164 |
| Point 7 | 159 | 2,164 |
| Point 8 | 221 | 2,195 |
| Point 9 | 231 | 2,195 |
| Point 10 | 291 | 2,225 |
| Point 11 | 304 | 2,225 |
| Point 12 | 364 | 2,255 |
| Point 13 | 375 | 2,255 |
| Point 14 | 442 | 2,288 |
| Point 15 | 530 | 2,308 |
| Point 16 | 591 | 2,318 |
| Point 17 | 642 | 2,317 |
| Point 18 | 693 | 2,313 |
| Point 19 | 764 | 2,300 |
| Point 20 | 811 | 2,288 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,910 |
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## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 | 1,26,23,24,25,20,19,18,17,16,15,29,28,27,3,2 | 1.1206e+005 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 | 23,26,22,21,25,24 | $1.9434 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region $3$ | Fill | $3,27,28,29,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5,4$ | 14,105 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 105,473
Fof S: 1.11
Volume: $15,653.932 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,878,471.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $889,080.31 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: 799,701.22 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: ( $91.910285,2,141.2733$ ) ft
Entry: $(468.48139,2,294.0024) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 215.82605 ft
Center: (233.73808, 2,332.1847) ft
Slip Slices
Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 98.046499 | $2,141.2733$ | 0 | 340.9008 | 221.38357 | 200 |
|  | 110.31893 | $2,141.2733$ | 0 | $1,022.7024$ | 664.1507 | 200 |


| Slice <br> 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 3 | 122.59136 | $2,141.2733$ | 0 | $1,704.504$ | $1,106.9178$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 134.86379 | $2,141.2733$ | 0 | $2,386.3056$ | $1,549.685$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 150 | $2,141.2733$ | 0 | $2,727.2064$ | $1,771.0685$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 165.35 | $2,141.2733$ | 0 | $3,108.2064$ | $2,018.4928$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 178.05 | $2,141.2733$ | 0 | $3,870.2064$ | $2,513.3414$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 189.67244 | $2,142.6762$ | 0 | $3,763.0085$ | $2,443.7263$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 200.21731 | $2,145.482$ | 0 | $4,018.9963$ | $2,609.9667$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 213.24487 | $2,148.9485$ | 0 | $4,528.6368$ | $2,111.738$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 226 | $2,152.3424$ | 0 | $4,580.8154$ | $2,136.0693$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 237 | $2,155.2694$ | 0 | $4,588.6985$ | $2,139.7453$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 249 | $2,158.4624$ | 0 | $4,891.5517$ | $2,280.968$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 261 | $2,161.6554$ | 0 | $5,194.405$ | $2,422.1908$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 273 | $2,164.8484$ | 0 | $5,497.2582$ | $2,563.4136$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 285 | $2,168.0414$ | 0 | $5,800.1114$ | $2,704.6364$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 297.5 | $2,171.3675$ | 0 | $5,764.9315$ | $2,688.2317$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 310 | $2,174.6936$ | 0 | $5,729.7516$ | $2,671.827$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 322 | $2,177.8866$ | 0 | $6,032.6048$ | $2,813.0498$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 334 | $2,181.0796$ | 0 | $6,335.458$ | $2,954.2726$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 346 | $2,184.2726$ | 0 | $6,638.3113$ | $3,095.4954$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 358 | $2,187.4656$ | 0 | $6,941.1645$ | $3,236.7182$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 369.5 | $2,190.5256$ | 0 | $6,934.6933$ | $3,233.7006$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 381.775 | $2,193.7918$ | 0 | $6,942.3262$ | $3,237.2599$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 395.325 | $2,197.3973$ | 0 | $7,273.388$ | $3,391.6365$ | 100 |
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| Slice <br> 26 | 408.75 | $2,208.6972$ | 0 | $3,499.7987$ | $2,936.6798$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 27 | 422.05 | $2,227.6916$ | 0 | $2,783.1982$ | $2,335.3806$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 435.35 | $2,246.6859$ | 0 | $2,066.5977$ | $1,734.0814$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 447.83806 | $2,264.5207$ | 0 | $1,304.3584$ | $1,094.4866$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 461.07875 | $2,283.4304$ | 0 | 439.95509 | 285.71017 | 200 |
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## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 120
Date: 3/20/2016
Time: 1:53:40 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 12-12 Static Temporary Final without keyway SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: C:\Users\Alexander\Desktop\LGC valley\original sections\Final Results for Section 12\}
Last Solved Date: 3/20/2016
Last Solved Time: 1:54:59 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100pcf-25 bedding 8-15
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-240,2,108) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,288) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(-3,2,120.9992) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (34, 1,927.9128) ft
Lower Right: $(259,2,001.527) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 135
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(358,2,253)$ ft
Lower Left: $(402,2,095)$ ft
Lower Right: $(667,2,189) \mathrm{ft}$

X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$150-17^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(15,0.75)$
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$
100 pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.5$ )
Data Point: ( $15,0.5$ )
Data Point: (15.1, 1 )
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding $8-15^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.425$ )

## Data Point: (15, 0.425

 Data Point: $(15.1,1)$Tmc100pcf- $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: (15, 0.625 )
Data Point: $(15.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Point 1 | -240 | 2,108 |
| Point 2 | -107 | 2,112 |
| Point 3 | 36 | 2,119 |
| Point 4 | 530 | 2,308 |
| Point 5 | 591 | 2,318 |
| Point 6 | 642 | 2,317 |
| Point 7 | 693 | 2,313 |
| Point 8 | 764 | 2,300 |
| Point 9 | 811 | 2,288 |
| Point 10 | 810 | 1,910 |
| Point 11 | -240 | 1,910 |
| Point 12 | -200 | 1,965 |
| Point 13 | 450 | 2,139 |
| Point 14 | 810.8624 | 2,236 |
| Point 15 | -240 | 1,957 |
| Point 16 | 51 | 2,104 |
| Point 17 | 121 | 2,104 |
| Point 18 | 517 | 2,305 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 | $1,15,12,13,14,9,8,7,6,5,4,18,17,16,3,2$ | $1.1206 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ bedding 8-15 | $12,15,11,10,14,13$ | $1.9434 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 96,734
F of $\mathrm{S}: 1.33$
Volume: $13,980.199 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,677,623.9 lbs
Resisting Force: $756,993.04 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $568,227.64 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: (158.16867, 2,122.8659) ft
Entry: (534.04644, 2,308.6634) ft
Radius: 239.0956 ft
Center: (277.22741, 2,355.1127) ft

## Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 164.44641 | $2,124.5187$ | 0 | 150.44855 | 70.15531 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 177.00188 | $2,127.8243$ | 0 | 487.49666 | 227.32343 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 189.55735 | $2,131.1299$ | 0 | 824.54477 | 384.49154 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 202.11282 | $2,134.4355$ | 0 | $1,161.5929$ | 541.65966 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 214.6683 | $2,137.7411$ | 0 | $1,498.641$ | 698.82777 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 227.22377 | $2,141.0466$ | 0 | $1,835.6891$ | 855.99589 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 239.77924 | $2,144.3522$ | 0 | $2,172.7372$ | $1,013.164$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 252.33471 | $2,147.6578$ | 0 | $2,509.7853$ | $1,170.3321$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 264.89018 | $2,150.9634$ | 0 | $2,846.8334$ | $1,327.5002$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 277.44566 | $2,154.269$ | 0 | $3,183.8816$ | $1,484.6683$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 290.00113 | $2,157.5746$ | 0 | $3,520.9297$ | $1,641.8365$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 302.5566 | $2,160.8802$ | 0 | $3,857.9778$ | $1,799.0046$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 315.11207 | $2,164.1858$ | 0 | $4,195.0259$ | $1,956.1727$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 327.66754 | $2,167.4913$ | 0 | $4,532.074$ | $2,113.3408$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 340.22302 | $2,170.7969$ | 0 | $4,869.1221$ | $2,270.5089$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 352.77849 | $2,174.1025$ | 0 | $5,206.1702$ | $2,427.677$ | 100 |
|  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 17 | 365.33396 | $2,177.4081$ | 0 | $5,543.2183$ | $2,584.8452$ | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 18 | 377.88943 | $2,180.7137$ | 0 | $5,880.2664$ | $2,742.0133$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 390.4449 | $2,184.0193$ | 0 | $6,217.3146$ | $2,899.1814$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 403.00038 | $2,187.3249$ | 0 | $6,554.3627$ | $3,056.3495$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 415.55585 | $2,190.6304$ | 0 | $6,891.4108$ | $3,213.5176$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 428.11132 | $2,193.936$ | 0 | $7,228.4589$ | $3,370.6857$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 440.66679 | $2,197.2416$ | 0 | $7,565.507$ | $3,527.8539$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 453.22226 | $2,200.5472$ | 0 | $7,902.5551$ | $3,685.022$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 465.25 | $2,210.4119$ | 0 | $4,205.6975$ | $3,528.9992$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 476.75 | $2,226.8356$ | 0 | $3,536.5318$ | $2,967.5025$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 488.25 | $2,243.2593$ | 0 | $2,867.366$ | $2,406.0058$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 499.75 | $2,259.683$ | 0 | $2,198.2003$ | $1,844.5091$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 511.25 | $2,276.1067$ | 0 | $1,529.0346$ | $1,283.0123$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 523.5 | $2,293.6015$ | 0 | 702.49952 | 589.46709 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 532.02322 | $2,305.7739$ | 0 | 48.872803 | 41.009151 | 200 |

## Section 13-13 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 13-13 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/22/2016 12:10:09 PM


Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Name: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $\left.20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100-25 (A-Bed $\left.20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}\right)$

Name: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Name: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 (A-Bed4 ${ }^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed 20 ${ }^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right.$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 (A-Bed4 $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(927.8352,2,117.665) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(1,200,2,135) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(1,300,2,182.5946) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(1,923.1499,2,329.2888) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-50,2,033) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,2,352) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
Tmc 100- $\mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $20,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(34,0.625)$
Data Point: $(34.1,1)$
100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## -Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: $(20,0.5)$
Data Point: $(34,0.5)$
Data Point: (34.1, 1
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}\right.$ ) Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $4,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(12,0.425)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
100 (A-Bed4옹ํ)
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$ Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
$150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$

## Points

| Point <br> 1 | -50 | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 2 | 118 | $\mathrm{ft})$ |
| Point <br> 3 | 296 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 4 | 360 | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 5 | 373 | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 6 | 403 | 2,097 |
| Point <br> 7 | 416 | 2,097 |
| Point <br> 8 | 437 | 2,110 |
| Point <br> 9 | 505 | 2,110 |
| Point <br> 10 | 700 | 2,109 |
| Point <br> 11 | 831 | 2,106 |
| Point <br> 12 | 862 | 2,117 |
| Point <br> 13 | 1,060 | 2,119 |
| Point <br> 14 | 1,163 | 2,117 |
| Point <br> 15 | 1,163 | 2,121 |
| Point <br> 16 | 1,192 | 2,135 |
| Point <br> 17 | 1,202 | 2,135 |
| Point <br> 18 | 1,218 | 2,146 |
| Point <br> 19 | 1,234 | 2,145 |
| Point <br> 20 | 1,271 | 2,163 |
| Point <br> 21 | 1,295 | 2,174 |
| Point <br> 22 | 1,327 | 2,182 |
| Point <br> 23 | 1,369 | 2,192 |
|  | 1,412 | 2,200 |


| Point <br> 24 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 25 | 1,429 | 2,201 |
| Point <br> 26 | 1,462 | 2,207 |
| Point <br> 27 | 1,582 | 2,236 |
| Point <br> 28 | 1,631 | 2,240 |
| Point <br> 29 | 1,713 | 2,261 |
| Point <br> 30 | 1,859 | 2,311 |
| Point <br> 31 | 1,895 | 2,322 |
| Point <br> 32 | 2,007 | 2,351 |
| Point <br> 33 | 2,036 | 2,353 |
| Point <br> 34 | 2,050 | 2,352 |
| Point <br> 35 | 2,050 | 2,100 |
| Point <br> 36 | -50 | $1,914.8161$ |
| Point <br> 37 | 1,250 | 2,164 |
| Point <br> 38 | 1,308 | 2,188 |
| Point <br> 39 | 1,335 | 2,189 |
| Point <br> 40 | 1,347 | 2,194 |
| Point <br> 41 | 1,359 | 2,194 |
| Point <br> 42 | 1,410 | 2,223 |
| Point <br> 43 | 1,425 | 2,223 |
| Point <br> 44 | 1,476 | 2,249 |
| Point <br> 45 | 1,586 | 2,253 |
| Point <br> 46 | 549 | $2,109.7744$ |
| Point <br> 47 | 863 |  |
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| Point <br> 48 | 1,089 | 2,117 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 49 | -50 | 1,996 |
| Point <br> 50 | 625 | $2,087.3194$ |
| Point <br> 51 | 863 | 1,994 |
| Point <br> 52 | 2,049 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 53 | -50 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 54 | $1,007.64$ | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 55 | 2,050 | 2,230 |
| Point <br> 56 | 1,260 | $2,157.3607$ |
| Point <br> 57 | 1,168 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 58 | 1,188 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 59 | 1,313 | $2,178.5$ |
| Point <br> 60 | $1,276.0361$ | $2,158.8352$ |


| Regions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 46,50,47,54,48,13,12,11,10 | 25,797 |
| Region | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\mathrm{A}-\text { Bed } 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 49,50,46,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1 | 16,398 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc 100- } 25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\text { A-Bed } 20^{\circ}\right. \\ & -34^{\circ} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 47,50,49,36,51 | 82,160 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc 150-17 } \\ & \left(\text { A-Bed } 4^{\circ}\right. \\ & -12^{\circ} \text { ) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 36,51,35,52,53 | 8.959e+005 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\text { A-Bed } 20^{\circ}\right. \\ & -34^{\circ} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 51,35,55,60,58,57,14,48,54,47 | $1.3322 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region $6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right. \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | $55,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,59,60$ | 49,472 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 18,19,56,20,37 | 372.83 |
|  |  |  |  |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Page 8 of 9

| Region <br> 8 | Fill | $22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,45,44,43,42,41,40,39,38,20,21,59$ | 7,527 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 9 | Fill | $14,57,58,60,59,21,20,56,19,18,17,16,15$ | $1,578.4$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 109,307
F of S: 1.68
Volume: 1,809.91 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: $217,189.2$ lbs
Resisting Moment: 33,555,141 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: 20,003,789 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: $(1,163,2,117.0471) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(1,311.3619,2,188.1245) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 237.73425 ft
Center: $(1,140.81,2,353.7435) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

| X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | $1,165.4167$ | $2,117.2986$ | 0 | 549.66949 | 356.95954 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | $1,170.25$ | $2,117.8517$ | 0 | 746.90945 | 485.04867 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | $1,175.0833$ | $2,118.5054$ | 0 | 929.65523 | 603.72517 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | $1,179.9167$ | $2,119.2606$ | 0 | $1,098.0953$ | 713.11143 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | $1,184.75$ | $2,120.1181$ | 0 | $1,252.3944$ | 813.3144 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | $1,189.5833$ | $2,121.0793$ | 0 | $1,392.6943$ | 904.42625 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | $1,194.5$ | $2,122.1655$ | 0 | $1,388.1535$ | 901.47742 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | $1,199.5$ | $2,123.382$ | 0 | $1,241.5709$ | 806.28554 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | $1,204.6667$ | $2,124.7626$ | 0 | $1,277.5841$ | 829.67281 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 1,210 | $2,126.3176$ | 0 | $1,490.4238$ | 967.89252 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | $1,215.3333$ | $2,128.0092$ | 0 | $1,684.637$ | $1,094.016$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | $1,220.6494$ | $2,129.8343$ | 0 | $1,824.7915$ | $1,185.0334$ | 200 |
|  | $1,225.9742$ | $2,131.8056$ | 0 | $2,005.1994$ | 935.03984 | 100 |
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| Slice <br> 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 14 | $1,231.3247$ | $2,133.9338$ | 0 | $2,084.6151$ | 972.07198 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | $1,236.6667$ | $2,136.2105$ | 0 | $2,146.0572$ | $1,000.7229$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 1,242 | $2,138.6401$ | 0 | $2,189.3557$ | $1,020.9133$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 17 | $1,247.3333$ | $2,141.2312$ | 0 | $2,214.3685$ | $1,032.577$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 18 | $1,252.5$ | $2,143.8985$ | 0 | $2,061.6702$ | 961.37258 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | $1,257.5$ | $2,146.6377$ | 0 | $1,735.673$ | 809.35762 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | $1,262.75$ | $2,149.6897$ | 0 | $1,379.9504$ | 643.48142 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | $1,268.25$ | $2,153.0796$ | 0 | 993.29364 | 463.18043 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | $1,273.518$ | $2,156.5204$ | 0 | 793.48877 | 370.00989 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | $1,276.5501$ | $2,158.5722$ | 0 | 666.91206 | 559.60566 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,278.3402$ | $2,159.8348$ | 0 | 657.61914 | 551.80798 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | $1,282.1802$ | $2,162.6365$ | 0 | 670.39184 | 435.35755 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | $1,287.3081$ | $2,166.5396$ | 0 | 617.5782 | 401.05997 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,292.436$ | $2,170.6696$ | 0 | 544.73919 | 353.75777 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | $1,295.9866$ | $2,173.6432$ | 0 | 484.76012 | 314.8069 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | $1,299.7299$ | $2,176.9716$ | 0 | 405.09049 | 263.06884 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | $1,305.2433$ | $2,182.0906$ | 0 | 271.17684 | 176.1043 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | $1,309.6809$ | $2,186.428$ | 0 | 54.655435 | 35.493655 | 200 |
|  | 1, |  |  |  |  |  |

## Section 13-13 Seismic Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz



Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Name: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $\left.20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )

Name: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$

Name: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )

## LGC Valley, Inc

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING
28532 Constellation Road, Valencia, CA 91355
Phone 661-702-8474, Fax 661-702-8475

## Skyline Ranch

Development project, Tract 60922 Los Angeles CA

Project No:
Engineer:
Date:

153035-01
BAS
March 2016

## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Reporenated

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 135
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 12:06:01 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 13-13 Seismic Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 13-13 results\
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 12:06:33 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed 20 $0^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 (A-Bed4 $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(927.8352,2,117.665) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(1,200,2,135) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(1,300,2,182.5946) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(1,923.1499,2,329.2888) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-50,2,033) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,2,352) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
Tmc 100- $\mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept:

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $20,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(34,0.625)$
Data Point: $(34.1,1)$
100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: $(20,0.5)$
Data Point: $(34,0.5)$
Data Point: (34.1, 1
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$ Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $4,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(12,0.425)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
100 (A-Bed4오웅
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$ Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
$150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$

## Points

| Point <br> 1 | -50 | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 2 | 118 | $\mathrm{ft})$ |
| Point <br> 3 | 296 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 4 | 360 | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 5 | 373 | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 6 | 403 | 2,097 |
| Point <br> 7 | 416 | 2,097 |
| Point <br> 8 | 437 | 2,110 |
| Point <br> 9 | 505 | 2,110 |
| Point <br> 10 | 700 | 2,109 |
| Point <br> 11 | 831 | 2,106 |
| Point <br> 12 | 862 | 2,117 |
| Point <br> 13 | 1,060 | 2,119 |
| Point <br> 14 | 1,163 | 2,117 |
| Point <br> 15 | 1,163 | 2,121 |
| Point <br> 16 | 1,192 | 2,135 |
| Point <br> 17 | 1,202 | 2,135 |
| Point <br> 18 | 1,218 | 2,146 |
| Point <br> 19 | 1,234 | 2,145 |
| Point <br> 20 | 1,271 | 2,163 |
| Point <br> 21 | 1,295 | 2,174 |
| Point <br> 22 | 1,327 | 2,182 |
| Point <br> 23 | 1,369 | 2,192 |
|  | 1,412 | 2,200 |


| Point <br> 24 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 25 | 1,429 | 2,201 |
| Point <br> 26 | 1,462 | 2,207 |
| Point <br> 27 | 1,582 | 2,236 |
| Point <br> 28 | 1,631 | 2,240 |
| Point <br> 29 | 1,713 | 2,261 |
| Point <br> 30 | 1,859 | 2,311 |
| Point <br> 31 | 1,895 | 2,322 |
| Point <br> 32 | 2,007 | 2,351 |
| Point <br> 33 | 2,036 | 2,353 |
| Point <br> 34 | 2,050 | 2,352 |
| Point <br> 35 | 2,050 | 2,100 |
| Point <br> 36 | -50 | $1,914.8161$ |
| Point <br> 37 | 1,250 | 2,164 |
| Point <br> 38 | 1,308 | 2,188 |
| Point <br> 39 | 1,335 | 2,189 |
| Point <br> 40 | 1,347 |  |
| Point <br> 41 | 1,359 | 2,194 |
| Point <br> 42 | 1,410 | 2,223 |
| Point <br> 43 | 1,425 | 2,223 |
| Point <br> 44 | 1,476 | 2,249 |
| Point <br> 45 | 1,586 | 2,253 |
| Point <br> 46 | 549 | $2,109.7744$ |
| Point <br> 47 | 863 | 2,017 |

file:///G:/SLOPE\%20RESULTS/Section\%2013-13\%20results/Latest\%20updated\%203-22-... 3/22/2016

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

| Point <br> 48 | 1,089 | 2,117 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 49 | -50 | 1,996 |
| Point <br> 50 | 625 | $2,087.3194$ |
| Point <br> 51 | 863 | 1,994 |
| Point <br> 52 | 2,049 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 53 | -50 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 54 | $1,007.64$ | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 55 | 2,050 | 2,230 |
| Point <br> 56 | 1,260 | $2,157.3607$ |
| Point <br> 57 | 1,168 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 58 | 1,188 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 59 | 1,313 | $2,178.5$ |
| Point <br> 60 | $1,276.0361$ | $2,158.8352$ |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 46,50,47,54,48,13,12,11,10 | 25,797 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\text { (A- Bed } 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 49,50,46,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1 | 16,398 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\text { A-Bed } 20^{\circ}\right. \\ & \left.-34^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 47,50,49,36,51 | 82,160 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 150-17^{\circ} \\ & \text { (A-Bed } 4^{\circ} \\ & -12^{\circ} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 36,51,35,52,53 | 8.959e+005 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \text { (A-Bed } 20^{\circ} \\ & -34^{\circ} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 51,35,55,60,58,57,14,48,54,47 | $1.3322 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\text { A- Bed } 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 55,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,59,60 | 49,472 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 18,19,56,20,37 | 372.83 |
|  |  |  |  |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Page 8 of 9

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 109,307
F of S: 1.19
Volume: 1,809.91 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: $217,189.2$ lbs
Resisting Moment: 31,921,881 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $26,799,449 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: $(1,163,2,117.0471) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(1,311.3619,2,188.1245) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 237.73425 ft
Center: $(1,140.81,2,353.7435) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | $1,165.4167$ | $2,117.2986$ | 0 | 536.3873 | 348.33399 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | $1,170.25$ | $2,117.8517$ | 0 | 727.5247 | 472.46006 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | $1,175.0833$ | $2,118.5054$ | 0 | 903.38437 | 586.66467 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | $1,179.9167$ | $2,119.2606$ | 0 | $1,064.2894$ | 691.15761 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | $1,184.75$ | $2,120.1181$ | 0 | $1,210.5317$ | 786.1285 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | $1,189.5833$ | $2,121.0793$ | 0 | $1,342.3745$ | 871.74817 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | $1,194.5$ | $2,122.1655$ | 0 | $1,333.2452$ | 865.81958 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | $1,199.5$ | $2,123.382$ | 0 | $1,187.0504$ | 770.87955 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | $1,204.6667$ | $2,124.7626$ | 0 | $1,217.2142$ | 790.46816 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 1,210 | $2,126.3176$ | 0 | $1,416.6076$ | 919.95575 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | $1,215.3333$ | $2,128.0092$ | 0 | $1,596.9446$ | $1,037.0679$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | $1,220.6494$ | $2,129.8343$ | 0 | $1,724.6363$ | $1,119.9919$ | 200 |
|  | $1,225.9742$ | $2,131.8056$ | 0 | $1,921.5658$ | 896.04083 | 100 |
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| Slice <br> 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 14 | $1,231.3247$ | $2,133.9338$ | 0 | $1,992.5326$ | 929.13323 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | $1,236.6667$ | $2,136.2105$ | 0 | $2,045.8591$ | 953.99979 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 1,242 | $2,138.6401$ | 0 | $2,081.4956$ | 970.61735 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 17 | $1,247.3333$ | $2,141.2312$ | 0 | $2,099.4124$ | 978.97206 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 18 | $1,252.5$ | $2,143.8985$ | 0 | $1,948.4264$ | 908.56613 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | $1,257.5$ | $2,146.6377$ | 0 | $1,633.9893$ | 761.94173 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | $1,262.75$ | $2,149.6897$ | 0 | $1,292.7285$ | 602.80921 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | $1,268.25$ | $2,153.0796$ | 0 | 923.90126 | 430.82223 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | $1,273.518$ | $2,156.5204$ | 0 | 732.84731 | 341.73231 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | $1,276.5501$ | $2,158.5722$ | 0 | 580.98647 | 487.50553 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,278.3402$ | $2,159.8348$ | 0 | 571.45265 | 479.50571 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | $1,282.1802$ | $2,162.6365$ | 0 | 589.23793 | 382.65558 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | $1,287.3081$ | $2,166.5396$ | 0 | 537.68794 | 349.17863 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,292.436$ | $2,170.6696$ | 0 | 468.17483 | 304.03629 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | $1,295.9866$ | $2,173.6432$ | 0 | 411.62717 | 267.31381 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | $1,299.7299$ | $2,176.9716$ | 0 | 337.38954 | 219.10333 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | $1,305.2433$ | $2,182.0906$ | 0 | 213.82023 | 138.85648 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | $1,309.6809$ | $2,186.428$ | 0 | 17.499119 | 11.36406 | 200 |
|  | 1, |  |  |  |  |  |



## 2 - Translational

Report generated using GeoStudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 13
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 12:10:09 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 13-13 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 13-13 results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 12:10:33 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 (A-Bed4 $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-50,2,033) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,2,352) f$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(1,111,2,143) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,134,2,025) \mathrm{ft}$
ower Right: (1,248, 2,046)
Lower Right: (1,248, 2,046) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(1,266.6877,2,201.9943) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,284.7124,2,069.4062) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(1,386.5849,2,091.0405) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: (4, 0.625)
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $20,0.625$
Data Point: ( $34,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(34.1,1)$
100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: $(20,0.5)$
Data Point: $(34,0.5)$
Data Point: $(34.1,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: (12, 0.425
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
100 (A-Bed4응 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: (12.1, 1

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -50 | 2,033 |
| Point 2 | 118 | 2,039 |
| Point 3 | 296 | 2,045 |
| Point 4 | 360 | 2,081 |
| Point 5 | 373 | 2,081 |
| Point 6 | 403 | 2,097 |
| Point 7 | 416 | 2,097 |
| Point 8 | 437 | 2,110 |
| Point 9 | 505 | 2,110 |
| Point 10 | 700 | 2,109 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 2,106 |
| Point 12 | 862 | 2,117 |
| Point 13 | 1,060 | 2,119 |
| Point 14 | 1,163 | 2,117 |
| Point 15 | 1,163 | 2,121 |
| Point 16 | 1,192 | 2,135 |
| Point 17 | 1,202 | 2,135 |
| Point 18 | 1,218 | 2,146 |
| Point 19 | 1,234 | 2,145 |
| Point 20 | 1,271 | 2,163 |
| Point 21 | 1,295 | 2,174 |
| Point 22 | 1,327 | 2,182 |
| Point 23 | 1,369 | 2,192 |
| Point 24 | 1,412 | 2,200 |
| Point 25 | 1,429 | 2,201 |
| Point 26 | 1,462 | 2,207 |
| Point 27 | 1,582 | 2,236 |
| Point 28 | 1,631 | 2,240 |
| Point 29 | 1,713 | 2,261 |
| Point 30 | 1,859 | 2,311 |
| Point 31 | 1,895 | 2,322 |
| Point 32 | 2,007 | 2,351 |
| Point 33 | 2,036 | 2,353 |
| Point 34 | 2,050 | 2,352 |
| Point 35 | 2,050 | 2,100 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 36 | -50 | $1,914.8161$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 37 | 1,250 | 2,164 |
| Point <br> 38 | 1,308 | 2,188 |
| Point <br> 39 | 1,335 | 2,189 |
| Point <br> 40 | 1,347 | 2,194 |
| Point <br> 41 | 1,359 | 2,194 |
| Point <br> 42 | 1,410 | 2,223 |
| Point <br> 43 | 1,425 | 2,223 |
| Point <br> 44 | 1,476 | 2,249 |
| Point <br> 45 | 1,586 | 2,253 |
| Point <br> 46 | 549 | $2,109.7744$ |
| Point <br> 47 | 863 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 48 | 1,089 | 2,117 |
| Point <br> 49 | -50 | 1,996 |
| Point <br> 50 | 625 | $2,087.3194$ |
| Point <br> 51 | 863 | 1,994 |
| Point <br> 52 | 2,049 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 53 | -50 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 54 | $1,007.64$ | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 55 | 2,050 | 2,230 |
| Point <br> 56 | 1,260 | $2,157.3607$ |
| Point <br> 57 | 1,168 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 58 | 1,188 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 59 | 1,313 | $2,178.5$ |
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## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 77,888
Fof S: 1.58
F of S: 1.58
Volume: $3,321.8473 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Volume: $3,321.8473 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $398,621.67 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $207,769.45 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $207,769.45 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $131,647.76 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $131,647.76 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surf
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100
Exit: $(1,151.3679,2,117) \mathrm{ft}$
Exit: $(1,151.3679,2,117) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(1,318.8608,2,188.4023) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 98.718185 ft
Center: $(1,212.2853,2,206.2528) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices
Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | $1,154.2759$ | $2,115.7955$ | 0 | 252.06089 | 211.5042 | 200 |


| Slice <br> 2 | $1,160.092$ | $2,113.3864$ | 0 | 622.32647 | 522.19392 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 3 | $1,165.5$ | $2,111.1463$ | 0 | $1,766.8934$ | $1,482.5996$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | $1,170.3$ | $2,109.1581$ | 0 | $2,428.6247$ | $2,037.8581$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | $1,174.9$ | $2,107.2527$ | 0 | $3,062.7838$ | $2,569.9808$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | $1,179.9$ | $2,107.3836$ | 0 | $2,314.4647$ | $1,079.2526$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 7 | $1,185.3$ | $2,109.5509$ | 0 | $2,361.6524$ | $1,101.2566$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 1,190 | $2,111.4372$ | 0 | $2,402.7231$ | $1,120.4082$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | $1,194.5$ | $2,113.2432$ | 0 | $2,312.5102$ | $1,078.3412$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | $1,199.5$ | $2,115.2499$ | 0 | $2,097.1304$ | 977.90795 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | $1,204.6667$ | $2,117.3235$ | 0 | $2,071.3426$ | 965.88294 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 1,210 | $2,119.464$ | 0 | $2,235.147$ | $1,042.2662$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 13 | $1,215.3333$ | $2,121.6045$ | 0 | $2,398.9514$ | $1,118.6494$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 14 | $1,220.6667$ | $2,123.745$ | 0 | $2,526.9791$ | $1,178.3497$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 1,226 | $2,125.8855$ | 0 | $2,619.2302$ | $1,221.3671$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | $1,231.3333$ | $2,128.026$ | 0 | $2,711.4814$ | $1,264.3845$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 17 | $1,236.6667$ | $2,130.1665$ | 0 | $2,803.7325$ | $1,307.4019$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 1,242 | $2,132.3069$ | 0 | $2,895.9836$ | $1,350.4193$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | $1,247.3333$ | $2,134.4474$ | 0 | $2,988.2348$ | $1,393.4367$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | $1,252.5$ | $2,136.521$ | 0 | $2,913.8931$ | $1,358.7706$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | $1,257.5$ | $2,138.5277$ | 0 | $2,672.9585$ | $1,246.421$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | $1,262.75$ | $2,140.6348$ | 0 | $2,419.9773$ | $1,128.4539$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | $1,268.25$ | $2,142.8422$ | 0 | $2,154.9493$ | $1,004.8694$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,273.518$ | $2,144.9565$ | 0 | $2,096.5773$ | 977.65006 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 25 | $1,279.0754$ | $2,147.1869$ | 0 | $2,260.21$ | $1,053.9532$ | 100 |
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| Slice <br> 26 | $1,285.1541$ | $2,149.6265$ | 0 | $2,439.1914$ | $1,137.4136$ | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,291.2327$ | $2,152.0661$ | 0 | $2,618.1728$ | $1,220.874$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 28 | $1,294.636$ | $2,153.8057$ | 0 | $1,617.1724$ | $1,356.9688$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | $1,297.34$ | $2,157.6674$ | 0 | $1,478.1217$ | $1,240.2913$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | $1,303.84$ | $2,166.9503$ | 0 | $1,143.8597$ | 959.81228 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | $1,309.6451$ | $2,175.2409$ | 0 | 773.52797 | 649.06703 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | $1,311.4949$ | $2,177.8827$ | 0 | 662.10652 | 429.977 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | $1,315.2802$ | $2,183.2886$ | 0 | 263.44322 | 171.08203 | 200 |



## 2 - Translational

Report generated using GeoStudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 133
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 11:59:24 AM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 13-13 Seismic Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 13-13 results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 12:00:10 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A- Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 (A-Bed4 $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-50,2,033) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,2,352) f$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(1,111,2,143) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,134,2,025) \mathrm{ft}$
ower Right: (1,248, 2046)
Lower Right: (1,248, 2,046) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(1,266.6877,2,201.9943) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,284.7124,2,069.4062) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(1,386.5849,2,091.0405) \mathrm{ft}$
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $\mathbf{1 0 0}-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-\mathbf{8}^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: (4, 0.625)
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $20,0.625$
Data Point: ( $34,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(34.1,1)$
100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: $(20,0.5)$
Data Point: $(34,0.5)$
Data Point: $(34.1,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: (12, 0.425
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
100 (A-Bed4응 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: (12.1, 1

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -50 | 2,033 |
| Point 2 | 118 | 2,039 |
| Point 3 | 296 | 2,045 |
| Point 4 | 360 | 2,081 |
| Point 5 | 373 | 2,081 |
| Point 6 | 403 | 2,097 |
| Point 7 | 416 | 2,097 |
| Point 8 | 437 | 2,110 |
| Point 9 | 505 | 2,110 |
| Point 10 | 700 | 2,109 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 2,106 |
| Point 12 | 862 | 2,117 |
| Point 13 | 1,060 | 2,119 |
| Point 14 | 1,163 | 2,117 |
| Point 15 | 1,163 | 2,121 |
| Point 16 | 1,192 | 2,135 |
| Point 17 | 1,202 | 2,135 |
| Point 18 | 1,218 | 2,146 |
| Point 19 | 1,234 | 2,145 |
| Point 20 | 1,271 | 2,163 |
| Point 21 | 1,295 | 2,174 |
| Point 22 | 1,327 | 2,182 |
| Point 23 | 1,369 | 2,192 |
| Point 24 | 1,412 | 2,200 |
| Point 25 | 1,429 | 2,201 |
| Point 26 | 1,462 | 2,207 |
| Point 27 | 1,582 | 2,236 |
| Point 28 | 1,631 | 2,240 |
| Point 29 | 1,713 | 2,261 |
| Point 30 | 1,859 | 2,311 |
| Point 31 | 1,895 | 2,322 |
| Point 32 | 2,007 | 2,351 |
| Point 33 | 2,036 | 2,353 |
| Point 34 | 2,050 | 2,352 |
| Point 35 | 2,050 | 2,100 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 36 | -50 | $1,914.8161$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 37 | 1,250 | 2,164 |
| Point <br> 38 | 1,308 | 2,188 |
| Point <br> 39 | 1,335 | 2,189 |
| Point <br> 40 | 1,347 | 2,194 |
| Point <br> 41 | 1,359 | 2,194 |
| Point <br> 42 | 1,410 | 2,223 |
| Point <br> 43 | 1,425 | 2,223 |
| Point <br> 44 | 1,476 | 2,249 |
| Point <br> 45 | 1,586 | 2,253 |
| Point <br> 46 | 549 | $2,109.7744$ |
| Point <br> 47 | 863 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 48 | 1,089 | 2,117 |
| Point <br> 49 | -50 | 1,996 |
| Point <br> 50 | 625 | $2,087.3194$ |
| Point <br> 51 | 863 | 1,994 |
| Point <br> 52 | 2,049 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 53 | -50 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 54 | $1,007.64$ | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 55 | 2,050 | 2,230 |
| Point <br> 56 | 1,260 | $2,157.3607$ |
| Point <br> 57 | 1,168 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 58 | 1,188 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 59 | 1,313 | $2,178.5$ |
| 59 |  |  |
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| Point $60$ | 1,276.0361 2,1 | 88.8352 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regions |  |  |  |
|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 46,50,47,54,48,13,12,11,10 | 25,797 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 49,50,46,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1 | 16,398 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc 100-25 } \\ & \left(\text { A-Bed } 20^{\circ}\right. \\ & -34^{\circ} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 47,50,49,36,51 | 82,160 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 150-17^{\circ} \\ & \left(\text { A-Bed } 4^{\circ}\right. \\ & -12^{\circ} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 36,51,35,52,53 | 8.959e+005 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc 100- } 25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 20^{\circ}\right. \\ & \left.-34^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 51,35,55,60,58,57,14,48,54,47 | $1.3322 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \\ & \left(\mathrm{A}-\text { Bed } 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 55,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,59,60 | 49,472 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 18,19,56,20,37 | 372.83 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,45,44,43,42,41,40,39,38,20,21,59 | 7,527 |
| Region | Fill | 14,57,58,60,59,21,20,56,19,18,17,16,15 | 1,578.4 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 77,891
Fof S: 1.13
Volume: 3,731.129 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Volume: $3,731.129 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $447,735.48 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $224,668.02 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $224,668.02 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $198,819.85 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $198,819.85 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: $(1,151.3679,2,117) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(1,327.7641,2,188.732) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 100.80246 ft
Center: $(1,217.6885,2,206.665) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices
Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | $1,154.2759$ | $2,115.7955$ | 0 | 313.80973 | 263.31763 | 200 |


| Slice <br> 2 | $1,160.092$ | $2,113.3864$ | 0 | 730.69628 | 613.12698 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 3 | $1,165.5$ | $2,111.1463$ | 0 | $2,019.3782$ | $1,694.4595$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | $1,170.3$ | $2,109.1581$ | 0 | $2,764.4296$ | $2,319.6318$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | $1,174.9$ | $2,107.2527$ | 0 | $3,478.4371$ | $2,918.7553$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | $1,179.9$ | $2,107.3428$ | 0 | $2,229.6729$ | $1,039.7135$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 7 | $1,185.3$ | $2,109.4283$ | 0 | $2,283.6585$ | $1,064.8875$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 1,190 | $2,111.2435$ | 0 | $2,330.6461$ | $1,086.7981$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | $1,194.5$ | $2,112.9815$ | 0 | $2,250.658$ | $1,049.499$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | $1,199.5$ | $2,114.9126$ | 0 | $2,050.6923$ | 956.25353 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | $1,204.6667$ | $2,116.908$ | 0 | $2,033.9059$ | 948.42592 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 1,210 | $2,118.9678$ | 0 | $2,200.2988$ | $1,026.0162$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 13 | $1,215.3333$ | $2,121.0276$ | 0 | $2,366.6917$ | $1,103.6065$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 14 | $1,220.6667$ | $2,123.0874$ | 0 | $2,498.5673$ | $1,165.1011$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 1,226 | $2,125.1472$ | 0 | $2,595.9257$ | $1,210.5$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | $1,231.3333$ | $2,127.2071$ | 0 | $2,693.2841$ | $1,255.899$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 17 | $1,236.6667$ | $2,129.2669$ | 0 | $2,790.6425$ | $1,301.298$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 1,242 | $2,131.3267$ | 0 | $2,888.001$ | $1,346.697$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | $1,247.3333$ | $2,133.3865$ | 0 | $2,985.3594$ | $1,392.0959$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | $1,252.5$ | $2,135.3819$ | 0 | $2,921.7282$ | $1,362.4242$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | $1,257.5$ | $2,137.313$ | 0 | $2,697.1074$ | $1,257.6818$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | $1,262.75$ | $2,139.3406$ | 0 | $2,461.2555$ | $1,147.7023$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | $1,268.25$ | $2,141.4648$ | 0 | $2,214.1727$ | $1,032.4857$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,273.518$ | $2,143.4994$ | 0 | $2,166.1078$ | $1,010.0727$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 25 | $1,279.1968$ | $2,145.6926$ | 0 | $2,336.3225$ | $1,089.4451$ | 100 |
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| Slice <br> 26 | $1,285.518$ | $2,148.134$ | 0 | $2,525.7987$ | $1,177.7993$ | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,291.8394$ | $2,150.5753$ | 0 | $2,715.2748$ | $1,266.1534$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 28 | $1,297.3648$ | $2,152.7094$ | 0 | $2,880.8969$ | $1,343.3843$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 29 | $1,302.0945$ | $2,154.536$ | 0 | $3,022.665$ | $1,409.4918$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 30 | $1,306.2297$ | $2,157.9776$ | 0 | $1,559.2192$ | $1,308.3402$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | $1,308.4746$ | $2,161.1837$ | 0 | $1,442.9885$ | $1,210.8111$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | $1,310.9746$ | $2,164.7541$ | 0 | $1,240.098$ | $1,040.5658$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | $1,315.303$ | $2,170.9358$ | 0 | 888.81685 | 745.80589 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | $1,319.9091$ | $2,177.514$ | 0 | 515.00429 | 432.13991 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 35 | $1,324.9881$ | $2,184.7675$ | 0 | 116.32431 | 75.541893 | 200 |

## Section 13-13 Static Temporary Final SSA without key for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 13-13 Static Temporary Final SSA without key for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/22/2016 12:20:39 PM


Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf Phi': $33^{\circ}$

Name: Tmc 100-25 $\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}\right)$ Model: Anisotropic Fn. Unit Weight: 120 pcf Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )

Name: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Name: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 (A- Bed4${ }^{\circ} 8^{\circ}$ )

## 2 - Translational
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A- Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 (A-Bed4 $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-50,2,033) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,2,352) f$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(1,111,2,143) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,134,2,025) \mathrm{ft}$
Ower Right: (1,248, 2,046)
Lower Right: $(1,248,2,046)$ ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(1,266.6877,2,201.9943) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,284.7124,2,069.4062) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(1,386.5849,2,091.0405) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: (4, 0.625)
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: $(20,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $34,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(34.1,1)$
100-25 (A-Bed $20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(19.9,1)$
Data Point: $(20,0.5)$
Data Point: $(34,0.5)$
Data Point: $(34.1,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.425)$
Data Point: (12, 0.425
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
100 (A-Bed4응 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
$150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 4^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1

2-Translational

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: (12.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -50 | 2,033 |
| Point 2 | 118 | 2,039 |
| Point 3 | 296 | 2,045 |
| Point 4 | 360 | 2,081 |
| Point 5 | 373 | 2,081 |
| Point 6 | 403 | 2,097 |
| Point 7 | 416 | 2,097 |
| Point 8 | 437 | 2,110 |
| Point 9 | 505 | 2,110 |
| Point 10 | 700 | 2,109 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 2,106 |
| Point 12 | 862 | 2,117 |
| Point 13 | 1,060 | 2,119 |
| Point 14 | 1,163 | 2,117 |
| Point 15 | 1,327 | 2,182 |
| Point 16 | 1,369 | 2,192 |
| Point 17 | 1,412 | 2,200 |
| Point 18 | 1,429 | 2,201 |
| Point 19 | 1,462 | 2,207 |
| Point 20 | 1,582 | 2,236 |
| Point 21 | 1,631 | 2,240 |
| Point 22 | 1,713 | 2,261 |
| Point 23 | 1,859 | 2,311 |
| Point 24 | 1,895 | 2,322 |
| Point 25 | 2,007 | 2,351 |
| Point 26 | 2,036 | 2,353 |
| Point 27 | 2,050 | 2,352 |
| Point 28 | 2,050 | 2,100 |
| Point 29 | -50 | $1,914.8161$ |
| Point 30 | 549 | $2,109.7744$ |
| Point 31 | 863 | 2,017 |
| Point 32 | 1,089 | 2,117 |
| Point 33 | -50 | 1,996 |
| Point 34 | 625 | $2,087.3194$ |
| Point 35 | 863 | 1,994 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 36 | 2,049 | 1,580 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 37 | -50 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 38 | $1,007.64$ | 2,081 |
| Point <br> 39 | 2,050 | 2,230 |
| Point <br> 40 | 1,168 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 41 | 1,188 | 2,112 |
| Point <br> 42 | 1,313 | $2,178.5$ |
| Point <br> 43 | $1,276.0361$ | $2,158.8352$ |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 30,34,31,38,32,13,12,11,10 | 25,797 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ ) | 33,34,30,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1 | 16,398 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \text { (A-Bed } \\ & \left.20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 31,34,33,29,35 | 82,160 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A} \text {-Bed } 4^{\circ}\right. \\ & \left.-12^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 29,35,28,36,37 | $8.959 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 100-25^{\circ} \text { (A-Bed } \\ & \left.20^{\circ}-34^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 35,28,39,43,41,40,14,32,38,31 | $1.3322 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $4^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ ) | 39,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,42,43 | 49,472 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 80,069
F of S: 1.32
Volume: $1,586.6086 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 190,393.03 lbs
Resisting Force: $93,953.979 \mathrm{lb}$
Activating Force: $70,977.484$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 100 slip surfaces
Exit: $(1,191.6678,2,113.9513) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (1,322.2122, 2,180.803) ft
Radius: 84.174713 ft
Center: $(1,231.2639,2,197.516) \mathrm{ft}$
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| Slice <br> 23 | $1,290.2477$ | $2,149.334$ | 0 | $1,750.2615$ | 816.16033 | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,294.3082$ | $2,151.0813$ | 0 | $1,793.3033$ | 836.23106 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 25 | $1,298.3686$ | $2,152.8285$ | 0 | $1,836.3451$ | 856.3018 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 26 | $1,302.4291$ | $2,154.5757$ | 0 | $1,879.3869$ | 876.37253 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,306.7043$ | $2,158.6554$ | 0 | 926.90038 | 777.76176 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | $1,310.9746$ | $2,164.7541$ | 0 | 685.61877 | 575.30246 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | $1,315.303$ | $2,170.9358$ | 0 | 400.1049 | 335.72787 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | $1,319.9091$ | $2,177.514$ | 0 | 57.956299 | 48.631109 | 200 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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## Project Settings

```
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1
```


## Analysis Settings

## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure <br> Kind: SLOPE/W

Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

## Fill

Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$

Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-19.3634, 2,101.4383) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(250,2,187.1628) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $300,2,202.2642$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: (661.3692, 2,287.5638) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-200.4103, 1,933) ft
Right Coordinate: $(812,2,307) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(17.9,1)$
Data Point: $(18,0.425)$
Data Point: $(22,0.425)$
Data Point: $(22.1,1)$
150 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.5)$
Data Point: $(20,0.5)$

Data Point: $(20.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.625)$
Data Point: $(20,0.625)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Point 1 | -199 | 2,107 |
| Point 2 | -96 | 2,106 |
| Point 3 | -12 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 52 | 2,100 |
| Point 5 | 101 | 2,129 |
| Point 6 | 111 | 2,129 |
| Point 7 | 156 | 2,154 |
| Point 8 | 176 | 2,154 |
| Point 9 | 215 | 2,176 |
| Point 10 | 230 | 2,176 |
| Point 11 | 273 | 2,200 |
| Point 12 | 295 | 2,200 |
| Point 13 | 348 | 2,224 |
| Point 14 | 358 | 2,224 |
| Point 15 | 409 | 2,255 |
| Point 16 | 812 | 2,296 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 17 | 812 | 2,264 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 18 | 812 | 2,122 |
| Point <br> 19 | 812 | 1,901 |
| Point <br> 20 | -200 | 1,901 |
| Point <br> 21 | -200.4103 | 1,933 |
| Point <br> 22 | 812 | 2,155 |
| Point <br> 23 | 77 | 2,075 |
| Point <br> 24 | 127 | 2,075 |
| Point <br> 25 | 812 | 2,307 |
| Point <br> 26 | 399 | 2,168 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $21,20,19,18,22$ | $1.4477 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,21,22,17,16,25,26,24,23,4,3,2$ | $1.1865 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | Fill | $4,23,24,26,25,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5$ | 39,768 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 32,293
F of S: 1.87
Volume: 10,691.937 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,283,032.5 lbs

Resisting Moment: 6.6036603e+008 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $3.5256276 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: $(52.287117,2,100.1699) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(444.60145,2,259.5937) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 758.84435 ft
Center: (-25.892211, 2,854.9764) ft

## Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP (psf) | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice 1 | 58.376228 | 2,100.8503 | 0 | 326.26504 | 211.87899 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 70.554448 | 2,102.311 | 0 | 983.14483 | 638.46172 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 82.732669 | 2,103.972 | 0 | 1,609.9659 | 1,045.5241 | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 94.91089 | 2,105.8346 | 0 | 2,206.9897 | 1,433.2359 | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 106 | 2,107.699 | 0 | 2,391.1884 | 1,552.8559 | 200 |
| Slice 6 | 118.5 | 2,110.0352 | 0 | 2,581.8512 | 1,676.6738 | 200 |
| Slice 7 | 133.5 | 2,113.1003 | 0 | 3,150.6971 | 2,046.0866 | 200 |
| Slice 8 | 148.5 | 2,116.4828 | 0 | 3,676.3283 | 2,387.4355 | 200 |
| Slice 9 | 161 | 2,119.5245 | 0 | 3,777.6225 | 2,453.2168 | 200 |
| Slice 10 | 171 | 2,122.1384 | 0 | 3,471.8107 | 2,254.6202 | 200 |
| Slice 11 | 182.5 | 2,125.3383 | 0 | 3,502.6191 | 2,274.6275 | 200 |
| Slice 12 | 195.5 | 2,129.1774 | 0 | 3,858.6928 | 2,505.8644 | 200 |
| Slice 13 | 208.5 | 2,133.2712 | 0 | 4,182.5488 | 2,716.179 | 200 |
| Slice 14 | 222.5 | 2,137.9805 | 0 | 4,040.7658 | 2,624.104 | 200 |
| Slice 15 | 237.16667 | 2,143.2275 | 0 | 3,877.1846 | 2,517.8731 | 200 |
| Slice 16 | 251.5 | 2,148.691 | 0 | 4,115.6046 | 2,672.7049 | 200 |
| Slice 17 | 265.83333 | 2,154.4903 | 0 | 4,314.667 | 2,801.9775 | 200 |
| Slice 18 | 278.5 | 2,159.8835 | 0 | 4,139.6801 | 2,688.3397 | 200 |
| Slice 19 | 289.5 | 2,164.8054 | 0 | 3,604.3878 | 2,340.7168 | 200 |
| Slice 20 | 301.625 | 2,170.4887 | 0 | 3,303.1551 | 2,145.094 | 200 |
| Slice 21 | 314.875 | 2,176.9885 | 0 | 3,226.3732 | 2,095.2312 | 200 |
| Slice 22 | 328.125 | 2,183.8128 | 0 | 3,117.0171 | 2,024.2146 | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 23 | 341.375 | $2,190.9717$ | 0 | $2,974.789$ | $1,931.8506$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 24 | 353 | $2,197.5175$ | 0 | $2,598.0916$ | $1,687.2204$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 364.375 | $2,204.2222$ | 0 | $2,297.4012$ | $1,491.9498$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 377.125 | $2,212.0415$ | 0 | $2,270.4658$ | $1,474.4577$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 389.875 | $2,220.2132$ | 0 | $2,208.7276$ | $1,434.3645$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 402.625 | $2,228.7511$ | 0 | $2,111.6537$ | $1,371.3239$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 414.93358 | $2,237.3484$ | 0 | $1,711.1396$ | 659.58289 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 426.80073 | $2,245.9943$ | 0 | $1,015.6686$ | 193.015 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 438.66788 | $2,254.9994$ | 0 | 297.21704 | 200 |  |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Report senatedurg
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-19.3634, 2,101.4383) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $250,2,187.1628$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (300, 2,202.2642) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $661.3692,2,287.5638$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200.4103,1,933) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,2,307) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(17.9,1)$
Data Point: $(18,0.425$
Data Point: (22, 0.425$)$
Data Point: $(22.1,1)$
150 psf (A-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$ Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.5)$
Data Point: $(20,0.5)$
Data Point: (20.1, 1

Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.625$
Data Point: $(12,0.625)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Point 1 | -199 | 2,107 |
| Point 2 | -96 | 2,106 |
| Point 3 | -12 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 52 | 2,100 |
| Point 5 | 101 | 2,129 |
| Point 6 | 111 | 2,129 |
| Point 7 | 156 | 2,154 |
| Point 8 | 176 | 2,154 |
| Point 9 | 215 | 2,176 |
| Point 10 | 230 | 2,176 |
| Point 11 | 273 | 2,200 |
| Point 12 | 295 | 2,200 |
| Point 13 | 348 | 2,224 |
| Point 14 | 358 | 2,224 |
| Point 15 | 409 | 2,255 |
| Point 16 | 812 | 2,296 |
| Point 17 | 812 | 2,264 |
| Point 18 | 812 | 2,122 |
| Point 19 | 812 | 1,901 |
| Point 20 | -200 | 1,901 |
| Point 21 | -200.4103 | 1,933 |
| Point 22 | 812 | 2,155 |
| Point 23 | 77 | 2,075 |
| Point 24 | 127 | 2,075 |
| Point 25 | 812 | 2,307 |
| Point 26 | 399 | 2,168 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}(\mathrm{A}$-Bed <br> $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $21,20,19,18,22$ | $1.4477 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}(\mathrm{A}$-Bed <br> $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,21,22,17,16,25,26,24,23,4,3,2$ | $1.1865 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $4,23,24,26,25,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5$ | 39,768 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 32,343
F of S: 1.29
Volume: $10,673.463 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,280,815.6 Ibs
Resisting Moment: $6.9068626 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $5.3349881 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: (52.344529, 2,100.2039) ft
Entry: $(452.0762,2,260.5582) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 836.87766 ft
Center: $(-48.878949,2,930.9373) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 58.426462 | $2,100.9902$ | 0 | 298.35774 | 193.75579 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 70.59033 | $2,102.6538$ | 0 | 913.672 | 593.34553 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 82.754198 | $2,104.4998$ | 0 | $1,500.1129$ | 974.18469 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 94.918066 | $2,106.5293$ | 0 | $2,058.0556$ | $1,336.517$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 106 | $2,108.5318$ | 0 | $2,218.1618$ | $1,440.4911$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 118.5 | $2,111.0045$ | 0 | $2,384.4715$ | $1,548.4939$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 133.5 | $2,114.2103$ | 0 | $2,914.7123$ | $1,892.8363$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 148.5 | $2,117.7054$ | 0 | $3,404.5314$ | $2,210.9286$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 161 | $2,120.8211$ | 0 | $3,489.2712$ | $2,265.9592$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 171 | $2,123.478$ | 0 | $3,186.5388$ | $2,069.3625$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 182.5 | $2,126.7096$ | 0 | $3,208.6478$ | $2,083.7202$ | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 12 | 195.5 | $2,130.5643$ | 0 | $3,543.8568$ | $2,301.4075$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 13 | 208.5 | $2,134.6499$ | 0 | $3,849.6503$ | $2,499.9921$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 222.5 | $2,139.322$ | 0 | $3,711.8753$ | $2,410.52$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 237.16667 | $2,144.4998$ | 0 | $3,556.7246$ | $2,309.764$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 251.5 | $2,149.8626$ | 0 | $3,788.3182$ | $2,460.1626$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 265.83333 | $2,155.5274$ | 0 | $3,984.9675$ | $2,587.8681$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 278.5 | $2,160.774$ | 0 | $3,827.5805$ | $2,485.6599$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 289.5 | $2,165.5435$ | 0 | $3,330.0726$ | $2,162.5744$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 301.625 | $2,171.0308$ | 0 | $3,059.2436$ | $1,986.696$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 314.875 | $2,177.2841$ | 0 | $3,005.705$ | $1,951.9277$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 328.125 | $2,183.8248$ | 0 | $2,924.8351$ | $1,899.4101$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 341.375 | $2,190.6604$ | 0 | $2,816.6197$ | $1,829.1342$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 353 | $2,196.8903$ | 0 | $2,487.4426$ | $1,615.3641$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 364.375 | $2,203.2481$ | 0 | $2,233.1968$ | $1,450.2549$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 377.125 | $2,210.6388$ | 0 | $2,243.3842$ | $1,456.8707$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 389.875 | $2,218.3343$ | 0 | $2,224.6931$ | $1,444.7326$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 402.625 | $2,226.3445$ | 0 | $2,176.9669$ | $1,413.7388$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 416.17937 | $2,235.2288$ | 0 | $1,784.0371$ | $1,158.5673$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 430.5381 | $2,245.0461$ | 0 | $1,052.2684$ | 683.3511 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 444.89684 | $2,255.3112$ | 0 | 297.19019 | 192.99757 | 200 |



## 2 - Translational

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: (-200.4103, 1,933) ft
Right Coordinate: $(812,2,307)$ ft

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(80,2,122) \mathrm{ft}$
ower Left: (111, 1,991) ft
Lower Right: $(229,2,014)$ ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (323.3505, 2,220.2241) ft
Lower Left: $(360.3413,2,059.0196) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Right: (481.0019, 2,079.2802) ft $X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(17.9,1)$
Data Point: $(18,0.425)$
Data Point: (22, 0.425)
Data Point: $(22.1,1)$
150 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.5)$
Data Point: $(20,0.5)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: (12, 0.625
Data Point: $(20,0.625$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Point 1 | -199 | 2,107 |
| Point 2 | -96 | 2,106 |
| Point 3 | -12 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 52 | 2,100 |
| Point 5 | 101 | 2,129 |
| Point 6 | 111 | 2,129 |
| Point 7 | 156 | 2,154 |
| Point 8 | 176 | 2,154 |
| Point 9 | 215 | 2,176 |
| Point 10 | 230 | 2,176 |
| Point 11 | 273 | 2,200 |
| Point 12 | 295 | 2,200 |
| Point 13 | 348 | 2,224 |
| Point 14 | 358 | 2,224 |
| Point 15 | 409 | 2,255 |
| Point 16 | 812 | 2,296 |
| Point 17 | 812 | 2,264 |
| Point 18 | 812 | 2,122 |
| Point 19 | 812 | 1,901 |
| Point 20 | -200 | 1,901 |
| Point 21 | -200.4103 | 1,933 |


| Point <br> 22 | 812 | 2,155 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 23 | 77 | 2,075 |
| Point <br> 24 | 127 | 2,075 |
| Point <br> 25 | 812 | 2,307 |
| Point <br> 26 | 399 | 2,168 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $21,20,19,18,22$ | $1.4477 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,21,22,17,16,25,26,24,23,4,3,2$ | $1.1865 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | Fill | $4,23,24,26,25,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5$ | 39,768 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 76,807
Fof S: 1.64
Volume: $25,292.21 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 3,035,065.2 lbs
Resisting Force: $1,472,366 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $900,131.81 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: (66.994388, 2,108.8742) ft
Entry: (499.24963, 2,266.6451) ft
Radius: 236.24981 ft
Center: $(239.93286,2,306.0878) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 75.495791 | $2,105.3528$ | 0 | $1,288.0005$ | 836.43731 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 92.498597 | $2,098.31$ | 0 | $3,743.2141$ | $2,430.8717$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 106 | $2,092.7176$ | 0 | $5,268.0856$ | $3,421.1348$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 117.98201 | $2,087.7545$ | 0 | $6,537.1969$ | $4,245.3053$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 132.28201 | $2,081.8312$ | 0 | $8,527.6566$ | $5,537.9249$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 147.8 | $2,081.558$ | 0 | $7,416.861$ | $3,458.5391$ | 100 |


| Slice <br> 7 | 166 | $2,087.6796$ | 0 | $7,245.3415$ | $3,378.5582$ | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 8 | 182.5 | $2,093.2293$ | 0 | $7,039.0904$ | $3,282.3818$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 195.5 | $2,097.6018$ | 0 | $7,363.3879$ | $3,433.6042$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 208.5 | $2,101.9743$ | 0 | $7,687.6854$ | $3,584.8266$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 222.5 | $2,106.6832$ | 0 | $7,573.5342$ | $3,531.597$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 237.16667 | $2,111.6163$ | 0 | $7,471.3329$ | $3,483.9397$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 251.5 | $2,116.4373$ | 0 | $7,819.5301$ | $3,646.3068$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 265.83333 | $2,121.2582$ | 0 | $8,167.7274$ | $3,808.6738$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 278.5 | $2,125.5186$ | 0 | $8,139.2061$ | $3,795.3741$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 289.5 | $2,129.2184$ | 0 | $7,733.9662$ | $3,606.4077$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 301.625 | $2,133.2967$ | 0 | $7,615.8702$ | $3,551.3386$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 314.875 | $2,137.7533$ | 0 | $7,784.9182$ | $3,630.167$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 328.125 | $2,142.2099$ | 0 | $7,953.9662$ | $3,708.9953$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 341.375 | $2,146.6665$ | 0 | $8,123.0141$ | $3,787.8237$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 353 | $2,150.5765$ | 0 | $8,023.3382$ | $3,741.344$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 364.74619 | $2,154.5273$ | 0 | $8,039.7486$ | $3,748.9963$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 378.23856 | $2,159.0654$ | 0 | $8,440.9692$ | $3,936.0886$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 391.99237 | $2,163.865$ | 0 | $8,773.2329$ | $4,091.0257$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 400.20925 | $2,167.6047$ | 0 | $6,433.873$ | $5,398.6605$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 405.20925 | $2,172.6047$ | 0 | $6,798.2248$ | $4,414.8188$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 416.5208 | $2,183.9163$ | 0 | $6,107.2759$ | $3,966.1113$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 431.56241 | $2,198.9579$ | 0 | $4,980.9835$ | $3,234.6885$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 446.60401 | $2,213.9995$ | 0 | $3,854.6912$ | $2,503.2657$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 461.64562 | $2,229.0411$ | 0 | $2,728.3989$ | $1,771.8429$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 31 | 476.68723 | $2,244.0827$ | 0 | $1,602.1065$ | $1,040.4201$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 32 | 491.72883 | $2,259.1243$ | 0 | 475.81419 | 308.99735 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: (-200.4103, 1,933) ft
Right Coordinate: $(812,2,307) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(80,2,122) \mathrm{ft}$
ower Left: (111, 1,991) ft
Lower Right: $(229,2,014)$ ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (323.3505, 2,220.2241) ft
Lower Left: (360.3413, 2,059.0196) ft Lower Right: (481.0019, 2,079.2802) ft X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(17.9,1)$
Data Point: (18, 0.425)
Data Point: (22, 0.425
Data Point: $(22.1,1)$
150 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: (12, 0.667
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.5$
Data Point: $(20,0.5$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.625)$
Data Point: $(20,0.625)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 2,107 |
| Point 2 | -96 | 2,106 |
| Point 3 | -12 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 52 | 2,100 |
| Point 5 | 101 | 2,129 |
| Point 6 | 111 | 2,129 |
| Point 7 | 156 | 2,154 |
| Point 8 | 176 | 2,154 |
| Point 9 | 215 | 2,176 |
| Point 10 | 230 | 2,176 |
| Point 11 | 273 | 2,200 |
| Point 12 | 295 | 2,200 |
| Point 13 | 348 | 2,224 |
| Point 14 | 358 | 2,224 |
| Point 15 | 409 | 2,255 |
| Point 16 | 812 | 2,296 |
| Point 17 | 812 | 2,264 |
| Point 18 | 812 | 2,122 |
| Point 19 | 812 | 1,901 |
| Point 20 | -200 | 1,901 |
| Point 21 | -200.4103 | 1,933 |
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## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $21,20,19,18,22$ | $1.4477 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,21,22,17,16,25,26,24,23,4,3,2$ | $1.1865 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | Fill | $4,23,24,26,25,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5$ | 39,768 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 76,807
Fof S : 1.13
Volume: $25,292.21 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 3,035,065.2 lbs
Resisting Force: $1,429,519.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $1,268,278.3 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: (66.994388, 2,108.8742) ft
Entry: (499.24963, 2,266.6451) ft
Radius: 236.24981 ft
Center: $(239.93286,2,306.0878) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 75.495791 | $2,105.3528$ | 0 | $1,443.3086$ | 937.2956 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 92.498597 | $2,098.31$ | 0 | $4,137.4452$ | $2,686.8883$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 106 | $2,092.7176$ | 0 | $5,810.7057$ | $3,773.5164$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 117.98201 | $2,087.7545$ | 0 | $7,203.3174$ | $4,677.889$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 132.28201 | $2,081.8312$ | 0 | $9,387.4735$ | $6,096.2966$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 147.8 | $2,081.558$ | 0 | $7,127.1722$ | $3,323.455$ | 100 |


| Slice <br> 7 | 166 | $2,087.6796$ | 0 | $6,962.1637$ | $3,246.5103$ | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 8 | 182.5 | $2,093.2293$ | 0 | $6,763.742$ | $3,153.9847$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 195.5 | $2,097.6018$ | 0 | $7,075.729$ | $3,299.4666$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 208.5 | $2,101.9743$ | 0 | $7,387.7159$ | $3,444.9485$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 222.5 | $2,106.6832$ | 0 | $7,277.898$ | $3,393.7396$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 237.16667 | $2,111.6163$ | 0 | $7,179.5763$ | $3,347.8914$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 251.5 | $2,116.4373$ | 0 | $7,514.5558$ | $3,504.0949$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 265.83333 | $2,121.2582$ | 0 | $7,849.5353$ | $3,660.2984$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 278.5 | $2,125.5186$ | 0 | $7,822.0967$ | $3,647.5036$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 289.5 | $2,129.2184$ | 0 | $7,432.2399$ | $3,465.7104$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 301.625 | $2,133.2967$ | 0 | $7,318.627$ | $3,412.7318$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 314.875 | $2,137.7533$ | 0 | $7,481.2578$ | $3,488.5678$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 328.125 | $2,142.2099$ | 0 | $7,643.8886$ | $3,564.4038$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 341.375 | $2,146.6665$ | 0 | $7,806.5194$ | $3,640.2398$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 353 | $2,150.5765$ | 0 | $7,710.6272$ | $3,595.5245$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 364.74619 | $2,154.5273$ | 0 | $7,726.4146$ | $3,602.8863$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 378.23856 | $2,159.0654$ | 0 | $8,112.4048$ | $3,782.8765$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 391.99237 | $2,163.865$ | 0 | $8,410.1981$ | $3,921.7398$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 400.20925 | $2,167.6047$ | 0 | $5,548.3739$ | $4,655.6385$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 405.20925 | $2,172.6047$ | 0 | $5,990.5138$ | $3,890.2852$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 416.5208 | $2,183.9163$ | 0 | $5,378.1001$ | $3,492.5791$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 431.56241 | $2,198.9579$ | 0 | $4,379.8255$ | $2,844.2919$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 446.60401 | $2,213.9995$ | 0 | $3,381.5508$ | $2,196.0047$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 461.64562 | $2,229.0411$ | 0 | $2,383.2761$ | $1,547.7176$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 31 | 476.68723 | $2,244.0827$ | 0 | $1,385.0014$ | 899.43041 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 32 | 491.72883 | $2,259.1243$ | 0 | 386.72667 | 251.14324 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf (A-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200.4103,1,933) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,2,264)$ ft

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(74,2,123) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (105, 1,992) ft
Lower Right: $(223,2,015) \mathrm{ft}$
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 135
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (672.3505, 2,339.2241)
Lower Left: (709.3413, 2,178.0196) ft
Lower Right: (830.0019, 2,198.2802) ft
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Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(17.9,1)$
Data Point: $(18,0.425)$
Data Point: $(22,0.425)$
Data Point: $(22.1,1)$
150 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed $\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (11.9, 1
Data Point: (12, 0.5)

## Data Point: $(20,0.5)$ <br> Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.625)$
Data Point: $(20,0.625)$
Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Point 1 | -199 | 2,107 |
| Point 2 | -96 | 2,106 |
| Point 3 | -12 | 2,101 |
| Point 4 | 52 | 2,100 |
| Point 5 | 732 | 2,282 |
| Point 6 | 779 | 2,297 |
| Point 7 | 811 | 2,308 |
| Point 8 | 812 | 2,264 |
| Point 9 | 812 | 2,122 |
| Point 10 | 812 | 1,901 |
| Point 11 | -200 | 1,901 |
| Point 12 | -200.4103 | 1,933 |
| Point 13 | 812 | 2,155 |
| Point 14 | 77 | 2,075 |
| Point 15 | 127 | 2,075 |
| Point 16 | 665 | 2,260 |
| Point 17 | 399 | 2,168 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $12,11,10,9,13$ | $1.4477 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-20^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,12,13,8,7,6,5,16,17,15,14,4,3,2$ | $1.1922 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 66,983

F of S: 1.62
Volume: $13,462.726 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,615,527.1 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 767,036.08 lbs
Activating Force: $474,731.75 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 50 slip surfaces
Exit: $(140.34873,2,079.5641) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (810.47325, 2,307.8189) ft
Radius: 331.6586 ft
Center: (417.10062, 2,364.8826) ft

## Slip Slices

| X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 150.32436 | $2,075.432$ | 0 | $1,220.9089$ | $1,024.4642$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 171.15 | $2,074.8216$ | 0 | $1,656.5548$ | 772.46419 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 192.85 | $2,081.8648$ | 0 | $1,697.821$ | 791.70693 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 214.55 | $2,088.908$ | 0 | $1,739.0872$ | 810.94967 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 236.25 | $2,095.9512$ | 0 | $1,780.3534$ | 830.19241 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 257.95 | $2,102.9944$ | 0 | $1,821.6196$ | 849.43515 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 279.65 | $2,110.0376$ | 0 | $1,862.8857$ | 868.67789 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 301.35 | $2,117.0808$ | 0 | $1,904.1519$ | 887.92063 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 323.05 | $2,124.124$ | 0 | $1,945.4181$ | 907.16337 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 344.75 | $2,131.1672$ | 0 | $1,986.6843$ | 926.40611 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 366.45 | $2,138.2104$ | 0 | $2,027.9505$ | 945.64885 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 388.15 | $2,145.2536$ | 0 | $2,069.2167$ | 964.89159 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 410.08333 | $2,152.3725$ | 0 | $2,115.7312$ | 986.58168 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 432.25 | $2,159.5672$ | 0 | $2,167.4941$ | $1,010.7191$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 454.41667 | $2,166.7618$ | 0 | $2,219.257$ | $1,034.8565$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 476.58333 | $2,173.9565$ | 0 | $2,271.0199$ | $1,058.994$ | 100 |
|  | 498.75 | $2,181.1511$ | 0 | $2,322.7827$ | $1,083.1314$ | 100 |


| Slice <br> 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 18 | 520.91667 | $2,188.3458$ | 0 | $2,374.5456$ | $1,107.2688$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 543.08333 | $2,195.5405$ | 0 | $2,426.3085$ | $1,131.4062$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 565.25 | $2,202.7351$ | 0 | $2,478.0714$ | $1,155.5437$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 587.41667 | $2,209.9298$ | 0 | $2,529.8343$ | $1,179.6811$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 609.58333 | $2,217.1245$ | 0 | $2,581.5971$ | $1,203.8185$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 631.75 | $2,224.3191$ | 0 | $2,633.36$ | $1,227.9559$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 653.91667 | $2,231.5138$ | 0 | $2,685.1229$ | $1,252.0934$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 676.16667 | $2,238.7355$ | 0 | $2,715.6418$ | $1,266.3246$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 698.5 | $2,245.9843$ | 0 | $2,724.9168$ | $1,270.6496$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 720.83333 | $2,253.233$ | 0 | $2,734.1919$ | $1,274.9746$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 743.75 | $2,260.6711$ | 0 | $2,731.8423$ | $1,273.879$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 767.25 | $2,268.2985$ | 0 | $2,717.868$ | $1,267.3627$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 783.18719 | $2,273.4713$ | 0 | $2,719.6877$ | $1,268.2112$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 798.92381 | $2,291.3246$ | 0 | 758.88378 | 636.7791 | 200 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed - $6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf (A-Bed $\left.-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(116.082,2,040.0973) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: (497.0595, 2,100.471) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(549.9577,2,124.4788) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $715.1464,2,174.3322$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-200, 2,024) ft
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,175) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-11.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-11,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(18,0.75)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc $\mathbf{1 0 0}-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed - $6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-6,0.625$
Data Point: (-5.9, 1)
100psf (A-Bed -6 ${ }^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: (-11, 0.5)
Data Point: $(-6,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-5.9,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$ Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-11.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-11,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: (0, 0.425)
Data Point: $(18,0.425)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$

## Points

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

|  | X <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 1 | -200 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 2 | 26 | 2,032 |
| Point <br> 3 | 204 | 2,048 |
| Point <br> 4 | 316 | 2,051 |
| Point <br> 5 | 408 | 2,053 |
| Point <br> 6 | 455 | 2,084 |
| Point <br> 7 | 469 | 2,083 |
| Point <br> 8 | 522 | 2,116 |
| Point <br> 9 | 535 | 2,117 |
| Point <br> 10 | 588 | 2,145 |
| Point <br> 11 | 600 | 2,145 |
| Point <br> 12 | 656 | 2,171 |
| Point <br> 13 | 746 | 2,175 |
| Point <br> 14 | 778 | 2,173 |
| Point <br> 15 | 811 | 2,175 |
| Point <br> 16 | 811 | 2,094 |
| Point <br> 17 | 810 | 1,700 |
| Point <br> 18 | 180 | 1,700 |
| Point <br> 19 | -200 | 1,700 |
| Point <br> 20 | 407 | 1,700 |
| Point <br> 21 | 557 | 2,128 |
| Point <br> 22 | 423 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 23 | 453 | 2,038 |
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| Point <br> 24 | 727 | 2,175 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 25 | 618 | 2,120 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $17,16,25,23,22,5,20$ | $1.5639 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,19,18,20,5,4,3,2$ | $2.06 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ | $16,15,14,13,24,25$ | 10,062 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $5,22,23,25,24,12,11,10,21,9,8,7,6$ | 10,039 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 81,412
Fof S: 1.69
Volume: $3,373.1411 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $404,776.94 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 87,226,090 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: 51,612,584 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (408.04237, 2,053.0279) ft
Entry: $(597.63425,2,145) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 305.36559 ft
Center: ( $377.74289,2,356.8866$ ) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 411.39648 | $2,053.3999$ | 0 | 199.2744 | 129.41031 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 418.10472 | $2,054.2191$ | 0 | 606.71458 | 394.00506 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 424.81295 | $2,055.1897$ | 0 | 990.29782 | 643.10692 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 431.52118 | $2,056.3131$ | 0 | $1,350.3367$ | 876.91891 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 438.22942 | $2,057.5911$ | 0 | $1,687.0963$ | $1,095.6132$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 444.93765 | $2,059.0256$ | 0 | $2,000.7961$ | $1,299.3322$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 451.64588 | $2,060.6189$ | 0 | $2,291.6113$ | $1,488.1898$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 458.5 | $2,062.4154$ | 0 | $2,287.2438$ | $1,485.3535$ | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 9 | 465.5 | $2,064.4255$ | 0 | $1,994.072$ | $1,294.9655$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 10 | 472.3125 | $2,066.5547$ | 0 | $1,940.1482$ | $1,259.9469$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 478.9375 | $2,068.7973$ | 0 | $2,119.8342$ | $1,376.6364$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 485.5625 | $2,071.211$ | 0 | $2,277.95$ | $1,479.3181$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 492.1875 | $2,073.8004$ | 0 | $2,414.4406$ | $1,567.9561$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 498.8125 | $2,076.5702$ | 0 | $2,529.2118$ | $1,642.4893$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 505.4375 | $2,079.526$ | 0 | $2,622.1292$ | $1,702.8306$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 512.0625 | $2,082.6736$ | 0 | $2,693.0174$ | $1,748.8659$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 518.6875 | $2,086.0198$ | 0 | $2,741.6573$ | $1,780.4531$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 525.25 | $2,089.5366$ | 0 | $2,592.079$ | $1,683.3158$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 531.75 | $2,093.2281$ | 0 | $2,249.7615$ | $1,461.0122$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 538.66667 | $2,097.4004$ | 0 | $2,018.6813$ | $1,310.9469$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 546 | $2,102.0957$ | 0 | $1,891.561$ | $1,228.394$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 553.33333 | $2,107.0946$ | 0 | $1,737.3579$ | $1,128.2534$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 560.1 | $2,111.9803$ | 0 | $1,585.7026$ | $1,029.7673$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 566.3 | $2,116.7224$ | 0 | $1,439.3008$ | 934.69284 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 572.5 | $2,121.7237$ | 0 | $1,271.5684$ | 825.76619 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 578.7 | $2,127.0009$ | 0 | $1,081.9922$ | 702.65394 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 584.9 | $2,132.5737$ | 0 | 870.01372 | 564.99351 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 590.40856 | $2,137.7743$ | 0 | 548.38207 | 356.12348 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 595.22569 | $2,142.556$ | 0 | 124.86914 | 81.090969 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed - $6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf (A-Bed $\left.-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(116.082,2,040.0973) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: (497.0595, 2,100.471) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(549.9577,2,124.4788) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: (714.9781, 2,174.3702) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 5
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-200, 2,024) ft
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,175) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-11.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-11,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(18,0.75)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed - $6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-6,0.625$
Data Point: (-5.9, 1)
100psf (A-Bed -6 ${ }^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: (-11, 0.5)
Data Point: $(-6,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-5.9,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$ Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-11.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-11,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: (0, 0.425)
Data Point: $(18,0.425)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$

## Points

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

|  | X <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 1 | -200 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 2 | 26 | 2,032 |
| Point <br> 3 | 204 | 2,048 |
| Point <br> 4 | 316 | 2,051 |
| Point <br> 5 | 408 | 2,053 |
| Point <br> 6 | 455 | 2,084 |
| Point <br> 7 | 469 | 2,083 |
| Point <br> 8 | 522 | 2,116 |
| Point <br> 9 | 535 | 2,117 |
| Point <br> 10 | 588 | 2,145 |
| Point <br> 11 | 600 | 2,145 |
| Point <br> 12 | 656 | 2,171 |
| Point <br> 13 | 746 | 2,175 |
| Point <br> 14 | 778 | 2,173 |
| Point <br> 15 | 811 | 2,175 |
| Point <br> 16 | 811 | 2,094 |
| Point <br> 17 | 810 | 1,700 |
| Point <br> 18 | 180 | 1,700 |
| Point <br> 19 | -200 | 1,700 |
| Point <br> 20 | 407 | 1,700 |
| Point <br> 21 | 557 | 2,128 |
| Point <br> 22 | 423 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 23 | 453 | 2,038 |
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| Point <br> 24 | 726 | 2,175 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 25 | 618 | 2,120 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $17,16,25,23,22,5,20$ | $1.5639 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,19,18,20,5,4,3,2$ | $2.06 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ | $16,15,14,13,24,25$ | 10,089 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $5,22,23,25,24,12,11,10,21,9,8,7,6$ | 10,014 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 59,072
F of S: 1.22
Volume: $5,332.3803 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 639,885.63 lbs
Resisting Moment: $2.0775189 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Resitivating Moment: $1.7087178 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (408.0629, 2,053.0415) ft
Entry: (665.76589, 2,171.5581) ft
Radius: 497.95078 ft
Center: $(337.47416,2,545.9636) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 412.75661 | $2,053.7594$ | 0 | 240.6821 | 156.30078 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 422.14403 | $2,055.2872$ | 0 | 748.01618 | 485.76739 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 431.53145 | 2,057 | 0 | $1,225.4595$ | 795.82272 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 440.91887 | $2,058.8998$ | 0 | $1,673.4931$ | $1,086.7791$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 450.30629 | $2,060.9887$ | 0 | $2,092.548$ | $1,358.9166$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 458.5 | $2,062.9577$ | 0 | $2,165.1899$ | $1,406.0908$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 465.5 | $2,064.7659$ | 0 | $1,904.7084$ | $1,236.9321$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 473.41667 | $2,066.9505$ | 0 | $1,919.4316$ | $1,246.4934$ | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 9 | 482.25 | $2,069.5461$ | 0 | $2,198.9284$ | $1,428.0008$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 10 | 491.08333 | $2,072.3207$ | 0 | $2,454.5819$ | $1,594.0241$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 499.91667 | $2,075.2773$ | 0 | $2,686.5675$ | $1,744.6774$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 508.75 | $2,078.4195$ | 0 | $2,895.0316$ | $1,880.0555$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 517.58333 | $2,081.7511$ | 0 | $3,080.0916$ | $2,000.2349$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 525.25 | $2,084.788$ | 0 | $3,048.0219$ | $1,979.4086$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 531.75 | $2,087.4885$ | 0 | $2,808.4051$ | $1,823.7996$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 538.66667 | $2,090.4853$ | 0 | $2,695.5171$ | $1,750.4893$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 546 | $2,093.7959$ | 0 | $2,704.8535$ | $1,756.5524$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 553.33333 | $2,097.2507$ | 0 | $2,699.6877$ | $1,753.1977$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 560.875 | $2,100.96$ | 0 | $2,696.7984$ | $1,751.3213$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 568.625 | $2,104.9362$ | 0 | $2,694.8414$ | $1,750.0505$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 576.375 | $2,109.0862$ | 0 | $2,676.0126$ | $1,737.8229$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 584.125 | $2,113.4148$ | 0 | $2,640.273$ | $1,714.6133$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 594 | $2,119.2313$ | 0 | $2,267.9321$ | $1,472.8123$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 604 | $2,125.3729$ | 0 | $1,850.1048$ | $1,201.4721$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 612 | $2,130.5511$ | 0 | $1,697.0741$ | $1,102.0928$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 620 | $2,135.9508$ | 0 | $1,527.0723$ | 991.69232 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 628 | $2,141.5808$ | 0 | $1,340.0231$ | 870.22115 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 636 | $2,147.451$ | 0 | $1,135.843$ | 737.62508 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 644 | $2,153.5721$ | 0 | 914.44314 | 593.84632 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 652 | $2,159.956$ | 0 | 675.73114 | 438.82493 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 660.88295 | $2,167.3867$ | 0 | 224.79826 | 145.9857 | 200 |
|  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
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File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 122
Date: 3/23/2016
Time: 9:49:45 AM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 15-15 Static Final with key SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section $15-15$ results
Last Solved Date: 3/24/2016
Last Solved Time: 2:56:43 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $\left.-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,2,024) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,175) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(341.5832,2,050.0454) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Left: ( $367.0512,1,947.4848$ ) ft Lower Right: (484.9793, 1,987.7541) ft
Lower Right: (484
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (520.6643, 2,104.9641) ft
Lower Left: $(549.385,1,991.8817) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: ( $678.6285,2,022.7223$ ) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: ( $-11,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

## Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$ <br> Data Point: $(0,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: $(18,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: $(18.1,1)$

Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed - $6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-5.9,1)$
100psf (A-Bed -6º-(-11$)) ~$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: (-11, 0.5)
Data Point: $(-6,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-5.9,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Cu
Stercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
Data Point: ( $0,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(18,0.425)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 2,024 |
| Point 2 | 26 | 2,032 |
| Point 3 | 204 | 2,048 |
| Point 4 | 316 | 2,051 |
| Point 5 | 408 | 2,053 |
| Point 6 | 455 | 2,084 |
| Point 7 | 469 | 2,083 |
| Point 8 | 522 | 2,116 |
| Point 9 | 535 | 2,117 |
| Point 10 | 588 | 2,145 |
| Point 11 | 600 | 2,145 |
| Point 12 | 656 | 2,171 |
| Point 13 | 746 | 2,175 |
| Point 14 | 778 | 2,173 |
| Point 15 | 811 | 2,175 |
| Point 16 | 811 | 2,094 |
| Point 17 | 810 | 1,700 |
| Point 18 | 180 | 1,700 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,700 |
| Point 20 | 407 | 1,700 |
| Point 21 | 557 | 2,128 |
| Point 22 | 423 | 2,038 |
| Point 23 | 453 | 2,038 |
| Point 24 | 727 | 2,175 |
| Point 25 | 618 | 2,120 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $17,16,25,23,22,5,20$ | $1.5639 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ - Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,19,18,20,5,4,3,2$ | $2.06 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ | $16,15,14,13,24,25$ | 10,062 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $5,22,23,25,24,12,11,10,21,9,8,7,6$ | 10,039 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 88,682
Fof $S$ : 1.66
Volume: $16,605.485 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,992,658,2 lbs
Resisting Force: 800,243,14
Resisting Force: $800,243.14 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 4 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Analysis): 4 of 131,769 slip surf
F of S Rank (Query): 4 of 10 slip
Exit: ( $356.56764,2,051.8819$ ) ft
Exit: ( $356.56764,2,051.8819$ ) ft
Entry: $(675.4982,2,172.0985) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 187.31574 ft
Center: (482.0474, 2,202.1526) ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 361.54604 | $2,049.8198$ | 0 | 393.26169 | 329.98574 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 371.50284 | $2,045.6955$ | 0 | $1,052.8474$ | 883.44389 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 381.45964 | $2,041.5713$ | 0 | $1,712.4332$ | $1,436.902$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 391.41644 | $2,037.4471$ | 0 | $2,372.0189$ | $1,990.3602$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 402.19742 | $2,035.3746$ | 0 | $2,100.8855$ | 748.46451 | 155.67179 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 415.5 | $2,035.3509$ | 0 | $2,712.5651$ | 829.31437 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 428 | $2,035.3286$ | 0 | $3,704.9266$ | $1,132.7097$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 438 | $2,035.3108$ | 0 | $4,498.8159$ | $1,375.426$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 448 | $2,035.293$ | 0 | $5,292.7051$ | $1,618.1423$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 454 | $2,035.2823$ | 0 | $5,769.0387$ | $1,763.7721$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 462 | $2,035.268$ | 0 | $5,789.9051$ | $1,770.1516$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 474.3 | $2,035.2461$ | 0 | $6,128.6467$ | $1,873.7153$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 484.9 | $2,035.2272$ | 0 | $6,923.1751$ | $2,116.627$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 495.5 | $2,035.2084$ | 0 | $7,717.7035$ | $2,359.5387$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 506.1 | $2,035.1895$ | 0 | $8,512.2319$ | $2,602.4504$ | 150 |
|  | 516.7 | $2,035.1706$ | 0 | $9,306.7603$ | $2,845.3622$ | 150 |
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| Slice <br> 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 17 | 528.5 | $2,035.1495$ | 0 | $9,765.4345$ | $2,985.593$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 540.5 | $2,035.1282$ | 0 | $10,158.13$ | $3,105.652$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 551.5 | $2,035.1086$ | 0 | $10,820.7$ | $3,308.2201$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 562.63546 | $2,035.0887$ | 0 | $11,524.163$ | $3,523.2901$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 573.90638 | $2,035.0686$ | 0 | $12,268.517$ | $3,750.8621$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 583.77092 | $2,041.0984$ | 0 | $6,966.2633$ | $5,845.3889$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 594 | $2,055.707$ | 0 | $6,111.3636$ | $5,128.043$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 604.5 | $2,070.7025$ | 0 | $5,213.5571$ | $4,374.6939$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 613.5 | $2,083.5559$ | 0 | $4,610.1095$ | $3,868.3412$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 622.80168 | $2,096.84$ | 0 | $3,986.4346$ | $3,345.0158$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 632.40503 | $2,110.5551$ | 0 | $3,342.5322$ | $2,804.7175$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 643.85429 | $2,126.9063$ | 0 | $2,574.8625$ | $2,160.5662$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 653.25094 | $2,140.3261$ | 0 | $2,149.0112$ | $1,395.5842$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 660.87455 | $2,151.2137$ | 0 | $1,431.3264$ | 929.51426 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 670.62365 | $2,165.1369$ | 0 | 403.31036 | 261.91281 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B:
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed $\left.-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,2,024) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,175) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(341.5832,2,050.0454) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Left: ( $367.0512,1,947.4848$ ) ft Lower Right: (484.9793, 1,987.7541) ft
Lower Right: (484
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Right Grid
Upper Left: (520.6643, 2,104.9641) ft
Lower Left: $(549.385,1,991.8817) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: ( $678.6285,2,022.7223$ ) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(18,0.75)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}$-(-11 $\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-5.9,1)$
100psf (A-Bed -6º-(-11$)) ~$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: (-11, 0.5)
Data Point: $(-6,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-5.9,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Cu
Stercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
Data Point: ( $0,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(18,0.425)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 2,024 |
| Point 2 | 26 | 2,032 |
| Point 3 | 204 | 2,048 |
| Point 4 | 316 | 2,051 |
| Point 5 | 408 | 2,053 |
| Point 6 | 455 | 2,084 |
| Point 7 | 469 | 2,083 |
| Point 8 | 522 | 2,116 |
| Point 9 | 535 | 2,117 |
| Point 10 | 588 | 2,145 |
| Point 11 | 600 | 2,145 |
| Point 12 | 656 | 2,171 |
| Point 13 | 746 | 2,175 |
| Point 14 | 778 | 2,173 |
| Point 15 | 811 | 2,175 |
| Point 16 | 811 | 2,094 |
| Point 17 | 810 | 1,700 |
| Point 18 | 180 | 1,700 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,700 |
| Point 20 | 407 | 1,700 |
| Point 21 | 557 | 2,128 |
| Point 22 | 423 | 2,038 |
| Point 23 | 453 | 2,038 |
| Point 24 | 726 | 2,175 |
| Point 25 | 618 | 2,120 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $17,16,25,23,22,5,20$ | $1.5639 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ - Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,19,18,20,5,4,3,2$ | $2.06 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ | $16,15,14,13,24,25$ | 10,089 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $5,22,23,25,24,12,11,10,21,9,8,7,6$ | 10,014 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 88,682
F of S : 1.10
Volume: $16,605.638 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,992,676,6 lbs
Resisting Force: 755,815,65
Resisting Force: $755,815.65 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surf
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip su
Exit: (356.56764, 2,051.8819) ft
Entry: $(675.50965,2,172.1148) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 187.33243 ft
Center: (482.0451, 2,202.1731) ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 361.54604 | $2,049.8198$ | 0 | 488.0084 | 409.48767 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 371.50284 | $2,045.6955$ | 0 | $1,246.5371$ | $1,045.9688$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 381.45964 | $2,041.5713$ | 0 | $2,005.0657$ | $1,682.4499$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 391.41644 | $2,037.4471$ | 0 | $2,763.5944$ | $2,318.931$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 402.19742 | $2,035.3746$ | 0 | $2,101.3632$ | 748.63471 | 155.67179 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 415.5 | $2,035.3509$ | 0 | $2,713.0825$ | 829.47257 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 428 | $2,035.3286$ | 0 | $3,705.6044$ | $1,132.9169$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 438 | $2,035.3108$ | 0 | $4,499.6219$ | $1,375.6725$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 448 | $2,035.293$ | 0 | $5,293.6393$ | $1,618.428$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 454 | $2,035.2823$ | 0 | $5,770.0498$ | $1,764.0813$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 462 | $2,035.268$ | 0 | $5,790.9196$ | $1,770.4618$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 474.3 | $2,035.2461$ | 0 | $6,129.716$ | $1,874.0422$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 484.9 | $2,035.2272$ | 0 | $6,924.3727$ | $2,116.9932$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 495.5 | $2,035.2084$ | 0 | $7,719.0294$ | $2,359.9441$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 506.1 | $2,035.1895$ | 0 | $8,513.6861$ | $2,602.8951$ | 150 |
|  | 516.7 | $2,035.1706$ | 0 | $9,308.3429$ | $2,845.846$ | 150 |
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| Slice <br> 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 17 | 528.5 | $2,035.1495$ | 0 | $9,767.0912$ | $2,986.0995$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 540.5 | $2,035.1282$ | 0 | $10,159.85$ | $3,106.1779$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 551.5 | $2,035.1086$ | 0 | $10,822.527$ | $3,308.7787$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 562.63546 | $2,035.0887$ | 0 | $11,526.104$ | $3,523.8835$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 573.90638 | $2,035.0686$ | 0 | $12,270.578$ | $3,751.4923$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 583.77092 | $2,041.0984$ | 0 | $5,736.178$ | $4,813.2248$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 594 | $2,055.707$ | 0 | $5,027.2403$ | $4,218.3555$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 604.5 | $2,070.7025$ | 0 | $4,282.7215$ | $3,593.63$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 613.5 | $2,083.5559$ | 0 | $3,782.304$ | $3,173.7299$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 622.80168 | $2,096.84$ | 0 | $3,265.1126$ | $2,739.7548$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 632.40503 | $2,110.5551$ | 0 | $2,731.1474$ | $2,291.7048$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 643.93692 | $2,127.0243$ | 0 | $2,089.9521$ | $1,753.6781$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 653.33356 | $2,140.4441$ | 0 | $1,775.9628$ | $1,153.3238$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 660.87741 | $2,151.2178$ | 0 | $1,170.9304$ | 760.41106 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 670.63224 | $2,165.1492$ | 0 | 296.82185 | 192.75836 | 200 |
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Date: 3/23/2016
Time: 9:56:37 AM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right.$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf (A-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 $\left(\right.$ A- Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,2,024) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,2,175) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (341.5832, 2,050.0454) ft
Lower Left: (367.0512, 1,947.4848) ft
Lower Right: (484.9793, 1,987.7541) ft

X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(520.6643,2,104.9641) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(549.385,1,991.8817)$ ft
Lower Right: (678.6285, 2,022.7223) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 0.425

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(18,0.75)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-6,0.625)$
Data Point: (-5.9, 1)
100psf (A-Bed -6․-(-11))
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-6,0.5)$
Data Point: (-5.9, 1
150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-11.1, 1)
Data Point: $(-11,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(0.9,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

$$
\text { Curve Fit to Data: } 100 \%
$$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(18,0.425)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 2,024 |
| Point 2 | 26 | 2,032 |
| Point 3 | 204 | 2,048 |
| Point 4 | 316 | 2,051 |
| Point 5 | 408 | 2,053 |
| Point 6 | 746 | 2,175 |
| Point 7 | 778 | 2,173 |
| Point 8 | 811 | 2,175 |
| Point 9 | 811 | 2,094 |
| Point 10 | 810 | 1,700 |
| Point 11 | 180 | 1,700 |
| Point 12 | -200 | 1,700 |
| Point 13 | 407 | 1,700 |
| Point 14 | 423 | 2,038 |
| Point 15 | 453 | 2,038 |
| Point 16 | 727 | 2,175 |
| Point 17 | 618 | 2,120 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $10,9,17,15,14,5,13$ | $1.5639 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-17 $7^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A- Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,12,11,13,5,4,3,2$ | $2.06 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | Tmc 100-25 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $-6^{\circ}-\left(-11^{\circ}\right)$ | $9,8,7,6,16,17$ | 10,062 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 90,116
F of S: 1.46
Volume: $13,960.378 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,675,245.3 lbs
Resisting Force: 641,094.52 lbs
Activating Force: $439,573.76 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (455.74432, 2,039.3638) ft
Entry: $(742.14439,2,175) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 188.37065 ft
Center: $(550.76743,2,208.909) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 1 | 460.51654 | $2,039.359$ | 0 | 285.34128 | 87.237585 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 2 | 470.061 | $2,039.3494$ | 0 | 855.81547 | 261.64905 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 479.60545 | $2,039.3397$ | 0 | $1,426.2897$ | 436.06051 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 489.1499 | $2,039.3301$ | 0 | $1,996.7638$ | 610.47197 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 498.69435 | $2,039.3205$ | 0 | $2,567.238$ | 784.88343 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 508.2388 | $2,039.3108$ | 0 | $3,137.7122$ | 959.29489 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 517.78326 | $2,039.3012$ | 0 | $3,708.1864$ | $1,133.7064$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 527.32771 | $2,039.2916$ | 0 | $4,278.6606$ | $1,308.1178$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 536.87216 | $2,039.2819$ | 0 | $4,849.1348$ | $1,482.5293$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 546.41661 | $2,039.2723$ | 0 | $5,419.6089$ | $1,656.9407$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 555.96106 | $2,039.2626$ | 0 | $5,990.0831$ | $1,831.3522$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 565.50551 | $2,039.253$ | 0 | $6,560.5573$ | $2,005.7637$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 575.04997 | $2,039.2434$ | 0 | $7,131.0315$ | $2,180.1751$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 584.59442 | $2,039.2337$ | 0 | $7,701.5057$ | $2,354.5866$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 594.13887 | $2,039.2241$ | 0 | $8,271.9799$ | $2,528.998$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 603.68332 | $2,039.2144$ | 0 | $8,842.454$ | $2,703.4095$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 613.22777 | $2,039.2048$ | 0 | $9,412.9282$ | $2,877.821$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 622.83928 | $2,039.1951$ | 0 | $9,991.8345$ | $3,054.8104$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 632.51783 | $2,039.1853$ | 0 | $10,579.173$ | $3,234.3778$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 642.19638 | $2,039.1755$ | 0 | $11,166.511$ | $3,413.9452$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 651.95726 | $2,046.1994$ | 0 | $5,874.686$ | $4,929.4468$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 661.80045 | $2,060.257$ | 0 | $5,276.6277$ | $4,427.6163$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 671.64364 | $2,074.3145$ | 0 | $4,678.5693$ | $3,925.7858$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 681.48683 | $2,088.372$ | 0 | $4,080.511$ | $3,423.9553$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 25 | 691.33002 | $2,102.4296$ | 0 | $3,482.4527$ | $2,922.1248$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 26 | 701.37635 | $2,116.7772$ | 0 | $2,872.0522$ | $2,409.938$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 711.62581 | $2,131.415$ | 0 | $2,249.3096$ | $1,887.3948$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 721.87527 | $2,146.0527$ | 0 | $1,626.5669$ | $1,364.8517$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 730.7861 | $2,158.7787$ | 0 | 959.47662 | 805.09648 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 738.35829 | $2,169.5929$ | 0 | 248.03868 | 208.12916 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: 0
TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{(A-b e d ~ 3-13}{ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Rang
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(-86,1,940) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $23,1,964.6667$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $30,1,969.3333$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $126,1,965.7089$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-177, 1,939) ft
Right Coordinate: $(644,2,039) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: (21, 0.425)
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \mathbf{8}^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

- Circular Mode of Failure

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: (21, 0.275
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed 3-13$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,939 |
| Point 2 | -92 | 1,940 |
| Point 3 | -32 | 1,940 |
| Point 4 | -7 | 1,957 |
| Point 5 | 10 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 43 | 1,978 |
| Point 7 | 75 | 1,967 |
| Point 8 | 154 | 1,965 |
| Point 9 | 230 | 1,964 |
| Point 10 | 276 | 1,990 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 11 | 297 | 1,990 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 12 | 341 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 13 | 351 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 14 | 377 | 2,022 |
| Point <br> 15 | 390 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 16 | 423 | 2,036 |
| Point <br> 17 | 433 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 18 | 460 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 19 | 482 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 20 | 644 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 21 | 644 | 1,802 |
| Point <br> 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 24 | -177 | 1,798 |
| Point <br> 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 26 | -177 | 1,842 |
| Point <br> 27 | 644 | 1,951 |
| Point <br> 28 | 244 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 29 | 289 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 30 | 336 | 1,973 |
| Point <br> 31 | 644 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 32 | -27 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 33 | -12 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 34 | 62 | 1,972 |
|  | 37 |  |
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Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,23,22,21,27,26$ | 79,110 |
| Region 2 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $26,27,31,30,29,28,9,8,7,34,33,32,3,2,1$ | 59,521 |
| Region 3 | Fill | $9,28,29,30,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10$ | 6,290 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $3,32,33,34,6,5,4$ | $1,137.5$ |
| Region 5 | TQs150-17 $(\mathrm{A}$ - bed 3-13 $)$ | $30,31,20,19$ | 9,966 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 112,377
F of S: 1.94
Volume: $235.2005 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $28,224.06 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 1,082,510.1 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $559,103.75 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
Fof S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (10.027233, 1,956.0182) ft
Entry: (47.266956, 1,976.6525) ft
Radius: 42.115532 ft
Center: $(11.034434,1,998.1216) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 10.63784 | $1,956.0124$ | 0 | 50.669416 | 32.905103 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 11.859054 | $1,956.0186$ | 0 | 143.53035 | 93.209698 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 13.080267 | $1,956.0603$ | 0 | 230.42213 | 149.63788 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 14.301481 | $1,956.1375$ | 0 | 311.483 | 202.27943 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 15.522694 | $1,956.2505$ | 0 | 386.82845 | 251.20933 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 16.743908 | $1,956.3995$ | 0 | 456.55284 | 296.48888 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 17.965121 | $1,956.5849$ | 0 | 520.73075 | 338.1665 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 19.186335 | $1,956.8073$ | 0 | 579.41791 | 376.27839 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 20.407549 | $1,957.0672$ | 0 | 632.65189 | 410.84894 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 21.628762 | $1,957.3653$ | 0 | 680.45247 | 441.891 | 200 |
|  | 22.849976 | $1,957.7025$ | 0 | 722.82179 | 469.40596 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 12 | 24.071189 | $1,958.0798$ | 0 | 759.74417 | 493.38363 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 25.292403 | $1,958.4983$ | 0 | 791.18568 | 513.80199 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 26.513617 | $1,958.9594$ | 0 | 817.09342 | 530.62667 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 27.73483 | $1,959.4645$ | 0 | 837.39437 | 543.81026 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 28.956044 | $1,960.0155$ | 0 | 851.99401 | 553.29138 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 30.177257 | $1,960.6143$ | 0 | 860.77431 | 558.99337 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 31.398471 | $1,961.2633$ | 0 | 863.59129 | 560.82274 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 32.619685 | $1,961.9652$ | 0 | 860.27189 | 558.6671 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 33.840898 | $1,962.7231$ | 0 | 850.60992 | 552.39254 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 35.062112 | $1,963.5408$ | 0 | 834.36104 | 541.8404 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 36.283325 | $1,964.4225$ | 0 | 811.23627 | 526.823 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 37.504539 | $1,965.3736$ | 0 | 780.8937 | 507.1183 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 38.725752 | $1,966.4002$ | 0 | 742.92769 | 482.46288 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 39.946966 | $1,967.5099$ | 0 | 696.85475 | 452.54277 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 41.16818 | $1,968.7123$ | 0 | 642.09467 | 416.98115 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 42.389393 | $1,970.0192$ | 0 | 577.94494 | 375.32183 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 43.711159 | $1,971.5759$ | 0 | 436.96587 | 283.76896 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 45.133478 | $1,973.4335$ | 0 | 222.05395 | 144.20352 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 46.555797 | $1,975.5342$ | 0 | -0.64302 | -0.41758207 | 200 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Renotenad

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 14
Date: 3/25/2016
Time: 4:18:37 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 17-17 Seismic Final for low key SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:|SLOPE RESULTS\Section 17-17\Latest Update 3-25-2016
Last Solved Date: 3/25/2016
Last Solved Time: 4:18:53 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{(A-b e d ~ 3-13}{ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Rang
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(-86,1,940) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $23,1,964.6667$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (30, 1,969.3333) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $126,1,965.7089$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-177, 1,939) ft
Right Coordinate: $(644,2,039) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: (21, 0.425)
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \mathbf{8}^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

- Circular Mode of Failure

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: (21, 0.275
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed 3-13$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,939 |
| Point 2 | -92 | 1,940 |
| Point 3 | -32 | 1,940 |
| Point 4 | -7 | 1,957 |
| Point 5 | 10 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 43 | 1,978 |
| Point 7 | 75 | 1,967 |
| Point 8 | 154 | 1,965 |
| Point 9 | 230 | 1,964 |
| Point 10 | 276 | 1,990 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 11 | 297 | 1,990 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 12 | 341 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 13 | 351 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 14 | 377 | 2,022 |
| Point <br> 15 | 390 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 16 | 423 | 2,036 |
| Point <br> 17 | 433 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 18 | 460 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 19 | 482 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 20 | 644 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 21 | 644 | 1,802 |
| Point <br> 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 24 | -177 | 1,798 |
| Point <br> 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 26 | -177 | 1,842 |
| Point <br> 27 | 644 | 1,951 |
| Point <br> 28 | 244 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 29 | 289 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 30 | 336 | 1,973 |
| Point <br> 31 | 644 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 32 | -27 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 33 | -12 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 34 | 62 | 1,972 |
|  | 37 |  |
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Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,23,22,21,27,26$ | 79,110 |
| Region 2 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $26,27,31,30,29,28,9,8,7,34,33,32,3,2,1$ | 59,521 |
| Region 3 | Fill | $9,28,29,30,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10$ | 6,290 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $3,32,33,34,6,5,4$ | $1,137.5$ |
| Region 5 | TQs150-17 $(\mathrm{A}$ - bed 3-13 $)$ | $30,31,20,19$ | 9,966 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 61,101
Fof S: 1.30
Volume: $1,273.6586 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $152,839.03 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $32,573,573 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $25,018,478 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (-31.95441, 1,940.031) ft
Entry: (75.769263, 1,966.9805) ft
Radius: 416.2632 ft
Center: ( $-78.214197,2,353.7158$ ) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | -30.171952 | $1,940.2381$ | 0 | 97.13462 | 63.07996 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | -26.607036 | $1,940.6679$ | 0 | 320.76091 | 208.30457 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | -23.042121 | $1,941.129$ | 0 | 539.03122 | 350.05097 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | -19.477205 | $1,941.6214$ | 0 | 751.98975 | 488.34785 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | -15.912289 | $1,942.1453$ | 0 | 959.67871 | 623.22264 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | -12.347374 | $1,942.7007$ | 0 | $1,162.1384$ | 754.70149 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | -8.7824579 | $1,943.2879$ | 0 | $1,359.4071$ | 882.80931 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | -5.3 | $1,943.8919$ | 0 | $1,408.7329$ | 914.84183 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | -1.9 | $1,944.5114$ | 0 | $1,312.0412$ | 852.04951 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 1.5 | $1,945.1601$ | 0 | $1,212.8783$ | 787.65237 | 200 |
|  | 4.9 | $1,945.8382$ | 0 | $1,111.2619$ | 721.66192 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 12 | 8.3 | $1,946.5459$ | 0 | $1,007.2094$ | 654.0894 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 11.6258 | $1,947.2664$ | 0 | $1,030.6152$ | 669.28934 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 15.110875 | $1,948.0535$ | 0 | $1,267.52$ | 387.51977 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 18.829425 | $1,948.927$ | 0 | $1,446.1427$ | 442.13019 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 22.547975 | $1,949.8366$ | 0 | $1,619.8731$ | 495.24491 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 26.266525 | $1,950.7826$ | 0 | $1,788.7063$ | 546.86239 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 29.985075 | $1,951.7652$ | 0 | $1,952.6357$ | 596.98063 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 33.703625 | $1,952.7847$ | 0 | $2,111.6534$ | 645.59722 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 37.422175 | $1,953.8414$ | 0 | $2,265.75$ | 692.70929 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 41.140725 | $1,954.9355$ | 0 | $2,414.9147$ | 738.31353 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 44.9 | $1,956.0803$ | 0 | $2,351.8357$ | 719.02832 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 48.7 | $1,957.2768$ | 0 | $2,077.8196$ | 635.25321 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 52.5 | $1,958.5135$ | 0 | $1,800.5383$ | 550.4798 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 56.3 | $1,959.7907$ | 0 | $1,519.9878$ | 464.7069 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 60.1 | $1,961.1089$ | 0 | $1,236.1639$ | 377.93323 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 63.625 | $1,962.3672$ | 0 | 957.73545 | 292.80911 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 66.875 | $1,963.5604$ | 0 | 685.12496 | 209.46372 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 70.125 | $1,964.7845$ | 0 | 410.21128 | 125.41417 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 73.375 | $1,966.0397$ | 0 | 98.022886 | 82.250967 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 75.384631 | $1,966.8278$ | 0 | -39.07695 | -32.789455 | 225 |
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## 2 - Translational

Report generated using GeoStudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

```File Information
    File Version: 8.15
    Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
    Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
    Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
    Revision Number: }14
    Date: 3/25/2016
    Time: 4:29:32 PM
    Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
    File Name: Section 17-17 Static Final for low key SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
    Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 17-17\Latest Update 3-25-2016\
    Last Solved Date: 3/25/2016
    Last Solved Time: 4:29:54 PM
Project Settings
    Length(L) Units: Feet
    Time(t) Units: Seconds
    Force(F) Units: Pounds
    Pressure(p) Units: psf
    Strength Units: psf
    Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
    View: 2D
    Element Thickness: 1
```


## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W

```
Method: Janbu
Settings
    PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
    Direction of movement: Right to Left
    Use Passive Mode: No
    Slip Surface Option: Block
    Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
    Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1 }\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ
    Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5 `
    Restrict Block Crossing: No
    Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
    Tension Crack
        Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
    F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
    Number of Slices: }3
    F of S Tolerance: 0.01
    Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft
```


## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$

C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-177, 1,939) ft
Right Coordinate: $(644,2,039) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (-71.5929, 1,953.474) ft
Lower Left: (-50.5113, 1,892.0009) ft
Lower Right: (22.7194, 1,911.321) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$

Angle Increments: 2

## Right Grid

Upper Left: (29.5713, 1,975.3338) ft
Lower Left: (42.8782, 1,913.6751) ft
Lower Right: (119.5885, 1,939.6366) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: (21, 0.425)
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150 psf- $11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21,0.667)$
Data Point: (21.1, 1)
TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \mathbf{8}^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: (8, 0.275)
Data Point: $(21,0.275)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed 3-13$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(f t)$ | $Y(f t)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,939 |
| Point 2 | -92 | 1,940 |
| Point 3 | -32 | 1,940 |
| Point 4 | -7 | 1,957 |
| Point 5 | 10 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 43 | 1,978 |
| Point 7 | 75 | 1,967 |
| Point 8 | 154 | 1,965 |
| Point 9 | 230 | 1,964 |
| Point 10 | 276 | 1,990 |
| Point 11 | 297 | 1,990 |
| Point 12 | 341 | 2,010 |
| Point 13 | 351 | 2,010 |
| Point 14 | 377 | 2,022 |
| Point 15 | 390 | 2,024 |
| Point 16 | 423 | 2,036 |
| Point 17 | 433 | 2,038 |
| Point 18 | 460 | 2,047 |
| Point 19 | 482 | 2,047 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 20 | 644 | 2,039 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 21 | 644 | 1,802 |
| Point <br> 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 24 | -177 | 1,798 |
| Point <br> 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 26 | -177 | 1,842 |
| Point <br> 27 | 644 | 1,951 |
| Point <br> 28 | 244 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 29 | 289 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 30 | 336 | 1,973 |
| Point <br> 31 | 644 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 32 | -27 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 33 | -12 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 34 | 62 | 1,972 |
|  | -17 |  |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,23,22,21,27,26$ | 79,110 |
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| Region <br> 2 | TQs150-17 <br>  <br> $-21^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}$ | $26,27,31,30,29,28,9,8,7,34,33,32,3,2,1$ | 59,521 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $9,28,29,30,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10$ | 6,290 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $3,32,33,34,6,5,4$ | $1,137.5$ |
| Region <br> 5 | TQs150-17 <br> $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$ | (A- bed | $30,31,20,19$ |

## Current Slip Surface

## Slip Surface: 66,992

F of S: 1.66
Volume: $1,230.3528 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $147,642.34 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 73,302.436 lbs
Activating Force: 44,088.634 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (-31.547049, 1,940.308) ft
Entry: (52.033121, 1,975.1474) ft
Radius: 49.716909 ft
Center: (-0.648774, 1,983.8573) ft

## Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{PWP}(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 1 | -30.265582 | $1,939.7772$ | 0 | 260.43337 | 169.12741 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | -27.70265 | $1,938.7156$ | 0 | 662.09149 | 429.96724 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | -25.139717 | $1,937.654$ | 0 | $1,063.7496$ | 690.80708 | 200 |
| Slice 4 | -22.576785 | $1,936.5924$ | 0 | $1,465.4077$ | 951.64691 | 200 |
| Slice 5 | -20.013852 | $1,935.5308$ | 0 | $1,867.0659$ | $1,212.4867$ | 200 |
| Slice 6 | -17.923033 | $1,934.6648$ | 0 | $2,334.1401$ | $1,958.5761$ | 225 |
| Slice 7 | -16.046699 | $1,934.6648$ | 0 | $1,808.8485$ | 553.02049 | 150.075 |
| Slice 8 | -13.649765 | $1,935.4179$ | 0 | $1,789.2707$ | $1,161.966$ | 200 |
| Slice 9 | -10.989859 | $1,936.2536$ | 0 | $1,893.2415$ | $1,229.4854$ | 200 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | -8.329953 | 1,937.0894 | 0 | 1,997.2123 | 1,297.0048 | 200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | -5.5671332 | 1,937.9574 | 0 | 2,123.5976 | 649.24894 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $-2.7208397$ | 1,938.8517 | 0 | 2,003.1636 | 612.42857 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 0.10601357 | 1,939.7399 | 0 | 1,883.5521 | 575.85968 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | 2.9328668 | 1,940.6281 | 0 | 1,763.9407 | 539.29079 | 150.075 |
| Slice 15 | 5.7597201 | 1,941.5163 | 0 | 1,644.3293 | 502.72191 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 8.5865734 | 1,942.4045 | 0 | 1,524.7178 | 466.15302 | 150.075 |
| Slice $17$ | 11.383003 | 1,943.2832 | 0 | 1,520.2058 | 464.77355 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 14.14901 | 1,944.1522 | 0 | 1,630.7931 | 498.5835 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 16.915017 | 1,945.0213 | 0 | 1,741.3805 | 532.39345 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 19.681023 | 1,945.8904 | 0 | 1,851.9679 | 566.2034 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | 22.44703 | 1,946.7595 | 0 | 1,962.5552 | 600.01335 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | 25.213037 | 1,947.6285 | 0 | 2,073.1426 | 633.8233 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | 27.979043 | 1,948.4976 | 0 | 2,183.73 | 667.63325 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | 30.74505 | 1,949.3667 | 0 | 2,294.3173 | 701.4432 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | 33.511057 | 1,950.2358 | 0 | 2,404.9047 | 735.25315 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ | 36.24505 | 1,952.5997 | 0 | 1,343.4384 | 1,127.2787 | 225 |
|  | 38.94703 | 1,956.4586 | 0 | 1,200.0909 | 1,006.9958 | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 28 | 41.64901 | $1,960.3174$ | 0 | $1,056.7434$ | 886.71296 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 43.1364 | $1,962.4416$ | 0 | 968.49692 | 812.66541 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 44.732853 | $1,964.7216$ | 0 | 869.46013 | 564.63401 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 47.65296 | $1,968.8919$ | 0 | 477.50066 | 310.09255 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 50.573067 | $1,973.0623$ | 0 | 85.541187 | 55.551096 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 150-11 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150-17 (A- bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-177,1,939) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(644,2,039) \mathrm{ft}$
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## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(-71.5929,1,953.474) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $-50.5113,1,892.0009$ ) ft
Lower Right: (22.7194, 1,911.321) ft
X Increments: 10
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(29.5713,1,975.3338) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (42.8782, 1,913.6751) ft
Lower Right: (119.5885, 1,939.6366) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.425$ )
Data Point: ( $21,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

## Data Point: $(7.9,1)$ <br> Data Point: $(8,0.667)$

Data Point: $(21,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: $(21,0.275)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,939 |
| Point 2 | -92 | 1,940 |
|  |  |  |

2 - Translational

| Point <br> 3 | -32 | 1,940 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 4 | -7 | 1,957 |
| Point <br> 5 | 10 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 6 | 43 | 1,978 |
| Point <br> 7 | 75 | 1,967 |
| Point <br> 8 | 154 | 1,965 |
| Point <br> 9 | 230 | 1,964 |
| Point <br> 10 | 276 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 11 | 297 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 12 | 341 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 13 | 351 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 14 | 377 | 2,022 |
| Point <br> 15 | 390 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 16 | 423 | 2,036 |
| Point <br> 17 | 433 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 18 | 460 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 19 | 482 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 20 | 644 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 21 | 644 | 1,802 |
| Point <br> 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 24 | -177 | 1,798 |
| Point <br> 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 26 | -177 | 1,842 |


| Point <br> 27 | 644 | 1,951 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 28 | 244 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 29 | 289 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 30 | 336 | 1,973 |
| Point <br> 31 | 644 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 32 | -27 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 33 | -12 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 34 | 62 | 1,972 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,23,22,21,27,26$ | 79,110 |
| Region 2 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $26,27,31,30,29,28,9,8,7,34,33,32,3,2,1$ | 59,521 |
| Region 3 | Fill | $9,28,29,30,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10$ | 6,290 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $3,32,33,34,6,5,4$ | $1,137.5$ |
| Region 5 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}(\mathrm{A}-$ bed 3-13 $)$ | $30,31,20,19$ | 9,966 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 66,996
F of S: 1.17
Volume: 1,305.1222 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $156,614.67 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 71,619.411 Ibs
Activating Force: $61,416.48 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (-31.547049, 1,940.308) ft
Entry: $(52.673982,1,974.9451) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 49.625828 ft
Center: $(-0.12025445,1,983.6043) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | -30.265582 | $1,939.7772$ | 0 | 309.49193 | 200.98641 | 200 |
|  | -27.70265 | $1,938.7156$ | 0 | 745.81675 | 484.33906 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 3 | -25.139717 | $1,937.654$ | 0 | $1,182.1416$ | 767.69171 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | -22.576785 | $1,936.5924$ | 0 | $1,618.4664$ | $1,051.0444$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | -20.013852 | $1,935.5308$ | 0 | $2,054.7912$ | $1,334.397$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | -17.923033 | $1,934.6648$ | 0 | $2,651.8689$ | $2,225.1822$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 7 | -16.057174 | $1,934.6648$ | 0 | $1,755.8349$ | 536.81261 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 8 | -13.667224 | $1,935.4231$ | 0 | $1,694.3413$ | $1,100.3181$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | -11.000334 | $1,936.2694$ | 0 | $1,793.1051$ | $1,164.4561$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | -8.3334447 | $1,937.1156$ | 0 | $1,891.869$ | $1,228.5941$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | -6.8939956 | $1,937.5724$ | 0 | $1,937.1796$ | $1,258.0192$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | -5.3889919 | $1,938.0499$ | 0 | $2,052.8105$ | 627.60716 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | -2.5909934 | $1,938.9378$ | 0 | $1,936.1422$ | 591.93809 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 0.20700514 | $1,939.8256$ | 0 | $1,819.474$ | 556.26901 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 3.0050037 | $1,940.7135$ | 0 | $1,702.8057$ | 520.59994 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 5.8030022 | $1,941.6013$ | 0 | $1,586.1374$ | 484.93086 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 8.6010007 | $1,942.4892$ | 0 | $1,469.4691$ | 449.26179 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 11.356879 | $1,943.3636$ | 0 | $1,463.6836$ | 447.49299 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 14.070636 | $1,944.2248$ | 0 | $1,568.781$ | 479.62447 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 16.784394 | $1,945.0859$ | 0 | $1,673.8783$ | 511.75595 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 19.498151 | $1,945.947$ | 0 | $1,778.9756$ | 543.88744 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 22.211909 | $1,946.8081$ | 0 | $1,884.073$ | 576.01892 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 24.925666 | $1,947.6692$ | 0 | $1,989.1703$ | 608.1504 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 27.639424 | $1,948.5303$ | 0 | $2,094.2677$ | 640.28188 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 30.353181 | $1,949.3915$ | 0 | $2,199.365$ | 672.41336 | 150.075 |


| Slice <br> 26 | 33.066939 | $1,950.2526$ | 0 | $2,304.4624$ | 704.54485 | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 27 | 35.780696 | $1,951.1137$ | 0 | $2,409.5597$ | 736.67633 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 38.494454 | $1,951.9748$ | 0 | $2,514.657$ | 768.80781 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 41.208211 | $1,952.8359$ | 0 | $2,619.7544$ | 800.93929 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 42.782545 | $1,953.7328$ | 0 | 981.94904 | 823.95308 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 44.261908 | $1,956.9053$ | 0 | 819.45343 | 687.60307 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 46.785723 | $1,962.3176$ | 0 | 524.94659 | 440.48249 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 49.204218 | $1,967.5041$ | 0 | 302.04072 | 196.14754 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 51.517394 | $1,972.4647$ | 0 | -10.633346 | -6.9053757 | 200 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Renotenad

File Information
File Version: 8.15
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Revision Number: 136
Date: 3/25/2016
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Last Solved Time: 3:57:45 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: 0
TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{(A-b e d ~ 3-13}{ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(140.0889,1,965.3522) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $300,1,991.3636$ ) f
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (325, 2,002.7273) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: (554.9691, 2,043.3966) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-177,1,939)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(644,2,039) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: (21, 0.425 )
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \mathbf{8}^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: (21, 0.275
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed 3-13$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,939 |
| Point 2 | -92 | 1,940 |
| Point 3 | -32 | 1,940 |
| Point 4 | -7 | 1,957 |
| Point 5 | 10 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 43 | 1,978 |
| Point 7 | 75 | 1,967 |
| Point 8 | 154 | 1,965 |
| Point 9 | 230 | 1,964 |
| Point 10 | 276 | 1,990 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 11 | 297 | 1,990 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 12 | 341 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 13 | 351 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 14 | 377 | 2,022 |
| Point <br> 15 | 390 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 16 | 423 | 2,036 |
| Point <br> 17 | 433 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 18 | 460 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 19 | 482 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 20 | 644 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 21 | 644 | 1,802 |
| Point <br> 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 24 | -177 | 1,798 |
| Point <br> 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 26 | -177 | 1,842 |
| Point <br> 27 | 644 | 1,951 |
| Point <br> 28 | 244 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 29 | 289 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 30 | 336 | 1,973 |
| Point <br> 31 | 644 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 32 | -27 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 33 | -12 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 34 | 62 | 1,972 |
|  | 37 |  |
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Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,23,22,21,27,26$ | 79,110 |
| Region 2 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $26,27,31,30,29,28,9,8,7,34,33,32,3,2,1$ | 59,521 |
| Region 3 | Fill | $9,28,29,30,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10$ | 6,290 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $3,32,33,34,6,5,4$ | $1,137.5$ |
| Region 5 | TQs150-17 $(\mathrm{A}$ - bed 3-13 $)$ | $30,31,20,19$ | 9,966 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 56,373
F of S: 2.20
Volume: $7,725.7384 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $927,088.61 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $1.7022767 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
Activating Moment: 77,536,641 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (210.24346, 1,964.26)
Entry: $(478.83576,2,047) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 285.78335 ft
Center: (271.27916, 2,243.4494) ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 215.1826 | $1,963.2711$ | 0 | 142.24681 | 119.35925 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 225.06087 | $1,961.4726$ | 0 | 349.76389 | 293.48675 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 231.93782 | $1,960.3937$ | 0 | 610.84461 | 512.55949 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 238.08808 | $1,959.6317$ | 0 | $1,122.2048$ | 728.76831 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 246.51295 | $1,958.7726$ | 0 | $1,801.5307$ | $1,169.9277$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 254.93782 | $1,958.1649$ | 0 | $2,438.1386$ | $1,583.3457$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 263.36269 | $1,957.8068$ | 0 | $3,033.4091$ | $1,969.9189$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 271.78756 | $1,957.6976$ | 0 | $3,588.5277$ | $2,330.4171$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 281.25 | $1,957.8884$ | 0 | $3,810.8886$ | $2,474.82$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 291.75 | $1,958.4488$ | 0 | $3,701.0402$ | $2,403.4836$ | 200 |
|  | 303.53516 | $1,959.5685$ | 0 | $3,868.0147$ | $2,511.9181$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 12 | 314.39194 | $1,960.9706$ | 0 | $4,329.8108$ | $1,323.756$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 323.03516 | $1,962.4261$ | 0 | $4,598.5548$ | $1,405.9193$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 331.67839 | $1,964.1566$ | 0 | $4,832.5803$ | $1,477.4681$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 338.5 | $1,965.6962$ | 0 | $4,995.3531$ | $1,527.2327$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 346 | $1,967.6559$ | 0 | $4,878.8734$ | $1,491.6213$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 355.33333 | $1,970.3442$ | 0 | $4,773.2702$ | $1,459.3352$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 364 | $1,973.1644$ | 0 | $4,883.7333$ | $1,493.1071$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 372.66667 | $1,976.2955$ | 0 | $4,956.8749$ | $1,515.4687$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 378.74367 | $1,978.6477$ | 0 | $4,496.1241$ | $3,772.6961$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 385.24367 | $1,981.424$ | 0 | $4,267.9123$ | $3,581.2036$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 394.125 | $1,985.4569$ | 0 | $4,024.6106$ | $3,377.0493$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 402.375 | $1,989.5509$ | 0 | $3,859.943$ | $3,238.8767$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 410.625 | $1,993.9849$ | 0 | $3,663.2232$ | $3,073.8092$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 418.875 | $1,998.7774$ | 0 | $3,433.9022$ | $2,881.3861$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 428 | $2,004.5458$ | 0 | $3,060.6204$ | $2,568.1655$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 437.5 | $2,011.0443$ | 0 | $2,624.608$ | $2,202.3076$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 446.5 | $2,017.7565$ | 0 | $2,228.9149$ | $1,870.2817$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 455.5 | $2,025.0458$ | 0 | $1,791.1848$ | $1,502.9825$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 463.95776 | $2,032.4557$ | 0 | $1,224.7179$ | $1,027.6603$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 471.87329 | $2,039.9716$ | 0 | 539.40003 | 452.61036 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 477.3334 | $2,045.4366$ | 0 | 71.039899 | 46.13385 | 200 |
|  | 3, |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A- bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{(A-b e d ~ 3-13}{ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(140.0889,1,965.3522) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $300,1,991.3636$ ) f
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (325, 2,002.7273) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: (554.9691, 2,043.3966) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-177, 1,939) ft
Right Coordinate: $(644,2,039) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: (21, 0.425)
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
TQs 150-11 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \mathbf{8}^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: (21, 0.275
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed 3-13$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,939 |
| Point 2 | -92 | 1,940 |
| Point 3 | -32 | 1,940 |
| Point 4 | -7 | 1,957 |
| Point 5 | 10 | 1,956 |
| Point 6 | 43 | 1,978 |
| Point 7 | 75 | 1,967 |
| Point 8 | 154 | 1,965 |
| Point 9 | 230 | 1,964 |
| Point 10 | 276 | 1,990 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 11 | 297 | 1,990 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 12 | 341 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 13 | 351 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 14 | 377 | 2,022 |
| Point <br> 15 | 390 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 16 | 423 | 2,036 |
| Point <br> 17 | 433 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 18 | 460 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 19 | 482 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 20 | 644 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 21 | 644 | 1,802 |
| Point <br> 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 24 | -177 | 1,798 |
| Point <br> 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 26 | -177 | 1,842 |
| Point <br> 27 | 644 | 1,951 |
| Point <br> 28 | 244 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 29 | 289 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 30 | 336 | 1,973 |
| Point <br> 31 | 644 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 32 | -27 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 33 | -12 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 34 | 62 | 1,972 |
|  | 37 |  |
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Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,23,22,21,27,26$ | 79,110 |
| Region 2 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $26,27,31,30,29,28,9,8,7,34,33,32,3,2,1$ | 59,521 |
| Region 3 | Fill | $9,28,29,30,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10$ | 6,290 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $3,32,33,34,6,5,4$ | $1,137.5$ |
| Region 5 | TQs150-17 $(\mathrm{A}$ - bed 3-13 $)$ | $30,31,20,19$ | 9,966 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 53,923
F of S: 1.43
Volume: $8,437.7293 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,012,527.5 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $1.9751456 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: 1.3820597 e+008
Fof S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: $(206.90261,1,964.3039) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (493.11389, 2,046.4512) ft
Radius: 326.7372 ft
Center: (269.77051, 2,284.9358) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 212.67696 | $1,963.279$ | 0 | 158.24193 | 132.78075 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 224.22565 | $1,961.4411$ | 0 | 368.75512 | 309.42229 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 231.90862 | $1,960.4054$ | 0 | 621.6594 | 521.63417 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 239.09009 | $1,959.6854$ | 0 | $1,198.7847$ | 778.49991 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 249.63578 | $1,958.8624$ | 0 | $2,013.3632$ | $1,307.4934$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 260.18147 | $1,958.382$ | 0 | $2,762.156$ | $1,793.7651$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 270.72716 | $1,958.2426$ | 0 | $3,448.2639$ | $2,239.3287$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 281.25 | $1,958.4426$ | 0 | $3,722.5916$ | $2,417.4793$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 291.75 | $1,958.9812$ | 0 | $3,602.6169$ | $2,339.5668$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 304.06132 | $1,960.0806$ | 0 | $3,779.7273$ | $2,454.5836$ | 200 |
|  | 315.26886 | $1,961.4091$ | 0 | $4,283.9685$ | $1,309.7406$ | 150.075 |
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| Slice <br> 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 12 | 323.56132 | $1,962.6843$ | 0 | $4,547.0693$ | $1,390.1786$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 331.85377 | $1,964.1789$ | 0 | $4,781.6767$ | $1,461.9053$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 338.5 | $1,965.5193$ | 0 | $4,951.2061$ | $1,513.7356$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 346 | $1,967.257$ | 0 | $4,855.1557$ | $1,484.3701$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 355.33333 | $1,969.6327$ | 0 | $4,778.64$ | $1,460.9769$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 364 | $1,972.114$ | 0 | $4,918.3017$ | $1,503.6757$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 372.66667 | $1,974.8572$ | 0 | $5,026.0973$ | $1,536.6321$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 382.68126 | $1,978.3878$ | 0 | $4,913.1984$ | $1,502.1155$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 389.18126 | $1,980.8018$ | 0 | $4,151.4333$ | $3,483.4661$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 395.5 | $1,983.4167$ | 0 | $4,053.5684$ | $3,401.3478$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 406.5 | $1,988.2448$ | 0 | $3,887.8469$ | $3,262.2909$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 417.5 | $1,993.5681$ | 0 | $3,678.7198$ | $3,086.8124$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 428 | $1,999.1248$ | 0 | $3,365.697$ | $2,824.1551$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 437.5 | $2,004.5851$ | 0 | $3,032.2483$ | $2,544.3585$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 446.5 | $2,010.1718$ | 0 | $2,743.7251$ | $2,302.2587$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 455.5 | $2,016.176$ | 0 | $2,427.0248$ | $2,036.5156$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 465.5 | $2,023.4019$ | 0 | $1,886.4833$ | $1,582.9474$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 476.5 | $2,032.0136$ | 0 | $1,128.945$ | 947.29731 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 487.55694 | $2,041.4801$ | 0 | 320.67201 | 269.07577 | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 150-11 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150-17 (A- bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-177,1,939) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(644,2,039) \mathrm{ft}$

2-Translational

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(203.4071,1,966.474) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Left: (224.4887, 1,905.0009) ft Lower Right: (297.7194, 1,924.321) ft
X Increments: 10
XIncrements: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: (402.5713, 2,011.3338) ft
Lower Left: $(415.8782,1,949.6751) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (492.5885, 1,975.6366) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $21,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150 psf- $11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

## Data Point: $(7.9,1)$ <br> Data Point: $(8,0.667)$

Data Point: $(21,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.275$ )
Data Point: $(21,0.275)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,939 |
| Point 2 | -92 | 1,940 |
|  |  |  |
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| Point <br> 3 | -32 | 1,940 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 4 | -7 | 1,957 |
| Point <br> 5 | 10 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 6 | 43 | 1,978 |
| Point <br> 7 | 75 | 1,967 |
| Point <br> 8 | 154 | 1,965 |
| Point <br> 9 | 230 | 1,964 |
| Point <br> 10 | 276 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 11 | 297 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 12 | 341 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 13 | 351 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 14 | 377 | 2,022 |
| Point <br> 15 | 390 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 16 | 423 | 2,036 |
| Point <br> 17 | 433 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 18 | 460 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 19 | 482 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 20 | 644 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 21 | 644 | 1,802 |
| Point <br> 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 24 | -177 | 1,798 |
| Point <br> 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 26 | -177 | 1,842 |


| Point <br> 27 | 644 | 1,951 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 28 | 244 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 29 | 289 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 30 | 336 | 1,973 |
| Point <br> 31 | 644 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 32 | -27 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 33 | -12 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 34 | 62 | 1,972 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,23,22,21,27,26$ | 79,110 |
| Region 2 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $26,27,31,30,29,28,9,8,7,34,33,32,3,2,1$ | 59,521 |
| Region 3 | Fill | $9,28,29,30,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10$ | 6,290 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $3,32,33,34,6,5,4$ | $1,137.5$ |
| Region 5 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}(\mathrm{A}$ - bed 3-13 $)$ | $30,31,20,19$ | 9,966 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 53,897
F of S : 1.73
Volume: $9,718.7286 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,166,247.4 lbs
Resisting Force: 496,685.99 lbs
Activating Force: $287,333.37 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (191.70356, 1,964.5039) ft
Entry: (467.49181, 2,047) ft
Radius: 141.55999 ft
Center: (311.08999, 2,067.624) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 196.49061 | $1,962.521$ | 0 | 355.02851 | 297.90429 | 225 |
|  | 206.06472 | $1,958.5553$ | 0 | 931.00138 | 781.20291 | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 3 | 215.63883 | $1,954.5896$ | 0 | $1,506.9742$ | $1,264.5015$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 225.21294 | $1,950.6239$ | 0 | $2,082.9471$ | $1,747.8002$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 233.5 | $1,947.1912$ | 0 | $2,885.1439$ | $2,420.9232$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 240.5 | $1,944.2918$ | 0 | $3,913.5646$ | $3,283.8706$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 248.3357 | $1,941.0461$ | 0 | $5,064.7648$ | $4,249.8423$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 256.55951 | $1,940.3008$ | 0 | $4,412.2459$ | $1,348.9589$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 264.33571 | $1,942.4019$ | 0 | $4,675.044$ | $1,429.3044$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 272.1119 | $1,944.5031$ | 0 | $4,937.8421$ | $1,509.6498$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 282.5 | $1,947.3099$ | 0 | $4,868.0477$ | $1,488.3116$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 293 | $1,950.1471$ | 0 | $4,543.0431$ | $1,388.9477$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 301.875 | $1,952.5451$ | 0 | $4,522.1784$ | $1,382.5687$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 311.625 | $1,955.1796$ | 0 | $4,728.0718$ | $1,445.5166$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 321.375 | $1,957.8141$ | 0 | $4,933.9651$ | $1,508.4645$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 331.125 | $1,960.4485$ | 0 | $5,139.8584$ | $1,571.4124$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 338.5 | $1,962.4413$ | 0 | $5,295.5982$ | $1,619.0268$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 346 | $1,964.4678$ | 0 | $5,193.6272$ | $1,587.8512$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 355.33333 | $1,966.9897$ | 0 | $5,133.8426$ | $1,569.5732$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 364 | $1,969.3314$ | 0 | $5,323.8015$ | $1,627.6495$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 372.66667 | $1,971.6732$ | 0 | $5,513.7605$ | $1,685.7258$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 383.5 | $1,974.6004$ | 0 | $5,522.1008$ | $1,688.2756$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 394.125 | $1,977.4713$ | 0 | $5,479.6125$ | $1,675.2857$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 402.375 | $1,979.7005$ | 0 | $5,567.9143$ | $1,702.2822$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 410.625 | $1,981.9296$ | 0 | $5,656.2161$ | $1,729.2788$ | 150.075 |


| Slice <br> 26 | 418.875 | $1,984.1588$ | 0 | $5,744.5179$ | $1,756.2754$ | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 27 | 423.60928 | $1,985.438$ | 0 | $5,783.7689$ | $1,768.2756$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 428.60928 | $1,991.6716$ | 0 | $3,163.5561$ | $2,654.5388$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 437.41836 | $2,004.0507$ | 0 | $2,406.3027$ | $2,019.1277$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 446.25509 | $2,016.6708$ | 0 | $1,719.1959$ | $1,442.5766$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 455.09181 | $2,029.291$ | 0 | $1,032.0891$ | 866.02559 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 459.75509 | $2,035.9508$ | 0 | 750.94143 | 487.66707 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 463.7459 | $2,041.6503$ | 0 | 311.39534 | 202.2225 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 150-11 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-11 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs150-17 (A- bed 3-13 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-177,1,939) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(644,2,039) \mathrm{ft}$
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## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(203.4071,1,966.474) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Left: (224.4887, 1,905.0009) ft Lower Right: (297.7194, 1,924.321) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: (402.5713, 2,011.3338) ft
Lower Left: $(415.8782,1,949.6751) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (492.5885, 1,975.6366) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $21,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150 psf- $11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$

## Data Point: $(7.9,1)$ <br> Data Point: $(8,0.667)$

Data Point: $(21,0.667)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.275)$
Data Point: $(21,0.275)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$ - bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13,0.667)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ bed $\left.3-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(2.9,1)$
Data Point: $(3,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13,0.425)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -177 | 1,939 |
| Point 2 | -92 | 1,940 |
|  |  |  |

2 - Translational

| Point <br> 3 | -32 | 1,940 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 4 | -7 | 1,957 |
| Point <br> 5 | 10 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 6 | 43 | 1,978 |
| Point <br> 7 | 75 | 1,967 |
| Point <br> 8 | 154 | 1,965 |
| Point <br> 9 | 230 | 1,964 |
| Point <br> 10 | 276 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 11 | 297 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 12 | 341 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 13 | 351 | 2,010 |
| Point <br> 14 | 377 | 2,022 |
| Point <br> 15 | 390 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 16 | 423 | 2,036 |
| Point <br> 17 | 433 | 2,038 |
| Point <br> 18 | 460 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 19 | 482 | 2,047 |
| Point <br> 20 | 644 | 2,039 |
| Point <br> 21 | 644 | 1,802 |
| Point <br> 22 | 299 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 23 | 51 | 1,800 |
| Point <br> 24 | -177 | 1,798 |
| Point <br> 25 | -200 | 1,801 |
| Point <br> 26 | -177 | 1,842 |


| Point <br> 27 | 644 | 1,951 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 28 | 244 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 29 | 289 | 1,950 |
| Point <br> 30 | 336 | 1,973 |
| Point <br> 31 | 644 | 2,017 |
| Point <br> 32 | -27 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 33 | -12 | 1,935 |
| Point <br> 34 | 62 | 1,972 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $150-11^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,23,22,21,27,26$ | 79,110 |
| Region 2 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $26,27,31,30,29,28,9,8,7,34,33,32,3,2,1$ | 59,521 |
| Region 3 | Fill | $9,28,29,30,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10$ | 6,290 |
| Region 4 | Fill | $3,32,33,34,6,5,4$ | $1,137.5$ |
| Region 5 | TQs150-17 ${ }^{\circ}(\mathrm{A}-$ bed 3-13 $)$ | $30,31,20,19$ | 9,966 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 56,054
F of S: 1.13
Volume: 11,237.219 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,348,466.3 lbs
Resisting Force: 541,566.83 lbs
Activating Force: $477,623.83 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (216.46483, 1,964.1781) ft
Entry: (496.06625, 2,046.3054) ft
Radius: 140.58973 ft
Center: (338.17312, 2,066.8372) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 223.23242 | $1,961.3749$ | 0 | 585.73832 | 491.49281 | 225 |
|  | 234.63339 | $1,956.6524$ | 0 | $1,837.0901$ | $1,541.5016$ | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 3 | 244.98028 | $1,952.3666$ | 0 | $3,250.8355$ | $2,111.1173$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 254.84972 | $1,948.2786$ | 0 | $5,253.5951$ | $4,408.2897$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 263.16161 | $1,944.8357$ | 0 | $6,658.2807$ | $5,586.9608$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 271.65877 | $1,944.1877$ | 0 | $4,849.2884$ | $1,482.5762$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 282.5 | $1,946.8685$ | 0 | $4,823.7311$ | $1,474.7626$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 293 | $1,949.465$ | 0 | $4,531.5147$ | $1,385.4231$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 301.875 | $1,951.6596$ | 0 | $4,533.9115$ | $1,386.1559$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 311.625 | $1,954.0706$ | 0 | $4,761.3463$ | $1,455.6896$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 321.375 | $1,956.4816$ | 0 | $4,988.781$ | $1,525.2234$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 331.125 | $1,958.8925$ | 0 | $5,216.2158$ | $1,594.7572$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 338.5 | $1,960.7162$ | 0 | $5,388.2497$ | $1,647.3533$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 346 | $1,962.5708$ | 0 | $5,307.4157$ | $1,622.6398$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 355.33333 | $1,964.8788$ | 0 | $5,272.7576$ | $1,612.0438$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 364 | $1,967.0219$ | 0 | $5,481.7427$ | $1,675.9369$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 372.66667 | $1,969.165$ | 0 | $5,690.7278$ | $1,739.8301$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 383.5 | $1,971.8438$ | 0 | $5,726.8694$ | $1,750.8797$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 394.125 | $1,974.4712$ | 0 | $5,712.5365$ | $1,746.4977$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 402.375 | $1,976.5113$ | 0 | $5,820.5726$ | $1,779.5276$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 410.625 | $1,978.5513$ | 0 | $5,928.6087$ | $1,812.5576$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 418.875 | $1,980.5914$ | 0 | $6,036.6448$ | $1,845.5875$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 428 | $1,982.8478$ | 0 | $6,064.0571$ | $1,853.9683$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 436.93027 | $1,985.0561$ | 0 | $6,075.5153$ | $1,857.4714$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 444.79081 | $1,986.9998$ | 0 | $6,151.6433$ | $1,880.7461$ | 150.075 |


| Slice <br> 26 | 452.77213 | $1,989.1161$ | 0 | $6,154.1147$ | $1,881.5017$ | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 27 | 458.41159 | $1,992.5289$ | 0 | $3,020.2274$ | $2,534.2717$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 465.5 | $2,002.6522$ | 0 | $2,458.6349$ | $2,063.0397$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 476.5 | $2,018.3619$ | 0 | $1,539.0432$ | $1,291.4105$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 485.51656 | $2,031.2389$ | 0 | 775.10001 | 650.38613 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 492.54968 | $2,041.2832$ | 0 | 166.80547 | 139.96641 | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf-25 $5^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12${ }^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{( }$(A-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$

## Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $-183.7817,1,893.2287$ ) ft

Left-Zone Right Coordinate: (-50, 1,932.8947) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $-40,1,937.6316$ ) ft
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(-40,1,937.6316) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(84.5043,1,951.4673) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 10
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,892) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,703) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

```
TQs 100-25 (A-Bed 0}
    Model: Spline Data Point Function
    Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclinatio
        Curve Fit to Data: 100 %
            Segment Curvature: 0%
    Y-Intercept: 0.625
    Data Points: Inclination ('), Modifier Factor
        Data Point: (-90, 1)
        Data Point: (-0.9, 1
        Data Point: (0, 0.625)
        Data Point: (1, 0.625)
        Data Point: (1.1, 1)
100 psf (A-Bed 12 - 24*)
    Model: Spline Data Point Function
    Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
        Curve Fit to Data: 100 %
        Segment Curvature: 0%
    Y-Intercept: 1
    Data Points: Inclination (}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}),M\mathrm{ Modifier Facto
        Data Point: (-90, 1)
        Data Point: (11.9, 1)
        Data Point: (12, 0.5
        Data Point: (24, 0.5)
        Data Point: (24.1, 1)
100psf-25 (A-Bed 0}
    Model: Spline Data Point Function
```

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.444
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $0,0.444$ )
Data Point: (1, 0.444)
Data Point: $(1.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.625)$
Data Point: $(24,0.625)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12 ${ }^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $24,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(24,0.75)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$

100 psf $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.444)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\mathbf{8}^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(10,0.625)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -134 | 1,897 |
| Point 2 | -102 | 1,913 |
| Point 3 | -92 | 1,913 |
| Point 4 | -35 | 1,940 |
| Point 5 | -7 | 1,940 |
| Point 6 | 14 | 1,953 |
| Point 7 | 106 | 1,951 |
| Point 8 | 232 | 1,953 |
| Point 9 | 356 | 1,957 |
| Point 10 | 430 | 1,956 |
| Point 11 | 444 | 1,961 |
| Point 12 | 477 | 1,961 |
| Point 13 | 523 | 1,961 |
| Point 14 | 556 | 1,977 |
| Point 15 | 586 | 1,977 |
| Point 16 | 632 | 2,002 |
| Point 17 | 682 | 2,001 |
| Point 18 | 718 | 2,000 |
|  |  |  |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

| Point <br> 19 | 810 | 1,998 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 20 | 810 | 1,975 |
| Point <br> 21 | -200 | 1,885 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,718 |
| Point <br> 23 | 810 | 1,901 |
| Point <br> 24 | -200 | 1,892 |
| Point <br> 25 | 353 | 1,930 |
| Point <br> 26 | 354 | 1,939 |
| Point <br> 27 | 810 | 1,969 |
| Point <br> 28 | 811 | 1,703 |
| Point <br> 29 | -200 | 1,703 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$ | $22,23,27,25,21$ | $1.1817 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | TQs 100-25 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed 0 $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,21,25,26,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 17,412 |
| Region 3 | TQs 100-25 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$ | $25,27,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,26$ | 13,833 |
| Region 4 | Tmc 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed12 $\left.2^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$ | $22,23,28,29$ | $1.0766 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

## Slip Surface: 9,606

F of $\mathrm{S}: 2.77$
Volume: $1,196.0805 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 143,529.66 lbs
Resisting Moment: 17,939,873 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: 6,484,986.1 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 28,611 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: ( $-135.58029,1,896.8803$ ) ft
Entry: (-27.657398, 1,940) ft
Radius: 127.50094 ft
Center: ( $-123.7261,2,023.829$ ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | -134.79015 | $1,896.8115$ | 0 | 23.130741 | 19.408996 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | -132.22222 | $1,896.6239$ | 0 | 160.4751 | 134.6546 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | -128.66667 | $1,896.4362$ | 0 | 395.45432 | 331.82557 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | -125.11111 | $1,896.3479$ | 0 | 614.02221 | 435.95028 | 186.42259 |
| Slice <br> 5 | -121.55556 | $1,896.3589$ | 0 | 820.63137 | 382.66669 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 6 | -118 | $1,896.4691$ | 0 | $1,006.3444$ | 844.42322 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 7 | -114.44444 | $1,896.6788$ | 0 | $1,179.8474$ | 990.00949 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 8 | -110.88889 | $1,896.9885$ | 0 | $1,338.7653$ | $1,123.3574$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 9 | -107.33333 | $1,897.3989$ | 0 | $1,483.3139$ | $1,244.6481$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 10 | -103.77778 | $1,897.9111$ | 0 | $1,613.6657$ | $1,354.0263$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 11 | -100.33333 | $1,898.5038$ | 0 | $1,632.0637$ | $1,369.4641$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 12 | -97 | $1,899.1722$ | 0 | $1,541.747$ | $1,293.6794$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 13 | -93.666667 | $1,899.9339$ | 0 | $1,442.1848$ | $1,210.1368$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 14 | -90.21875 | $1,900.8235$ | 0 | $1,422.8438$ | $1,193.9077$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 15 | -86.65625 | $1,901.8501$ | 0 | $1,480.6904$ | $1,242.4467$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 16 | -83.09375 | $1,902.9903$ | 0 | $1,524.7266$ | $1,279.3976$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 17 | -79.53125 | $1,904.2476$ | 0 | $1,554.8728$ | $1,304.6932$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 18 | -75.96875 | $1,905.6256$ | 0 | $1,571.0094$ | $1,318.2334$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 19 | -72.40625 | $1,907.1286$ | 0 | $1,572.9755$ | $1,319.8832$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 20 | -68.84375 | $1,908.7615$ | 0 | $1,560.5666$ | $1,309.4709$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | -65.28125 | $1,910.5299$ | 0 | $1,533.5312$ | $1,286.7855$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | -61.71875 | $1,912.4404$ | 0 | $1,491.5672$ | $1,251.5735$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | -58.15625 | $1,914.5002$ | 0 | $1,434.3174$ | $1,203.5352$ | 225 |
|  | 1, |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 24 | -54.59375 | $1,916.7182$ | 0 | $1,361.3636$ | $1,142.3197$ | 225 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 25 | -51.03125 | $1,919.1043$ | 0 | $1,272.2201$ | $1,067.5194$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | -47.46875 | $1,921.6704$ | 0 | $1,166.3259$ | 978.66367 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | -43.90625 | $1,924.4305$ | 0 | $1,043.035$ | 875.21029 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | -40.34375 | $1,927.4011$ | 0 | 901.60582 | 756.53711 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | -36.78125 | $1,930.6026$ | 0 | 741.18954 | 621.93187 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | -33.16435 | $1,934.1169$ | 0 | 477.79408 | 400.91683 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | -29.493049 | $1,937.985$ | 0 | 114.51666 | 96.090885 | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12${ }^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{( }$(A-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12 $2^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )

## Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $-183.7817,1,893.2287$ ) ft

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Left-Zone Increment: 50
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordin
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $-40,1,937.6316$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(84.5043,1,951.4673) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 10
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,892) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,703) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

```
TQs 100-25 (A-Bed 0}\mp@subsup{0}{}{\circ}-\mp@subsup{1}{}{\circ}
    Model: Spline Data Point Function
    Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
        Curve Fit to Data: 100%
            Segment Curvature: 0%
    Y-Intercept: 0.625
    Data Points: Inclination( (})\mathrm{ ), Modifier Factor
        Data Point: (-90, 1)
        Data Point: (-0.9, 1
        Data Point: (0, 0.625)
        Data Point:(1,0.625)
        Data Point: (1.1, 1)
```

100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.5)$
Data Point: $(24,0.5)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
$100 \mathrm{psf}-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.444
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.444)$
Data Point: (1, 0.444)
Data Point: $(1.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.625)$
Data Point: $(24,0.625$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $24,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-2^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(24,0.75)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$

100 psf $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.444)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\mathbf{8}^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(10,0.625)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -134 | 1,897 |
| Point 2 | -102 | 1,913 |
| Point 3 | -92 | 1,913 |
| Point 4 | -35 | 1,940 |
| Point 5 | -7 | 1,940 |
| Point 6 | 14 | 1,953 |
| Point 7 | 106 | 1,951 |
| Point 8 | 232 | 1,953 |
| Point 9 | 356 | 1,957 |
| Point 10 | 430 | 1,956 |
| Point 11 | 444 | 1,961 |
| Point 12 | 477 | 1,961 |
| Point 13 | 523 | 1,961 |
| Point 14 | 556 | 1,977 |
| Point 15 | 586 | 1,977 |
| Point 16 | 632 | 2,002 |
| Point 17 | 682 | 2,001 |
| Point 18 | 718 | 2,000 |
|  |  |  |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

| Point <br> 19 | 810 | 1,998 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 20 | 810 | 1,975 |
| Point <br> 21 | -200 | 1,885 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,718 |
| Point <br> 23 | 810 | 1,901 |
| Point <br> 24 | -200 | 1,892 |
| Point <br> 25 | 353 | 1,930 |
| Point <br> 26 | 354 | 1,939 |
| Point <br> 27 | 810 | 1,969 |
| Point <br> 28 | 811 | 1,703 |
| Point <br> 29 | -200 | 1,703 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$ | $22,23,27,25,21$ | $1.1817 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | TQs 100-25 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,21,25,26,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 17,412 |
| Region 3 | TQs 100-25 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$ | $25,27,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,26$ | 13,833 |
| Region 4 | Tmc 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed12 $\left.2^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$ | $22,23,28,29$ | $1.0766 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

## Slip Surface: 2,010

F of S : 1.90
Volume: $4,805.593 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $576,671.16 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 86,314,275 Ibs-ft
Activating Moment: $45,380,337 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 28,611 slip surfaces
Fof $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(-175.27557,1,893.8731) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (33.015783, 1,952.5866) ft
Radius: 191.08825 ft
Center: ( $-113.86136,2,074.8234$ ) ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWPP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength <br> (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | -172.13922 | $1,892.8685$ | 0 | 217.65997 | 182.6384 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | -165.86654 | $1,890.9768$ | 0 | 533.00672 | 447.24575 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | -159.59385 | $1,889.3164$ | 0 | 806.12499 | 676.41918 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | -152.71459 | $1,887.7658$ | 0 | $1,056.5577$ | 886.55718 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | -145.22875 | $1,886.3654$ | 0 | $1,285.9335$ | $1,079.0263$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | -137.74292 | $1,885.2709$ | 0 | $1,468.2738$ | $1,232.028$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | -130.8 | $1,884.5145$ | 0 | $1,769.0414$ | $1,484.402$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | -124.4 | $1,884.0529$ | 0 | $2,188.773$ | $1,836.5986$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | -118 | $1,883.8068$ | 0 | $2,570.0169$ | $2,156.5002$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | -111.6 | $1,883.7753$ | 0 | $2,914.5093$ | $2,445.5637$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | -105.2 | $1,883.9584$ | 0 | $3,223.7228$ | $2,705.0246$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | -97 | $1,884.5467$ | 0 | $3,277.0477$ | $2,749.7695$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | -88.407729 | $1,885.4727$ | 0 | $3,297.8835$ | $2,767.2528$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | -81.223188 | $1,886.5784$ | 0 | $3,497.5775$ | $2,934.816$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | -74.038646 | $1,887.9668$ | 0 | $3,814.555$ | $1,778.7562$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 16 | -66.854105 | $1,889.6443$ | 0 | $3,971.664$ | $1,852.0174$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 17 | -59.669564 | $1,891.6187$ | 0 | $4,091.4028$ | $1,907.8525$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 18 | -52.485022 | $1,893.9$ | 0 | $4,173.3937$ | $1,946.0855$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 19 | -45.300481 | $1,896.4998$ | 0 | $4,217.0584$ | $1,966.4466$ | 100 |
| Slice <br> 20 | -38.354105 | $1,899.324$ | 0 | $3,899.8192$ | $3,272.3369$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | -31.5 | $1,902.4393$ | 0 | $3,676.3553$ | $3,084.8284$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | -24.5 | $1,905.9637$ | 0 | $3,260.9175$ | $2,736.2346$ | 225 |
| -17.5 | $1,909.8604$ | 0 | $2,821.1088$ | $2,367.1913$ | 225 |  |



## 2 - Translational
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constan
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12${ }^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12 ${ }^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotr
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,892) f$

Right Coordinate: $(811,1,703) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (-211, 1,912) ft
Lower Left: (-202, 1,842) ft
Lower Right: $(-119,1,858) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(-97,1,935)$ ft
Lower Left: $(-89,1,852) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(7,1,872) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(1,0.625)$
Data Point: $(1.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.5)$
Data Point: $(24,0.5)$
Data Point: (24.1, 1
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.444
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.444)$
Data Point: (1, 0.444)
Data Point: (1.1, 1)
Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.625)$
Data Point: $(24,0.625)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12 ${ }^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 4}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: (12, 0.425
Data Point: $(24,0.425)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12 ${ }^{\circ}-4^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

2-Translational

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(24,0.75)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.444)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -134 | 1,897 |
| Point 2 | -102 | 1,913 |
| Point 3 | -92 | 1,913 |
| Point 4 | -35 | 1,940 |
| Point 5 | -7 | 1,940 |
| Point 6 | 14 | 1,953 |
| Point 7 | 106 | 1,951 |
| Point 8 | 232 | 1,953 |
| Point 9 | 356 | 1,957 |
|  |  |  |

2-Translational

| Point <br> 10 | 430 | 1,956 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 11 | 444 | 1,961 |
| Point <br> 12 | 477 | 1,961 |
| Point <br> 13 | 523 | 1,961 |
| Point <br> 14 | 556 | 1,977 |
| Point <br> 15 | 586 | 1,977 |
| Point <br> 16 | 632 | 2,002 |
| Point <br> 17 | 682 | 2,001 |
| Point <br> 18 | 718 | 2,000 |
| Point <br> 19 | 810 | 1,998 |
| Point <br> 20 | 810 | 1,975 |
| Point <br> 21 | -200 | 1,885 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,718 |
| Point <br> 23 | 810 | 1,901 |
| Point <br> 24 | -200 | 1,892 |
| Point <br> 25 | 353 | 1,930 |
| Point <br> 26 | 354 | 1,939 |
| Point <br> 27 | 810 | 1,969 |
| Point <br> 28 | 811 | 1,703 |
| Point <br> 29 | -200 | 1,703 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$ | $22,23,27,25,21$ | $1.1817 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,21,25,26,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 17,412 |
| Region 3 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$ | $25,27,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,26$ | 13,833 |
|  |  |  |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc 150-17 }{ }^{\circ} \text { (A-Bed } 12^{\circ} \\ & \left.-24^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 22,23,28,29 | $1.0766 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 82,576
F of S: 2.10
Volume: $1,528.6087 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $183,433.04 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $108,394.45 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $51,627.123 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (-131.15023, 1,898.4249) ft
Entry: $(-23.7,1,940) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 61.907579 ft
Center: $(-89.489932,1,950.3938) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 -129.32834 $1,898.4541$ 0 104.6639 48.80558 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 2 -125.68456 $1,898.5127$ 0 315.51615 147.1276 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 3 -122.04078 $1,898.5712$ 0 526.3684 245.44962 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 4 -118.397 $1,898.6297$ 0 737.22065 343.77164 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 5 -114.75322 $1,898.6882$ 0 948.0729 442.09365 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 6 -111.10945 $1,898.7467$ 0 $1,158.9252$ 540.41567 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 7 -107.46567 $1,898.8052$ 0 $1,369.7774$ 638.73769 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 8 -103.82189 $1,898.8637$ 0 $1,580.6296$ 737.05971 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 9 -100.33333 $1,898.9198$ 0 $1,682.8555$ 784.72842 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 10 -97 $1,898.9733$ 0 $1,676.455$ 781.74381 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 11 -93.666667 $1,899.0268$ 0 $1,670.0545$ 778.75921 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 12 -90.2625 $1,899.0815$ 0 $1,761.9298$ 821.60135 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 13 -86.7875 $1,899.1373$ 0 $1,952.0808$ 910.27022 99.9 <br>  -83.3125 $1,899.1931$ 0 $2,142.2318$ 998.9391 99.9 |


| Slice <br> 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 15 | -79.8375 | $1,899.2489$ | 0 | $2,332.3828$ | $1,087.608$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 16 | -76.3625 | $1,899.3047$ | 0 | $2,522.5339$ | $1,176.2769$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 17 | -72.8875 | $1,899.3605$ | 0 | $2,712.6849$ | $1,264.9457$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 18 | -69.4125 | $1,899.4163$ | 0 | $2,902.8359$ | $1,353.6146$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 19 | -65.9375 | $1,899.4721$ | 0 | $3,092.9869$ | $1,442.2835$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 20 | -62.375 | $1,901.325$ | 0 | $2,126.7401$ | $1,784.5468$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | -58.725 | $1,904.975$ | 0 | $1,962.0909$ | $1,646.3897$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | -55.075 | $1,908.625$ | 0 | $1,797.4417$ | $1,508.2327$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | -51.425 | $1,912.275$ | 0 | $1,632.7925$ | $1,370.0756$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | -47.775 | $1,915.925$ | 0 | $1,468.1433$ | $1,231.9185$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | -44.125 | $1,919.575$ | 0 | $1,303.4941$ | $1,093.7614$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | -40.475 | $1,923.225$ | 0 | $1,138.8448$ | 955.60429 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | -36.825 | $1,926.875$ | 0 | 974.19563 | 817.4472 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | -33.116667 | $1,930.5833$ | 0 | 730.45466 | 612.92423 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | -29.35 | $1,934.35$ | 0 | 407.62191 | 342.0354 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | -25.583333 | $1,938.1167$ | 0 | 84.789167 | 71.146559 | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constan
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5} \mathbf{N}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12${ }^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,892) f$

Right Coordinate: $(811,1,703) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(-211,1,912) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (-202, 1,842) ft
Lower Right: $(-119,1,858) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(-97,1,935)$ ft
Lower Left: $(-89,1,852) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(7,1,872) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(1,0.625)$
Data Point: $(1.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.5)$
Data Point: $(24,0.5)$
Data Point: (24.1, 1
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.444
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.444)$
Data Point: $(1,0.444)$
Data Point: (1.1, 1)
Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.625)$
Data Point: $(24,0.625)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12 ${ }^{\circ}-\mathbf{2 4}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: (12, 0.425
Data Point: $(24,0.425)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed12 ${ }^{\circ}-4^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

2-Translational

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(11.9,1)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(24,0.75)$
Data Point: $(24.1,1)$
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.444)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444)$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(10,0.625)$
Data Point: (10.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -134 | 1,897 |
| Point 2 | -102 | 1,913 |
| Point 3 | -92 | 1,913 |
| Point 4 | -35 | 1,940 |
| Point 5 | -7 | 1,940 |
| Point 6 | 14 | 1,953 |
| Point 7 | 106 | 1,951 |
| Point 8 | 232 | 1,953 |
| Point 9 | 356 | 1,957 |
|  |  |  |

2-Translational

| Point <br> 10 | 430 | 1,956 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 11 | 444 | 1,961 |
| Point <br> 12 | 477 | 1,961 |
| Point <br> 13 | 523 | 1,961 |
| Point <br> 14 | 556 | 1,977 |
| Point <br> 15 | 586 | 1,977 |
| Point <br> 16 | 632 | 2,002 |
| Point <br> 17 | 682 | 2,001 |
| Point <br> 18 | 718 | 2,000 |
| Point <br> 19 | 810 | 1,998 |
| Point <br> 20 | 810 | 1,975 |
| Point <br> 21 | -200 | 1,885 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,718 |
| Point <br> 23 | 810 | 1,901 |
| Point <br> 24 | -200 | 1,892 |
| Point <br> 25 | 353 | 1,930 |
| Point <br> 26 | 354 | 1,939 |
| Point <br> 27 | 810 | 1,969 |
| Point <br> 28 | 811 | 1,703 |
| Point <br> 29 | -200 | 1,703 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.12^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\right)$ | $22,23,27,25,21$ | $1.1817 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-1^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,21,25,26,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 17,412 |
| Region 3 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$ | $25,27,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,26$ | 13,833 |
|  |  |  |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc 150-17 }{ }^{\circ} \text { (A-Bed } 12^{\circ} \\ & \left.-24^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 22,23,28,29 | $1.0766 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 82,576
Fof $S$ : 1.42
Volume: $1,528.6087 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $183,433.04 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $102,236.95 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: 71,915.356 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (-131.15023, 1,898.4249) ft
Entry: $(-23.7,1,940) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 61.907579 ft
Center: $(-89.489932,1,950.3938) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 -129.32834 $1,898.4541$ 0 104.1289 48.556104 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 2 -125.68456 $1,898.5127$ 0 314.62741 146.71317 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 3 -122.04078 $1,898.5712$ 0 525.12593 244.87024 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 4 -118.397 $1,898.6297$ 0 735.62444 343.02731 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 5 -114.75322 $1,898.6882$ 0 946.12295 441.18438 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 6 -111.10945 $1,898.7467$ 0 $1,156.6215$ 539.34145 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 7 -107.46567 $1,898.8052$ 0 $1,367.12$ 637.49852 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 8 -103.82189 $1,898.8637$ 0 $1,577.6185$ 735.65559 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 9 -100.33333 $1,898.9198$ 0 $1,679.6729$ 783.24432 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 10 -97 $1,898.9733$ 0 $1,673.2831$ 780.26472 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 11 -93.666667 $1,899.0268$ 0 $1,666.8933$ 777.28513 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 12 -90.2625 $1,899.0815$ 0 $1,758.6145$ 820.05539 99.9 <br> Slice <br> 13 -86.7875 $1,899.1373$ 0 $1,948.4465$ 908.57551 99.9 <br>  -83.3125 $1,899.1931$ 0 $2,138.2785$ 997.09563 99.9 |


| Slice <br> 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 15 | -79.8375 | $1,899.2489$ | 0 | $2,328.1105$ | $1,085.6158$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 16 | -76.3625 | $1,899.3047$ | 0 | $2,517.9425$ | $1,174.1359$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 17 | -72.8875 | $1,899.3605$ | 0 | $2,707.7745$ | $1,262.656$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 18 | -69.4125 | $1,899.4163$ | 0 | $2,897.6065$ | $1,351.1761$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 19 | -65.9375 | $1,899.4721$ | 0 | $3,087.4386$ | $1,439.6962$ | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 20 | -62.375 | $1,901.325$ | 0 | $1,841.9307$ | $1,545.5634$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | -58.725 | $1,904.975$ | 0 | $1,696.8622$ | $1,423.8365$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | -55.075 | $1,908.625$ | 0 | $1,551.7938$ | $1,302.1096$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | -51.425 | $1,912.275$ | 0 | $1,406.7253$ | $1,180.3827$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | -47.775 | $1,915.925$ | 0 | $1,261.6569$ | $1,058.6558$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | -44.125 | $1,919.575$ | 0 | $1,116.5884$ | 936.92891 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | -40.475 | $1,923.225$ | 0 | 971.51994 | 815.20202 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | -36.825 | $1,926.875$ | 0 | 826.45148 | 693.47513 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | -33.116667 | $1,930.5833$ | 0 | 611.69717 | 513.27487 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | -29.35 | $1,934.35$ | 0 | 327.25701 | 274.60124 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | -25.583333 | $1,938.1167$ | 0 | 42.816852 | 35.927605 | 225 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': 11
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: 0
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $(-143,1,955.5472) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(117,2,000) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(144,2,007.5862) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(446.0769,2,094.1331) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}\right)$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}\right)$

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(7,0.425)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed0응 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

## 150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $0,0.75$ )
Data Point: $(5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425)
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
$100 \mathrm{psf}-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
| Point 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| Point 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point 7 | 136 | 2,004 |


| Point <br> 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point <br> 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point <br> 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point <br> 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point <br> 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point <br> 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point <br> 15 | 810 | 2,090 |
| Point <br> 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| Point <br> 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point <br> 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point <br> 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point <br> 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point <br> 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point <br> 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
| Point <br> 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| Point <br> 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
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| Point <br> 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point <br> 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point <br> 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point <br> 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point <br> 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
| Point <br> 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| Point <br> 41 | 380 | 2,058 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-170 ( A -Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | 1.5359e+005 |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{( }$( A -Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{7}^{\circ}$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ ( A - $\mathrm{Bed6}^{\circ} \mathrm{7}^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{( }$( $\mathrm{CBed6}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{7}^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 | Fill | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 | Fill | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 73,962
Fof S: 1.95
Volume: $4,985.6137 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Volume: $4,985.6137 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $598,273.65 \mathrm{lbs}$
Weight: $598,273.65 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $1.7198055 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Resisting Moment: $1.7198055 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lb}$
Activating Moment: $88,332,379 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $88,332,379 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: $(11.062112,1,957.0342) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(274.42074,2,057) \mathrm{ft}$
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1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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Radius: 425.87562 ft
Center: $(0.11326597,2,382.769) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 11.485152 | 1,957.0455 | 0 | 23.214728 | 19.47947 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 16.681144 | 1,957.2426 | 0 | 340.67392 | 158.85886 | 100 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 26.227048 | 1,957.7217 | 0 | 901.97821 | 420.59934 | 100 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 36.208551 | 1,958.458 | 0 | 1,467.9654 | 684.52352 | 100 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 43.208551 | 1,959.0833 | 0 | 1,815.9215 | 1,523.7391 | 225 |
| Slice $6$ | 49 | 1,959.7277 | 0 | 1,894.3848 | 883.36615 | 99.9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 57 | 1,960.7291 | 0 | 1,768.574 | 824.69962 | 99.9 |
| Slice $8$ | 65 | 1,961.885 | 0 | 1,625.9435 | 758.18992 | 99.9 |
| Slice $9$ | 74.487111 | 1,963.4749 | 0 | 1,748.9389 | 815.54359 | 99.9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 84.476799 | 1,965.3583 | 0 | 2,047.0582 | 1,329.3752 | 200 |
| Slice $11$ | 93.481955 | 1,967.2801 | 0 | 2,318.6769 | 1,505.7664 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | 102.48711 | 1,969.407 | 0 | 2,563.4837 | 1,664.7458 | 200 |
| Slice $13$ | 111.49227 | 1,971.7423 | 0 | 2,781.578 | 1,806.3779 | 200 |
| Slice $14$ | 120.49742 | 1,974.2893 | 0 | 2,973.0171 | 1,930.6999 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 130.5 | 1,977.3853 | 0 | 2,854.8839 | 1,853.9833 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 140.14286 | 1,980.5968 | 0 | 2,684.1928 | 1,743.1352 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 148.42857 | 1,983.5785 | 0 | 2,741.7028 | 1,780.4826 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 156.71429 | 1,986.756 | 0 | 2,777.1612 | 1,803.5096 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 165 | 1,990.134 | 0 | 2,790.4633 | 1,812.148 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 173.28571 | 1,993.7179 | 0 | 2,781.4751 | 1,806.311 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 181.57143 | 1,997.5132 | 0 | 2,750.0323 | 1,785.8919 | 200 |
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| 1 - Circular | ode of Failu |  |  |  |  |  | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice $22$ | 189.85714 | 2,001.5265 | 0 | 2,695.9395 | 1,750.7636 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | 199.5 | 2,006.5028 | 0 | 2,350.3947 | 1,526.3642 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 209.5 | 2,011.9584 | 0 | 2,000.7209 | 1,299.2834 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | 218.5 | 2,017.1876 | 0 | 1,906.7696 | 1,238.2706 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ | 227.5 | 2,022.7176 | 0 | 1,783.8154 | 1,158.4232 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 236.5 | 2,028.5627 | 0 | 1,631.3352 | 1,059.4015 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 245.5 | 2,034.7387 | 0 | 1,448.7448 | 940.82588 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | 254.5 | 2,041.2636 | 0 | 1,235.3954 | 802.27518 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 30 \end{aligned}$ | 262.85519 | 2,047.6381 | 0 | 827.0096 | 537.06631 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 31 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 270.56556 | 2,053.8303 | 0 | 232.37144 | 150.90378 | 200 |  |
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## Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SOPE International Ltd
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constan
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 $6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf- $1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-BedO ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 $6^{\circ}-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.425$ )
Data Point: (7, 0.425)

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## 100 psf (A-Bedo ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: ( $-0.9,1$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $5,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-0.9, 1

## Data Point: $(0,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: $(5,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425)
Data Point: (5.1, 1)
$100 p s f-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: (13, 0.444)
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
| Point 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| Point 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point 15 | 810 | 2,090 |


| Point <br> 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point <br> 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point <br> 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point <br> 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point <br> 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point <br> 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
| Point <br> 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| Point <br> 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point <br> 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point <br> 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point <br> 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point <br> 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point <br> 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
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| Point <br> 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 41 | 380 | 2,058 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed0 $\left.0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$ | $20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2$ | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-BedO $\left.0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$ | $23,22,21,24$ | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed6 $\left.6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$ | $19,18,17,16,26,34,33$ | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | $26,25,35,34$ | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed6 $\left.6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$ | $15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25$ | $8,477.5$ |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed6 $\left.6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$ | $13,12,39,41,28$ | $3,375.5$ |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | $27,28,41,40$ | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$ | $2,1,32,5,4,3$ | 769.03 |
| Region 9 | Fill | $5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6$ | $9,276.8$ |
| Region 10 | Fill | $37,38,40,41,39,36,31$ | $1,921.5$ |

Current Slip Surface
Slip Surface:
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.33$
Volume: $4,985.6138 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 598,273.65 lbs
Resisting Moment: $1.635034 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $1.2270073 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Exit: (11.062112, 1,957.0342) ft
Entry: $(274.42074,2,057)$ ft
Radius: 425.87562 ft
Center: $(0.11326597,2,382.769) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 11.485152 | $1,957.0455$ | 0 | 21.700369 | 18.208771 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 16.681144 | $1,957.2426$ | 0 | 338.32928 | 157.76554 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 26.227048 | $1,957.7217$ | 0 | 894.59485 | 417.15643 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 36.208551 | $1,958.458$ | 0 | $1,452.6829$ | 677.39714 | 100 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 43.208551 | $1,959.0833$ | 0 | $1,776.4992$ | $1,490.6599$ | 225 |


| Slice <br> 6 | 49 | $1,959.7277$ | 0 | $1,868.6313$ | 871.35709 | 99.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 7 | 57 | $1,960.7291$ | 0 | $1,740.5085$ | 811.61246 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 65 | $1,961.885$ | 0 | $1,596.3436$ | 744.38722 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 74.487111 | $1,963.4749$ | 0 | $1,712.8834$ | 798.73067 | 99.9 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 84.476799 | $1,965.3583$ | 0 | $1,980.6949$ | $1,286.2783$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 93.481955 | $1,967.2801$ | 0 | $2,237.1954$ | $1,452.8517$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 102.48711 | $1,969.407$ | 0 | $2,466.2917$ | $1,601.6286$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 111.49227 | $1,971.7423$ | 0 | $2,668.3053$ | $1,732.8177$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 120.49742 | $1,974.2893$ | 0 | $2,843.5097$ | $1,846.5968$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 130.5 | $1,977.3853$ | 0 | $2,720.1762$ | $1,766.5031$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 140.14286 | $1,980.5968$ | 0 | $2,547.7601$ | $1,654.5347$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 148.42857 | $1,983.5785$ | 0 | $2,594.7472$ | $1,685.0485$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 156.71429 | $1,986.756$ | 0 | $2,620.4747$ | $1,701.7561$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 165 | $1,990.134$ | 0 | $2,625.0033$ | $1,704.697$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 173.28571 | $1,993.7179$ | 0 | $2,608.3675$ | $1,693.8937$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 181.57143 | $1,997.5132$ | 0 | $2,570.5769$ | $1,669.3522$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 189.85714 | $2,001.5265$ | 0 | $2,511.6151$ | $1,631.0619$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 199.5 | $2,006.5028$ | 0 | $2,178.8795$ | $1,414.9809$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 209.5 | $2,011.9584$ | 0 | $1,844.0994$ | $1,197.5722$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 218.5 | $2,017.1876$ | 0 | $1,749.7803$ | $1,136.3206$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 227.5 | $2,022.7176$ | 0 | $1,629.0525$ | $1,057.9191$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 236.5 | $2,028.5627$ | 0 | $1,481.7076$ | 962.23216 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 245.5 | $2,034.7387$ | 0 | $1,307.5028$ | 849.10223 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 254.5 | $2,041.2636$ | 0 | $1,106.1616$ | 718.34975 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 30 | 262.85519 | $2,047.6381$ | 0 | 728.36017 | 473.00262 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 31 | 270.56556 | $2,053.8303$ | 0 | 183.77153 | 119.34263 | 200 |

## Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz



## 2 - Translational Below Key <br> Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
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Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 16
Date: 3/25/2016
Time: 3:10:06 PM
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Last Solved Date: 3/25/2016
Last Solved Time: 3:14:40 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational Below Key
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed0} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: 0
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(66,1,973) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(68,1,898) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: ( $276,1,938$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 135
Ending Angle: 180
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(311,2,024) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(332,1,933) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(460,1,948) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: (7, 0.425)
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## 100 psf (A-Bed0o․․)

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: (5, 0.75
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425)
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.444$ )
Data Point: $(13,0.444$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
| Point 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| Point 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point 15 | 810 | 2,090 |
| Point 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| Point 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
| Point 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| Point 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
| Point 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| Point 41 | 380 | 2,058 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ ( A -Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-170 (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} \mathbf{7}^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 | Fill | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 | Fill | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 109,511
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.91$
Volume: $17,572.776 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $2,108,733.1 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 892,277.22 lbs
Activating Force: $466,878.37 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (70.045537, 1,976.5228) ft
Entry: (444.30533, 2,094.1809) ft
Radius: 190.20752 ft
Center: (229.43379, 2,123.5955) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 78.522769 | $1,973.0114$ | 0 | $1,132.4216$ | 735.40318 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 93.333333 | $1,970.2467$ | 0 | $2,055.832$ | $1,335.0729$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 106 | $1,971.7402$ | 0 | $2,614.2742$ | $1,697.7295$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 118.66667 | $1,973.2337$ | 0 | $3,172.7165$ | $2,060.3862$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 130.5 | $1,974.629$ | 0 | $3,377.1123$ | $2,193.1224$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 142.72551 | $1,976.0704$ | 0 | $3,558.6593$ | $2,311.0204$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 156.17653 | $1,977.6564$ | 0 | $4,071.4041$ | $2,644.0007$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 169.62755 | $1,979.2424$ | 0 | $4,584.1488$ | $2,976.981$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 9 | 183.07857 | $1,980.8283$ | 0 | $5,096.8935$ | $3,309.9614$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 10 | 191.90204 | $1,981.8687$ | 0 | $5,548.0244$ | $1,696.2013$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 199.5 | $1,982.7645$ | 0 | $5,553.279$ | $1,697.8078$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 211.75 | $1,984.2089$ | 0 | $5,780.6734$ | $1,767.3292$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 225.25 | $1,985.8006$ | 0 | $6,388.2225$ | $1,953.0756$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 238.75 | $1,987.3924$ | 0 | $6,995.7715$ | $2,138.822$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 252.25 | $1,988.9841$ | 0 | $7,603.3206$ | $2,324.5684$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 265 | $1,990.4874$ | 0 | $7,823.7713$ | $2,391.9669$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 272 | $1,991.3128$ | 0 | $7,726.5603$ | $2,362.2465$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 280.16667 | $1,992.2757$ | 0 | $7,613.1474$ | $2,327.5727$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 294.5 | $1,993.9657$ | 0 | $7,414.0962$ | $2,266.7167$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 308.83333 | $1,995.6557$ | 0 | $7,215.045$ | $2,205.8606$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 324.5 | $1,997.5029$ | 0 | $6,997.4774$ | $2,139.3435$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 338.75 | $1,999.1831$ | 0 | $7,070.4818$ | $2,161.6632$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 350.25 | $2,000.539$ | 0 | $7,452.5744$ | $2,278.4807$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 357 | $2,001.3349$ | 0 | $7,676.8462$ | $2,347.0474$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 366 | $2,002.396$ | 0 | $8,070.1007$ | $2,467.2774$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 377 | $2,003.693$ | 0 | $8,565.1407$ | $2,618.6263$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 380.65 | $2,004.1234$ | 0 | $8,729.4039$ | $2,668.8466$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 387.2948 | $2,012.7615$ | 0 | $4,980.3847$ | $4,179.039$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 399.2844 | $2,029.8844$ | 0 | $4,159.1546$ | $3,489.9451$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 405.68846 | $2,039.0303$ | 0 | $5,332.3913$ | $1,036.5119$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 410.04886 | $2,045.2576$ | 0 | $3,421.8405$ | $2,871.2651$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 417.43289 | $2,055.8031$ | 0 | $2,782.5531$ | $2,334.8392$ | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 33 | 421.77934 | $2,062.0105$ | 0 | $3,337.5479$ | 648.75359 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 34 | 431.55828 | $2,075.9763$ | 0 | $1,265.6468$ | $1,062.0038$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 442.3645 | $2,091.4091$ | 0 | 127.77485 | 82.97796 | 200 |

## Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational Below Key Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 2 - Translational Below Key
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1{ }^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constan
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-BedO ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

2 - Translational Below Key Seismic

Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: ( $810,2,090$ ) ft

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mathbf{7}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.425$ )
Data Point: (7, 0.425)

2 - Translational Below Key Seismic

TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## 100 psf (A-Bedo ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: ( $-0.9,1$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$ Data Point: ( $5,0.625$ ) Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-0.9, 1

## Data Point: ( $0,0.75$ ) <br> Data Point: $(5,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425)
Data Point: (5.1, 1)
$100 p s f-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: (13, 0.444)
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
| Point 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| Point 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point 15 | 810 | 2,090 |


| Point <br> 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point <br> 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point <br> 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point <br> 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point <br> 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point <br> 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
| Point <br> 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| Point <br> 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point <br> 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point <br> 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point <br> 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point <br> 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point <br> 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
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| Point <br> 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 41 | 380 | 2,058 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ ( A -Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-170 ( A -Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{(A-B e d 6}{ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\text {(A-Bed6 }}{ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{(A-B e d 6}{ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 | Fill | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 | Fill | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 1
$F$ of $S$ : 1.18
Volume: $17,572.776 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $2,108,733.1 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $850,911.89 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $723,551.56 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Exit: (70.045537, 1,976.5228) ft
Entry: (444.30533, 2,094.1809) ft
Radius: 190.20752 ft
Center: $(229.43379,2,123.5955) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

| X (ft) | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 78.522769 | $1,973.0114$ | 0 | $1,296.8419$ | 842.17901 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 93.333333 | $1,970.2467$ | 0 | $2,000.202$ | $1,298.9464$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 106 | $1,971.7402$ | 0 | $2,545.5017$ | $1,653.0681$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 118.66667 | $1,973.2337$ | 0 | $3,090.8016$ | $2,007.19$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 130.5 | $1,974.629$ | 0 | $3,290.3871$ | $2,136.8024$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 6 | 142.72551 | $1,976.0704$ | 0 | $3,467.6616$ | $2,251.9258$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 7 | 156.17653 | $1,977.6564$ | 0 | $3,968.3394$ | $2,577.0697$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 169.62755 | $1,979.2424$ | 0 | $4,469.0171$ | $2,902.2136$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 183.07857 | $1,980.8283$ | 0 | $4,969.6949$ | $3,227.3576$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 191.90204 | $1,981.8687$ | 0 | $5,478.1816$ | $1,674.8482$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 199.5 | $1,982.7645$ | 0 | $5,483.3761$ | $1,676.4363$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 211.75 | $1,984.2089$ | 0 | $5,708.1669$ | $1,745.1618$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 225.25 | $1,985.8006$ | 0 | $6,308.7598$ | $1,928.7814$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 238.75 | $1,987.3924$ | 0 | $6,909.3526$ | $2,112.4011$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 252.25 | $1,988.9841$ | 0 | $7,509.9455$ | $2,296.0207$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 265 | $1,990.4874$ | 0 | $7,727.8721$ | $2,362.6476$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 272 | $1,991.3128$ | 0 | $7,631.7739$ | $2,333.2674$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 280.16667 | $1,992.2757$ | 0 | $7,519.6597$ | $2,298.9907$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 294.5 | $1,993.9657$ | 0 | $7,322.8875$ | $2,238.8314$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 308.83333 | $1,995.6557$ | 0 | $7,126.1154$ | $2,178.6721$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 324.5 | $1,997.5029$ | 0 | $6,911.0389$ | $2,112.9166$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 338.75 | $1,999.1831$ | 0 | $6,983.2075$ | $2,134.9808$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 350.25 | $2,000.539$ | 0 | $7,360.9253$ | $2,250.4607$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 357 | $2,001.3349$ | 0 | $7,582.629$ | $2,318.2423$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 366 | $2,002.396$ | 0 | $7,971.381$ | $2,437.0957$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 377 | $2,003.693$ | 0 | $8,460.7531$ | $2,586.7118$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 380.65 | $2,004.1234$ | 0 | $8,623.1354$ | $2,636.3571$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 387.2948 | $2,012.7615$ | 0 | $3,960.2784$ | $3,323.0681$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 399.2844 | $2,029.8844$ | 0 | $3,298.6628$ | $2,767.9067$ | 225 |
|  | 257 |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice <br> 30 | 405.68846 | $2,039.0303$ | 0 | $4,883.5655$ | 949.26896 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 31 | 410.04886 | $2,045.2576$ | 0 | $2,704.6534$ | $2,269.4736$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 417.43289 | $2,055.8031$ | 0 | $2,189.6181$ | $1,837.3078$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 421.77934 | $2,062.0105$ | 0 | $3,035.4$ | 590.022 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 431.55828 | $2,075.9763$ | 0 | 967.53849 | 811.86119 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 442.3645 | $2,091.4091$ | 0 | 53.789956 | 34.931606 | 200 |



## 3 - Translational Upper Clay <br> merald

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 16
Date: 3/25/2016
Time: 3:19:32 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11777
File Name: Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 19-19 results\Latest Update 3-25-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/25/2016
Last Solved Time: 3:19:54 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

3 - Translational Upper Clay
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constan Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right.$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: 0
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(268,2,056.1838) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $270,2,035.5966$ ) ft
Lower Right: $(378,2,049) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135{ }^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(379.3498,2,068) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(381,2,050) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(584,2,075) \mathrm{ft}$
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 45
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf- $-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: (7, 0.425)
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed0o․ ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: (5, 0.75
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425)
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.444$ )
Data Point: $(13,0.444$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
| Point 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| Point 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point 15 | 810 | 2,090 |
| Point 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| Point 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
| Point 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| Point 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
| Point 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| Point 41 | 380 | 2,058 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-170 ( A -Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right.$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-170 (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 60-13 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 | Fill | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 | Fill | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 45,149
F of S: 1.73
Volume: $1,446.3483 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $173,561.79 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $84,158.986 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $48,538.805 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (339.06665, 2,059.4267) ft
Entry: (425.14631, 2,094.6987) ft
Radius: 52.408887 ft
Center: (371.26663, 2,103.5168) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 340.11149 | $2,058.9939$ | 0 | 177.87364 | 115.51249 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 342.6207 | $2,057.9545$ | 0 | 468.34829 | 304.14893 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 345.54944 | $2,056.7414$ | 0 | 807.38839 | 524.32415 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 348.47817 | $2,055.5283$ | 0 | $1,146.4285$ | 744.49937 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 351.4069 | $2,054.3152$ | 0 | $1,485.4686$ | 964.67458 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 354.33563 | $2,053.102$ | 0 | $1,824.5087$ | $1,184.8498$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 356.9 | $2,052.6722$ | 0 | $1,553.8778$ | $1,009.1$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 359.43641 | $2,053.0797$ | 0 | $1,638.8191$ | $1,064.2615$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 9 | 362.30922 | $2,053.5413$ | 0 | $1,749.124$ | $1,135.8944$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 10 | 365.18204 | $2,054.0029$ | 0 | $1,859.4289$ | $1,207.5272$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 368.05485 | $2,054.4645$ | 0 | $1,969.7338$ | $1,279.1601$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 370.92767 | $2,054.9261$ | 0 | $2,080.0387$ | $1,350.7929$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 373.80048 | $2,055.3877$ | 0 | $2,190.3435$ | $1,422.4257$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 376.42767 | $2,055.8098$ | 0 | $2,391.2045$ | 464.80306 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 378.80922 | $2,056.1924$ | 0 | $2,486.4548$ | 483.31785 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 381.47428 | $2,056.6206$ | 0 | $2,593.0438$ | 504.03666 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 384.42284 | $2,057.0944$ | 0 | $2,710.9715$ | 526.95948 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 387.3714 | $2,057.5681$ | 0 | $2,828.8992$ | 549.8823 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 390.31996 | $2,058.0419$ | 0 | $2,946.8269$ | 572.80512 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 393.26852 | $2,058.5156$ | 0 | $3,064.7545$ | 595.72793 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 396.21708 | $2,058.9894$ | 0 | $3,182.6822$ | 618.65075 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 399.16564 | $2,059.4631$ | 0 | $3,300.6099$ | 641.57357 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 400.97346 | $2,060.1763$ | 0 | $2,819.1823$ | 547.99354 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 402.78183 | $2,062.759$ | 0 | $1,775.5906$ | $1,489.8974$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 405.73149 | $2,066.9715$ | 0 | $1,581.7606$ | $1,327.2548$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 408.68116 | $2,071.1841$ | 0 | $1,387.9307$ | $1,164.6121$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 412.078 | $2,076.0353$ | 0 | $1,297.1631$ | 842.38757 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 415.39329 | $2,080.77$ | 0 | 999.75259 | 649.24692 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 418.17987 | $2,084.7496$ | 0 | 683.33531 | 443.76314 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 420.96644 | $2,088.7293$ | 0 | 366.91804 | 238.27936 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 423.75302 | $2,092.7089$ | 0 | 50.500762 | 32.795578 | 200 |
|  | 0, |  |  |  |  |  |
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\section*{3 - Translational Upper Clay Seismic

## Reporseration

## Reporseration

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 16
Date: 3/25/2016
Time: 3:19:32 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11777
File Name: Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 19-19 results\Latest Update 3-25-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/25/2016
Last Solved Time: 3:19:54 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: ps
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

3 - Translational Upper Clay Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 3 - Translational Upper Clay
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constan
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 $6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf- $1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-BedO ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

3 - Translational Upper Clay Seismic

C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bedo ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.425$ )
Data Point: (7, 0.425)

3 - Translational Upper Clay Seismic

Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## 100 psf (A-Bedo ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$ Data Point: ( $5,0.625$ ) Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1

## Data Point: $(0,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: $(5,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425)
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right.$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: (13, 0.444)
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
| Point 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| Point 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point 15 | 810 | 2,090 |


| Point <br> 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point <br> 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point <br> 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point <br> 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point <br> 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point <br> 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
| Point <br> 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| Point <br> 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point <br> 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point <br> 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point <br> 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point <br> 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point <br> 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
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| Point <br> 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 41 | 380 | 2,058 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-170 ( A -Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{(A-B e d 6}{ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{(A-B e d 6}{ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{(A-B e d 6}{ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 | Fill | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 | Fill | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

Current Slip Surface
slip Surface:
Fof S : 1.21
Volume: $1,446.3483 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $173,561.79 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $81,242.323 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $66,989.512 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Exit: (339.06665, 2,059.4267) ft
Entry: (425.14631, 2,094.6987) ft
Radius: 52.408887 ft
Center: (371.26663, 2,103.5168) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice <br> 1 | 340.11149 | $2,058.9939$ | 0 | 219.33856 | 142.44013 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 342.6207 | $2,057.9545$ | 0 | 534.6041 | 347.17597 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 345.54944 | $2,056.7414$ | 0 | 902.57992 | 586.14225 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 348.47817 | $2,055.5283$ | 0 | $1,270.5553$ | 825.10823 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 351.4069 | $2,054.3152$ | 0 | $1,638.5314$ | $1,064.0747$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 6 | 354.33563 | $2,053.102$ | 0 | $2,006.5072$ | $1,303.041$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 7 | 356.9 | $2,052.6722$ | 0 | $1,509.7522$ | 980.44452 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 359.43641 | $2,053.0797$ | 0 | $1,592.6802$ | $1,034.2986$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 362.30922 | $2,053.5413$ | 0 | $1,700.3708$ | $1,104.2337$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 365.18204 | $2,054.0029$ | 0 | $1,808.0615$ | $1,174.1689$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 368.05485 | $2,054.4645$ | 0 | $1,915.7521$ | $1,244.104$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 370.92767 | $2,054.9261$ | 0 | $2,023.4428$ | $1,314.0391$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 373.80048 | $2,055.3877$ | 0 | $2,131.1335$ | $1,383.9742$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 376.42767 | $2,055.8098$ | 0 | $2,367.4456$ | 460.18481 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 378.80922 | $2,056.1924$ | 0 | $2,461.9802$ | 478.56048 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 381.47428 | $2,056.6206$ | 0 | $2,567.7687$ | 499.12367 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 384.42284 | $2,057.0944$ | 0 | $2,684.8105$ | 521.8743 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 387.3714 | $2,057.5681$ | 0 | $2,801.8524$ | 544.62493 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 390.31996 | $2,058.0419$ | 0 | $2,918.8942$ | 567.37555 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 393.26852 | $2,058.5156$ | 0 | $3,035.936$ | 590.12618 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 396.21708 | $2,058.9894$ | 0 | $3,152.9779$ | 612.87681 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 399.16564 | $2,059.4631$ | 0 | $3,270.0197$ | 635.62744 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 400.97346 | $2,060.1763$ | 0 | $2,619.1381$ | 509.10888 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 402.78183 | $2,062.759$ | 0 | $1,472.0275$ | $1,235.1778$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 405.73149 | $2,066.9715$ | 0 | $1,306.9878$ | $1,096.693$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 408.68116 | $2,071.1841$ | 0 | $1,141.948$ | 958.20819 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 412.078 | $2,076.0353$ | 0 | $1,089.2551$ | 707.37052 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 415.39329 | $2,080.77$ | 0 | 830.36721 | 539.24677 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 418.17987 | $2,084.7496$ | 0 | 554.93442 | 360.37862 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 30 | 420.96644 | $2,088.7293$ | 0 | 279.50165 | 181.51049 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 31 | 423.75302 | $2,092.7089$ | 0 | 4.0688543 | 2.6423449 | 200 |
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Name: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 $6^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$

Name: Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Name: Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

Name: Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 $\left.0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

Name: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
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File Information
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

4 - Translational Lower Clay
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constan Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: 0
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

4 - Translational Lower Clay

Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(235,2,030.1838) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(237,2,009.5966) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(439,2,033) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 135
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(447,2,053) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(450,2,033) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(552,2,049)$ ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75$
Data Point: (7, 0.75
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: ( $7,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## 100 psf (A-Bed0o․ ${ }^{\circ}$ )

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: (5, 0.75
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc $\mathbf{1 5 0 - 1 7}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: ( $-0.9,1$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.444$ )
Data Point: $(13,0.444$
Data Point: (13.1, 1)

| Points |
| :--- |
| $\qquad$ $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ <br> Point 1 59 1,960 <br> Point 2 11 1,957 <br> Point 3 31 1,968 <br> Point 4 45 1,976 <br> Point 5 69 1,976 <br> Point 6 125 2,004 <br> Point 7 136 2,004 <br> Point 8 194 2,030 <br> Point 9 205 2,030 <br> Point 10 259 2,057 <br> Point 11 333 2,057 <br> Point 12 550 2,091 <br> Point 13 603 2,090 <br> Point 14 715 2,088 <br> Point 15 810 2,090 <br> Point 16 810 2,016 <br> Point 17 642 2,006 <br> Point 18 466 1,993 <br> Point 19 312 1,983 <br> Point 20 -201 1,955 <br> Point 21 810 1,803 <br> Point 22 -200 1,803 <br> Point 23 -200.75 1,920 <br> Point 24 810 1,990 <br> Point 25 810 2,087 <br> Point 26 810 2,085 <br> Point 27 654 $2,089.0893$ <br> Point 28 629 2,089 <br> Point 29 88 1,956 <br> Point 30 138 1,956 <br> Point 31 358 2,067 <br> Point 32 82.1967 $1,962.1088$ <br> Point 33 167 1,970 <br> Point 34 271 2,023 <br> Point 35 273 2,024 <br> Point 36 414 2,095 <br> Point 37 316 $2,045.9574$ <br> Point 38 356 2,046 <br> Point 39 451 2,094 <br> Point 40 374 2,055 <br> Point 41 380 2,058 |
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## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ ( A - $\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{( }$( - Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | 1.5359e+005 |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-170 (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-170 (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 | Fill | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 | Fill | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 60,791
F of S: 2.09
Volume: $10,128.773 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,215,452.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $419,685.86 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $201,121.49 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (171.44737, 2,019.8902) ft
Entry: (492.41156, 2,092.7451) ft
Radius: 143.01965 ft
Center: $(319.5266,2,110.9588) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 177.08553 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | 303.294 | 196.96143 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 188.36184 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | 909.882 | 590.88428 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 199.5 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | $1,213.176$ | 787.84571 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 210.16667 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | $1,523.176$ | 989.16206 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 220.5 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | $2,143.176$ | $1,391.7948$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 230.83333 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | $2,763.176$ | $1,794.4275$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 241.75 | $2,020.5282$ | 0 | $3,219.6852$ | $2,090.888$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 253.25 | $2,021.8042$ | 0 | $3,738.6295$ | $2,427.8944$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 9 | 265.99429 | $2,023.2182$ | 0 | $3,908.0864$ | $2,537.941$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 10 | 278.36929 | $2,024.5913$ | 0 | $3,841.3179$ | 746.67656 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 289.125 | $2,025.7847$ | 0 | $3,699.5756$ | 719.12465 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 299.875 | $2,026.9775$ | 0 | $3,557.9086$ | 691.58738 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 310.625 | $2,028.1703$ | 0 | $3,416.2416$ | 664.0501 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 320.25 | $2,029.2382$ | 0 | $3,289.4003$ | 639.39464 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 328.75 | $2,030.1813$ | 0 | $3,177.3845$ | 617.62098 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 338.75 | $2,031.2909$ | 0 | $3,318.775$ | 645.10452 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 350.25 | $2,032.5669$ | 0 | $3,713.5719$ | 721.84525 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 357 | $2,033.3158$ | 0 | $3,945.3005$ | 766.88873 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 366 | $2,034.3144$ | 0 | $4,349.2889$ | 845.41612 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 377 | $2,035.5349$ | 0 | $4,857.569$ | 944.21577 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 385.66667 | $2,036.4965$ | 0 | $5,258.0321$ | $1,022.0579$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 397 | $2,037.754$ | 0 | $5,781.7147$ | $1,123.8515$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 408.33333 | $2,039.0115$ | 0 | $6,305.3972$ | $1,225.6451$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 420.16667 | $2,040.3245$ | 0 | $6,466.1769$ | $1,256.8975$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 432.5 | $2,041.693$ | 0 | $6,264.0539$ | $1,217.6087$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 444.83333 | $2,043.0614$ | 0 | $6,061.9308$ | $1,178.32$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 454.85 | $2,044.1728$ | 0 | $5,896.2761$ | $1,146.12$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 459.1524 | $2,045.2461$ | 0 | $5,046.1015$ | 980.86276 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 467.07953 | $2,056.5672$ | 0 | $2,717.3001$ | $2,280.0855$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 475.52445 | $2,068.6278$ | 0 | $2,517.4828$ | 489.34909 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 484.45311 | $2,081.3792$ | 0 | 786.55519 | 659.99817 | 225 |
|  | 350 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/25/2016 3:10:06 PM


## 4 - Translational Lower Clay Seismic <br> Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copvist © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Lid

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 16
Date: 3/25/2016
Time: 3:10:06 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11777
File Name: Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 19-19 results\Latest Update 3-25-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/25/2016
Last Solved Time: 3:14:40 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

4 - Translational Lower Clay Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 4 - Translational Lower Clay
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1{ }^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constan
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6ㅇ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf- $1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-BedO ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

4 - Translational Lower Clay Seismic

Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed6 $\left.{ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $6,0.425$ )
Data Point: (7, 0.425)

4 - Translational Lower Clay Seismic

TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## 100 psf (A-Bed0oº $)$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$ Data Point: ( $5,0.625$ ) Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1

## Data Point: $(0,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: $(5,0.75)$ <br> Data Point: (5.1, 1)

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425)
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
$100 p s f-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
| Point 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| Point 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point 15 | 810 | 2,090 |


| Point <br> 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point <br> 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point <br> 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point <br> 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point <br> 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point <br> 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
| Point <br> 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| Point <br> 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point <br> 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point <br> 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point <br> 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point <br> 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point <br> 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
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| Point <br> 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 41 | 380 | 2,058 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-170 ( A -Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}\right.$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 | Fill | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 | Fill | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 1
$F$ of $S$ : 1.12
Volume: $10,128.773 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,215,452.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 402,601.72 lbs
Activating Force: 359, 261.89 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Exit: (171.44737, 2,019.8902) ft
Entry: (492.41156, 2,092.7451) ft
Radius: 143.01965 ft
Center: $(319.5266,2,110.9588) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 177.08553 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | 303.294 | 196.96143 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 188.36184 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | 909.882 | 590.88428 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 199.5 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | $1,213.176$ | 787.84571 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 210.16667 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | $1,523.176$ | 989.16206 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 220.5 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | $2,143.176$ | $1,391.7948$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 6 | 230.83333 | $2,019.8902$ | 0 | $2,763.176$ | $1,794.4275$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 7 | 241.75 | $2,020.5282$ | 0 | $3,119.8364$ | $2,026.0455$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 253.25 | $2,021.8042$ | 0 | $3,624.0923$ | $2,353.513$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 265.99429 | $2,023.2182$ | 0 | $3,788.7528$ | $2,460.4448$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 278.36929 | $2,024.5913$ | 0 | $3,800.4981$ | 738.74199 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 289.125 | $2,025.7847$ | 0 | $3,660.0101$ | 711.43389 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 299.875 | $2,026.9775$ | 0 | $3,519.5966$ | 684.14027 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 310.625 | $2,028.1703$ | 0 | $3,379.1832$ | 656.84667 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 320.25 | $2,029.2382$ | 0 | $3,253.4642$ | 632.40938 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 328.75 | $2,030.1813$ | 0 | $3,142.4397$ | 610.8284 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 338.75 | $2,031.2909$ | 0 | $3,282.5791$ | 638.06873 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 350.25 | $2,032.5669$ | 0 | $3,673.8825$ | 714.13042 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 357 | $2,033.3158$ | 0 | $3,903.5601$ | 758.77522 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 366 | $2,034.3144$ | 0 | $4,303.9741$ | 836.60782 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 377 | $2,035.5349$ | 0 | $4,807.7564$ | 934.53317 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 385.66667 | $2,036.4965$ | 0 | $5,204.6759$ | $1,011.6865$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 397 | $2,037.754$ | 0 | $5,723.7245$ | $1,112.5793$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 408.33333 | $2,039.0115$ | 0 | $6,242.773$ | $1,213.4722$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 420.16667 | $2,040.3245$ | 0 | $6,402.13$ | $1,244.448$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 432.5 | $2,041.693$ | 0 | $6,201.7955$ | $1,205.5069$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 444.83333 | $2,043.0614$ | 0 | $6,001.4611$ | $1,166.5659$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 454.85 | $2,044.1728$ | 0 | $5,837.2721$ | $1,134.6508$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 459.1524 | $2,045.2461$ | 0 | $4,505.4158$ | 875.76412 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 467.07953 | $2,056.5672$ | 0 | $1,996.5612$ | $1,675.3138$ | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 30 | 475.52445 | $2,068.6278$ | 0 | $2,211.7987$ | 429.93011 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 31 | 484.45311 | $2,081.3792$ | 0 | 531.9321 | 446.34403 | 225 |

## Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/25/2016 2:28:52 PM


## 5 - Translational Temporary upper clay <br> Reporter

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 159
Date: 3/25/2016
Time: 2:28:52 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11777
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Last Solved Date: 3/25/2016
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pc
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

5 - Translational Temporary upper clay Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constan Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 5 0 - 1 7}{ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$

5 - Translational Temporary upper clay

Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(360,2,068)$
Lower Left: $(359,2,048) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (407, 2,053) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: 180
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(416,2,073) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(417,2,054) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(570,2,072) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed6 $\left.{ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$

5 - Translational Temporary upper clay

TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ} \mathbf{7}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(7,0.425)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: ( $-0.9,1$ )
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1

## Data Point: ( $0,0.625$ ) <br> Data Point: (5, 0.625) <br> Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

## 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point <br> 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point <br> 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point <br> 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point <br> 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point <br> 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point <br> 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point <br> 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point <br> 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point <br> 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point <br> 15 | 810 | 2,090 |
| Point <br> 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| Point <br> 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point <br> 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point <br> 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point <br> 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point <br> 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point <br> 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
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| Point <br> 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point <br> 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point <br> 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point <br> 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point <br> 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point <br> 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
| Point <br> 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| Point <br> 41 | 380 | 2,058 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}\right.$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 |  | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 |  | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface <br> Slip Surface: 44,427

F of S: 1.28
Volume: $1,157.9967 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $138,959.6 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $40,952.797 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $32,083.997 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: $(379,2,057.5) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (460.49548, 2,093.7123) ft
Radius: 50.117051 ft
Center: (407.67964, 2,102.7653) ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 379.5 | $2,057.5$ | 0 | 30 | 5.8314093 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 381.29 | $2,057.5$ | 0 | 138.49014 | 26.919756 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 383.87 | $2,057.5$ | 0 | 295.47042 | 57.433632 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 386.45 | $2,057.5$ | 0 | 452.4507 | 87.947508 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 389.03 | $2,057.5$ | 0 | 609.43099 | 118.46138 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 391.61 | $2,057.5$ | 0 | 766.41127 | 148.97526 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 394.21875 | $2,057.687$ | 0 | 867.1672 | 168.56023 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 396.85625 | $2,058.061$ | 0 | 980.3117 | 190.55329 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 399.49375 | $2,058.435$ | 0 | $1,093.4562$ | 212.54635 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 402.13125 | $2,058.809$ | 0 | $1,206.6007$ | 234.53941 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 404.76875 | $2,059.183$ | 0 | $1,319.7452$ | 256.53248 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 407.40625 | $2,059.5571$ | 0 | $1,432.8897$ | 278.52554 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 410.04375 | $2,059.9311$ | 0 | $1,546.0342$ | 300.5186 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 412.68125 | $2,060.3051$ | 0 | $1,659.1787$ | 322.51166 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 415.38333 | $2,060.6882$ | 0 | $1,775.0937$ | 345.04326 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 418.15 | $2,061.0806$ | 0 | $1,893.7792$ | 368.11339 | 150 |
|  | 420.91667 | $2,061.4729$ | 0 | $2,012.4648$ | 391.18352 | 150 |
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| Slice <br> 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 18 | 423.68333 | $2,061.8652$ | 0 | $2,131.1503$ | 414.25365 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 426.45 | $2,062.2576$ | 0 | $2,249.8358$ | 437.32378 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 429.21667 | $2,062.6499$ | 0 | $2,368.5214$ | 460.39392 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 431.98333 | $2,063.0422$ | 0 | $2,487.2069$ | 483.46405 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 434.75 | $2,063.4345$ | 0 | $2,605.8924$ | 506.53418 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 437.51667 | $2,063.8269$ | 0 | $2,724.578$ | 529.60431 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 440.28333 | $2,064.2192$ | 0 | $2,843.2635$ | 552.67444 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 443.05 | $2,064.6115$ | 0 | $2,961.949$ | 575.74457 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 445.81667 | $2,065.0038$ | 0 | $3,080.6346$ | 598.8147 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 447.48868 | $2,065.8191$ | 0 | $2,195.2379$ | 426.71102 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 449.38868 | $2,069.8936$ | 0 | 999.89357 | 839.01033 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 452.58258 | $2,076.743$ | 0 | 697.82189 | 585.54209 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 455.74774 | $2,083.5307$ | 0 | 355.84044 | 298.58558 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 458.9129 | $2,090.3184$ | 0 | 13.858984 | 11.629069 | 225 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

5 - Translational Temporary
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constan Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$

5-Translational Temporary

Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(235,2,030.1838) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(237,2,009.5966) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (439, 2,033) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(447,2,053) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (450, 2,033) ft
Lower Right: $(552,2,049) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 45
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed6 $\left.{ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$

Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-\mathbf{7}^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(7,0.425)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
100 psf (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1

## Data Point: ( $0,0.625$ ) <br> Data Point: $(5,0.625)$ <br> Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: $(5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: $(5,0.425)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |
| Point 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point <br> 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point <br> 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point <br> 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point <br> 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point <br> 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point <br> 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point <br> 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point <br> 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point <br> 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point <br> 15 | 810 | 2,090 |
| Point <br> 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| Point <br> 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point <br> 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point <br> 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point <br> 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point <br> 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
| Point <br> 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
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| Point <br> 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point <br> 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point <br> 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point <br> 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point <br> 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point <br> 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
| Point <br> 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| Point <br> 41 | 380 | 2,058 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ} 5^{\circ}\right.$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}\right.$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 |  | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 |  | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface <br> Slip Surface: 60,792

5-Translational Temporary
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F of S: 1.32
Volume: $4,896.8003 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $587,616.03 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $151,439.98 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $114,811.73 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (272.98858, 2,023.9943) ft
Entry: (481.30734, 2,093.0816) ft
Radius: 107.29461 ft
Center: $(359.96375,2,110.3534) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 272.99429 | $2,023.9949$ | 0 | -12.118371 | -2.3555727 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 276.58333 | $2,024.3931$ | 0 | 157.24981 | 30.566266 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 283.75 | $2,025.1883$ | 0 | 495.46134 | 96.307928 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 290.91667 | $2,025.9835$ | 0 | 833.67287 | 162.04959 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 298.08333 | $2,026.7787$ | 0 | $1,171.8844$ | 227.79125 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 305.25 | $2,027.5739$ | 0 | $1,510.0959$ | 293.53292 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 312.41667 | $2,028.3691$ | 0 | $1,848.3075$ | 359.27458 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 320.25 | $2,029.2382$ | 0 | $1,962.2682$ | 381.4263 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 328.75 | $2,030.1813$ | 0 | $1,851.9782$ | 359.98809 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 336.83333 | $2,031.0782$ | 0 | $1,747.0945$ | 339.60078 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 344.5 | $2,031.9289$ | 0 | $1,647.6173$ | 320.26435 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 352.16667 | $2,032.7795$ | 0 | $1,548.14$ | 300.92793 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 357 | $2,033.3158$ | 0 | $1,544.3377$ | 300.18883 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 362 | $2,033.8706$ | 0 | $1,774.0193$ | 344.83442 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 370 | $2,034.7582$ | 0 | $2,141.5098$ | 416.26735 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 377 | $2,035.5349$ | 0 | $2,463.0641$ | 478.77116 | 150 |
|  | 383.4 | $2,036.245$ | 0 | $2,759.8837$ | 536.46705 | 150 |
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| Slice <br> 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 18 | 390.2 | $2,036.9995$ | 0 | $3,077.905$ | 598.28412 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 397 | $2,037.754$ | 0 | $3,395.9262$ | 660.10119 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 403.8 | $2,038.5085$ | 0 | $3,713.9475$ | 721.91826 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 410.6 | $2,039.263$ | 0 | $4,031.9688$ | 783.73533 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 417.7 | $2,040.0508$ | 0 | $4,364.0204$ | 848.27963 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 425.1 | $2,040.8719$ | 0 | $4,710.1023$ | 915.55115 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 432.5 | $2,041.693$ | 0 | $5,056.1843$ | 982.82267 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 439.9 | $2,042.514$ | 0 | $5,402.2663$ | $1,050.0942$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 447.3 | $2,043.3351$ | 0 | $5,748.3483$ | $1,117.3657$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 454.85 | $2,044.1728$ | 0 | $5,857.1748$ | $1,138.5195$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 458.99253 | $2,045.2273$ | 0 | $4,243.2272$ | 824.79981 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 464.11227 | $2,056.2067$ | 0 | $1,746.609$ | $1,465.5789$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 469.56179 | $2,067.8932$ | 0 | $2,145.8657$ | 417.11405 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 472.96491 | $2,075.1912$ | 0 | 767.82686 | 644.28324 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 478.52653 | $2,087.1181$ | 0 | 152.91282 | 128.30909 | 225 |

## Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 19 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/25/2016 2:18:40 PM


Lower Keyway depth 20<br>width 50 ', backcut slope $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$<br>Upper Keyway depth 10

Width 25', Backcut Slope 2H:1V
5 - Translational Temporary lower portion of slope

Name: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ )
Name: Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Name: Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $100 \mathrm{psf}-5^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$

Name: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\right.$ Bed $\left.0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17º (A-Bed0ㅇ․ ${ }^{\circ}$ )

Name: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Cohesion: $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )

## 5 - Translational Temporary lower portion of slope
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Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

5 - Translational Temporary lower portion of slope
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No

Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant

## Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 150 psf- $17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$.
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0ㅇ․ $5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-BedO $\left.{ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0o- $5^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs 100-25 (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf

Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,955)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(810,2,090) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(161,2,006)$ ft
Lower Left: $(166,1,953)$ ft
Lower Right: ( $368,1,976.4034$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(404,2,031)$ ft
Lower Left: $(404,1,978) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(513,1,991) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed}^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$

Data Point: $(6,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7,0.75)$
Data Point: $(7.1,1)$
TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: (7, 0.425 )
Data Point: (7.1, 1)
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: (13, 0.625
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
100 psf (A-BedO응 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100psf- $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor

```
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: \((-0.9,1)\)
Data Point: \((0,0.625)\)
Data Point: \((5,0.625)\)
Data Point: \((5.1,1)\)
```


## 150psf- $17^{\circ}$ (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.75)$
Data Point: (5, 0.75)
Data Point: $(5,0.75)$
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{BedO} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.425)$
Data Point: (5, 0.425)
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13,0.444)$
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 59 | 1,960 |
| Point 2 | 11 | 1,957 |


| Point <br> 3 | 31 | 1,968 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 4 | 45 | 1,976 |
| Point <br> 5 | 69 | 1,976 |
| Point <br> 6 | 125 | 2,004 |
| Point <br> 7 | 136 | 2,004 |
| Point <br> 8 | 194 | 2,030 |
| Point <br> 9 | 205 | 2,030 |
| Point <br> 10 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Point <br> 11 | 333 | 2,057 |
| Point <br> 12 | 550 | 2,091 |
| Point <br> 13 | 603 | 2,090 |
| Point <br> 14 | 715 | 2,088 |
| Point <br> 15 | 810 | 2,090 |
| Point <br> 16 | 810 | 2,016 |
| Point <br> 17 | 642 | 2,006 |
| Point <br> 18 | 466 | 1,993 |
| Point <br> 19 | 312 | 1,983 |
| Point <br> 20 | -201 | 1,955 |
| Point <br> 21 | 810 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 22 | -200 | 1,803 |
| Point <br> 23 | -200.75 | 1,920 |
| Point <br> 24 | 810 | 1,990 |
| Point <br> 25 | 810 | 2,087 |
| Point <br> 26 | 810 | 2,085 |
|  | 31 |  |
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| Point <br> 27 | 654 | $2,089.0893$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 28 | 629 | 2,089 |
| Point <br> 29 | 88 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 30 | 138 | 1,956 |
| Point <br> 31 | 358 | 2,067 |
| Point <br> 32 | 82.1967 | $1,962.1088$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 167 | 1,970 |
| Point <br> 34 | 271 | 2,023 |
| Point <br> 35 | 273 | 2,024 |
| Point <br> 36 | 414 | 2,095 |
| Point <br> 37 | 316 | $2,045.9574$ |
| Point <br> 38 | 356 | 2,046 |
| Point <br> 39 | 451 | 2,094 |
| Point <br> 40 | 374 | 2,055 |
| Point <br> 41 | 380 | 2,058 |


| Regions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| Region 1 | Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ ( A -Bed0 ${ }^{\circ} 5^{\circ}$ ) | 20,23,24,16,17,18,19,33,30,29,32,1,2 | 26,270 |
| Region 2 | Tmc 150-170 ( $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ ) | 23,22,21,24 | $1.5359 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 3 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\right.$ ) | 19,18,17,16,26,34,33 | 32,238 |
| Region 4 | Shear Layer | 26,25,35,34 | 744.5 |
| Region 5 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ} 7^{\circ}$ ) | 15,14,27,40,38,37,35,25 | 8,477.5 |
| Region 6 | TQs 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed6 ${ }^{\circ}-7^{\circ}$ ) | 13,12,39,41,28 | 3,375.5 |
| Region 7 | Shear Layer | 27,28,41,40 | 694.11 |
| Region 8 | TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) | 2,1,32,5,4,3 | 769.03 |
| Region 9 |  | 5,32,29,30,33,34,35,37,31,11,10,9,8,7,6 | 9,276.8 |
| Region 10 |  | 37,38,40,41,39,36,31 | 1,921.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 48,782
Fof $S$ : 1.49
Volume: $13,344,53 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,601,343,6 1
Resisting Force: $580,417.7 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $580,417.7 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $389,532.89 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $389,532.89$ lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surf
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip
Exit: $(178.1736,1,975.6942$ ) ft
Exit: (178.1736, 1,975.6942) ft ft
Entry: (489.54135, 2,0
Center: $(300.80667,2,122.1165) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

| p Slices |
| :--- |
| X (ft) Y (ft) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf)  <br> Slice <br> 1 182.1302 $1,976.1114$ 0 176.18597 53.865457 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 2 190.0434 $1,976.9456$ 0 551.88815 168.72914 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 3 199.5 $1,977.9426$ 0 $1,000.8677$ 305.99596 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 4 210.4 $1,979.0917$ 0 $1,518.3768$ 464.21437 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 5 221.2 $1,980.2303$ 0 $2,031.1381$ 620.98124 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 6 232 $1,981.3688$ 0 $2,543.8994$ 777.74811 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 7 242.8 $1,982.5074$ 0 $3,056.6607$ 934.51497 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 8 253.6 $1,983.646$ 0 $3,569.4221$ $1,091.2818$ 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 9 265 $1,984.8478$ 0 $4,110.6701$ $1,256.758$ 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 10 272 $1,985.5858$ 0 $4,441.886$ $1,358.0208$ 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 11 278.375 $1,986.2579$ 0 $4,744.0733$ $1,450.4087$ 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 12 289.125 $1,987.3912$ 0 $5,255.751$ $1,606.8443$ 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 13 299.875 $1,988.5245$ 0 $5,767.4287$ $1,763.2799$ 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 14 310.625 $1,989.6578$ 0 $6,279.1064$ $1,919.7155$ 168.75 <br> Slice <br> 15 320.25 $1,990.6725$ 0 $6,482.847$ $1,982.0052$ 168.75 <br>  328.75 $1,991.5686$ 0 $6,378.6505$ $1,950.1492$ 168.75 |
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| Slice <br> 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 17 | 338.75 | $1,992.6228$ | 0 | $6,256.0663$ | $1,912.6714$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 350.25 | $1,993.8352$ | 0 | $6,115.0946$ | $1,869.572$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 357 | $1,994.5468$ | 0 | $6,090.9571$ | $1,862.1925$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 362 | $1,995.074$ | 0 | $6,322.6993$ | $1,933.0432$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 370 | $1,995.9173$ | 0 | $6,693.4868$ | $2,046.4043$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 377 | $1,996.6553$ | 0 | $7,017.9259$ | $2,145.5953$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 385.66667 | $1,997.569$ | 0 | $7,424.2999$ | $2,269.8363$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 397 | $1,998.7638$ | 0 | $7,958.9573$ | $2,433.2974$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 408.33333 | $1,999.9586$ | 0 | $8,493.6146$ | $2,596.7586$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 419.9 | $2,001.178$ | 0 | $9,039.2797$ | $2,763.5851$ | 168.75 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 432.1 | $2,010.7973$ | 0 | $4,781.1383$ | $4,011.8513$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 444.7 | $2,028.792$ | 0 | $4,008.5811$ | $3,363.5989$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 453.25253 | $2,041.0063$ | 0 | $3,403.6207$ | $2,855.9769$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 455.9582 | $2,044.8704$ | 0 | $4,834.9442$ | 939.81795 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 463.88066 | $2,056.1848$ | 0 | $2,371.8111$ | $1,990.1858$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 472.3168 | $2,068.2329$ | 0 | $2,420.8687$ | 470.5692 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 477.34804 | $2,075.4182$ | 0 | $1,064.3596$ | 893.10378 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 485.47691 | $2,087.0275$ | 0 | 275.18592 | 230.9084 | 225 |
|  | 354 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Section 20-20 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 20-20 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/24/2016 2:17:59 PM
 Phi': $11^{\circ}$

Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf

Materials
$\square$ Shear Layer
$\square$ Fill
$\square$ Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$ $\square$ TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 0-5 $)$

Keyway depth $15^{\prime}$ width 30', backcut slope $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$

Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-(-18)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$

Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf Cohesion
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQS 100-25 (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength En. 100 psf (A-Bed $0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )

Tmc $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\operatorname{Bed}\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)\right.$
Section 20-20

## LGC Valley, Inc

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING
28532 Constellation Road, Valencia, CA 91355 Phone 661-702-8474, Fax 661-702-8475

Skyline Ranch
Development project, Tract 60922
Los Angeles CA

Project No: 153035-01
Engineer: BAS
Date: March 2016

## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

## Renoterain

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 180
Date: 3/24/2016
Time: 2:17:59 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 20-20 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 20-20 results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/24/2016
Last Solved Time: 2:39:39 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant

Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$ Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf $\left(A-B e d 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (272, 1,742.6102) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(425,1,812.5833) \mathrm{ft}$
eft-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(444,1,817.5) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $727.9594,1,866.9135$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-159, 1,579) ft
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,896) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

100 psf (A-Bed0응ํ $)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept. 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed (-3$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-18.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-2.9,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: (5, 0.625
Data Point: (5.1, 1)

100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed ( $-3^{\circ}$ )-(-18 $\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: ( $-18.1,1$
Data Point: $(-18,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-3,0.5)$
Data Point: (-2.9, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 323 | 1,760 |
| Point 2 | 350 | 1,775 |
| Point 3 | 366 | 1,776 |
| Point 4 | 418 | 1,812 |
| Point 5 | 430 | 1,813 |
| Point 6 | 458 | 1,822 |
| Point 7 | 503 | 1,835 |
| Point 8 | 519 | 1,835 |
| Point 9 | 554 | 1,846 |
| Point 10 | 563 | 1,846 |
| Point 11 | 792 | 1,888 |
| Point 12 | 811 | 1,896 |
| Point 13 | 811 | 1,883 |
| Point 14 | 811 | 1,852 |
| Point 15 | 811 | 1,786 |
| Point 16 | -159 | 1,579 |
| Point 17 | -119 | 1,580 |
| Point 18 | -63 | 1,612 |
| Point 19 | -54 | 1,612 |
| Point 20 | 5 | 1,640 |
| Point 21 | 16 | 1,641 |
| Point 22 | 84 | 1,674 |
| Point 23 | 93 | 1,674 |
| Point 24 | 144 | 1,696 |
| Point 25 | 153 | 1,697 |
| Point 26 | 215 | 1,726 |
| Point 27 | 223 | 1,726 |
| Point 28 | 282 | 1,746 |
| Point 29 | 297 | 1,748 |
| Point 30 | 811 | 1,644 |
| Point 31 | 810 | 1,500 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 32 -159 <br> Point <br> 33 1,505 <br> Point <br> 34 811$\| 1,795$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 35 | 381 | 1,796 |
| Point <br> 36 | 411 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 37 | 710 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 38 | 379 | 1,763 |
| Point <br> 39 | 428 | 1,767 |
| Point <br> 40 | 465 | 1,779 |
| Point <br> 41 | 468 | 1,780 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}$ <br> (A-Bed <br> (-3 ${ }^{\circ}$ )-(- <br> $18^{\circ}$ ) | 16,32,31,30,15,39,36,35,38,1,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17 | $2.1207 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Shear Layer | 33,34,41,40 | 320.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TQs } \\ & 100-25^{\circ} \\ & (\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \\ & \left.0-5^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 14,13,12,11,37,41,34 | 16,934 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 3,38,35,36,39,40,41,37,10,9,8,7,6,5,4 | 10,221 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TQs } \\ & 100-25^{\circ} \\ & (\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \\ & \left.0-5^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1,38,3,2 | 490 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TQs } \\ & 100-25^{\circ} \\ & (\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \\ & \left.0-5^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 15,33,40,39 | 3,503.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 75,446
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.71$

Volume: $829.50517 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 99,540.62 lbs
Resisting Moment: $8,779,718.6 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: 5,143,754, 7 lbs ft
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
$F$ of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: ( $366.06486,1,776.0449$ ) ft
Entry: (444, 1,817.5) ft
Radius: 114.37316 ft
Center: $(355.48166,1,889.9274) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 367.36324 | 1,776.1805 | 0 | 76.35423 | 49.585017 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 369.96 | 1,776.4819 | 0 | 244.4064 | 158.71938 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 372.55675 | 1,776.8436 | 0 | 402.75278 | 261.55071 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 375.15351 | 1,777.2664 | 0 | 551.52314 | 358.16332 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 377.75027 | 1,777.7508 | 0 | 690.82643 | 448.62793 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 380.34703 | 1,778.2978 | 0 | 820.75155 | 533.00229 | 200 |
| Slice $7$ | 382.94378 | 1,778.9082 | 0 | 941.36799 | 611.33152 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 385.54054 | 1,779.583 | 0 | 1,052.7263 | 683.64848 | 200 |
| Slice $9$ | 388.1373 | 1,780.3236 | 0 | 1,154.8586 | 749.97392 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 390.73405 | 1,781.1311 | 0 | 1,247.7781 | 810.31655 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 393.33081 | 1,782.0072 | $0$ | 1,331.4797 | 864.67302 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 395.92757 | 1,782.9534 | 0 | 1,405.9395 | 913.02777 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 398.52432 | 1,783.9718 | 0 | 1,471.1142 | 955.35273 | 200 |
| Slice $14$ | 401.12108 | 1,785.0643 | 0 | 1,526.9408 | 991.60697 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 403.71784 | 1,786.2334 | 0 | 1,573.3356 | 1,021.7361 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 406.31459 | 1,787.4816 | 0 | 1,610.1932 | 1,045.6717 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 408.91135 | 1,788.8119 | 0 | 1,637.3849 | 1,063.3302 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 411.50811 | 1,790.2276 | 0 | 1,654.7576 | 1,074.6122 | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice <br> 19 | 414.10486 | $1,791.7324$ | 0 | $1,662.1315$ | $1,079.4008$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 20 | 416.70162 | $1,793.3304$ | 0 | $1,659.2976$ | $1,077.5604$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 419.2 | $1,794.9584$ | 0 | $1,577.0049$ | $1,024.1189$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 421.6 | $1,796.6138$ | 0 | $1,418.1585$ | 920.96293 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 424 | $1,798.362$ | 0 | $1,253.1884$ | 813.83005 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 426.4 | $1,800.2085$ | 0 | $1,081.992$ | 702.65383 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 428.8 | $1,802.1595$ | 0 | 904.46401 | 587.3658 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 431.4 | $1,804.4047$ | 0 | 734.28963 | 476.85326 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 434.2 | $1,806.9761$ | 0 | 569.01665 | 369.52373 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 437 | $1,809.7276$ | 0 | 392.47425 | 254.87576 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 439.8 | $1,812.6788$ | 0 | 204.32202 | 132.68827 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 442.6 | $1,815.8535$ | 0 | 4.2300002 | 2.7469943 | 200 |
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## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

## Renot

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
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Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant

Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$ Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf $\left(A-B e d 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (272, 1,742.6102) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(425,1,812.5833) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection. Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(444,1,817.5) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(727.9594,1,866.9135) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-159, 1,579) ft
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,896) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

100 psf (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed (-3$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-18.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-2.9,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.625)$
Data Point: (5, 0.625
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$

100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: ( $-18.1,1$
Data Point: $(-18,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-3,0.5)$
Data Point: (-2.9, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 323 | 1,760 |
| Point 2 | 350 | 1,775 |
| Point 3 | 366 | 1,776 |
| Point 4 | 418 | 1,812 |
| Point 5 | 430 | 1,813 |
| Point 6 | 458 | 1,822 |
| Point 7 | 503 | 1,835 |
| Point 8 | 519 | 1,835 |
| Point 9 | 554 | 1,846 |
| Point 10 | 563 | 1,846 |
| Point 11 | 792 | 1,888 |
| Point 12 | 811 | 1,896 |
| Point 13 | 811 | 1,883 |
| Point 14 | 811 | 1,852 |
| Point 15 | 811 | 1,786 |
| Point 16 | -159 | 1,579 |
| Point 17 | -119 | 1,580 |
| Point 18 | -63 | 1,612 |
| Point 19 | -54 | 1,612 |
| Point 20 | 5 | 1,640 |
| Point 21 | 16 | 1,641 |
| Point 22 | 84 | 1,674 |
| Point 23 | 93 | 1,674 |
| Point 24 | 144 | 1,696 |
| Point 25 | 153 | 1,697 |
| Point 26 | 215 | 1,726 |
| Point 27 | 223 | 1,726 |
| Point 28 | 282 | 1,746 |
| Point 29 | 297 | 1,748 |
| Point 30 | 811 | 1,644 |
| Point 31 | 810 | 1,500 |
|  |  |  |


| Point <br> 32 | -159 | 1,505 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 33 | 811 | 1,795 |
| Point <br> 34 | 811 | 1,796 |
| Point <br> 35 | 381 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 36 | 411 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 37 | 710 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 38 | 379 | 1,763 |
| Point <br> 39 | 428 | 1,767 |
| Point <br> 40 | 465 | 1,779 |
| Point <br> 41 | 468 | 1,780 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}$ <br> (A-Bed <br> (-3 ${ }^{\circ}$ )-(- <br> $18^{\circ}$ ) | 16,32,31,30,15,39,36,35,38,1,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17 | $2.1207 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Shear Layer | 33,34,41,40 | 320.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TQs } \\ & 100-25^{\circ} \\ & (\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \\ & \left.0-5^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 14,13,12,11,37,41,34 | 16,934 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 3,38,35,36,39,40,41,37,10,9,8,7,6,5,4 | 10,221 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TQs } \\ & 100-25^{\circ} \\ & (\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \\ & \left.0-5^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1,38,3,2 | 490 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TQs } \\ & 100-25^{\circ} \\ & (\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \\ & \left.0-5^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 15,33,40,39 | 3,503.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 67,643
Fof S : 1.27
Volume: $797.58287 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $95,709.944 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $8,515,823.8 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: 6,701,235 lbs-ft
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
$F$ of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (366.06489, 1,776.0449) ft
Entry: (444, 1,817.5) ft
Radius: 121.12055 ft
Center: $(352.06352,1,896.3535) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice <br> 1 | 367.36327 | 1,776.2103 | 0 | 63.911433 | 41.50457 | 200 |
| Slice $2$ | 369.96002 | 1,776.5696 | 0 | 220.43805 | 143.15414 | 200 |
| Slice $3$ | 372.55678 | 1,776.9865 | 0 | 367.30928 | 238.53343 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 375.15353 | 1,777.4616 | 0 | 504.70052 | 327.75635 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 377.75029 | 1,777.9955 | 0 | 632.76615 | 410.92314 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | 380.34704 | 1,778.5891 | 0 | 751.64066 | 488.12115 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 382.9438 | 1,779.2433 | 0 | 861.43962 | 559.42543 | 200 |
| Slice $8$ | 385.54056 | 1,779.9591 | 0 | 962.26049 | 624.89927 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 388.13731 | 1,780.7377 | 0 | 1,054.1832 | 684.59458 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 390.73407 | 1,781.5802 | 0 | 1,137.2707 | 738.55225 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 393.33082 | 1,782.4883 | 0 | 1,211.5694 | 786.80234 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | 395.92758 | 1,783.4633 | 0 | 1,277.1089 | 829.36423 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 398.52433 | 1,784.5071 | 0 | 1,333.9029 | 866.24664 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 401.12109 | 1,785.6217 | 0 | 1,381.9482 | 897.44764 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 403.71784 | 1,786.8092 | 0 | 1,421.2252 | 922.95444 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 406.3146 | 1,788.0719 | 0 | 1,451.6973 | 942.74322 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 408.91136 | 1,789.4126 | 0 | 1,473.3101 | 956.77879 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 411.50811 | 1,790.8343 | 0 | 1,485.9915 | 965.01414 | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice <br> 19 | 414.10487 | $1,792.3401$ | 0 | $1,489.6498$ | 967.38987 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 20 | 416.70162 | $1,793.934$ | 0 | $1,484.1735$ | 963.83356 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 419.2 | $1,795.5527$ | 0 | $1,404.8394$ | 912.31339 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 421.6 | $1,797.1934$ | 0 | $1,254.8025$ | 814.87826 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 424 | $1,798.9209$ | 0 | $1,100.1482$ | 714.44462 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 426.4 | $1,800.7399$ | 0 | 940.86216 | 611.00303 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 428.8 | $1,802.6556$ | 0 | 776.93524 | 504.54764 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 431.4 | $1,804.8522$ | 0 | 621.43083 | 403.5619 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 434.2 | $1,807.3582$ | 0 | 472.33446 | 306.73759 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 437 | $1,810.0278$ | 0 | 314.71921 | 204.38105 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 439.8 | $1,812.8767$ | 0 | 148.51278 | 96.445329 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 442.6 | $1,815.9241$ | 0 | -26.316766 | -17.090308 | 200 |
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## 2 - Translational

Report generated using GeoStudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 180
Date: 3/24/2016
Time: 2:17:59 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 20-20 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 20-20 results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/24/2016
Last Solved Time: 2:37:00 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1{ }^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \mathrm{0-5}{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed0 $\left.{ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-159,1,579) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,896) \mathrm{ft}$

Slip Surface Block
Left Grid
Upper Left: $(389,1,801) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (398.4302, 1,750.9572) ft

2-Translational

Lower Right: $(489,1,755) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Increments: 10
tarting Angle: 135
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(621.85,1,800.3944) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $642.3716,1,766.6249$ ) ft
ower Right: $(788,1,773) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: 65
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: (5.1, 1)
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed ( $-3^{\circ}$ )-(-18 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-18.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-18,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-2.9,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$ Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $0,0.625$
Data Point: $(5,0.625)$
$100 p s f-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed (-3$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-18.1,1)$
Data Point: ( $-18,0.5$ )
Data Point. ( $-3,0.5$ )
Data Point: (-2.9, 1)

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 323 | 1,760 |
| Point 2 | 350 | 1,775 |
| Point 3 | 366 | 1,776 |
| Point 4 | 418 | 1,812 |
| Point 5 | 430 | 1,813 |
| Point 6 | 458 | 1,822 |
| Point 7 | 503 | 1,835 |
| Point 8 | 519 | 1,835 |
| Point 9 | 554 | 1,846 |
| Point 10 | 563 | 1,846 |
| Point 11 | 792 | 1,888 |
| Point 12 | 811 | 1,896 |
| Point 13 | 811 | 1,883 |
| Point 14 | 811 | 1,852 |
| Point 15 | 811 | 1,786 |
| Point 16 | -159 | 1,579 |
| Point 17 | -119 | 1,580 |
| Point 18 | -63 | 1,612 |
| Point 19 | -54 | 1,612 |
| Point 20 | 5 | 1,640 |
| Point 21 | 16 | 1,641 |
| Point 22 | 84 | 1,674 |

2 - Translational

| Point <br> 23 | 93 | 1,674 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 24 | 144 | 1,696 |
| Point <br> 25 | 153 | 1,697 |
| Point <br> 26 | 215 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 27 | 223 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 28 | 282 | 1,746 |
| Point <br> 29 | 297 | 1,748 |
| Point <br> 30 | 811 | 1,644 |
| Point <br> 31 | 810 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 32 | -159 | 1,505 |
| Point <br> 33 | 811 | 1,795 |
| Point <br> 34 | 811 | 1,796 |
| Point <br> 35 | 381 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 36 | 411 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 37 | 710 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 38 | 379 | 1,763 |
| Point <br> 39 | 428 | 1,767 |
| Point <br> 40 | 465 | 1,779 |
| Point <br> 41 | 468 | 1,780 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc <br> $100-25^{\circ}$ <br> $($ A-Bed <br> $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-(-$ <br> $\left.18^{\circ}\right)$ | $16,32,31,30,15,39,36,35,38,1,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17$ | $2.1207 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Shear <br> Layer | $33,34,41,40$ | 320.5 |
|  |  |  |  |
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| Region <br> 3 | TQs <br> 100-25 <br> (A-Bed <br> $\left.0-5^{\circ}\right)$ | $14,13,12,11,37,41,34$ | 16,934 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $3,38,35,36,39,40,41,37,10,9,8,7,6,5,4$ | 10,221 |
| Region <br> 5 | TQs <br> TO-25 <br> (A-3ed <br> $\left.0-5^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,38,3,2$ | 490 |
| Region <br> 6 | TQs <br> $100-25^{\circ}$ <br> (A-Bed <br> $\left.0-5^{\circ}\right)$ | $15,33,40,39$ | $3,503.5$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 60,842
F of $\mathrm{s}: 2.16$
Volume: $22,175.401 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $2,661,048.2 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $846,644.37 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $846,644.3 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $391,561.67 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $391,561.67$ lbs
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: $(365.6576,1,775.9786) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (802.88262, 1,892.5822) ft
Radius: 208.81205 ft
Center: $(560.94736,1,921.733)$ ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 365.8288 | $1,775.9786$ | 0 | 1.284 | 0.59873903 | 112.5 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 372.93412 | $1,775.9786$ | 0 | 578.63377 | 375.76916 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 386.79168 | $1,775.9786$ | 0 | $1,729.8764$ | $1,123.3949$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 399.78632 | $1,776.2545$ | 0 | $2,734.7637$ | $1,775.9763$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 411.92877 | $1,776.8062$ | 0 | $3,664.6129$ | $2,379.8274$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 424 | $1,777.3547$ | 0 | $4,156.4552$ | $2,699.2336$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 437 | $1,777.9453$ | 0 | $4,412.0816$ | $2,865.2393$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 451 | $1,778.5815$ | 0 | $4,869.4989$ | $3,162.2896$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 461.87786 | $1,779.0757$ | 0 | $5,209.9696$ | $3,383.3938$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 10 | 466.87786 | $1,779.3029$ | 0 | $5,406.1583$ | $1,050.8507$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 11 | 476.75 | $1,779.7515$ | 0 | $5,693.3909$ | $1,106.6831$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 494.25 | $1,780.5466$ | 0 | $6,202.558$ | $1,205.6551$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 511 | $1,781.3077$ | 0 | $6,413.6997$ | $1,246.6969$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 527.75 | $1,782.0687$ | 0 | $6,651.3995$ | $1,292.9011$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 545.25 | $1,782.8639$ | 0 | $7,213.6828$ | $1,402.1979$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 558.5 | $1,783.4659$ | 0 | $7,470.3884$ | $1,452.0964$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 570.35 | $1,784.0044$ | 0 | $7,495.6737$ | $1,457.0114$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 585.05 | $1,784.6723$ | 0 | $7,595.1163$ | $1,476.341$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 599.75 | $1,785.3402$ | 0 | $7,694.5588$ | $1,495.6707$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 614.45 | $1,786.0081$ | 0 | $7,794.0014$ | $1,515.0004$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 629.15 | $1,786.676$ | 0 | $7,893.444$ | $1,534.3301$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 643.85 | $1,787.344$ | 0 | $7,992.8866$ | $1,553.6598$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 658.55 | $1,788.0119$ | 0 | $8,092.3292$ | $1,572.9895$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 673.25 | $1,788.6798$ | 0 | $8,191.7718$ | $1,592.3191$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 687.95 | $1,789.3477$ | 0 | $8,291.2144$ | $1,611.6488$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 702.65 | $1,790.0157$ | 0 | $8,390.657$ | $1,630.9785$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 715.49963 | $1,790.5995$ | 0 | $8,626.9316$ | $1,676.9056$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 726.49889 | $1,791.0993$ | 0 | $9,000.0382$ | $1,749.4302$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 739.76082 | $1,802.4349$ | 0 | $5,180.7499$ | $4,347.1653$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 754.93593 | $1,824.1072$ | 0 | $3,893.7093$ | $3,267.2101$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 769.76156 | $1,845.2804$ | 0 | $2,636.3095$ | $2,212.1264$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 784.58719 | $1,866.4536$ | 0 | $1,378.9097$ | $1,157.0427$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 797.44131 | $1,884.8112$ | 0 | 327.26453 | 274.60755 | 225 |
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## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 177
Date: 3/24/2016
Time: 2:11:22 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 20-20 Seismic Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 20-20 results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/24/2016
Last Solved Time: 2:27:54 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \mathrm{0-5}{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed0 $\left.{ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-159,1,579) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,896) \mathrm{ft}$

Slip Surface Block
Left Grid
Upper Left: $(389,1,801) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (398.4302, 1,750.9572) ft
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Lower Right: $(489,1,755) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Increments: 10
tarting Angle: 135
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(621.85,1,800.3944) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $642.3716,1,766.6249$ ) ft
ower Right: $(788,1,773) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Increments: 10
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: 65
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$100 \mathrm{psf}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: (5.1, 1)
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed (-3 ${ }^{\circ}$ )-(-18 $\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-18.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-18,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-2.9,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$ Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
-Intercept: 0.625
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $0,0.625$
Data Point: $(5,0.625)$
$100 p s f-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed (-3$\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-18.1,1)$
Data Point: ( $-18,0.5$ )
Data Point. ( $-3,0.5$ )
Data Point: (-2.9, 1)

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 323 | 1,760 |
| Point 2 | 350 | 1,775 |
| Point 3 | 366 | 1,776 |
| Point 4 | 418 | 1,812 |
| Point 5 | 430 | 1,813 |
| Point 6 | 458 | 1,822 |
| Point 7 | 503 | 1,835 |
| Point 8 | 519 | 1,835 |
| Point 9 | 554 | 1,846 |
| Point 10 | 563 | 1,846 |
| Point 11 | 792 | 1,888 |
| Point 12 | 811 | 1,896 |
| Point 13 | 811 | 1,883 |
| Point 14 | 811 | 1,852 |
| Point 15 | 811 | 1,786 |
| Point 16 | -159 | 1,579 |
| Point 17 | -119 | 1,580 |
| Point 18 | -63 | 1,612 |
| Point 19 | -54 | 1,612 |
| Point 20 | 5 | 1,640 |
| Point 21 | 16 | 1,641 |
| Point 22 | 84 | 1,674 |

2 - Translational

| Point <br> 23 | 93 | 1,674 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 24 | 144 | 1,696 |
| Point <br> 25 | 153 | 1,697 |
| Point <br> 26 | 215 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 27 | 223 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 28 | 282 | 1,746 |
| Point <br> 29 | 297 | 1,748 |
| Point <br> 30 | 811 | 1,644 |
| Point <br> 31 | 810 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 32 | -159 | 1,505 |
| Point <br> 33 | 811 | 1,795 |
| Point <br> 34 | 811 | 1,796 |
| Point <br> 35 | 381 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 36 | 411 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 37 | 710 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 38 | 379 | 1,763 |
| Point <br> 39 | 428 | 1,767 |
| Point <br> 40 | 465 | 1,779 |
| Point <br> 41 | 468 | 1,780 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc <br> $100-25^{\circ}$ <br> $($ A-Bed <br> $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-(-$ <br> $\left.18^{\circ}\right)$ | $16,32,31,30,15,39,36,35,38,1,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17$ | $2.1207 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Shear <br> Layer | $33,34,41,40$ | 320.5 |
|  |  |  |  |
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| Region <br> 3 | TQs <br> 100-25 <br> (A-Bed <br> $\left.0-5^{\circ}\right)$ | $14,13,12,11,37,41,34$ | 16,934 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $3,38,35,36,39,40,41,37,10,9,8,7,6,5,4$ | 10,221 |
| Region <br> 5 | TQs <br> (A0-25 <br> (A-Bed <br> $\left.0-5^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,38,3,2$ | 490 |
| Region <br> 6 | TQs <br> $100-25^{\circ}$ <br> (A-Bed <br> $\left.0-5^{\circ}\right)$ | $15,33,40,39$ | $3,503.5$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 60,842
F of S: 1.12
Volume: $22,175.401 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $2,661,048.2 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $795,760.17 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $795,760.17 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $710,791.63 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
Exit: (365.6576, 1,775.9786) ft
Entry: (802.88262, 1,892.5822) f
Radius: 208.81205 ft
Center: $(560.94736,1,921.733)$ ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 365.8288 | $1,775.9786$ | 0 | 1.284 | 0.59873903 | 112.5 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 372.93412 | $1,775.9786$ | 0 | 578.63377 | 375.76916 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 386.79168 | $1,775.9786$ | 0 | $1,729.8764$ | $1,123.3949$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 399.78632 | $1,776.2545$ | 0 | $2,696.4754$ | $1,751.1116$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 411.92877 | $1,776.8062$ | 0 | $3,614.6239$ | $2,347.3642$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 424 | $1,777.3547$ | 0 | $4,100.2771$ | $2,662.7511$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 437 | $1,777.9453$ | 0 | $4,352.6868$ | $2,826.6678$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 451 | $1,778.5815$ | 0 | $4,804.3482$ | $3,119.9802$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 461.87786 | $1,779.0757$ | 0 | $5,140.5345$ | $3,338.3022$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 10 | 466.87786 | $1,779.3029$ | 0 | $5,382.4596$ | $1,046.2442$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 11 | 476.75 | $1,779.7515$ | 0 | $5,668.5903$ | $1,101.8623$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 494.25 | $1,780.5466$ | 0 | $6,175.8043$ | $1,200.4547$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 511 | $1,781.3077$ | 0 | $6,386.136$ | $1,241.3391$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 527.75 | $1,782.0687$ | 0 | $6,622.924$ | $1,287.366$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 545.25 | $1,782.8639$ | 0 | $7,183.0503$ | $1,396.2435$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 558.5 | $1,783.4659$ | 0 | $7,438.7712$ | $1,445.9506$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 570.35 | $1,784.0044$ | 0 | $7,463.9594$ | $1,450.8467$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 585.05 | $1,784.6723$ | 0 | $7,563.0206$ | $1,470.1023$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 599.75 | $1,785.3402$ | 0 | $7,662.0817$ | $1,489.3578$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 614.45 | $1,786.0081$ | 0 | $7,761.1428$ | $1,508.6133$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 629.15 | $1,786.676$ | 0 | $7,860.204$ | $1,527.8689$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 643.85 | $1,787.344$ | 0 | $7,959.2651$ | $1,547.1244$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 658.55 | $1,788.0119$ | 0 | $8,058.3262$ | $1,566.3799$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 673.25 | $1,788.6798$ | 0 | $8,157.3873$ | $1,585.6355$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 687.95 | $1,789.3477$ | 0 | $8,256.4485$ | $1,604.891$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 702.65 | $1,790.0157$ | 0 | $8,355.5096$ | $1,624.1465$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 715.49963 | $1,790.5995$ | 0 | $8,590.8778$ | $1,669.8975$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 726.49889 | $1,791.0993$ | 0 | $8,962.5531$ | $1,742.1438$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 739.76082 | $1,802.4349$ | 0 | $3,806.0107$ | $3,193.6222$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 754.93593 | $1,824.1072$ | 0 | $2,843.6865$ | $2,386.1363$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 769.76156 | $1,845.2804$ | 0 | $1,903.5247$ | $1,597.2469$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 784.58719 | $1,866.4536$ | 0 | 963.36303 | 808.35756 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 797.44131 | $1,884.8112$ | 0 | 177.04466 | 148.55811 | 225 |

file:///G:/SLOPE\%20RESULTS/Section\%2020-20\%20results/section\%2020-20\%20seismi... 3/24/2016


## 2 - Translational
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## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 183
Date: 3/24/2016
Time: 2:21:39 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 20-20 Static Temporary Final SSA without key for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 20-20 results
Last Solved Date: 3/24/2016
Last Solved Date. 3/24/2016

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
Fof S Tolerance: 0
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Shear Layer
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $11^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100-25 (A-Bed ( $-3^{\circ}$ ) $-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf (A-Bed0 $\left.0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-159, 1,579) ft
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,896) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block



Upper Left: $(389,1,801)$ ft
Lower Left: (398.4302, 1,750.9572) ft
ower Right: $(489,1,755)$ ft
X Increments: 10
Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
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Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(621.85,1,800.3944) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $642.3716,1,766.6249$ ) ft
Lower Right: $(788,1,773) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

100 psf (A-Bed0 ${ }^{\circ}-5^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.5
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: $(0,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
Tmc 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-Bed ( $-3^{\circ}$ )-(-18 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-18.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-18,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-3,0.625)$
Data Point: $(-2.9,1)$
TQs 100-25 (A-Bed 0-5 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.625

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $0,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(5,0.625)$
Data Point: $(5.1,1)$
100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)-\left(-18^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-18.1, 1 )
Data Point: $(-18,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-3,0.5)$
Data Point: (-2.9, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 323 | 1,760 |
| Point 2 | 350 | 1,775 |
| Point 3 | 366 | 1,776 |
| Point 4 | 792 | 1,888 |
| Point 5 | 811 | 1,896 |
| Point 6 | 811 | 1,883 |
| Point 7 | 811 | 1,852 |
| Point 8 | 811 | 1,786 |
| Point 9 | -159 | 1,579 |
| Point 10 | -119 | 1,580 |
| Point 11 | -63 | 1,612 |
| Point 12 | -54 | 1,612 |
| Point 13 | 5 | 1,640 |
| Point 14 | 16 | 1,641 |
| Point 15 | 84 | 1,674 |
| Point 16 | 93 | 1,674 |
| Point 17 | 144 | 1,696 |
| Point 18 | 153 | 1,697 |
| Point 19 | 215 | 1,726 |
| Point 20 | 223 | 1,726 |
| Point 21 | 282 | 1,746 |
| Point 22 | 297 | 1,748 |
| Point 23 | 811 | 1,644 |
| Point 24 | 810 | 1,500 |
|  |  |  |
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| Point <br> 25 | -159 | 1,505 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 26 | 811 | 1,795 |
| Point <br> 27 | 811 | 1,796 |
| Point <br> 28 | 381 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 29 | 411 | 1,761 |
| Point <br> 30 | 710 | 1,861 |
| Point <br> 31 | 379 | 1,763 |
| Point <br> 32 | 428 | 1,767 |
| Point <br> 33 | 465 | 1,779 |
| Point <br> 34 | 468 | 1,780 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc $100-25^{\circ}$ <br> (A-Bed <br> $\left(-3^{\circ}\right)$-(- <br> 18) | 9,25,24,23,8,32,29,28,31,1,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10 | $2.1207 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Shear Layer | 26,27,34,33 | 320.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | TQs <br> 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ <br> (A-Bed <br> $0-5^{\circ}$ ) | 7,6,5,4,30,34,27 | 16,934 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs } \\ & 100-25^{\circ} \\ & (\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} \\ & \left.0-5^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 1,31,3,2 | 490 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs } \\ \text { 100-25 } \\ \text { (A-Bed } \\ \left.0-5^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 8,26,33,32 | 3,503.5 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 71,732
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.45$
Volume: $12,949.205 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$

Weight: $1,553,904.6 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: 432,084.76 lbs
Resisting Force: $432,084.76 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $298,222.81 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surf
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 500 slip s
Exit: ( $468.06394,1,780.0214$ ) ft
Exit: $(468.06394,1,780.0214) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(802.88262,1,892.5822) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (802.88262, 1,8
Radius: 177.45619 ft
Center: $(607.09242,1,920.7223) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 468.26135 | $1,780.0214$ | 0 | 7.9291643 | 3.69743 | 112.5 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 476.37183 | $1,780.0214$ | 0 | 333.68902 | 64.862576 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 489.92778 | $1,780.2794$ | 0 | 837.28115 | 162.75097 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 501.21353 | $1,780.7955$ | 0 | $1,226.2476$ | 238.35839 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 512.49929 | $1,781.3116$ | 0 | $1,615.2141$ | 313.96581 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 523.78504 | $1,781.8277$ | 0 | $2,004.1805$ | 389.57323 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 535.0708 | $1,782.3438$ | 0 | $2,393.147$ | 465.18065 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 546.35655 | $1,782.8599$ | 0 | $2,782.1134$ | 540.78807 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 557.64231 | $1,783.376$ | 0 | $3,171.0799$ | 616.39549 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 568.92806 | $1,783.8921$ | 0 | $3,560.0464$ | 692.00291 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 580.21382 | $1,784.4082$ | 0 | $3,949.0128$ | 767.61033 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 591.49957 | $1,784.9243$ | 0 | $4,337.9793$ | 843.21775 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 602.78533 | $1,785.4403$ | 0 | $4,726.9457$ | 918.82517 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 614.07108 | $1,785.9564$ | 0 | $5,115.9122$ | 994.43259 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 625.35684 | $1,786.4725$ | 0 | $5,504.8786$ | $1,070.04$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 636.64259 | $1,786.9886$ | 0 | $5,893.8451$ | $1,145.6474$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 647.92835 | $1,787.5047$ | 0 | $6,282.8116$ | $1,221.2549$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 659.2141 | $1,788.0208$ | 0 | $6,671.778$ | $1,296.8623$ | 150 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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2 - Translational

| Slice <br> 19 | 670.49986 | $1,788.5369$ | 0 | $7,060.7445$ | $1,372.4697$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 20 | 681.78561 | $1,789.053$ | 0 | $7,449.7109$ | $1,448.0771$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 693.07137 | $1,789.5691$ | 0 | $7,838.6774$ | $1,523.6845$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 704.35712 | $1,790.0851$ | 0 | $8,227.6438$ | $1,599.292$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 715.49963 | $1,790.5947$ | 0 | $8,608.1035$ | $1,673.2458$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 726.49889 | $1,791.0977$ | 0 | $8,980.0563$ | $1,745.5461$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 732.34801 | $1,791.8483$ | 0 | $7,574.0834$ | $1,472.2527$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 738.62774 | $1,800.8167$ | 0 | $4,439.6407$ | $3,725.3009$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 750.48824 | $1,817.7552$ | 0 | $3,585.5992$ | $3,008.675$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 762.34875 | $1,834.6938$ | 0 | $2,731.5577$ | $2,292.0491$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 774.20925 | $1,851.6323$ | 0 | $1,877.5163$ | $1,575.4232$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 786.06975 | $1,868.5709$ | 0 | $1,023.4748$ | 858.79732 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 797.44131 | $1,884.8112$ | 0 | 237.36695 | 199.17452 | 225 |

## Section 21-21 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 21-21 Static Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/24/2016 11:17:07 AM


## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-bedding 4-21 )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed ( $-2^{\circ}$ )-( $\left.2^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 $\left(A-b e d ~\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(-39.1067,1,781.3158) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: (349.9651, 1,740.2631) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $380.965,1,725.0172$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(739.0283,1,605) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 10
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,780) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,605) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $\mathbf{1 5 0 - 1 7}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$
TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: (21, 0.625
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.75)$
Data Point: $(2,0.75)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$

100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding $4-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.444)$
Data Point: (21, 0.444)
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 183 | 1,679 |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,780 |
| Point 3 | -89 | 1,781 |
| Point 4 | 69 | 1,782 |
| Point 5 | 260 | 1,783 |
| Point 6 | 306 | 1,755 |
| Point 7 | 320 | 1,755 |
| Point 8 | 381 | 1,725 |
| Point 9 | 400 | 1,726 |
| Point 10 | 462 | 1,699 |
| Point 11 | 694 | 1,605 |
| Point 12 | 634 | 1,634 |
| Point 13 | 622 | 1,634 |
| Point 14 | 558 | 1,665 |
| Point 15 | 536 | 1,664 |
| Point 16 | 483 | 1,694 |
| Point 17 | -199 | 1,660 |
| Point 18 | 811 | 1,605 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,502 |
| Point 20 | 474 | 1,699 |
| Point 21 | 811 | 1,500 |
| Point 22 | 669 | 1,580 |
| Point 23 | 609 | 1,580 |
| Point 24 | 205 | 1,783 |
| Point 25 | 394.7786 | $1,689.3389$ |

Regions
Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc 150-170 (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | 17,19,21,18,11,22,23,25,1 | $1.5107 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 17,1,25,24,4,3,2 | 54,880 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 11,12,13,14,15,16,20,10,9,8,7,6,5,24,25,23,22 | 18,436 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 20,103
Fof S: 1.92
Volume: 11,340.004 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,360,800.4 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $8.7742978 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $4.5727768 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 28,611 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (692.11664, 1,605.9103) ft
Entry: (241.1374, 1,783) ft
Radius: 943.06163 ft
Center: (799.75699, 2,542.8088) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 250.5687 | $1,776.2432$ | 0 | 592.73178 | 384.92452 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 267.66667 | $1,764.2467$ | 0 | $1,315.4245$ | 854.24665 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 283 | $1,753.9847$ | 0 | $1,419.3917$ | 921.76373 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 298.33333 | $1,744.1489$ | 0 | $1,482.2639$ | 962.59344 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 313 | $1,735.117$ | 0 | $1,930.1136$ | $1,253.4304$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 327.625 | $1,726.4884$ | 0 | $2,435.1886$ | $1,581.43$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 342.875 | $1,717.8554$ | 0 | $2,568.8728$ | $1,668.2455$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 358.125 | $1,709.591$ | 0 | $2,666.2898$ | $1,731.5089$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 373.375 | $1,701.6842$ | 0 | $2,727.7958$ | $1,771.4513$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 390.5 | $1,693.2426$ | 0 | $3,285.7949$ | $2,133.8202$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 407.75 | $1,685.124$ | 0 | $3,856.7852$ | $2,504.6256$ | 200 |
|  | 423.25 | $1,678.207$ | 0 | $3,900.7414$ | $2,533.1711$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 13 | 438.75 | $1,671.6206$ | 0 | $3,909.8234$ | $2,539.069$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 454.25 | $1,665.3575$ | 0 | $3,884.2063$ | $2,522.4331$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 468 | $1,660.0509$ | 0 | $4,112.4291$ | $2,670.6427$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 478.5 | $1,656.1655$ | 0 | $4,278.4935$ | $2,778.4861$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 489.625 | $1,652.228$ | 0 | $4,049.7653$ | $2,629.9483$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 502.875 | $1,647.7235$ | 0 | $3,748.4572$ | $2,434.2765$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 516.125 | $1,643.4369$ | 0 | $3,420.2104$ | $2,221.1106$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 529.375 | $1,639.3648$ | 0 | $3,065.0483$ | $1,990.4656$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 547 | $1,634.3217$ | 0 | $3,283.675$ | $2,132.4435$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 566 | $1,629.2144$ | 0 | $3,499.9805$ | $2,272.9139$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 582 | $1,625.2689$ | 0 | $3,099.4311$ | $2,012.7941$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 598 | $1,621.6181$ | 0 | $2,661.0562$ | $1,728.1101$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 614 | $1,618.2586$ | 0 | $2,184.7026$ | $1,418.7625$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 628 | $1,615.5399$ | 0 | $2,066.5586$ | $1,342.0388$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 641.26458 | $1,613.19$ | 0 | $1,945.9787$ | $1,263.7334$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 655.79374 | $1,610.8293$ | 0 | $1,425.9278$ | 926.00832 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 670.3229 | $1,608.7005$ | 0 | 873.86398 | 567.4939 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 684.85206 | $1,606.8021$ | 0 | 289.53849 | 188.0285 | 200 |
|  | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Section 21-21 Seismic Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 21-21 Seismic Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/24/2016 11:09:07 AM

| Materials |
| :--- |
| $\square$ TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21$)$ |
| $\square$ Fill |
| $\square$ Tmc 150-17 (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$ |

Seimic load
Horizontal: 0.15
Vertical: 0.0
Keyway depth $25^{\prime}$
width 60', backcut slope 2H:1V


Name: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bedding $\left.4-21^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psi
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )

## Name: Fill

Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
1.32

Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pst-17 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
$\qquad$ ${ }^{029} 6$


LGC

## LGC Valley, Inc
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-bedding 4-21 )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed ( $-2^{\circ}$ )-( $\left.2^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 $\left(A-b e d ~\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(-39.1067,1,781.3158) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: (349.9651, 1,740.2631) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $380.965,1,725.0172$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(739.0283,1,605) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 10
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,780) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,605) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$
TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: (21, 0.625
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.75)$
Data Point: $(2,0.75)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$

100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding $4-21^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.444)$
Data Point: (21, 0.444)
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 183 | 1,679 |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,780 |
| Point 3 | -89 | 1,781 |
| Point 4 | 69 | 1,782 |
| Point 5 | 260 | 1,783 |
| Point 6 | 306 | 1,755 |
| Point 7 | 320 | 1,755 |
| Point 8 | 381 | 1,725 |
| Point 9 | 400 | 1,726 |
| Point 10 | 462 | 1,699 |
| Point 11 | 694 | 1,605 |
| Point 12 | 634 | 1,634 |
| Point 13 | 622 | 1,634 |
| Point 14 | 558 | 1,665 |
| Point 15 | 536 | 1,664 |
| Point 16 | 483 | 1,694 |
| Point 17 | -199 | 1,660 |
| Point 18 | 811 | 1,605 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,502 |
| Point 20 | 474 | 1,699 |
| Point 21 | 811 | 1,500 |
| Point 22 | 669 | 1,580 |
| Point 23 | 609 | 1,580 |
| Point 24 | 205 | 1,783 |
| Point 25 | 394.7786 | $1,689.3389$ |

Regions
Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 150-17^{\circ} \text { (A-bed } \\ & \left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$ | 17,19,21,18,11,22,23,25,1 | $1.5107 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TQs } 100-25^{\circ} \\ \text { (A-bedding 4-21 }) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 17,1,25,24,4,3,2 | 54,880 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 11,12,13,14,15,16,20,10,9,8,7,6,5,24,25,23,22 | 18,436 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 19,541
Fof S: 1.32
Volume: $11,409.938 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 1,369,192.5 lbs
Resisting Moment: 9.3039048e+008 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $7.0610888 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 28,611 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (691.72283, 1,606.1006) ft
Entry: $(233.13026,1,783) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: $1,045.7308 \mathrm{ft}$
Center: (828.23993, 2,642.8821) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 239.84769 | $1,778.4278$ | 0 | 333.88252 | 216.82585 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 253.28256 | $1,769.4337$ | 0 | $1,154.6236$ | 749.82134 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 267.66667 | $1,760.1432$ | 0 | $1,590.1902$ | $1,032.6816$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 283 | $1,750.5899$ | 0 | $1,627.7071$ | $1,057.0454$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 298.33333 | $1,741.3985$ | 0 | $1,631.6461$ | $1,059.6033$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 313 | $1,732.9283$ | 0 | $2,004.7822$ | $1,301.9208$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 327.625 | $1,724.8069$ | 0 | $2,437.2277$ | $1,582.7542$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 342.875 | $1,716.6534$ | 0 | $2,522.4028$ | $1,638.0675$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 358.125 | $1,708.8201$ | 0 | $2,577.5842$ | $1,673.9027$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 373.375 | $1,701.2989$ | 0 | $2,602.8155$ | $1,690.2881$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 390.5 | $1,693.2363$ | 0 | $3,099.4505$ | $2,012.8067$ | 200 |
|  | 407.75 | $1,685.4536$ | 0 | $3,613.7828$ | $2,346.818$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 13 | 423.25 | $1,678.7943$ | 0 | $3,635.3004$ | $2,360.7917$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 438.75 | $1,672.4283$ | 0 | $3,627.1409$ | $2,355.4928$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 454.25 | $1,666.3498$ | 0 | $3,589.2406$ | $2,330.8801$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 468 | $1,661.18$ | 0 | $3,797.7081$ | $2,466.2605$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 478.5 | $1,657.3813$ | 0 | $3,951.1439$ | $2,565.9029$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 491.83333 | $1,652.783$ | 0 | $3,679.8981$ | $2,389.7538$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 509.5 | $1,646.9546$ | 0 | $3,280.7772$ | $2,130.5616$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 527.16667 | $1,641.4718$ | 0 | $2,838.3276$ | $1,843.2315$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 547 | $1,635.7444$ | 0 | $2,996.9507$ | $1,946.2425$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 566 | $1,630.6002$ | 0 | $3,214.3646$ | $2,087.4328$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 582 | $1,626.5894$ | 0 | $2,839.3644$ | $1,843.9048$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 598 | $1,622.8453$ | 0 | $2,429.7554$ | $1,577.9016$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 614 | $1,619.365$ | 0 | $1,985.2095$ | $1,289.2101$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 628 | $1,616.5199$ | 0 | $1,887.0695$ | $1,225.4773$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 641.21535 | $1,614.0377$ | 0 | $1,789.5293$ | $1,162.1339$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 655.64606 | $1,611.5186$ | 0 | $1,309.2381$ | 850.22917 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 670.07677 | $1,609.2072$ | 0 | 799.38585 | 519.12724 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 684.50748 | $1,607.1019$ | 0 | 259.61725 | 168.59741 | 200 |
|  | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulom
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Tmc $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 $\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,780)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,605) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: ( $345.9397,1,691.465$ ) it
Lower Left: (295.0306, 1,576.1191) ft
Lower Right: (409.9866, 1,529.9807) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
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Starting Angle: $115^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (644.9611, 1,663.7267) ft
Lower Left: $(598.3451,1,550.8695) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: (717.2158, 1,501.4945) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $0^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: $(21,0.625)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
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## Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.75)$
Data Point: $(2,0.75)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$
100psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.444)$
Data Point: $(21,0.444)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 183 | 1,679 |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,780 |
| Point 3 | -89 | 1,781 |
| Point 4 | 69 | 1,782 |
| Point 5 | 260 | 1,783 |
| Point 6 | 306 | 1,755 |
| Point 7 | 320 | 1,755 |
| Point 8 | 381 | 1,725 |
| Point 9 | 400 | 1,726 |
| Point 10 | 462 | 1,699 |
| Point 11 | 694 | 1,605 |
| Point 12 | 634 | 1,634 |
| Point 13 | 622 | 1,634 |
| Point 14 | 558 | 1,665 |
| Point 15 | 536 | 1,664 |
| Point 16 | 483 | 1,694 |
| Point 17 | -199 | 1,660 |
| Point 18 | 811 | 1,605 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,502 |
| Point 20 | 474 | 1,699 |
| Point 21 | 811 | 1,500 |
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## Regions

|  Material Points Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> Region <br> 1 Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left(-2^{\circ}\right)$ <br> $\left.-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$ $17,19,21,18,11,22,23,25,1$ $1.5107 \mathrm{e}+005$ <br> Region <br> 2 TQs $100-25^{\circ}($ A-bedding <br> $\left.4-21^{\circ}\right)$ $17,1,25,24,4,3,2$ 54,880 <br> Region <br> 3 Fill $11,12,13,14,15,16,20,10,9,8,7,6,5,24,25,23,22$ 18,436 |
| :--- |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 41,930
$F$ of $S$ : 1.74
Volume: $40,416.641 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $4,849,996.9$ Ibs
Resisting Force: $1,895,838.6 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $1,087,812.1 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (758.94849, 1,605) ft
Entry: $(230.99836,1,783) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 290.73895 ft
Center: $(539.98336,1,827.5) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Slices

Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 237.86261 | $1,773.1968$ | 0 | 660.01214 | 428.6169 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 252.36343 | $1,752.4875$ | 0 | $2,058.0993$ | $1,726.9504$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 269.9566 | $1,727.3619$ | 0 | $3,412.4242$ | $2,863.3638$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 289.86979 | $1,698.9229$ | 0 | $4,571.5966$ | $3,836.025$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 302.91319 | $1,680.295$ | 0 | $5,343.0266$ | $4,483.3316$ | 200 |
|  | 313 | $1,665.8895$ | 0 | $6,232.8712$ | $5,229.9999$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 7 | 327.96355 | $1,644.5193$ | 0 | $7,472.7242$ | $6,270.3601$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 343.89067 | $1,621.7731$ | 0 | $8,532.115$ | $7,159.2946$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 359.81777 | $1,599.0268$ | 0 | $9,591.5059$ | $8,048.229$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 374.39067 | $1,587.4508$ | 0 | $16,802.629$ | $5,137.0792$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 387.8893 | $1,587.0365$ | 0 | $16,507.389$ | $5,046.8154$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 397.3893 | $1,586.745$ | 0 | $16,601.867$ | $5,075.7002$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 407.75 | $1,586.427$ | 0 | $16,253.394$ | $4,969.1613$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 423.25 | $1,585.9513$ | 0 | $15,504.521$ | $4,740.2079$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 438.75 | $1,585.4756$ | 0 | $14,755.649$ | $4,511.2545$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 454.25 | $1,584.9999$ | 0 | $14,006.776$ | $4,282.3011$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 468 | $1,584.5778$ | 0 | $13,654.318$ | $4,174.544$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 478.5 | $1,584.2556$ | 0 | $13,394.392$ | $4,095.0765$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 491.83333 | $1,583.8464$ | 0 | $12,548.065$ | $3,836.3285$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 509.5 | $1,583.3042$ | 0 | $11,419.223$ | $3,491.2067$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 527.16667 | $1,582.762$ | 0 | $10,290.38$ | $3,146.0849$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 547 | $1,582.1533$ | 0 | $9,825.9316$ | $3,004.0888$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 566.413 | $1,581.5574$ | 0 | $9,470.3418$ | $2,895.374$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 583.23901 | $1,581.041$ | 0 | $8,559.2166$ | $2,616.8151$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 600.06501 | $1,580.5246$ | 0 | $7,648.0915$ | $2,338.2562$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 612.81839 | $1,580.1332$ | 0 | $6,914.8939$ | $4,490.5846$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 619.57939 | $1,579.9257$ | 0 | $6,591.3916$ | $2,015.1906$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 628 | $1,579.6673$ | 0 | $6,482.2948$ | $1,981.8364$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 642.75 | $1,579.2146$ | 0 | $6,031.5507$ | $1,844.0301$ | 150 |
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| Slice <br> 30 | 660.25 | $1,578.6775$ | 0 | $5,086.1046$ | $1,554.9782$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 31 | 681.5 | $1,578.2532$ | 0 | $3,924.9424$ | $1,199.9753$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 702.11856 | $1,581.4603$ | 0 | $3,590.1224$ | $3,012.4704$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 718.35568 | $1,588.1859$ | 0 | $2,581.3887$ | $2,166.0423$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 734.59281 | $1,594.9115$ | 0 | $1,572.6551$ | $1,319.6143$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 750.82993 | $1,601.6372$ | 0 | 563.92146 | 473.18629 | 200 |

## Section 21-21 Seismic Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 21-21 Seismic Final SSA with key for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/24/2016 10:46:22 AM

| Materials |
| :--- |
| $\square$ TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bedding $\left.4-21^{\circ}\right)$ |
| $\square$ Fill |
| $\square$ Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$ |

Seimic load
Horizontal: 0.15
Vertical: 0.0
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Keyway depth 25
width 60', backcut slope $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$


Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psff $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )

## Name: Fill

Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Name: Tmc 150-170 (A-bed (-20)-(20))
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-170 (A-bed (-20)-(20))
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-170 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulom
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 $\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,780)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,605) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: ( $345.9397,1,691.465$ ) it
Lower Left: (295.0306, 1,576.1191) ft
Lower Right: (409.9866, 1,529.9807) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

Starting Angle: 115
Ending Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Angle Increments:
Right Grid
Upper Left: (644.9611, 1,663.7267) ft
Lower Left: (598.3451, 1,550.8695) ft
Lower Right: (717.2158, 1,501.4945) ft
$X$ Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $0^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $150-17^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

## Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: (21, 0.625)
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
$150 p s f-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.75$
Data Point: $(2,0.75)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$
100psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.444)$
Data Point: $(21,0.444)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 183 | 1,679 |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,780 |
| Point 3 | -89 | 1,781 |
| Point 4 | 69 | 1,782 |
| Point 5 | 260 | 1,783 |
| Point 6 | 306 | 1,755 |
| Point 7 | 320 | 1,755 |
| Point 8 | 381 | 1,725 |
| Point 9 | 400 | 1,726 |
| Point 10 | 462 | 1,699 |
| Point 11 | 694 | 1,605 |
| Point 12 | 634 | 1,634 |
| Point 13 | 622 | 1,634 |
| Point 14 | 558 | 1,665 |
| Point 15 | 536 | 1,664 |
| Point 16 | 483 | 1,694 |
| Point 17 | -199 | 1,660 |
| Point 18 | 811 | 1,605 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,502 |
| Point 20 | 474 | 1,699 |
| Point 21 | 811 | 1,500 |

2 - Translational

| Point <br> 22 | 669 | 1,580 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 23 | 609 | 1,580 |
| Point <br> 24 | 205 | 1,783 |
| Point <br> 25 | 394.7786 | $1,689.3389$ |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } 150-17^{\circ}\left(A-\text { bed }\left(-2^{\circ}\right)\right. \\ & \left.-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$ | 17,19,21,18,11,22,23,25,1 | $1.5107 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TQs } 100-25^{\circ} \text { (A-bedding } \\ & 4-21^{\circ} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 17,1,25,24,4,3,2 | 54,880 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 11,12,13,14,15,16,20,10,9,8,7,6,5,24,25,23,22 | 18,436 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 27,773
$F$ of $S$ : 1.11
Volume: $46,767.473 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $5,612,096.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $2,032,506.4 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $1,827,168.4 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: $(758.94849,1,605) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (201.31988, 1,782.9729) ft
Radius: 299.26834 ft
Center: $(522.73561,1,827.4662) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Slices

Slices

|  | X (ft) | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 203.15994 | $1,780.3451$ | 0 | 13.993672 | 11.742085 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 214.16667 | $1,764.6258$ | 0 | 924.34296 | 775.61584 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 232.5 | $1,738.4431$ | 0 | $2,439.3604$ | $2,046.8664$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 250.83333 | $1,712.2604$ | 0 | $3,954.3779$ | $3,318.117$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 265.55529 | $1,691.2353$ | 0 | $4,975.2971$ | $4,174.77$ | 225 |
|  | 279.83293 | $1,670.8447$ | 0 | $5,667.716$ | $4,755.7784$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 7 | 297.27764 | $1,645.9311$ | 0 | $6,494.878$ | $5,449.8497$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 313 | $1,623.4772$ | 0 | $7,486.9202$ | $6,282.272$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 329.84961 | $1,599.4135$ | 0 | $8,599.033$ | $7,215.4454$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 350.02441 | $1,585.1225$ | 0 | $18,500.355$ | $5,656.1262$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 370.6748 | $1,584.6739$ | 0 | $17,342.361$ | $5,302.092$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 387.8893 | $1,584.3$ | 0 | $16,824.47$ | $5,143.7566$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 397.3893 | $1,584.0937$ | 0 | $16,908.731$ | $5,169.5178$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 410.33333 | $1,583.8125$ | 0 | $16,421.856$ | $5,020.6653$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 431 | $1,583.3636$ | 0 | $15,401.796$ | $4,708.8015$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 451.66667 | $1,582.9147$ | 0 | $14,381.735$ | $4,396.9377$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 468 | $1,582.5599$ | 0 | $13,887.252$ | $4,245.7589$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 478.5 | $1,582.3318$ | 0 | $13,616.234$ | $4,162.9004$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 491.83333 | $1,582.0422$ | 0 | $12,756.106$ | $3,899.9331$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 509.5 | $1,581.6584$ | 0 | $11,608.982$ | $3,549.2221$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 527.16667 | $1,581.2747$ | 0 | $10,461.858$ | $3,198.511$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 547 | $1,580.8439$ | 0 | $9,976.4437$ | $3,050.1049$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 566.5 | $1,580.4203$ | 0 | $9,595.4765$ | $2,933.6316$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 583.5 | $1,580.0511$ | 0 | $8,657.2465$ | $2,646.7859$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 600.5 | $1,579.6818$ | 0 | $7,719.0165$ | $2,359.9402$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 615.5 | $1,579.356$ | 0 | $6,891.1665$ | $2,106.841$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 628 | $1,579.0845$ | 0 | $6,547.9785$ | $2,001.9179$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 642.75 | $1,578.7641$ | 0 | $6,081.7002$ | $1,859.3623$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 660.25 | $1,578.3839$ | 0 | $5,118.0497$ | $1,564.7448$ | 150 |
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| Slice <br> 30 | 681.5 | $1,578.1457$ | 0 | $3,942.8349$ | $1,205.4456$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 31 | 704.82475 | $1,582.5812$ | 0 | $4,014.9791$ | $3,368.9675$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 726.47425 | $1,591.5487$ | 0 | $2,452.1136$ | $2,057.5677$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 748.12374 | $1,600.5162$ | 0 | 889.24821 | 746.16784 | 200 |



## 2 - Translational

Report generated using GeoStudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2015 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 142
Date: 3/24/2016
Time: 10:53:54 AM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
File Name: Section 21-21 Static Temporary Final SSA without key for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: G:\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 21-21 results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/24/2016
Last Solved Time: 10:54:07 AM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21²)
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100-25 (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150psf-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,780) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(811,1,605) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(345.9397,1,691.465) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (295.0306, 1,576.1191) ft
Lower Right: (409.9866, 1,529.9807) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: 115
Ending Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (599.9611, 1,661.7267) ft
Lower Left: (553.3451, 1,548.8695) ft
Lower Right: (672.2158, 1,499.4945) ft

X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $0^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc 150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.425
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2,0.425)$
Data Point: $(2.1,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $21,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$
150psf-17º (A-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 0.75
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-2.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-2,0.75)$

Data Point: $(2,0.75)$ Data Point: $(2.1,1)$

100psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bedding 4-21 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(3.9,1)$
Data Point: $(4,0.444)$
Data Point: $(21,0.444)$
Data Point: $(21.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 183 | 1,679 |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,780 |
| Point 3 | -89 | 1,781 |
| Point 4 | 69 | 1,782 |
| Point 5 | 694 | 1,605 |
| Point 6 | -199 | 1,660 |
| Point 7 | 811 | 1,605 |
| Point 8 | -200 | 1,502 |
| Point 9 | 811 | 1,500 |
| Point 10 | 669 | 1,580 |
| Point 11 | 609 | 1,580 |
| Point 12 | 205 | 1,783 |
| Point 13 | 394.7786 | $1,689.3389$ |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.\left(-2^{\circ}\right)-\left(2^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $6,8,9,7,5,10,11,13,1$ | $1.5107 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 2 | TQs 100-25 | (A-bedding $\left.4-21^{\circ}\right)$ | $6,1,13,12,4,3,2$ |
| 54,880 |  |  |  |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 26,76
Fof S: 1.37
Volume: $27,789.799 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 3,334,775.9 lbs
Resisting Force: 1,232,169.4 lbs

```
Activating Force: 897,971.46 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): }1\mathrm{ of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query):1 Of 150 slip
Entry: (193.09726, 1,782.9125) ft
Radius: 275.194 ft
Center: (473.25182, 1,833.2651) ft
```

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice <br> 1 | 199.04863 | 1,774.413 | 0 | 424.55202 | 356.24144 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 212.26485 | 1,755.5383 | 0 | 1,410.0248 | 1,183.1513 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 226.79455 | 1,734.7878 | 0 | 2,282.8096 | 1,915.5047 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 241.32425 | 1,714.0372 | 0 | 3,155.5943 | 2,647.858 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 255.85395 | 1,693.2866 | 0 | 4,028.379 | 3,380.2114 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 269.62729 | 1,673.6163 | 0 | 4,869.5659 | 4,086.051 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 282.64425 | 1,655.0261 | 0 | 5,651.482 | 4,742.1565 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 295.66121 | 1,636.436 | 0 | 6,433.3981 | 5,398.262 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 308.67818 | 1,617.8458 | 0 | 7,215.3142 | 6,054.3674 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 321.69514 | 1,599.2557 | 0 | 7,997.2302 | 6,710.4729 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | 334.86112 | 1,589.7579 | 0 | 15,391.277 | 4,705.5857 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 348.17611 | 1,589.3526 | 0 | 14,656.309 | 4,480.8834 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 361.49111 | 1,588.9472 | 0 | 13,921.341 | 4,256.1811 | 150 |
| Slice $14$ | 374.80611 | 1,588.5419 | 0 | 13,186.373 | 4,031.4787 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 388.1211 | 1,588.1365 | 0 | 12,451.405 | 3,806.7764 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 401.82122 | 1,587.7195 | 0 | 11,681.014 | 3,571.2443 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 415.90647 | 1,587.2907 | 0 | 10,875.2 | 3,324.8824 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 429.99171 | 1,586.8619 | 0 | 10,069.387 | 3,078.5205 | 150 |
|  | 444.07696 | 1,586.4331 | 0 | 9,263.5733 | 2,832.1586 | 150 |


| Slice <br> 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 20 | 458.1622 | $1,586.0043$ | 0 | $8,457.7598$ | $2,585.7967$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 472.24745 | $1,585.5755$ | 0 | $7,651.9463$ | $2,339.4347$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 486.33269 | $1,585.1467$ | 0 | $6,846.1328$ | $2,093.0728$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 500.41794 | $1,584.7179$ | 0 | $6,040.3193$ | $1,846.7109$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 514.50318 | $1,584.2891$ | 0 | $5,234.5058$ | $1,600.349$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 528.58843 | $1,583.8603$ | 0 | $4,428.6923$ | $1,353.9871$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 542.67367 | $1,583.4315$ | 0 | $3,622.8788$ | $1,107.6252$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 556.75892 | $1,583.0027$ | 0 | $2,817.0653$ | 861.26328 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 570.84416 | $1,582.574$ | 0 | $2,011.2518$ | 614.90137 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 584.92941 | $1,582.1452$ | 0 | $1,205.4383$ | 368.53946 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 599.01465 | $1,581.7164$ | 0 | 399.62475 | 122.17755 | 150 |

## Section 22-22 Static Left SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 22-22 Static Left SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/25/2016 3:25:12 PM


## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Renotserad

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsev
Revision Number: 163
Date: 3/25/2016
Time: 3:25:12 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.1.11236
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed -1$\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-190.7941, 1,777.3607) ft

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Left-Zone Increment: 50
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(131,1,671.1538)$ f
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(319,1,626) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,773) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,1,751) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ ) <br> Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: (10, 0.625 )
Data Point: $(10,0.625)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: ( $-5,0.625$ )
Data Point: (-1, 0.625
Data Point: (-0.9, 1)
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0}-2^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(1.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $2,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(10,0.625$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$ Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.75)$
Data Point: ( $-1,0.75$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
100psf-25 (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.444$
Data Point: $(18,0.444)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)

100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-5.1, 1
Data Point: $(-5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | $1,665.0405$ |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,773 |
| Point 3 | -181 | 1,782 |
| Point 4 | -161 | 1,788 |
| Point 5 | -128 | 1,769 |
| Point 6 | -115 | 1,769 |
| Point 7 | -56 | 1,730 |
| Point 8 | -36 | 1,730 |
| Point 9 | 21 | 1,709 |
| Point 10 | 31 | 1,709 |
| Point 11 | 83 | 1,685 |
| Point 12 | 96 | 1,679 |
| Point 13 | 114 | 1,679 |
| Point 14 | 166 | 1,655 |
| Point 15 | 176 | 1,655 |
| Point 16 | 235 | 1,626 |
| Point 17 | 332 | 1,626 |
| Point 18 | 367 | 1,649 |
| Point 19 | 443 | 1,648 |
| Point 20 | 523 | 1,678 |
| Point 21 | 566 | 1,702 |
| Point 22 | 592 | 1,702 |
| Point 23 | 639 | 1,726 |
| Point 24 | 661 | 1,726 |
| Point 25 | 731 | 1,728 |
| Point 26 | 812 | 1,733 |
| Point 27 | 812 | 1,500 |
| Point 28 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point 29 | 703 | 1,749 |
|  |  |  |
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| Point <br> 30 | 768 | 1,750 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 31 | 812 | 1,751 |
| Point <br> 32 | 542 | $1,688.6047$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 812 | 1,701 |

## Regions

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $10^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-18^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ | 18,295 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $2^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-10^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,29,30,31,26,25$ | 2,654 |
| Region <br> 3 | Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $32,33,26,25,24,23,22,21$ | $6,933.1$ |
| Region <br> 4 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $1,28,27,33,32,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11$ | $1.7108 e+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 6,847
F of S: 2.44
Volume: 13,249.685 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: 1,589,962.2 lbs
Resisting Moment: $8.4245847 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $3.4512137 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (247.61564, 1,626) ft
Entry: (-178.33604, 1,782.7992) ft
Radius: 632.66709 ft
Center: (238.65057, 2,258.6036) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | -169.66802 | $1,775.4734$ | 0 | 862.95277 | 724.10335 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | -152.75 | $1,761.6499$ | 0 | $1,983.248$ | $1,664.1427$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | -136.25 | $1,749.0819$ | 0 | $2,309.1293$ | $1,937.5895$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | -121.5 | $1,738.5106$ | 0 | $2,904.48$ | $2,437.1481$ | 225 |
|  | -107.625 | $1,729.1858$ | 0 | $3,374.7018$ | $2,831.7111$ | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 6 | -92.875 | $1,719.824$ | 0 | $3,376.2433$ | $2,833.0045$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 7 | -78.125 | $1,711.0195$ | 0 | $3,320.0237$ | $2,785.8307$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 8 | -63.375 | $1,702.7459$ | 0 | $3,207.2002$ | $2,691.1605$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 9 | -46 | $1,693.6998$ | 0 | $3,674.0528$ | $3,082.8964$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 10 | -30.294986 | $1,685.9813$ | 0 | $4,294.3348$ | $3,603.3748$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 11 | -18.884957 | $1,680.7592$ | 0 | $4,432.9194$ | $3,719.661$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 12 | -4.6349568 | $1,674.6566$ | 0 | $4,567.1967$ | $3,832.333$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 12.455014 | $1,667.8248$ | 0 | $4,673.1875$ | $3,921.2699$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 26 | $1,662.7687$ | 0 | $4,916.1845$ | $4,125.1686$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 37.5 | $1,658.8044$ | 0 | $5,054.1264$ | $4,240.9156$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 50.5 | $1,654.5997$ | 0 | $4,898.6594$ | $4,110.4633$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 63.5 | $1,650.7021$ | 0 | $4,706.6047$ | $3,949.3103$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 76.5 | $1,647.1057$ | 0 | $4,477.9566$ | $3,757.4517$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 89.5 | $1,643.8052$ | 0 | $4,212.6566$ | $3,534.8386$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 105 | $1,640.283$ | 0 | $4,308.6247$ | $3,615.3654$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 120.5 | $1,637.1019$ | 0 | $4,367.1863$ | $3,664.5044$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 133.5 | $1,634.7706$ | 0 | $3,983.2329$ | $3,342.3293$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 146.5 | $1,632.718$ | 0 | $3,561.7565$ | $2,988.6686$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 159.5 | $1,630.9413$ | 0 | $3,102.4103$ | $2,603.2313$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 171 | $1,629.5839$ | 0 | $2,932.8426$ | $2,460.9471$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 183.375 | $1,628.3993$ | 0 | $2,702.2945$ | $1,370.5115$ | 156.30856 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 198.125 | $1,627.279$ | 0 | $1,993.1701$ | 929.4305 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 212.875 | $1,626.5049$ | 0 | $1,232.3276$ | 574.6438 | 150 |
|  | -100 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-bed $\left.10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-190.7941, 1,777.3607) ft

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Left-Zone Increment: 50
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(131,1,671.1538)$ f
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(319,1,626) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,773) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,1,751) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ ) <br> Model: Spline Data Point Function

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: (10, 0.625 )
Data Point: $(18,0.625)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: ( $-5,0.625$ )
Data Point: (-1, 0.625
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0}-\mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
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Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(1.9,1)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: $(10,0.625$
Data Point: $(10.1,1)$
150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$ Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.75)$
Data Point: ( $-1,0.75$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1)
100psf-25 (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444$
Data Point: $(18,0.444)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)

100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-5.1, 1
Data Point: $(-5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | $1,665.0405$ |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,773 |
| Point 3 | -181 | 1,782 |
| Point 4 | -161 | 1,788 |
| Point 5 | -128 | 1,769 |
| Point 6 | -115 | 1,769 |
| Point 7 | -56 | 1,730 |
| Point 8 | -36 | 1,730 |
| Point 9 | 21 | 1,709 |
| Point 10 | 31 | 1,709 |
| Point 11 | 83 | 1,685 |
| Point 12 | 96 | 1,679 |
| Point 13 | 114 | 1,679 |
| Point 14 | 166 | 1,655 |
| Point 15 | 176 | 1,655 |
| Point 16 | 235 | 1,626 |
| Point 17 | 332 | 1,626 |
| Point 18 | 367 | 1,649 |
| Point 19 | 443 | 1,648 |
| Point 20 | 523 | 1,678 |
| Point 21 | 566 | 1,702 |
| Point 22 | 592 | 1,702 |
| Point 23 | 639 | 1,726 |
| Point 24 | 661 | 1,726 |
| Point 25 | 731 | 1,728 |
| Point 26 | 812 | 1,733 |
| Point 27 | 812 | 1,500 |
| Point 28 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point 29 | 703 | 1,749 |
|  |  |  |
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| Point <br> 30 | 768 | 1,750 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 31 | 812 | 1,751 |
| Point <br> 32 | 542 | $1,688.6047$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 812 | 1,701 |

## Regions

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $10^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-18^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ | 18,295 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $2^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-10^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,29,30,31,26,25$ | 2,654 |
| Region <br> 3 | Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $32,33,26,25,24,23,22,21$ | $6,933.1$ |
| Region <br> 4 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $1,28,27,33,32,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11$ | $1.7108 e+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 4,043
F of S: 1.66
Volume: $15,477.816 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,857,337.9 \mathrm{Ibs}$
Resisting Moment: $8.4460924 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $5.0779195 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (232.08549, 1,627.4326) ft
Entry: (-184.64029, 1,780.2757) ft
Radius: 581.50139 ft
Center: (208.80039, 2,208.4675) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | -182.82014 | $1,778.6174$ | 0 | 123.02745 | 103.23229 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | -171 | $1,768.33$ | 0 | $1,313.3356$ | $1,102.0194$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 3 | -152.75 | $1,753.1499$ | 0 | $2,503.8346$ | $2,100.9667$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 4 | -136.25 | $1,740.5156$ | 0 | $2,835.8265$ | $2,379.541$ | 225 |
|  | -121.5 | $1,729.9457$ | 0 | $3,408.7385$ | $2,860.2712$ | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 6 | -107.625 | $1,720.675$ | 0 | $3,864.362$ | $3,242.5847$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 7 | -92.875 | $1,711.4148$ | 0 | $3,885.8893$ | $3,260.6483$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 8 | -78.125 | $1,702.7544$ | 0 | $3,848.5455$ | $3,229.3131$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 9 | -63.375 | $1,694.6633$ | 0 | $3,752.9778$ | $3,149.1223$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 10 | -46 | $1,685.8809$ | 0 | $4,197.9731$ | $3,522.5177$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 11 | -31.811919 | $1,679.1015$ | 0 | $4,769.7903$ | $4,002.3293$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 12 | -21.545858 | $1,674.5756$ | 0 | $4,896.5226$ | $4,108.6703$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | -9.3898984 | $1,669.4927$ | 0 | $5,013.9371$ | $4,207.1928$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 2.766061 | $1,664.7291$ | 0 | $5,100.1884$ | $4,279.5662$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 14.92202 | $1,660.2765$ | 0 | $5,155.1702$ | $4,325.7014$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 26 | $1,656.471$ | 0 | $5,368.6344$ | $4,504.8192$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 37.5 | $1,652.8114$ | 0 | $5,493.0622$ | $4,609.2264$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 50.5 | $1,648.9685$ | 0 | $5,330.5209$ | $4,472.8381$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 63.5 | $1,645.4519$ | 0 | $5,128.4539$ | $4,303.2838$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 76.5 | $1,642.2557$ | 0 | $4,886.4485$ | $4,100.2171$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 89.5 | $1,639.3743$ | 0 | $4,604.0157$ | $3,863.2279$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 105 | $1,636.3787$ | 0 | $4,666.506$ | $3,915.6635$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 120.5 | $1,633.747$ | 0 | $4,689.1974$ | $3,934.7038$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 133.5 | $1,631.8995$ | 0 | $4,275.2794$ | $3,587.3854$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 146.5 | $1,630.3501$ | 0 | $3,817.9141$ | $3,203.6103$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 159.5 | $1,629.0965$ | 0 | $3,380.2808$ | $1,576.2508$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 171 | $1,628.2177$ | 0 | $3,150.5881$ | $1,469.1433$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 183.01069 | $1,627.5807$ | 0 | $2,837.5587$ | $1,323.1753$ | 150 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ (A-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Tmc150-17º (A-bed -1ํ.(-5ํ))
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fr
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,773) f$

Right Coordinate: $(812,1,751) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(-104,1,763) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $-145,1,621$ ) ft
Lower Right: ( $-5,1,570$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $115{ }^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(148,1,699)$ ft
Lower Left: $(118,1,596) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(278,1,551) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $0^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0}-\mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 8}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(18,0.625)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.625$
Data Point: $(-1,0.625$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(1.9,1)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$
150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$
Data Point: (20.1, 1)
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.75$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1 )
100psf-25 (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
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Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444)$
Data Point: $(18,0.444)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-5.1, 1 )
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | $1,665.0405$ |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,773 |
| Point 3 | -181 | 1,782 |
| Point 4 | -161 | 1,788 |
| Point 5 | -128 | 1,769 |
| Point 6 | -115 | 1,769 |
| Point 7 | -56 | 1,730 |
| Point 8 | -36 | 1,730 |
| Point 9 | 21 | 1,709 |
| Point 10 | 31 | 1,709 |
| Point 11 | 83 | 1,685 |
| Point 12 | 96 | 1,679 |
| Point 13 | 114 | 1,679 |
| Point 14 | 166 | 1,655 |
| Point 15 | 176 | 1,655 |
| Point 16 | 235 | 1,626 |
| Point 17 | 332 | 1,626 |
| Point 18 | 367 | 1,649 |
| Point 19 | 443 | 1,648 |
| Point 20 | 523 | 1,678 |
| Point 21 | 566 | 1,702 |
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| Point <br> 22 | 592 | 1,702 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 23 | 639 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 24 | 661 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 25 | 731 | 1,728 |
| Point <br> 26 | 812 | 1,733 |
| Point <br> 27 | 812 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 28 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 29 | 703 | 1,749 |
| Point <br> 30 | 768 | 1,750 |
| Point <br> 31 | 812 | 1,751 |
| Point <br> 32 | 542 | $1,688.6047$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 812 | 1,701 |

## Regions

| Regions |
| :--- |
| $\qquad$ Material Points Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> Region <br> 1 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $10^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-18^{\circ}\right)$ $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ 18,295 <br> Region <br> 2 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $2^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-10^{\circ}\right)$ $24,29,30,31,26,25$ 2,654 <br> Region <br> 3 Tmc100-25 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ $32,33,26,25,24,23,22,21$ |
| Region <br> 4 |
| Tmc150-17 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 51,804
Fof $S$ : 1.87
Volume: $17,312.036 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 2,077,444.3 lbs
Resisting Force: $1,031,602.7 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $551,786.92 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces

Exit: (213.17513, 1,636.7275) ft
Entry: $(-172.13666,1,784.659) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 216.64633 ft
Center: (63.115398, 1,821.6419) ft

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -166.56833 | 1,776.7066 | 0 | 600.17497 | 503.60659 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -155.5 | 1,760.8994 | 0 | 1,648.1723 | 1,382.9807 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | -144.5 | 1,745.1898 | 0 | 2,334.7981 | 1,959.1283 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | -133.5 | 1,729.4801 | 0 | 3,021.424 | 2,535.2758 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -121.5 | 1,712.3424 | 0 | 4,044.5281 | 3,393.762 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 6 | -109.65795 | 1,695.4302 | 0 | 5,024.4194 | 4,215.9885 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | -98.973857 | 1,680.1717 | 0 | 5,624.6197 | 4,719.6164 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | -90.115905 | 1,667.5212 | 0 | 6,133.845 | 5,146.9071 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | -78.95 | 1,661.8423 | 0 | 9,783.4562 | 4,562.1006 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | -63.65 | 1,660.5269 | 0 | 8,749.7613 | 4,080.0807 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | -51 | 1,659.4394 | 0 | 8,283.4185 | 3,862.6215 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | -41 | 1,658.5796 | 0 | 8,384.4277 | 3,909.7229 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -28.875 | 1,657.5372 | 0 | 8,198.491 | 3,823.0191 | 150 |
| Slice $14$ | -14.625 | 1,656.3121 | 0 | 7,725.6082 | 3,602.5103 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | -0.375 | 1,655.087 | 0 | 7,252.7255 | 3,382.0014 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 13.875 | 1,653.8619 | 0 | 6,779.8427 | 3,161.4926 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 26 | 1,652.8195 | 0 | 6,593.906 | 3,074.7889 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 37.5 | 1,651.8308 | 0 | 6,357.5975 | 2,964.5964 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 50.5 | 1,650.7131 | 0 | 5,783.9713 | 2,697.1101 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 63.5 | 1,649.5955 | 0 | 5,210.3451 | 2,429.6238 | 150 |
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| Slice <br> 21 | 76.5 | $1,648.4778$ | 0 | $4,636.7189$ | $2,162.1376$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 22 | 89.5 | $1,647.3602$ | 0 | $4,063.0928$ | $1,894.6513$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 105 | $1,646.0276$ | 0 | $3,867.188$ | $1,803.2994$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 120.5 | $1,644.695$ | 0 | $3,671.2832$ | $1,711.9475$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 133.5 | $1,643.5774$ | 0 | $3,097.657$ | $1,444.4612$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 146.5 | $1,642.4597$ | 0 | $2,524.0309$ | $1,176.9749$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 159.5 | $1,641.3421$ | 0 | $1,950.4047$ | 909.48863 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 171 | $1,640.3534$ | 0 | $1,714.0962$ | 799.29618 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 182.19586 | $1,639.3909$ | 0 | $1,469.3792$ | 685.18275 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 194.58757 | $1,638.3255$ | 0 | 878.93581 | 409.8545 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 206.97928 | $1,637.2602$ | 0 | 288.49248 | 134.52625 | 150 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings
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Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ (A-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Tmc150-17º (A-bed -1ํ.(-5ํ))
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,773) f$

Right Coordinate: $(812,1,751) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(-104,1,763) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $-145,1,621$ ) ft
Lower Right: ( $-5,1,570$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $115^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(148,1,699)$ ft
Lower Left: $(118,1,596) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(278,1,551) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $0^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0}-\mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 8}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0 \%

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(18,0.625)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $1^{\circ}$-(-5 $\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.625$
Data Point: $(-1,0.625$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(1.9,1)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$
150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$
Data Point: (20.1, 1)
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.75$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
100psf-25 (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
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Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444)$
Data Point: $(18,0.444)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-5.1, 1 )
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | $1,665.0405$ |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,773 |
| Point 3 | -181 | 1,782 |
| Point 4 | -161 | 1,788 |
| Point 5 | -128 | 1,769 |
| Point 6 | -115 | 1,769 |
| Point 7 | -56 | 1,730 |
| Point 8 | -36 | 1,730 |
| Point 9 | 21 | 1,709 |
| Point 10 | 31 | 1,709 |
| Point 11 | 83 | 1,685 |
| Point 12 | 96 | 1,679 |
| Point 13 | 114 | 1,679 |
| Point 14 | 166 | 1,655 |
| Point 15 | 176 | 1,655 |
| Point 16 | 235 | 1,626 |
| Point 17 | 332 | 1,626 |
| Point 18 | 367 | 1,649 |
| Point 19 | 443 | 1,648 |
| Point 20 | 523 | 1,678 |
| Point 21 | 566 | 1,702 |
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| Point <br> 22 | 592 | 1,702 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 23 | 639 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 24 | 661 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 25 | 731 | 1,728 |
| Point <br> 26 | 812 | 1,733 |
| Point <br> 27 | 812 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 28 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 29 | 703 | 1,749 |
| Point <br> 30 | 768 | 1,750 |
| Point <br> 31 | 812 | 1,751 |
| Point <br> 32 | 542 | $1,688.6047$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 812 | 1,701 |

## Regions

| Regions |
| :--- |
| $\qquad$ Material Points Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> Region <br> 1 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $10^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-18^{\circ}\right)$ $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ 18,295 <br> Region <br> 2 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $2^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-10^{\circ}\right)$ $24,29,30,31,26,25$ 2,654 <br> Region <br> 3 Tmc100-25 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ $32,33,26,25,24,23,22,21$ |
| Region <br> 4 |
| Tmc150-17 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 51,804
F of S: 1.24
Volume: $17,312.036 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 2,077,444.3 Ibs
Resisting Force: $979,875.01 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $787,554.94 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces

Exit: (213.17513, 1,636.7275) ft
Entry: $(-172.13666,1,784.659) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 216.64633 ft
Center: (63.115398, 1,821.6419) ft

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -166.56833 | 1,776.7066 | 0 | 457.06243 | 383.52092 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -155.5 | 1,760.8994 | 0 | 1,332.3335 | 1,117.9606 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | -144.5 | 1,745.1898 | 0 | 1,905.7928 | 1,599.15 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | -133.5 | 1,729.4801 | 0 | 2,479.2521 | 2,080.3395 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -121.5 | 1,712.3424 | 0 | 3,333.7327 | 2,797.3339 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 6 | -109.65795 | 1,695.4302 | 0 | 4,152.1227 | 3,484.0446 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | -98.973857 | 1,680.1717 | 0 | 4,653.4007 | 3,904.6668 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | -90.115905 | 1,667.5212 | 0 | 5,083.6083 | 4,265.6538 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | -78.95 | 1,661.8423 | 0 | 9,677.5455 | 4,512.7136 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | -63.65 | 1,660.5269 | 0 | 8,654.6847 | 4,035.7457 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | -51 | 1,659.4394 | 0 | 8,193.2295 | 3,820.5657 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | -41 | 1,658.5796 | 0 | 8,293.1801 | 3,867.1734 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -28.875 | 1,657.5372 | 0 | 8,109.1921 | 3,781.3784 | 150 |
| Slice $14$ | -14.625 | 1,656.3121 | 0 | 7,641.2656 | 3,563.1807 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | -0.375 | 1,655.087 | 0 | 7,173.3391 | 3,344.9829 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 13.875 | 1,653.8619 | 0 | 6,705.4125 | 3,126.7852 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 26 | 1,652.8195 | 0 | 6,521.4246 | 3,040.9902 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 37.5 | 1,651.8308 | 0 | 6,287.5928 | 2,931.9527 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 50.5 | 1,650.7131 | 0 | 5,719.9787 | 2,667.2699 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 63.5 | 1,649.5955 | 0 | 5,152.3647 | 2,402.5871 | 150 |
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| Slice <br> 21 | 76.5 | $1,648.4778$ | 0 | $4,584.7506$ | $2,137.9043$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 22 | 89.5 | $1,647.3602$ | 0 | $4,017.1365$ | $1,873.2215$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 105 | $1,646.0276$ | 0 | $3,823.285$ | $1,782.8271$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 120.5 | $1,644.695$ | 0 | $3,629.4335$ | $1,692.4326$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 133.5 | $1,643.5774$ | 0 | $3,061.8194$ | $1,427.7498$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 146.5 | $1,642.4597$ | 0 | $2,494.2053$ | $1,163.067$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 159.5 | $1,641.3421$ | 0 | $1,926.5913$ | 898.38426 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 171 | $1,640.3534$ | 0 | $1,692.7595$ | 789.34672 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 182.19586 | $1,639.3909$ | 0 | $1,450.6073$ | 676.4293 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 194.58757 | $1,638.3255$ | 0 | 866.35234 | 403.98673 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 206.97928 | $1,637.2602$ | 0 | 282.09737 | 131.54416 | 150 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100psf-25 (A-bed $\left.10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(242,1,626)$ ft

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Left-Zone Increment: 50
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $557,1,696.9768$ )
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(790,1,750.5) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,773) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,1,751) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 8}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $18,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: (-5, 0.625)
Data Point: (-1, 0.625
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function

- Circular Mode of Failure

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(1.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $2,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(10,0.625$
Data Point: (10.1, 1)
150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$ Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.75)$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1)
100psf-25 (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444$
Data Point: $(18,0.444)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)

100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-5.1, 1
Data Point: $(-5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | $1,665.0405$ |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,773 |
| Point 3 | -181 | 1,782 |
| Point 4 | -161 | 1,788 |
| Point 5 | -128 | 1,769 |
| Point 6 | -115 | 1,769 |
| Point 7 | -56 | 1,730 |
| Point 8 | -36 | 1,730 |
| Point 9 | 21 | 1,709 |
| Point 10 | 31 | 1,709 |
| Point 11 | 83 | 1,685 |
| Point 12 | 96 | 1,679 |
| Point 13 | 114 | 1,679 |
| Point 14 | 166 | 1,655 |
| Point 15 | 176 | 1,655 |
| Point 16 | 235 | 1,626 |
| Point 17 | 332 | 1,626 |
| Point 18 | 367 | 1,649 |
| Point 19 | 443 | 1,648 |
| Point 20 | 523 | 1,678 |
| Point 21 | 566 | 1,702 |
| Point 22 | 592 | 1,702 |
| Point 23 | 639 | 1,726 |
| Point 24 | 661 | 1,726 |
| Point 25 | 731 | 1,728 |
| Point 26 | 812 | 1,733 |
| Point 27 | 812 | 1,500 |
| Point 28 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point 29 | 703 | 1,749 |
|  |  |  |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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| Point <br> 30 | 768 | 1,750 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 31 | 812 | 1,751 |
| Point <br> 32 | 542 | $1,688.6047$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 812 | 1,701 |

## Regions

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $10^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-18^{\circ}\right)$ | $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ | 18,295 |
| Region <br> 2 | TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $2^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-10^{\circ}\right)$ | $24,29,30,31,26,25$ | 2,654 |
| Region <br> 3 | Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $32,33,26,25,24,23,22,21$ | $6,933.1$ |
| Region <br> 4 | Tmc $150-17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ | $1,28,27,33,32,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11$ | $1.7108 e+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 114,620
F of S: 2.45
Volume: $391.35693 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $46,962.832$ Ibs
Resisting Moment: 2,962,018.9 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $1,208,218.8 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (514.57611, 1,674.841) ft
Entry: $(570.4518,1,702) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 59.981802 ft
Center: (520.08275, 1,734.5695) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 515.4185 | $1,674.7753$ | 0 | 51.318155 | 23.930049 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 517.10328 | $1,674.6677$ | 0 | 138.8712 | 64.756702 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 518.78806 | $1,674.6076$ | 0 | 219.76672 | 102.4789 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 520.47283 | $1,674.5949$ | 0 | 293.70413 | 246.44703 | 200 |
|  | 522.15761 | $1,674.6296$ | 0 | 359.47327 | 301.63389 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 6 | 523.95 | $1,674.7201$ | 0 | 442.18814 | 371.03991 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 525.85 | $1,674.8733$ | 0 | 540.38254 | 453.43479 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 527.75 | $1,675.0875$ | 0 | 629.416 | 528.14274 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 529.65 | $1,675.3635$ | 0 | 709.44259 | 595.29301 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 531.55 | $1,675.702$ | 0 | 780.58027 | 654.98462 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 533.45 | $1,676.1043$ | 0 | 842.91275 | 707.28778 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 535.35 | $1,676.5716$ | 0 | 896.49061 | 752.24494 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 537.25 | $1,677.1055$ | 0 | 941.33186 | 789.87121 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 539.15 | $1,677.7078$ | 0 | 977.42199 | 820.15443 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 541.05 | $1,678.3809$ | 0 | $1,004.7134$ | 843.05461 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 542.9756 | $1,679.1383$ | 0 | $1,023.2543$ | 858.61231 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 544.92679 | $1,679.9853$ | 0 | $1,032.6654$ | 866.50917 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 546.87799 | $1,680.9166$ | 0 | $1,032.4128$ | 866.2972 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 548.82918 | $1,681.9366$ | 0 | $1,022.2782$ | 857.79326 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 550.78038 | $1,683.0508$ | 0 | $1,001.991$ | 840.77024 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 552.73157 | $1,684.2653$ | 0 | 971.22121 | 814.95136 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 554.68276 | $1,685.5876$ | 0 | 929.57122 | 780.00287 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 556.63396 | $1,687.0268$ | 0 | 876.56427 | 735.52475 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 558.58515 | $1,688.5939$ | 0 | 811.63049 | 681.03885 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 560.63396 | $1,690.3961$ | 0 | 729.46155 | 612.09091 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 562.78038 | $1,692.4697$ | 0 | 627.80021 | 526.78693 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 564.92679 | $1,694.7673$ | 0 | 508.49233 | 426.67572 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 567.11295 | $1,697.3841$ | 0 | 314.82507 | 264.1696 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exi
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: 5
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc150-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed -1$\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(242,1,626)$ ft

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Left-Zone Increment: 50
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $557,1,696.9768$ )
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(790,1,750.5) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,773) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,1,751) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $100-25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 8}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $18,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: (-5, 0.625)
Data Point: (-1, 0.625
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(1.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $2,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(10,0.625$
Data Point: (10.1, 1)
150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$ Data Point: $(20.1,1)$

150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.75)$
Data Point: (-0.9, 1)
100psf-25 (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444$
Data Point: $(18,0.444)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)

100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (-5.1, 1
Data Point: $(-5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | $1,665.0405$ |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,773 |
| Point 3 | -181 | 1,782 |
| Point 4 | -161 | 1,788 |
| Point 5 | -128 | 1,769 |
| Point 6 | -115 | 1,769 |
| Point 7 | -56 | 1,730 |
| Point 8 | -36 | 1,730 |
| Point 9 | 21 | 1,709 |
| Point 10 | 31 | 1,709 |
| Point 11 | 83 | 1,685 |
| Point 12 | 96 | 1,679 |
| Point 13 | 114 | 1,679 |
| Point 14 | 166 | 1,655 |
| Point 15 | 176 | 1,655 |
| Point 16 | 235 | 1,626 |
| Point 17 | 332 | 1,626 |
| Point 18 | 367 | 1,649 |
| Point 19 | 443 | 1,648 |
| Point 20 | 523 | 1,678 |
| Point 21 | 566 | 1,702 |
| Point 22 | 592 | 1,702 |
| Point 23 | 639 | 1,726 |
| Point 24 | 661 | 1,726 |
| Point 25 | 731 | 1,728 |
| Point 26 | 812 | 1,733 |
| Point 27 | 812 | 1,500 |
| Point 28 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point 29 | 703 | 1,749 |
|  |  |  |

1 - Circular Mode of Failure

## Regions

| egions |
| :--- |
|  Material Points Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> Region <br> 1 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $10^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-18^{\circ}\right)$ $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ 18,295 <br> Region <br> 2 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $2^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-10^{\circ}\right)$ $24,29,30,31,26,25$ 2,654 <br> Region <br> 3 Tmc100-25 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ $32,33,26,25,24,23,22,21$ $6,933.1$ <br> Region <br> 4 Tmc150-17 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ $1,28,27,33,32,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11$ | | $1.7108 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| :--- |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 86,107
F of S: 1.79
Volume: $1,812.5546 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $217,506.55 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 28,443,985 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $15,916,884 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces
Exit: (448.01933, 1,649.8823) ft
Entry: (580.29095, 1,702) ft
Radius: 148.63848 ft
Center: (466.30091, 1,797.3922) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> $(\mathrm{psf})$ | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 450.22465 | $1,649.6423$ | 0 | 147.725 | 123.95599 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 454.63528 | $1,649.2287$ | 0 | 390.75475 | 182.21193 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 459.0459 | $1,648.9473$ | 0 | 620.38457 | 289.29008 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 463.45653 | $1,648.7973$ | 0 | 830.61423 | 387.32178 | 150 |
|  | 467.86716 | $1,648.7783$ | 0 | $1,019.4097$ | 855.3863 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 6 | 472.27779 | $1,648.8903$ | 0 | $1,183.8301$ | 993.3514 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 476.68841 | $1,649.1336$ | 0 | $1,328.4882$ | $1,114.734$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 481.09904 | $1,649.5088$ | 0 | $1,454.0196$ | $1,220.0673$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 485.50967 | $1,650.0169$ | 0 | $1,560.9737$ | $1,309.8125$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 489.92029 | $1,650.6593$ | 0 | $1,649.8227$ | $1,384.3656$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 494.33092 | $1,651.4378$ | 0 | $1,720.9684$ | $1,444.064$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 498.74155 | $1,652.3546$ | 0 | $1,774.7487$ | $1,489.191$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 503.15218 | $1,653.4123$ | 0 | $1,811.4417$ | $1,519.9801$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 507.5628 | $1,654.6141$ | 0 | $1,831.2701$ | $1,536.6181$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 511.97343 | $1,655.9636$ | 0 | $1,834.4038$ | $1,539.2476$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 516.38406 | $1,657.4651$ | 0 | $1,820.9629$ | $1,527.9693$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 520.79469 | $1,659.1236$ | 0 | $1,791.0187$ | $1,502.8431$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 525.375 | $1,661.0215$ | 0 | $1,785.52$ | $1,498.2291$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 530.125 | $1,663.1798$ | 0 | $1,801.03$ | $1,511.2436$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 534.875 | $1,665.5444$ | 0 | $1,794.428$ | $1,505.7039$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 539.625 | $1,668.1269$ | 0 | $1,765.4639$ | $1,481.4001$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 544.4 | $1,670.9565$ | 0 | $1,713.3964$ | $1,437.7103$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 549.2 | $1,674.0521$ | 0 | $1,637.5306$ | $1,374.0514$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 554 | $1,677.4196$ | 0 | $1,537.4465$ | $1,290.0708$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 558.8 | $1,681.0826$ | 0 | $1,412.4479$ | $1,185.1845$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 563.6 | $1,685.0703$ | 0 | $1,261.706$ | $1,058.6971$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 567.44814 | $1,688.4944$ | 0 | $1,056.7822$ | 886.74553 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 570.7954 | $1,691.7174$ | 0 | 767.62652 | 644.11513 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ (A-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Tmc150-17º (A-bed -1ํ.(-5ํ))
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,773) f$

Right Coordinate: $(812,1,751) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(422.5932,1,659.817) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (429.7437, 1,606.3915) ft
Lower Right: (500.0051, 1,637.9872) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(538.0094,1,708.4308) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (548.9525, 1,620.2038) ft
Lower Right: ( $641.0569,1,671.1037$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0}-\mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 8}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(18,0.625)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $1^{\circ}$-(-5 $\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.625$
Data Point: $(-1,0.625$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(1.9,1)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$
150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$
Data Point: (20.1, 1)
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.75)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
100psf-25 (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

2-Translational

Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444)$
Data Point: $(18,0.444)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-5.1, 1 )
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | $1,665.0405$ |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,773 |
| Point 3 | -181 | 1,782 |
| Point 4 | -161 | 1,788 |
| Point 5 | -128 | 1,769 |
| Point 6 | -115 | 1,769 |
| Point 7 | -56 | 1,730 |
| Point 8 | -36 | 1,730 |
| Point 9 | 21 | 1,709 |
| Point 10 | 31 | 1,709 |
| Point 11 | 83 | 1,685 |
| Point 12 | 96 | 1,679 |
| Point 13 | 114 | 1,679 |
| Point 14 | 166 | 1,655 |
| Point 15 | 176 | 1,655 |
| Point 16 | 235 | 1,626 |
| Point 17 | 332 | 1,626 |
| Point 18 | 367 | 1,649 |
| Point 19 | 443 | 1,648 |
| Point 20 | 523 | 1,678 |
| Point 21 | 566 | 1,702 |
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| Point <br> 22 | 592 | 1,702 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 23 | 639 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 24 | 661 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 25 | 731 | 1,728 |
| Point <br> 26 | 812 | 1,733 |
| Point <br> 27 | 812 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 28 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 29 | 703 | 1,749 |
| Point <br> 30 | 768 | 1,750 |
| Point <br> 31 | 812 | 1,751 |
| Point <br> 32 | 542 | $1,688.6047$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 812 | 1,701 |

## Regions

| Regions |
| :--- |
| $\qquad$ Material Points Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> Region <br> 1 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $10^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-18^{\circ}\right)$ $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ 18,295 <br> Region <br> 2 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $2^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-10^{\circ}\right)$ $24,29,30,31,26,25$ 2,654 <br> Region <br> 3 Tmc100-25 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ $32,33,26,25,24,23,22,21$ |
| Region <br> 4 |
| Tmc150-17 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 92,368
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 2.01$
Volume: 1,180.4526 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: 141,654.31 lbs
Resisting Force: $88,231.604 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $43,801.645 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces

Exit: (489.78392, 1,665.544) ft
Entry: $(581.16365,1,702) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 54.17577 ft
Center: $(524.56566,1,711.114) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 491.29374 | 1,665.5095 | 0 | 74.177567 | 34.589567 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 494.31339 | 1,665.4405 | 0 | 219.10696 | 102.17125 | 150 |
| Slice $3$ | 497.33303 | 1,665.3715 | 0 | 364.03635 | 169.75294 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 500.35267 | 1,665.3025 | 0 | 508.96574 | 237.33462 | 150 |
| Slice $5$ | 503.37232 | 1,665.2336 | 0 | 653.89513 | 304.9163 | 150 |
| Slice 6 | 506.39196 | 1,665.1646 | 0 | 798.82452 | 372.49799 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 509.4116 | 1,665.0956 | 0 | 943.7539 | 440.07967 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 512.43125 | 1,665.0266 | 0 | 1,088.6833 | 507.66136 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 515.45089 | 1,664.9576 | 0 | 1,233.6127 | 575.24304 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 518.47053 | 1,664.8886 | 0 | 1,378.5421 | 642.82473 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | 521.49018 | 1,664.8197 | 0 | 1,523.4715 | 710.40641 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 524.58333 | 1,664.749 | 0 | 1,706.9114 | 795.94584 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 527.75 | 1,664.6767 | 0 | 1,928.8618 | 899.44302 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 530.91667 | 1,664.6043 | 0 | 2,150.8122 | 1,002.9402 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 534.08333 | 1,664.532 | 0 | 2,372.7626 | 1,106.4374 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 537.25 | 1,664.4596 | 0 | 2,594.713 | 1,209.9346 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 540.41667 | 1,664.3873 | 0 | 2,816.6635 | 1,313.4317 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 542.74047 | 1,664.3342 | 0 | 2,979.5379 | 1,389.3813 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 545.08945 | 1,665.9258 | 0 | 1,996.1248 | 1,674.9476 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 548.30646 | 1,669.1428 | 0 | 1,875.7643 | 1,573.9532 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 21 | 551.52347 | $1,672.3598$ | 0 | $1,755.4039$ | $1,472.9588$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 22 | 554.74047 | $1,675.5768$ | 0 | $1,635.0435$ | $1,371.9644$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 557.95748 | $1,678.7938$ | 0 | $1,514.6831$ | $1,270.97$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 561.17449 | $1,682.0108$ | 0 | $1,394.3226$ | $1,169.9756$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 564.3915 | $1,685.2278$ | 0 | $1,273.9622$ | $1,068.9812$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 567.50413 | $1,688.3405$ | 0 | $1,086.4229$ | 911.61708 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 570.52768 | $1,691.364$ | 0 | 830.40982 | 696.79657 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 573.56653 | $1,694.4029$ | 0 | 573.10169 | 480.88942 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 576.60538 | $1,697.4417$ | 0 | 315.79357 | 264.98227 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 579.64423 | $1,700.4806$ | 0 | 58.485447 | 49.075117 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)
$F$ of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-bed $\left.10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ (A-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $2^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Tmc150-17º (A-bed -1ํ.(-5ํ))
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf-17 $\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc100-25 (A-bed $-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 100 psf- $25^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,773) f$

Right Coordinate: $(812,1,751) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: (422.5932, 1,659.817) ft
Lower Left: (429.7437, 1,606.3915) ft
Lower Right: (500.0051, 1,637.9872) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(538.0094,1,708.4308) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (548.9525, 1,620.2038) ft
Lower Right: ( $641.0569,1,671.1037$ ) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0}-\mathbf{2 5}^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 8}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$ )
Data Point: $(18,0.625)$
Data Point: $(18.1,1)$
Tmc100-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $1^{\circ}$-(-5 $\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Facto
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.625$
Data Point: $(-1,0.625$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$
TQs $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}-10^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(1.9,1)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: $(2,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.625$
150pcf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(20,0.667)$
Data Point: (20.1, 1)
150psf-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed $\left.-1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.75)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.75$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1$
100psf-25 (A-bed $10^{\circ}-18^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

2-Translational

Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.444)$
Data Point: $(18,0.444)$
Data Point: (18.1, 1)
100psf-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ (A-bed - $\left.1^{\circ}-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-5.1, 1 )
Data Point: $(-5.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-5,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-1,0.5)$
Data Point: $(-0.9,1)$

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | $1,665.0405$ |
| Point 2 | -200 | 1,773 |
| Point 3 | -181 | 1,782 |
| Point 4 | -161 | 1,788 |
| Point 5 | -128 | 1,769 |
| Point 6 | -115 | 1,769 |
| Point 7 | -56 | 1,730 |
| Point 8 | -36 | 1,730 |
| Point 9 | 21 | 1,709 |
| Point 10 | 31 | 1,709 |
| Point 11 | 83 | 1,685 |
| Point 12 | 96 | 1,679 |
| Point 13 | 114 | 1,679 |
| Point 14 | 166 | 1,655 |
| Point 15 | 176 | 1,655 |
| Point 16 | 235 | 1,626 |
| Point 17 | 332 | 1,626 |
| Point 18 | 367 | 1,649 |
| Point 19 | 443 | 1,648 |
| Point 20 | 523 | 1,678 |
| Point 21 | 566 | 1,702 |
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| Point <br> 22 | 592 | 1,702 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point <br> 23 | 639 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 24 | 661 | 1,726 |
| Point <br> 25 | 731 | 1,728 |
| Point <br> 26 | 812 | 1,733 |
| Point <br> 27 | 812 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 28 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point <br> 29 | 703 | 1,749 |
| Point <br> 30 | 768 | 1,750 |
| Point <br> 31 | 812 | 1,751 |
| Point <br> 32 | 542 | $1,688.6047$ |
| Point <br> 33 | 812 | 1,701 |

## Regions

| Regions |
| :--- |
| $\qquad$ Material Points Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> Region <br> 1 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $10^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-18^{\circ}\right)$ $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$ 18,295 <br> Region <br> 2 TQs $100-25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}\right.$-bed $2^{\circ}$ <br> $\left.-10^{\circ}\right)$ $24,29,30,31,26,25$ 2,654 <br> Region <br> 3 Tmc100-25 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ A-bed $-1^{\circ}$ $32,33,26,25,24,23,22,21$ |
| Region <br> 4 |
| Tmc150-17 <br> $\left.-\left(-5^{\circ}\right)\right)$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 92,368
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.41$
Volume: 1,180.4526 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: $141,654.31 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $83,280.304 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: 59,030.339 lbs
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 300 slip surfaces

Exit: (489.78392, 1,665.544) ft
Entry: $(581.16365,1,702) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 54.17577 ft
Center: $(524.56566,1,711.114) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 491.29374 | 1,665.5095 | 0 | 75.068306 | 35.004926 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 494.31339 | 1,665.4405 | 0 | 220.32381 | 102.73868 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 497.33303 | 1,665.3715 | 0 | 365.57932 | 170.47244 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 500.35267 | 1,665.3025 | 0 | 510.83482 | 238.20619 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 503.37232 | 1,665.2336 | 0 | 656.09033 | 305.93995 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 506.39196 | 1,665.1646 | 0 | 801.34584 | 373.6737 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 509.4116 | 1,665.0956 | 0 | 946.60134 | 441.40745 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 512.43125 | 1,665.0266 | 0 | 1,091.8568 | 509.14121 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 515.45089 | 1,664.9576 | 0 | 1,237.1124 | 576.87496 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 518.47053 | 1,664.8886 | 0 | 1,382.3679 | 644.60872 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | 521.49018 | 1,664.8197 | 0 | 1,527.6234 | 712.34247 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 524.58333 | 1,664.749 | 0 | 1,711.476 | 798.07438 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 527.75 | 1,664.6767 | 0 | 1,933.9259 | 901.80445 | 150 |
| Slice $14$ | 530.91667 | 1,664.6043 | 0 | 2,156.3757 | 1,005.5345 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 534.08333 | 1,664.532 | 0 | 2,378.8256 | 1,109.2646 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 537.25 | 1,664.4596 | 0 | 2,601.2754 | 1,212.9947 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 540.41667 | 1,664.3873 | 0 | 2,823.7253 | 1,316.7247 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 542.74047 | 1,664.3342 | 0 | 2,986.9662 | 1,392.8452 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 545.08945 | 1,665.9258 | 0 | 1,749.3954 | 1,467.917 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 548.30646 | 1,669.1428 | 0 | 1,642.325 | 1,378.0743 | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 21 | 551.52347 | $1,672.3598$ | 0 | $1,535.2547$ | $1,288.2317$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 22 | 554.74047 | $1,675.5768$ | 0 | $1,428.1844$ | $1,198.389$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 557.95748 | $1,678.7938$ | 0 | $1,321.1141$ | $1,108.5464$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 561.17449 | $1,682.0108$ | 0 | $1,214.0438$ | $1,018.7037$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 564.3915 | $1,685.2278$ | 0 | $1,106.9735$ | 928.86108 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 567.50413 | $1,688.3405$ | 0 | 940.14223 | 788.873 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 570.52768 | $1,691.364$ | 0 | 712.39793 | 597.77284 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 573.56653 | $1,694.4029$ | 0 | 483.50161 | 405.70602 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 576.60538 | $1,697.4417$ | 0 | 254.6053 | 213.63921 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 579.64423 | $1,700.4806$ | 0 | 25.708978 | 21.572394 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant

## dvanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn .: TQs $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $25^{\circ}$ A-bed 8-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $17{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $8-17^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40{ }^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(23.826,1,747.1026) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $178,1,770.3333$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(224.2214,1,787.2149)$ ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(768,1,932.3566) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,746) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,1,942) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $25^{\circ}\left(\right.$ A-Bed $\left.6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-\mathbf{8}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Vata Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (5.9, 1)
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(8,0.444$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)
Tmc 150 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-\mathbf{1 7}^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(17,0.625)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc 100 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-1^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(17,0.5)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

## Points
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|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 15 | 1,747 |
| Point 2 | 101 | 1,748 |
| Point 3 | 143 | 1,747 |
| Point 4 | 191 | 1,779 |
| Point 5 | 204 | 1,779 |
| Point 6 | 268 | 1,805 |
| Point 7 | 295 | 1,811 |
| Point 8 | 420 | 1,850 |
| Point 9 | 570 | 1,890 |
| Point 10 | 650 | 1,904 |
| Point 11 | 779 | 1,935 |
| Point 12 | 810 | 1,942 |
| Point 13 | 810 | 1,818 |
| Point 14 | 556 | 1,791 |
| Point 15 | 371 | $1,770.9335$ |
| Point 16 | 255 | 1,759 |
| Point 17 | 140 | 1,746 |
| Point 18 | -10 | 1,731 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,746 |
| Point 20 | -152 | 1,746 |
| Point 21 | -61 | 1,746 |
| Point 22 | -39 | 1,709 |
| Point 23 | -67 | 1,690 |
| Point 24 | -94 | 1,678 |
| Point 25 | -111 | 1,677 |
| Point 26 | -138 | 1,676 |
| Point 27 | -158 | 1,681 |
| Point 28 | -200 | 1,691 |
| Point 29 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point 30 | 809 | 1,500 |
| Point 31 | 273 | 1,805 |
| Point 32 | 245 | 1,720 |
| Point 33 | -200 | 1,627 |
| Point 34 | 596 | $1,795.252$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $6-8^{\circ}$ | $1,2,3,4,5,6,31,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,34,14,15,16,17,18$ | 52,306 |
| Region 2 | Fill | $19,20,21,1,18,22,23,24,25,26,27,28$ | 10,854 |
| Region 3 | Tmc $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 8-17 | $29,30,13,34,32,33$ | $2.3309 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 4 | Tmc $25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bed 8-17 | $28,33,32,34,14,15,16,17,18,22,23,24,25,26,27$ | 27,717 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 91,059
F of $\mathrm{S}: 2.21$
Volume: $1,083.1046 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $129,972.55 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 9,943,306.7 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $4,508,734,5 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (136.68977, 1,747.1502) ft
Entry: $(224.22138,1,787.2149) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 87.952048 ft
Center: (149.81863, 1,834.1169) ft

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ Y (f) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 138.26733 $1,746.9412$ 0 35.879375 30.106371 225 <br> Slice <br> 2 141.42244 $1,746.5809$ 0 67.015711 56.232858 225 <br> Slice <br> 3 143.2404 $1,746.4115$ 0 100.34905 84.202853 225 <br> Slice <br> 4 144.93983 $1,746.3124$ 0 247.96103 208.064 200 <br> Slice <br> 5 147.85788 $1,746.1988$ 0 490.95238 411.95796 200 <br> Slice <br> 6 150.77593 $1,746.1821$ 0 716.26935 601.02134 200 <br> Slice <br> 7 153.69399 $1,746.2624$ 0 924.54681 775.78689 200 <br> Slice <br> 8 156.61204 $1,746.4398$ 0 $1,116.3169$ 936.7011 200 <br> Slice <br> 9 159.53009 $1,746.715$ 0 $1,292.0201$ $1,084.1335$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 10 162.44815 $1,747.0888$ 0 $1,492.8914$ 696.14667 100 <br> Slice <br> 11 165.3662 $1,747.5626$ 0 $1,651.0438$ 769.89436 100 <br> Slice <br> 12 168.28425 $1,748.1381$ 0 $1,795.0676$ 837.05377 100 <br> Slice <br> 13 171.20231 $1,748.8172$ 0 $1,924.91$ 897.60026 100 <br> Slice <br> 14 174.12036 $1,749.6025$ 0 $2,040.46$ 951.48211 100 <br> Slice 177.12145 $1,750.5257$ 0 $2,022.4419$ $1,697.0303$ 225 |
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| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 16 | 180.20557 | $1,751.5972$ | 0 | $2,094.3253$ | $1,757.3476$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 183.28969 | $1,752.7998$ | 0 | $2,149.2376$ | $1,803.4245$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 186.37382 | $1,754.1393$ | 0 | $2,186.935$ | $1,835.0563$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 189.45794 | $1,755.6229$ | 0 | $2,207.0754$ | $1,851.9561$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 192.625 | $1,757.3073$ | 0 | $2,101.4893$ | $1,763.3589$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 195.875 | $1,759.212$ | 0 | $1,874.1925$ | $1,572.6342$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 199.125 | $1,761.3117$ | 0 | $1,633.4157$ | $1,370.5986$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 202.375 | $1,763.6237$ | 0 | $1,378.7482$ | $1,156.9071$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 205.44438 | $1,766.015$ | 0 | $1,179.4645$ | 989.68827 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 208.33315 | $1,768.4825$ | 0 | $1,032.7814$ | 866.60651 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 211.22192 | $1,771.1794$ | 0 | 869.08801 | 729.25143 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 214.11069 | $1,774.1368$ | 0 | 687.4133 | 576.80825 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 216.99946 | $1,777.3958$ | 0 | 486.64944 | 408.34737 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 219.88823 | $1,781.0123$ | 0 | 265.57241 | 222.84171 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 222.777 | $1,785.0665$ | 0 | 22.934549 | 19.244372 | 225 |



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

eport generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 143
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 1:17:24 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 23 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 23-23 results\Latest Update 3-22-16
ast Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 1:18:00 PM

Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
nit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Method: Bishop
Settings
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
hi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $25^{\circ}$ A-bed 8-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
Tmc $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 8-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150 pst (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,746) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,1,942) \mathrm{ft}$

1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$ Data Point: (5.9, 1) Data Point: ( $6,0.444$ Data Point: $(8,0.444)$ Data Point: $(8.1,1$

Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: (17, 0.425)
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc 150 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function

- Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: (17, 0.75
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: (8, 0.625)
Data Point: $(17,0.625)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc 100 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(17,0.5)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 15 | 1,747 |
| Point 2 | 101 | 1,748 |
| Point 3 | 143 | 1,747 |
| Point 4 | 191 | 1,779 |
| Point 5 | 204 | 1,779 |
| Point 6 | 268 | 1,805 |
| Point 7 | 295 | 1,811 |
| Point 8 | 420 | 1,850 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 9 | 570 | 1,890 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 10 | 650 | 1,904 |
| Point 11 | 779 | 1,935 |
| Point 12 | 810 | 1,942 |
| Point 13 | 810 | 1,818 |
| Point 14 | 556 | 1,791 |
| Point 15 | 371 | $1,770.9335$ |
| Point 16 | 255 | 1,759 |
| Point 17 | 140 | 1,746 |
| Point 18 | -10 | 1,731 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,746 |
| Point 20 | -152 | 1,746 |
| Point 21 | -61 | 1,746 |
| Point 22 | -39 | 1,709 |
| Point 23 | -67 | 1,690 |
| Point 24 | -94 | 1,678 |
| Point 25 | -111 | 1,677 |
| Point 26 | -138 | 1,676 |
| Point 27 | -158 | 1,681 |
| Point 28 | -200 | 1,691 |
| Point 29 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point 30 | 809 | 1,500 |
| Point 31 | 273 | 1,805 |
| Point 32 | 245 | 1,720 |
| Point 33 | -200 | 1,627 |
| Point 34 | 596 | $1,795.252$ |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 6-8 |  |  |
| Region 2 | Fill | $1,2,3,4,5,6,31,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,34,14,15,16,17,18$ | 52,306 |
| Region 3 | Tmc $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 8-17 |  |  |
| Region 4 | Tmc $25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bed 8-17 |  | $29,30,21,1,18,22,23,24,25,26,27,28$ |
|  | $28,33,32,32,34,14,15,16,17,18,22,23,24,25,26,27$ | 10,854 |  |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 1
F of S: 1.61
Volume: 1,083.1046 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 129,972 55
Resisting Moment: 9,434,171.1 lbs-ft
Resisting Moment: 9,434,171.1 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $5,876,545.7 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $5,87,54$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surface
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces

Exit: (136.68977, 1,747.1502) ft
Entry: (224.22138, 1,787.2149) ft
Radius: 87.952048 ft
Center: (149.81863, 1,834.1169) ft

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice $1$ | 138.26733 | 1,746.9412 | 0 | 42.007126 | 35.248164 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 141.42244 | 1,746.5809 | 0 | 71.807421 | 60.253581 | 225 |
| Slice $3$ | 143.2404 | 1,746.4115 | 0 | 104.42197 | 87.620438 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 144.93983 | 1,746.3124 | 0 | 251.90147 | 211.37043 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 147.85788 | 1,746.1988 | 0 | 493.28254 | 413.91319 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 150.77593 | 1,746.1821 | 0 | 714.80618 | 599.79361 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 153.69399 | 1,746.2624 | 0 | 917.44647 | 769.829 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 156.61204 | 1,746.4398 | 0 | 1,102.0315 | 924.71419 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 159.53009 | 1,746.715 | 0 | 1,269.2606 | 1,065.0361 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 162.44815 | 1,747.0888 | 0 | 1,474.1811 | 687.42196 | 100 |
| Slice $11$ | 165.3662 | 1,747.5626 | 0 | 1,625.9798 | 758.20682 | 100 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 168.28425 | 1,748.1381 | 0 | 1,763.096 | 822.14516 | 100 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 171.20231 | 1,748.8172 | 0 | 1,885.5653 | 879.25354 | 100 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 174.12036 | 1,749.6025 | 0 | 1,993.3626 | 929.52026 | 100 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 177.12145 | 1,750.5257 | 0 | 1,931.9201 | 1,621.0734 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 180.20557 | 1,751.5972 | 0 | 1,990.9839 | 1,670.6339 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 183.28969 | 1,752.7998 | 0 | 2,033.24 | 1,706.0909 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 186.37382 | 1,754.1393 | 0 | 2,058.6223 | 1,727.3892 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 189.45794 | 1,755.6229 | 0 | 2,066.9723 | 1,734.3957 | 225 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 192.625 | 1,757.3073 | 0 | 1,956.5981 | 1,641.7807 | 225 |
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| Slice <br> 21 | 195.875 | $1,759.212$ | 0 | $1,732.9546$ | $1,454.1216$ | 225 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 22 | 199.125 | $1,761.3117$ | 0 | $1,498.6536$ | $1,257.5197$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 202.375 | $1,763.6237$ | 0 | $1,253.5564$ | $1,051.8587$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 205.44438 | $1,766.015$ | 0 | $1,062.0467$ | 891.163 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 208.33315 | $1,768.4825$ | 0 | 920.67172 | 772.5353 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 211.22192 | $1,771.1794$ | 0 | 764.95724 | 641.87534 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 214.11069 | $1,774.1368$ | 0 | 594.37962 | 498.74372 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 216.99946 | $1,777.3958$ | 0 | 408.39353 | 342.68286 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 219.88823 | $1,781.0123$ | 0 | 206.49947 | 173.27363 | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 222.777 | $1,785.0665$ | 0 | -11.59229 | -9.7270859 | 225 |



## 2 - Translational

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 141
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 1:00:43 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 23 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 23-23 results\Latest Update 3-22-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 1:02:52 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $25^{\circ}$ A-bed 8-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength $\mathrm{Fn} .:$ Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $8-17^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,746) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,1,942) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(50.8505,1,759.0368) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Left: (86.9521, 1,597.4756) ft Lower Right: ( $300.9825,1,637.5428$ ) ft X Increments: 15 Y Increments: 15 Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$ Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$ Angle Increments: 2

## ight Grid

Upper Left: (331.9615, 1,840.5347) ft Lower Left: $(422,1,628)$ ft Lower Right: (681.0585, 1,689.7014) ft X Increments: 15
Y Increments: 15
Starting Angle: 45
Ending Angle: 65
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.625$ )
Data Point: (8.1, 1
TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(8,0.444)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc 150 psf (A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1) Data Point: $(7.9,1)$ Data Point: $(8,0.75)$ Data Point: $(17,0.75)$ Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(17,0.625)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc 100 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%

Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(17,0.5)$
Data Point: (17.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 15 | 1,747 |
| Point 2 | 101 | 1,748 |
| Point 3 | 143 | 1,747 |
| Point 4 | 191 | 1,779 |
| Point 5 | 204 | 1,779 |
| Point 6 | 268 | 1,805 |
| Point 7 | 295 | 1,811 |
| Point 8 | 420 | 1,850 |
| Point 9 | 570 | 1,890 |
| Point 10 | 650 | 1,904 |
| Point 11 | 779 | 1,935 |
| Point 12 | 810 | 1,942 |
| Point 13 | 810 | 1,818 |
| Point 14 | 556 | 1,791 |
| Point 15 | 371 | $1,770.9335$ |
| Point 16 | 255 | 1,759 |
| Point 17 | 140 | 1,746 |
| Point 18 | -10 | 1,731 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,746 |
| Point 20 | -152 | 1,746 |
| Point 21 | -61 | 1,746 |
| Point 22 | -39 | 1,709 |
| Point 23 | -67 | 1,690 |
| Point 24 | -94 | 1,678 |
| Point 25 | -111 | 1,677 |
| Point 26 | -138 | 1,676 |
| Point 27 | -158 | 1,681 |
| Point 28 | -200 | 1,691 |
| Point 29 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point 30 | 809 | 1,500 |
| Point 31 | 273 | 1,805 |
| Point 32 | 245 | 1,720 |
| Point 33 | -200 | 1,627 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 34 | 596 | $1,795.252$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | TQs $25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $6-8^{\circ}$ | $1,2,3,4,5,6,31,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,34,14,15,16,17,18$ | 52,306 |
| Region 2 | Fill | $19,20,21,1,18,22,23,24,25,26,27,28$ | 10,854 |
| Region 3 | Tmc $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed $8-17^{\circ}$ | $29,30,13,34,32,33$ | $2.3309 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 4 | Tmc $25^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-bed $8-17^{\circ}$ | $28,33,32,34,14,15,16,17,18,22,23,24,25,26,27$ | 27,717 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 314,537
F of S: 1.73
Volume: $43,712.194 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $5,245,463.3 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $1,981,755.5 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $1,147,535 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 589,824 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Auery): 1 of 150 slip surface
Exit: (78.688554, 1,747.7406) ft
Entry: (679.98681, 1,911.2061) ft
Entry: (679.98681,
Center: ( $346.00856,1,952.0725$ ) ft

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ Y (ft) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 86.342679 $1,744.5701$ 0 556.60961 467.05092 225 <br> Slice <br> 2 97.498401 $1,739.9493$ 0 $1,262.2849$ $1,059.1828$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 3 110.75 $1,734.4603$ 0 $2,057.5531$ $1,726.4921$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 4 130.25 $1,726.3831$ 0 $3,200.3953$ $2,685.4505$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 5 141.5 $1,721.7232$ 0 $3,859.7272$ $3,238.6957$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 6 151.99337 $1,717.3767$ 0 $5,406.9132$ $4,536.9388$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 7 169.9801 $1,709.9264$ 0 $8,325.4632$ $6,985.8931$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 8 180.41046 $1,705.606$ 0 $10,017.907$ $8,406.0224$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 9 186.42373 $1,705.9972$ 0 $8,068.597$ $2,466.8177$ 150 <br> Slice 197.5 $1,708.3849$ 0 $8,145.2612$ $2,490.2563$ 150 |

file:///P:/FINAL\%20PROJECTS/PARDEE/Skyline\%20Ranch/SLOPE\%20RESULTS/Sect... 3/22/2016

2-Translational

| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 11 | 214.25 | $1,711.9956$ | 0 | $8,209.2266$ | $2,509.8124$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 234.75 | $1,716.4148$ | 0 | $8,661.116$ | $2,647.9689$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 250 | $1,719.7022$ | 0 | $8,997.2777$ | $2,750.7438$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 261.5 | $1,722.1812$ | 0 | $9,250.7767$ | $2,828.2463$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 270.5 | $1,724.1213$ | 0 | $9,331.7589$ | $2,853.005$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 284 | $1,727.0314$ | 0 | $9,342.146$ | $2,856.1807$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 304.5 | $1,731.4505$ | 0 | $9,520.738$ | $2,910.7817$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 323.5 | $1,735.5463$ | 0 | $9,732.5482$ | $2,975.5386$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 342.5 | $1,739.642$ | 0 | $9,944.3584$ | $3,040.2955$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 361.5 | $1,743.7378$ | 0 | $10,156.169$ | $3,105.0523$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 383.25 | $1,748.4264$ | 0 | $10,398.635$ | $3,179.1819$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 407.75 | $1,753.7078$ | 0 | $10,671.759$ | $3,262.6842$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 429.71429 | $1,758.4425$ | 0 | $10,865.706$ | $3,321.9797$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 449.14286 | $1,762.6307$ | 0 | $10,980.476$ | $3,357.0684$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 468.57143 | $1,766.8188$ | 0 | $11,095.246$ | $3,392.1571$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 488 | $1,771.007$ | 0 | $11,210.016$ | $3,427.2458$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 507.42857 | $1,775.1951$ | 0 | $11,324.786$ | $3,462.3346$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 526.85714 | $1,779.3833$ | 0 | $11,439.556$ | $3,497.4233$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 546.28571 | $1,783.5714$ | 0 | $11,554.326$ | $3,532.512$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 563 | $1,787.1745$ | 0 | $11,653.062$ | $3,562.6986$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 583 | $1,791.4858$ | 0 | $11,633.449$ | $3,556.7022$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 597.24842 | $1,794.5573$ | 0 | $11,566.63$ | $3,536.2736$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 607.25495 | $1,807.3343$ | 0 | $6,216.4244$ | $5,216.1994$ | 225 |
|  | 250 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 34 | 624.5098 | $1,831.9768$ | 0 | $4,682.6763$ | $3,929.2319$ | 225 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 35 | 641.50327 | $1,856.2459$ | 0 | $3,172.1622$ | $2,661.7601$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 664.9934 | $1,889.7933$ | 0 | $1,153.6301$ | 968.01058 | 225 |



## 2 - Translational Seismic

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 142
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 1:04:29 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 23 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 23-23 results\Latest Update 3-22-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 1:04:32 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 2 - Translational
Method: Spencer
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft
Search Method: Root Finder
Tolerable difference between starting and converged F of $\mathrm{S}: 3$
Maximum iterations to calculate converged lambda: 20
Max Absolute Lambda: 2

## Materials

TOs $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-8 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs $25^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Bed} 6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $25^{\circ}$ A-bed 8-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 100 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 8-17 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,746) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(810,1,942) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

TQs $25^{\circ}$ (A-Bed $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.625)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.625$
Data Point: (8.1, 1)
TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.444)$
Data Point: $(8,0.444)$
Data Point: $(8.1,1)$
Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$

Data Point: ( $8,0.425$ )
Data Point: $(17,0.425)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc 150 psf (A-Bed $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: ( $7.9,1$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17,0.75)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept:1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.625)$
Data Point: $(17,0.625)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$
Tmc 100 psf (A-Bed $\left.8^{\circ}-17^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.5)$
Data Point: $(17,0.5)$
Data Point: $(17.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | 15 | 1,747 |
| Point 2 | 101 | 1,748 |
| Point 3 | 143 | 1,747 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 4 | 191 | 1,779 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 5 | 204 | 1,779 |
| Point 6 | 268 | 1,805 |
| Point 7 | 295 | 1,811 |
| Point 8 | 420 | 1,850 |
| Point 9 | 570 | 1,890 |
| Point 10 | 650 | 1,904 |
| Point 11 | 779 | 1,935 |
| Point 12 | 810 | 1,942 |
| Point 13 | 810 | 1,818 |
| Point 14 | 556 | 1,791 |
| Point 15 | 371 | $1,770.9335$ |
| Point 16 | 255 | 1,759 |
| Point 17 | 140 | 1,746 |
| Point 18 | -10 | 1,731 |
| Point 19 | -200 | 1,746 |
| Point 20 | -152 | 1,746 |
| Point 21 | -61 | 1,746 |
| Point 22 | -39 | 1,709 |
| Point 23 | -67 | 1,690 |
| Point 24 | -94 | 1,678 |
| Point 25 | -111 | 1,677 |
| Point 26 | -138 | 1,676 |
| Point 27 | -158 | 1,681 |
| Point 28 | -200 | 1,691 |
| Point 29 | -200 | 1,500 |
| Point 30 | 809 | 1,500 |
| Point 31 | 273 | 1,805 |
| Point 32 | 245 | 1,720 |
| Point 33 | -200 | 1,627 |
| Point 34 | 596 | $1,795.252$ |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 1 | TQs $25^{\circ}$ A-Bed 6-8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 1,2,3,4,5,6,31,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,34,14,15,16,17,18 | 52,306 |
| Region 2 | Fill | 19,20,21,1,18,22,23,24,25,26,27,28 | 10,854 |
| Region 3 | Tmc $17^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$-Bed 8-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 29,30,13,34,32,33 | 2.3309e+005 |
| Region 4 | Tmc $25^{\circ}$ A-bed 8-17 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 28,33,32,34,14,15,16,17,18,22,23,24,25,26,27 | 27,717 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 1
F of S: 1.33

## 2-Translational Seismic

Page 6 of 7

Volume: $43,712.194 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $5,245,463.3 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $5.8921138 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Resisting Moment: 5.8921138e+008 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $4.4444677 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Resisting Force: $2,173,359.7 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $1,627,186.9 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Exit: (78.688554, 1,747.7406) ft
Entry: (679.98681, 1,911.2061) ft
Radius: 293.37541 ft
Center: $(346.00856,1,952.0725) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 86.342679 | $1,744.5701$ | 0 | $1,242.3928$ | $1,042.4914$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 97.498401 | $1,739.9493$ | 0 | $2,561.067$ | $2,148.9904$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 110.75 | $1,734.4603$ | 0 | $4,070.4482$ | $3,415.5116$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 130.25 | $1,726.3831$ | 0 | $6,239.5089$ | $5,235.5696$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 141.5 | $1,721.7232$ | 0 | $7,490.8912$ | $6,285.6041$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 151.99337 | $1,717.3767$ | 0 | $10,427.375$ | $8,749.6064$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 169.9801 | $1,709.9264$ | 0 | $15,966.644$ | $13,397.605$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 180.41046 | $1,705.606$ | 0 | $19,178.81$ | $16,092.933$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 186.42373 | $1,705.9972$ | 0 | $7,650.5963$ | $2,339.022$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 197.5 | $1,708.3849$ | 0 | $7,723.0176$ | $2,361.1634$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 214.25 | $1,711.9956$ | 0 | $7,783.4426$ | $2,379.6372$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 234.75 | $1,716.4148$ | 0 | $8,210.3216$ | $2,510.1472$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 250 | $1,719.7022$ | 0 | $8,527.8784$ | $2,607.2341$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 261.5 | $1,722.1812$ | 0 | $8,767.3464$ | $2,680.4468$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 270.5 | $1,724.1213$ | 0 | $8,843.8473$ | $2,703.8355$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 284 | $1,727.0314$ | 0 | $8,853.659$ | $2,706.8352$ | 150 |
|  | 274 |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Slice <br> 17 | 304.5 | $1,731.4505$ | 0 | $9,022.3667$ | $2,758.4143$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 18 | 323.5 | $1,735.5463$ | 0 | $9,222.454$ | $2,819.5871$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 342.5 | $1,739.642$ | 0 | $9,422.5412$ | $2,880.76$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 361.5 | $1,743.7378$ | 0 | $9,622.6285$ | $2,941.9328$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 383.25 | $1,748.4264$ | 0 | $9,851.6757$ | $3,011.9595$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 407.75 | $1,753.7078$ | 0 | $10,109.683$ | $3,090.8402$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 429.71429 | $1,758.4425$ | 0 | $10,292.895$ | $3,146.8539$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 449.14286 | $1,762.6307$ | 0 | $10,401.313$ | $3,180.0006$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 468.57143 | $1,766.8188$ | 0 | $10,509.731$ | $3,213.1473$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 488 | $1,771.007$ | 0 | $10,618.15$ | $3,246.2941$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 507.42857 | $1,775.1951$ | 0 | $10,726.567$ | $3,279.4407$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 526.85714 | $1,779.3833$ | 0 | $10,834.985$ | $3,312.5874$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 546.28571 | $1,783.5714$ | 0 | $10,943.403$ | $3,345.7341$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 563 | $1,787.1745$ | 0 | $11,036.674$ | $3,374.2499$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 583 | $1,791.4858$ | 0 | $11,018.147$ | $3,368.5855$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 597.24842 | $1,794.5573$ | 0 | $10,955.025$ | $3,349.2872$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 607.25495 | $1,807.3343$ | 0 | $4,605.1492$ | $3,864.179$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 624.5098 | $1,831.9768$ | 0 | $3,467.4955$ | $2,909.5742$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 641.50327 | $1,856.2459$ | 0 | $2,347.0754$ | $1,969.4301$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 664.9934 | $1,889.7933$ | 0 | 849.83429 | 713.09564 | 225 |
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## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

```
File Information
    Milveversion:.15}\mathrm{ tite: Staticslope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project,Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
    Comments: Run By:Dr.Alexander Bykovisev, Ph.D., P.E
    last Edited By: Alexander Bykon
    Mate:3/2/2016
    Time: 11:39:33 AM
```



```
    M,
```

Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Timett) Units seonds


| Forcesff Units: Pounds |
| :--- |
| Pressure(p) Units: pff |

    Strengt U ints ppr
    Unit weighto of water: 62.4 peft
Unit Weight of Water:
View
Element Thickness: 1
Analysis Settings
1- Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLIPOE $\mathcal{M}$
Method: Bishoo
Metrod: $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Sethop } \\ \text { SWW } \\ \text { Sonditions source: (none) }\end{array}\right)$
PWP Condition Source: (none)
Slip Surfaee
Direction of movement: Right to left
Use passive Modem No

Critical stip surfaces ssved: 11
Resisting Side Maximum Conve Angle: 1

Divinin Side Maximum Convex Angle: ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface location
Tension Crack Tension crack Option: (none)
Fof S Distribution
of f Calculation option: constant
F of C a
Advanced
Advanced
Number of slices: 30
Fif
Fof STolerance: .001
Minimum Slip surface Depth: 0.1 ft
Materials
TQS $17^{\circ}$ bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic fn
Unit Weigh: 120 pef
Unit Weight: 120 pef
Conesion:
phi: 40 :

C-Anistoropic Strength fn: Tas 150 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ} \cdot 8^{\circ}$ )
Phi:B:
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Model: Mohr: Coulomb
Unit Weight:10) poft
Cohesion: 150 opf
Cohesion:
Phi:
Phi: $0_{0}$
Po
Qs $25^{\circ}$ bedding $8-13$

Unit Weight: 120 pef
Cohesion: 225 pst
Conesion": 225 pst
Phil: $40^{\circ}$
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Fill

```
Mode:Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weigh: 120 pef
MPhi:3\mp@subsup{3}{}{\circ}
Tmc \(17^{\circ}\) bedding \(8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\)
    Model: Ansotropic Fn
    Col
```



Slip Surface Entry and Exit


Left-zone Increment: 50
Right Projection:
Range

Rightzone Itcrement: 10
Radius Increments: 50
Slip Surface Limits

Seismic Coefficients
Horr Seismic Coef: 0
vert seismic coef: 0
Anisotropic Strength Functions
Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )

ion ( $)$, Modifier Factor
Pata Point $(-(-90,1)$
Datat Point
and
 Data Point: $(13,0.0 .25)$
Data $P$ Point: $(131.1,1)$
Tmc 150 pst (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point funtion
 Curve Fitto Doatai $100 \%$

Segment Curvaure: $0 \%$ | Segment curvature: : |
| :--- |
|  |

Data Points: Inclination ( $($ ), Modifier Factor

 Data Point: $(13,0.75)$
Data Point: $(13,1,1)$
TQs $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
 Curve fitito 0 fata: $100 \%$
Segment Curature: Sesment turvature: $0 \%$
Data Points : Incination (1), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1$


TQs 150 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point function
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```
    Nunction:Modifie Factor vs. Inclination
        cuc
```



```
    M
    pate: Point:(:,9,1)
    MData Point:(8,0,657)
TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding 880-130)
    Model: Spline Data Pointinnuntion
        #Nction:Modifer Factor vs. Inclion
        Curve fitto oata:100%
    Data Points:Inclination (%),Modifie Factor
        M
        Mata Point(:.9, ,1)
        M, Data Point:(:8,0,044)
TQs 25' (Along Bedding bedding 8}\mp@subsup{8}{}{\circ}-1\mp@subsup{3}{}{\circ})(2
    Model:Spline Datat Paint Function
        \unction:Modifief Factor vs.1.ldinm
        \begin{subarray}{c}{\mathrm{ Cure Fitto Data:100%}}\\{\mathrm{ Segment urvature: 0%}}\end{subarray}
    v-ntercep:11 1 Imation), (%odifer Factor
        M
        OD, Pint:(7., (1)
        \
Points
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & x(tt) & \(r(t)\) \\
\hline Point 1 & -200 & 1,578 \\
\hline Point 2 & -180 & \({ }_{1,547}\) \\
\hline Point 3 & -158 & 1,530 \\
\hline Point 4 & -131 & 1,522 \\
\hline Point 5 & -111 & 1,518 \\
\hline Point 6 & -88 & 1,521 \\
\hline Point 7 & -131 & 1,536 \\
\hline Point 8 & -159 & 1,549 \\
\hline Point 9 & -70 & 1,508 \\
\hline Point 10 & -34 & 1,508 \\
\hline Point 11 & 14 & 1,508 \\
\hline Point 12 & 126 & 1,994 \\
\hline Point 13 & 200 & 1,519 \\
\hline Point 14 & 253 & 1,537 \\
\hline Point 15 & 294 & 1,550 \\
\hline Point 16 & 411.0219 & 1,589.767 \\
\hline Point 17 & 445.1762 & 1,601.0103 \\
\hline Point 18 & 484.351 & 1,614.0214 \\
\hline Point 19 & 562.5197 & 1,640.3984 \\
\hline Point 20 & 624.593 & 1,559.8269 \\
\hline Point 21 & 657.92 & 1,663.8109 \\
\hline Point 22 & 810 & 1,677 \\
\hline Point 23 & 811 & 1,300 \\
\hline Point 24 & -200 & 1,299 \\
\hline Point 25 & -28 & 1,521 \\
\hline Point 26 & 26 & 1,524 \\
\hline Point 27 & 40 & 1,531 \\
\hline Point 28 & 50 & 1,531 \\
\hline Point 29 & 89 & 1,554 \\
\hline Point 30 & 102 & 1,554 \\
\hline Point 31 & 148 & 1,575 \\
\hline Point 32 & 172 & 1,575 \\
\hline Point 33 & 225 & 1,583 \\
\hline Point 34 & 254 & 1,595 \\
\hline Point 35 & 275 & 1,595 \\
\hline Point 36 & 318 & 1,617 \\
\hline Point 37 & \({ }^{341}\) & 1,618 \\
\hline Point 38 & 391 & 1,644 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

file:///P:/FINAL\%20PROJECTS/PARDEE/Skyline\%20Ranch/SLOPE\%20RESULTS/Sect... 3/22/2016


Regions

|  | \| Material | Points | Area (tt) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | als | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, | 1,371 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Region } \\ 2 \end{array}$ |  |  | 2.6373 zeO |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill |  | 45,816 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ |  | 20,21,22,51,5,5,3,54,55,56 | 4,213.8 |
| Region 5 <br> 5 |  | 57,5,2,2,21,20,19,18,17,16 | 12,895 |

Current Slip Surface






Slip Slices
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1-Circular Mode of Failure
Page 5 of 5

| Slice 19 | 443 | 1,636.1724 | 0 | 3,227.6068 | 2,096.0324 | 200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice 20 | 452.33333 | 1,640.714 | 0 | 3,276.7078 | 2,127.9189 | 200 |
| Slice 21 | 463 | 1,646.274 | 0 | 2,977,3745 | 1,914,0474 | 200 |
| Slice 22 | 474 | 1,652.3675 | 0 | 2,565.1955 | 1,665.8575 | 200 |
| Slice 23 | 484 | 1,658.2955 | 0 | 2,467.9366 | 1,602.6968 | 200 |
| Slice 24 | 494 | 1,664.5956 | 0 | 2,335.0064 | 1,516.3709 | 200 |
| Slice 25 | 504 | 1,671.2873 | 0 | 2,165.6942 | 1,406.4183 | 200 |
| Slice 26 | 514 | 1,678.3932 | 0 | 1,994,9219 | 1,295.5174 | 200 |
| Slice 27 | 524 | 1,685.9391 | 0 | 1,820.4358 | 1,182.2048 | 200 |
| Slice 28 | 534.46759 | 1,694.3543 | 0 | 1,278.4859 | 830.25845 | 200 |
| Slice 29 | 545.40278 | 1,703.7271 | 0 | 378.4311 | 245.75603 | 200 |



1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

```
File Information
    M File Version: 8.15 
    Comments: Run By: Dr.Alexander Bykovisev, Ph.D., P.E
    lastEdited By: Alexander Byko,
    Mevion Number:145
    Time: 11:39:33 AM
    M
```



```
    lol
```

Project Settings

Forceffl Units: Pounds
Peresurepl) Units: psf
sf
Strengt Units. pps
Unit weighto of water 62.4 pot
Unit Weight of Water:
View
Element Thickness: 1
Analysis Settings
1- Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
Kinds. SIOPE/
Parent: 1 - Circual
Parent: 1-Circular Mode of failue
Method: Bishop
Setings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
nital
Intitia slip Surfacae sourre: Parent Analyss
Sip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to tefft
Ise Passive Mode: No
Sip Surface Option : critcal Slip Surfaces from oot

| sip surfacie opitices saved: 1 |
| :--- |
| Critical sip surfaces 5 fir |


Optimize critital Slip Surface Location
Tension Craick
Tension Crack Option: (none)
Fof D istribu
Fof Scaculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of S Slices: 30
Fof STolerance: 0.01
Mininum Slip surface Depth: 0.1 itt
Materials
TQS $17^{\circ}$ bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$

Conesion:
Phil: 40
an
and
hi-Anisotropic Strength n .: Tas $17^{\circ}$ A Along Bed ding bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$

Qls
Model: Mont-Coulome
Unit Weight: 100 poft
Unit Weight: 100 peff
Cohesion:: 150 opf

TQs $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8-13


Chineseigh:
Chin:
Phi:
Phisisot


```
1-Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
Fill
    M Model: Mohr:Coulomb
    M Wit Weight:120 pef
    M
Tmc 17 bedding 8}\mp@subsup{8}{}{\circ}-1\mp@subsup{3}{}{\circ
    #Nit Weight:120 peff
    *)
    M,
```

ip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,578)$ It
Right Cordinate:
(810.0105, $, 1,72.407)$ ft
Seismic Coefficients
Hor. Seismic Coef. 0.15
vert Seismic coef: 0
Anisotropic Strength Functions
Imc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Dotat Point function
Function: Modifier Factor vs.. Inclinatio

Y-Intercept: 1
Vata Points: Inclination (\%), Modifier Factor



Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function:
Modifier Factor vss. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: 100
Segment
unvature: 0
Intercept: 1
Sen
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{(2)}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point
Data Point: $-90,11)$
Data Point: $(7,9,1)$


Qs $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Datat Point function
Nodi: spine Datap Pont function

Segment Curvature: 0\%
r-ntereept.
Data Pointss: Inclination ( 9 ), Modifier Factor



TQs 150 psf (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Dota Point Function
Curve itito Dotat: 100
Segment curature: 0
$\underset{\substack{\text { Segment } \\ \text { l-nterent: } \\ \text { bata Poins: } \\ \text { and }}}{\text { In }}$
Mantercept: 11 Pints inction ( $)$ ), Modifier Facto
Data Point: (-90, 1

Data Point: (, 0.0 .6671
Data Point: $(8,0.657)$
Data Point: $(8,1,1)$
1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Dotata Point function
Function: Modifier Factor vs inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

| Segment Curvatu |
| :--- |
| - -ntercept: 1 |

 Data Point: (-90, 1)
Dotat Point: $7(7,9,1)$ Data Point: $(8,0.0 .44)$
Data Poit:
Dota Point
Doint:
$(13,1,1,14)$
TQs $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) (2)
Model: Sline Dotat Point function
Function: Modifier factor vs. Incilination
Pata Points Inclination ( 9 ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $:-90,1)$
Data Point $(7.9,1)$
 Data Point: $(13,0.625)$
Data Point: $(13,1,1)$
Points

|  | $x(t)$ | $Y(t)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,578 |
| Point 2 | ${ }^{-180}$ | 1,547 |
| Point 3 | -158 | 1,530 |
| Point 4 | -131 | 1,522 |
| Point 5 | -111 | 1,518 |
| Point 6 | -88 | 1,521 |
| Point 7 | -131 | 1,536 |
| Point 8 | -159 | 1,549 |
| Point 9 | -70 | 1,508 |
| Point 10 | -34 | 1,508 |
| Point 11 | 14 | 1,508 |
| Point 12 | 126 | 1,994 |
| Point 13 | 200 | 1,519 |
| Point 14 | 253 | 1,537 |
| Point 15 | 294 | 1,550 |
| Point 16 | 411.0219 | 1,589,767 |
| Point 17 | 445.1762 | 1,601.0003 |
| Point 18 | 484.351 | 1,614.0214 |
| Point 19 | 562.5197 | 1,640.3984 |
| Point 20 | 624.593 | 1,659.826 |
| Point 21 | 657.92 | 1,663.8109 |
| Point 22 | 810 | 1,677 |
| Point 23 | 811 | 1,300 |
| Point 24 | -200 | 1,299 |
| Point 25 | -28 | 1,521 |
| Point 26 | 26 | 1,524 |
| Point 27 | 40 | 1,531 |
| Point 28 | 50 | 1,531 |
| Point 29 | 89 | 1,554 |
| Point 30 | 102 | 1,554 |
| Point 31 | 148 | 1,575 |
| Point 32 | 172 | 1,575 1,583 |
| Point 33 | 225 | 1,583 |
| Poin 34 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 254 \\ \hline 275 \end{array}$ | 1,595 1.595 |
| Point 36 | 318 | 1,617 |
| Point 37 | 341 | 1,618 |
| Point 38 | 391 | 1,664 |
| Point 39 | 399 | 1,644 |
| Point 40 | 429 | 1,660 |
| Point 41 | 457 | 1,676 1,676 |
| Point 43 | 509 | ${ }_{1}^{1,697}$ |
| Point 44 | 529 | 1,709 |
| Point 45 | 580 | 1,708 |
| Point 46 | 629 | 1,710 |
| Point 47 | 676 | 1,734 |

## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure Seismic

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area (tr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{1}^{\text {Region }}$ | Q1s | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, | 1,371 |
| ${ }_{2}^{\text {Region }}$ |  | 6,5,4,3,3, 1, 24, 2, 3, 58,5, 1, 15,14,13,12,59,11, 10,9 | 2.6373 +0, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill |  | 45,816 |
| Region 4 |  | 20,21,22,51,52,53,54,5,56 | 4,213.8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | TQs $25^{\circ}$ bedding <br> 8-13 | 57,5,2,22,21,20,19,18,17,16 | 12,895 |

Current Slip Surface




Slip Slices
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1-Circular Mode of Failure Seismic
Page 5 of 5

| Silce 28 | 534.46759 | $1,694.343$ | 0 | $1,141.1053$ | 74.04242 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sice 29 | 545.40278 | $1,703.7271$ | 0 | 316.1279 | 205.2559 | 200 |



2-Translational

## 2 - Translational

```
File Information
    l
    Comments: Run By:DP.Al.Aexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
    Last Edited By: Alexander Bykon
    *)
    Time: 11:3:33 AM
    M
```



Project Settings

Foreself) Units: Pounds
Pressurelp) Uuits: psf
fster
Strength Units pps
Unit weight of Water 62.4 pof
Unit Weight of Water:
View:
Element
thickness 1
Analysis Settings
2 - Translational
ind. SLOPEN
Method: Janbu
setinss
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
PPW Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surfaree
Direction of movement: ight to teft
Usee easise Mode: :no
Slio Surface Ootion: Block
Use Passive Mode: :
Sop
Sip urface O Option: Block
If purface Option: Block
fitical silp surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Orivin side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict blockcossing

Tension Crack Tension Crack Option: (none)
Fof S Distribution Crack Option: (none)
Fofs catculation Option: Constant

| ddvanced |
| :---: |
| Number of Slices: 30 |


Materials
Tas $17^{\circ}$ bedding $6^{\circ}-8$

Conesion: 225 p
Phi: 40 .


Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100
pof
conesion
phi:
Phi
Pe:
Qs $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8 -13
Model: Anistropic en
Unit Weight: 120 pef
Cohesion: 22
Phi: 40 :
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## 2 - Translational

$\qquad$



Tmc $17^{\circ}$ bedding $8^{\circ}{ }^{-13}{ }^{\circ}$
Mode: Anistropich
Unit Weight: 120 pef
Chesion: 200 psf

Phi-B: 0
Slip Surface Limits Left Coordinate: $-(-200,1,578)$ It
Right coordinate: $(800.1055,1,722.407)$ ft

Slip Surface Block


X increments: 10
Y neremens: 10
Startin
Starting Anle: $1355^{\circ}$
Ending Angle:
$180^{\circ}$
$\underset{\substack{\text { Anghte } \\ \text { Right } \\ \text { Upoper Le }}}{\substack{\text { and }}}$

Lower Right: $(713,1,1,1$
XIncenens.
Y Increments: 10
Yincrements. 10
Starting Ange: 45
Ending Angle: $55:$
Soding Ange: s5 $^{\circ}$
Angle Incements:
Seismic Coefficients Horr Seismic Coef: 0
vert Seismic coef: 0

Anisotropic Strength Functions
Inc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Dotat Point Function

Segment Curature: 0


 Dotat Point: $(13,0.245)$
Data Poont: $(13.1,1)$
Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) Model: Sphin edarapontituction Cunve Fitito Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature:
r-nterecept:
Data Points
nen
Data Pointst: Inclination (9), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $-(-0,11)$

| Datat Point: $(-90,1)$ |
| :---: |
| Datat Point $(19,9)$ |


Qs $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )

| Model: spline e atata Point function |
| :--- |
| Find |
| $\left.6^{\circ}-8\right)$ |

Huction : Modifier Factor s s. In
Curve fit to oata: $100 \%$
Curve fitt o Data: $100 \%$
Segment curvature: $0 \%$
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```
2 - Translational
-Intercept : 11 chination ( 9 ), Modifier Factor Datat Point: \(-90,1\) )
Data Point \((59,1)\)
```



```
Data Point: (8, 0.4.25)
Data Point: \((8,1,1)\)
TQs 150 pff (Along Bedding \(6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\) )
Model: Spline Datat Point Function
Function: Modifier factors IIS Inclination
```



```
Curve fitt o Data: 1000
Segent curvatur: 0
```



```
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: \((5,9,1)\)
```



```
Datat Pinit: (:, 0.067\()\)
Data
Point \((81,11)\)
TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding \(8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\) )
```





```
\begin{tabular}{l} 
Data Point \((-90,1)\) \\
Data Point: \((7,9,1)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Dotat Point: \(18,0.0444\)
Data Point \((13,0.444)\)
and
Data Pint: (13.0.044)
Data Point ( \((13,1,1)\)
TQS \(25^{\circ}\) (Along Bedding bedding \(8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\) ) (2)
Model: Ssine Data Point function
Function: Modifier ractor vs, Incination
Curve fit to Data: \(100 \%\)
Segment curature: \(0 \%\)
```
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Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area (tt) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{1}^{\text {Region }}$ | Q1s | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 | 1,37 |
| Region 2 |  |  | 2.6373 e+0 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { Region } \\ 3 \end{array}$ | Fill |  | 45,816 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Region } \\ 4 \end{array}$ | Tas $17^{\circ}$ <br> bedding | 20,21,22,51,5, 5, 53,54,5,56 | 4,213.8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | TQs $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8-13 | 57,5,2,2,21,20,19,18,17,16 | 12,995 |

Current Slip Surface

| Slip Surace: 92,012 |
| :---: |
| Foff: 1.51 |






Radius: 20.1.124t
Center: ( $(362.16098$
, 1,739.7192) ft
Slip Slic


2 - Translational
Page 5 of 5
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2-Translational Seismic

## 2 - Translational Seismic

```
File Information
    l
    Comments: Run By: Dr.Alexader Bykoovsev, P.D., P.E.
    lug
    Mevision Number. 145
    Filel
```



Project Settings


| Forcesf) Units: Pounds |
| :--- |
| Pressurel() Units: pff |

    Strengt U ints. ppt
    Unit weighto of Water: 62.4 pcf
Unit Weight of Water: 22.2
View: 2.
Element Thickness: 1
Analysis Settings
2 - Translational Seismic

Parent: 2 - Transation
Method: Spencer

PWP Conditions Source: (none)
lnitial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Direction of movement: Right
Use passive Mode: No
Sis
Stip Surface Option: Critial Slip Surfaces from Other
Resistintips Side Maxaes savied 1
1
Ronvex Angle:

Optimize Critital Slip Surface Location
Tension Craick
Tension Crack Opption: (none)
of S Distribution
Advanced calcuation Option

| Number of Sices: 30 |
| :--- |
| Fof 5 Toleranace: 0.01 |

        Minimum Slip surface Depth: 0.1 tt
        Search Methot: Root finder
    Tolerabie e differenece between starting and converged $F$ of $s$ : 3

Max Absolutere Lambda: 2

## Materials

TQS $17^{\circ}$ bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.

Cohesion: 225


Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb Model. Morni-coulomb
Unitheseight 1.100 off
Chosesio: 150 opf Consesion":
Phis
Phis. $8: 0.0$

TQs $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8-13
Model: Anistropic $F$ Fn.

```
    M Unit Weight:120 pc 
    Conesion::225 psf
```



```
    C-.Anis
Fill
    Model: Morr-coulomb
        \
        M,
Tmc 17* bedding 8}\mp@subsup{8}{}{\circ}-1\mp@subsup{3}{}{\circ
    M
```



```
    C-Anistropicstrengh f.: TMc 150 psf(Along Bedding 8-13")
```

Slip Surface Limits

Seismic Coefficients
Hor. Seismic Coef: 0.15
Vert Seismic coef: 0
Anisotropic Strength Functions
Imc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Function: Modifier factor vs. Inclination
Curve itito Datai: 100
Segment Curavatue: 0

on ( 9 , Modifier Factor
Data Point: -90, 1

Data Point: (13,0.4.5)
Data Point: $(13.1,1)$
Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Model Spline Data Point tunction
Eunction: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination.
Curve fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Cegnent
Survature: 0
tercept: 1
V-ntercept: 1 .

Dotat Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data $)$ Point $(8,0,75)$

Qs $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )

Curve fitito Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curature: $0 \%$

| Segmen |
| :--- |
| -ntercept: |




as 150 pst (Along Bedding $6^{\circ}-8^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point tunction

Curve ift to Data: $100 \%$
s-Intercenent: 1
-Intercept: 11
nata Points : Inclination ( $)$ ), Modifier Factor
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2-Translational Seismic

TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Mopel: Spiline Dotat point function
Function: Modifer factor vs. Inclination
Eunction: Moditifir factor vis. Inclina
Cure fit
Segment Curatature: $0 \%$




TQs $25^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) (2)
Model: Sline Dotat Point Function
Function: Modifier factor vs. Inclination
Curve fitto onata1 $100 \%$
Segment curvatue: $0 \%$




Points

|  | $\mathrm{x}(\mathrm{tr})$ | $Y(t)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,578 |
| Point 2 | -180 | 1,547 |
| Point 3 | -158 | 1,530 |
| Point 4 | -131 | 1,522 |
| Point 5 | -111 | 1,518 |
| Point 6 | -88 | ${ }_{1,521}$ |
| Point 7 | ${ }^{131}$ | 1,536 |
| Point 8 | -159 | 1.549 |
| Point 9 | -70 | 1,508 |
| Point 10 | -34 | 1,508 |
| Point 11 | 14 | 1,508 |
| Point 12 | 126 | 1,994 |
| Point 13 | 200 | 1,519 |
| Point 14 | 253 | 1,537 |
| Point 15 | 294 | 1,550 |
| Point 16 | 411.0219 | 1,589.767 |
| Point 17 | 445.1762 | 1,601.0103 |
| Point 18 | 484.351 | 1,614.0214 |
| Point 19 | 562.519 | 1,640.3984 |
| Point 20 | 624.593 | 1,559.8269 |
| Point 21 | 657.92 | 1,663.8109 |
| Point 22 | 810 | 1,677 |
| Point 23 | 811 | 1,300 |
| Point 24 | $-200$ | 1,299 |
| Point 25 | -28 | 1,521 |
| Point 26 | 26 | 1,524 |
| Point 27 | 40 | 1,531 |
| Point 28 | 50 | 1,531 |
| Point 29 | 89 | 1,554 |
| Point 30 | 102 | 1,554 |
| Point 31 | 148 | 1,575 |
| Point 32 | 172 | 1,575 |
| Point 33 | 225 | ${ }_{1,583}$ |
| Point 34 | 254 | 1,595 |
| Point 35 | 275 | 1,595 |
| Point 36 | 318 | 1,617 |
| Point 37 | 341 | 1,618 |
| Point 38 | 391 | 1,644 |
| Point 39 | 399 | 1,644 |
| Point 40 | 429 | 1,660 |
| Point 41 | 457 | 1,676 |
| Point 42 | 469 | 1,676 |
| Point 43 | 509 | 1,697 |

Regions

|  | rial | Points | Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{1}^{\text {Region }}$ | als | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 | 1,371.5 |
| ${ }_{2}^{\text {Region }}$ |  |  | 2.6373 e+0 |
| ${ }_{3}^{\text {Region }}$ | Fill |  | 45,816 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & { }^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tostidio } \\ & \text { beding } \\ & 6^{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | 20,21,2,2,51, ,2, ,3, 5, 4, 5, 5, | 4,213.8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | TQs $25^{\circ}$ bedding | 57,5,2,2,2,1,20,19,18,17,16 | ${ }^{12,895}$ |

Current Slip Surface
Slip Surface:
Foff: 1.131


Resisting Force: $1, .000,319.1 .1 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $83,706.69$ bs



Radius: 20.1.124tt.
Center: ( $362.16098,1,739.7192$ ) th
Slip Slices
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2 - Translational Seismic
Page 5 of 5
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3 - Temporary

## 3 - Temporary

```
File Information
    C,
    Comments: uun By: Dr.,Alexander By,kovisev, Ph.D., P.E
```



```
    M
    Time: 11:5::10.4M
    File: vame: Section 24 24 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
```


Project Settings


Strength Units pps
Unit weight of Water 62.4 pof
Unit Weight of Water:
View:
Element
thickness 1
Analysis Settings

| 3 - Temporary |
| :---: |
| Kind: sLope |


Method.:Jantu
Settins
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
PSP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surfacee
Direction of movement: ight to teft
Direction of movement: R.
Use assive Mode: No.
Slip Surface opotion: liock
Slip Surface Option: Block
Citital Sip surfaces saved; 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Driving siide Mxximum Con
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimiz C Citaral Slip surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: ( none)
Fof Distribution
Sors catculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
N


## Materials

TQS $17^{\circ}$ bedding $6^{\circ}-8$

Conesion
Phit: $40^{\circ}$



Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb

Unit Weight: 100 off | Conesion" |
| :---: |
| Phi: $20^{\circ}$ |

Phi:
Phib:
0 $0^{\circ}$
QS $25^{\circ}$ bedding 8-13
Model: Ansisotropic $F$ n.

Conesion:
Phi: 40 $0^{\circ}$
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```
3 - Temporary
Tmc \(17^{\circ}\) bedding \(8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\)
```



```
Cohesion: 200 psf
hhi: 40
```




Slip Surface Limits

Slip Surface Block


Seismic Coefficients
Hor Seismic Coef:0
vert Seismic coef:i:

Anisotropic Strength Functions
Imc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ ) Model: Spline Datap Point function Curve fit to Data: 100
Segment Curature: 0
$\underset{\substack{\text { Segment } \\ \text { r-ntercept } 1 \\ \text { Data Points: } \\ \text { In }}}{ }$
Data Points: Incliaration ( $)$, Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7,9,1)$
 Data Point: $(13,0.0 .25)$
Data 0 oint: $(13.1,1)$
Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding $8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}$ )
Mode: Spline edatia Pont function Curve fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
$\underset{\substack{\text { Segment } \\ \text { Y-ntercept } \\ \text { Data Points: } \\ \text { In }}}{ }$
tion ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Facto: Datat Point: $(-90,1)$
Datat Point $(19,1)$
Pata

a, 17 $^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding bedding $\left.6^{\circ}-8\right)$
Model: Spine o oata Point Function
Eunction: Modifier Facator uvs Incling ination Curve fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Segment
l-nterent.
fata
1


Datat Point: $(8,0.025)$
Data
Point: $(8,1,1)$

```
3-Temporary
Model: Spline Data Pooint function Unction: Modifier factoro vs: Inclination Curve fit to Data: \(100 \%\)
Segment curvature: \(0 \%\)
```



``` \begin{tabular}{l} 
Dati Point: \(-(-90,1)\) \\
patat Point: \\
50,1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```



```
        M Data Pont:(8,0.067)
TQs 100 psf (Along Bedding \(8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\) ) Model: Spline e atata Point function Curve fit to Data: \(100 \%\)
Seement curature: intercept:
Data Points: Inclination
Data Point:
and
an Data Point: \(-(-90,1\)
Data Point: \(7,9,1\)
```



``` Data Point: \((13,0.444)\)
Data Point: \((13,1,1)\)
TQs \(22^{\circ}\) (Along Bedding bedding \(8^{\circ}-13^{\circ}\) ) (2)
Model: Spline Dita Point function
Function: Modifier \(F\) actor vs. Inclination
```



```
Curve fit to Data: 100
Segment curature: 0
--ntereepet: 1
l-Intercept: 1
Data Points : Inclination ( \()\) ), Modifier Factor \begin{tabular}{l} 
Datat Point: \((-90,1)\) \\
Data Point: \((7, \%, 1)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```



``` Data Point: (13.0.0.65)
Data Point \((13,1,1)\)
Points
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(x(t)\) & \(Y_{\text {(tr) }}\) \\
\hline Point 1 & -200 & 1,578 \\
\hline Point 2 & -180 & 1,547 \\
\hline Point 3 & -158 & 1,530 \\
\hline Point 4 & -131 & 1,522 \\
\hline Point 5 & -111 & 1,518 \\
\hline Point 6 & -88 & 1,521 \\
\hline Point 7 & -131 & 1,536 \\
\hline Point 8 & -159 & 1,549 \\
\hline Point 9 & -70 & 1,508 \\
\hline Point 10 & -34 & 1,508 \\
\hline Point 11 & 14 & 1,508 \\
\hline Point 12 & 126 & 1,994 \\
\hline Point 13 & 200 & 1,519 \\
\hline Point 14 & 253 & 1,537 \\
\hline Point 15 & 294 & 1,550 \\
\hline Point 16 & 411.0219 & 1,589.767 \\
\hline Point 17 & 445.1762 & 1,601.0103 \\
\hline Point 18 & 484.351 & 1,614.0214 \\
\hline Point 19 & 562.5197 & 1,640.3984 \\
\hline Point 20 & 624.593 & 1,659.8269 \\
\hline Point 21 & 657.92 & 1,663.8109 \\
\hline Point 22 & 810 & 1,677 \\
\hline Point 23 & 811 & 1,300 \\
\hline Point 24 & \(-200\) & 1,299 \\
\hline Point 25 & -28 & 1,521 \\
\hline Point 26 & 26 & 1,524 \\
\hline Point 27 & 40 & 1,531 \\
\hline Point 28 & 50 & 1,531 \\
\hline Point 29 & 89 & 1,554 \\
\hline Point 30 & 102 & 1,554 \\
\hline Point 31 & 148 & 1,575 \\
\hline Point 32 & 172 & 1,575 \\
\hline Point 33 & 225 & 1,583 \\
\hline Point 34 & 254 & 1,595 \\
\hline Point 35 & 275 & 1,595 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```


## 3 - Temporary



Regions

|  | Material | Poin | Area (tri) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{1}^{\text {Region }}$ | als | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, | 1,37 |
| Region <br> 2 |  |  | 2.6373 +0 |
| Region |  |  | 45,816 |
| Region 4 |  | 20,21,22,51, 5, 5, 3, 5, 5, 5, 56 | 4,213,8 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Region } \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Tas } 25^{\circ} \\ \text { bedding }}}{ }$ <br> 8.13 | 57,58,22,21,2,0,19,18,17,16 | 12,895 |

Current Slip Surface
Slip Surface: 51,674

| Slip Surface: 51, , |
| :---: |
| Fof S:1.3. |







Center
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## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Ceport senerated using Geostudio 2012. Copright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 168
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 3:34:50 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 28 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 28 -28 results\latest Update 3-21-16
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 3:35:16 PM

Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
nit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc - 17 bedding 6-12
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs-17 bedding 8-12
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $21.6156,1,723.1354$ ) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(271.8571,1,760) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $314.362,1,784.3497$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(669,1,805) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 10
Radius Increments: 50

Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,500) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,1,752) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(12,0.425)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
150 psf (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(12,0.667)$
Data Point: (12.1, 1)
$17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 8-12 )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$
Data Point: $(12,0.425)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$

Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: (12.1, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -197 | 1,708 |
| Point 2 | -121 | 1,714 |
| Point 3 | -53 | 1,726 |
| Point 4 | -25 | 1,725 |
| Point 5 | 25 | 1,723 |
| Point 6 | 72 | 1,731 |
| Point 7 | 110 | 1,739 |
| Point 8 | 152 | 1,738 |
| Point 9 | 188 | 1,730 |
| Point 10 | 205 | 1,721 |
| Point 11 | 215 | 1,711 |
| Point 12 | 270 | 1,711 |
| Point 13 | 338 | 1,745 |
| Point 14 | 354 | 1,739 |
| Point 15 | 374 | 1,722 |
| Point 16 | 455 | 1,735 |
| Point 17 | 514 | 1,743 |
| Point 18 | 574 | 1,746 |
| Point 19 | 656 | 1,747 |
| Point 20 | 742 | 1,745 |
| Point 21 | 812 | 1,752 |
| Point 22 | 811 | 1,501 |
| Point 23 | -201 | 1,500 |
| Point 24 | -198.0192 | 1,655 |
| Point 25 | 811.9124 | 1,730 |
| Point 26 | 277 | 1,763 |
| Point 27 | 333 | 1,795 |
| Point 28 | 382 | 1,795 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Point 29 | 471 | 1,794 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 30 | 499 | 1,805 |
| Point 31 | 580 | 1,805 |
| Point 32 | 715 | 1,805 |
| Point 33 | 809 | 1,805 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | TQs-17 bedding 8-12 | 1,24,25,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2 | 39,930 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Tmc - 17 bedding 6-12 | 24,23,22,25 | $1.9403 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 10,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11 | 33,691 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 8,487
Fof S: 1.55
Volume: 2,219.2631 $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $266,311.57 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $41,034,386 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
Activating Moment: 26,421,804 lbs-ft
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 28,611 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (205.11201, 1,721.0653) ft
Entry: $(347.48917,1,795) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 216.30974 ft
Center: $(183.72094,1,936.3148) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Yt})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 207.50828 | $1,721.3305$ | 0 | 116.34409 | 75.554737 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 212.30081 | $1,721.915$ | 0 | 363.90387 | 236.32194 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 217.09334 | $1,722.6087$ | 0 | 594.71158 | 386.21022 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 221.88588 | $1,723.4124$ | 0 | 809.02271 | 525.38549 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 226.67841 | $1,724.3276$ | 0 | $1,007.0583$ | 653.99128 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 231.47094 | $1,725.3555$ | 0 | $1,189.0064$ | 772.14976 | 200 |
| Slice | 236.26347 | $1,726.498$ | 0 | $1,355.0237$ | 879.9627 | 200 |


| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 8 | 241.05601 | $1,727.7568$ | 0 | $1,505.2367$ | 977.51216 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 245.84854 | $1,729.1342$ | 0 | $1,639.7422$ | $1,064.8611$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 250.64107 | $1,730.6324$ | 0 | $1,758.6082$ | $1,142.0535$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 255.4336 | $1,732.2541$ | 0 | $1,861.8741$ | $1,209.1152$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 260.22614 | $1,734.0024$ | 0 | $1,949.5509$ | $1,266.0532$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 265.01867 | $1,735.8805$ | 0 | $2,021.6213$ | $1,312.8562$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 269.8112 | $1,737.8921$ | 0 | $2,078.0389$ | $1,349.4942$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 274.60373 | $1,740.0414$ | 0 | $2,118.7281$ | $1,375.9181$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 279.33333 | $1,742.3009$ | 0 | $2,140.6919$ | $1,390.1816$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 284 | $1,744.6717$ | 0 | $2,144.3123$ | $1,392.5327$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 288.66667 | $1,747.1874$ | 0 | $2,132.7539$ | $1,385.0266$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 293.33333 | $1,749.8538$ | 0 | $2,105.8339$ | $1,367.5445$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 298 | $1,752.6775$ | 0 | $2,063.3378$ | $1,339.9473$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 302.66667 | $1,755.6659$ | 0 | $2,005.018$ | $1,302.0739$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 307.33333 | $1,758.8273$ | 0 | $1,930.5913$ | $1,253.7406$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 312 | $1,762.1712$ | 0 | $1,839.7367$ | $1,194.739$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 316.66667 | $1,765.7083$ | 0 | $1,732.0934$ | $1,124.8346$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 321.33333 | $1,769.4508$ | 0 | $1,607.2578$ | $1,043.7654$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 326 | $1,773.4131$ | 0 | $1,464.7812$ | 951.24005 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 330.66667 | $1,777.6115$ | 0 | $1,304.168$ | 846.93659 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 335.41486 | $1,782.1481$ | 0 | $1,003.941$ | 651.96689 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 340.24459 | $1,787.0566$ | 0 | 569.49418 | 369.83384 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 345.07431 | $1,792.2945$ | 0 | 123.21477 | 80.01661 | 200 |
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## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure seismic

Report senerated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 168
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 3:34:50 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 28 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 28 -28 results\latest Update 3-21-16
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 3:35:33 PM

Project Settings
Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc - 17 bedding 6-12
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs-17 bedding 8-12
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength $\mathrm{Fn} .: 17^{\circ}\left(\right.$ Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,500) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,1,752) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.1
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## Y-Intercept: 1

Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: (12, 0.425)
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
150 psf (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(12,0.667)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
$17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.425$ )
Data Point: (12, 0.425)
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$

Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Point 1 | -197 | 1,708 |
| Point 2 | -121 | 1,714 |
| Point 3 | -53 | 1,726 |
| Point 4 | -25 | 1,725 |
| Point 5 | 25 | 1,723 |
| Point 6 | 72 | 1,731 |
| Point 7 | 110 | 1,739 |
| Point 8 | 152 | 1,738 |
| Point 9 | 188 | 1,730 |
| Point 10 | 205 | 1,721 |
| Point 11 | 215 | 1,711 |
| Point 12 | 270 | 1,711 |
| Point 13 | 338 | 1,745 |
| Point 14 | 354 | 1,739 |
| Point 15 | 374 | 1,722 |
| Point 16 | 455 | 1,735 |
| Point 17 | 514 | 1,743 |
| Point 18 | 574 | 1,746 |
| Point 19 | 656 | 1,747 |
| Point 20 | 742 | 1,745 |
| Point 21 | 812 | 1,752 |
| Point 22 | 811 | 1,501 |
| Point 23 | -201 | 1,500 |
| Point 24 | -198.0192 | 1,655 |
| Point 25 | 811.9124 | 1,730 |
| Point 26 | 277 | 1,763 |
| Point 27 | 333 | 1,795 |
| Point 28 | 382 | 1,795 |
| Point 29 | 471 | 1,794 |
| Point 30 | 499 | 1,805 |
| Point 31 | 580 | 1,805 |
| Point 32 | 715 | 1,805 |
| Point 33 | 809 | 1,805 |

## Regions

|  | Material |  | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | TQs-17 |  | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
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## Current Slip Surface

## Slip Surface: 1

F of S: 1.15
Volume: $2,219.2631 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $266,311.58 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 38,620,651 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $33,588,095 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Exit: (205.11201, 1,721.0653) ft
Entry: $(347.48917,1,795) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 216.30974 ft
Center: (183.72094, 1,936.3148) ft

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 207.50828 $1,721.3305$ 0 109.90875 71.375575 200 <br> Slice <br> 2 212.30081 $1,721.915$ 0 351.77308 228.44411 200 <br> Slice <br> 3 217.09334 $1,722.6087$ 0 575.84446 373.95777 200 <br> Slice <br> 4 221.88588 $1,723.4124$ 0 782.53903 508.18679 200 <br> Slice <br> 5 226.67841 $1,724.3276$ 0 972.22869 631.3727 200 <br> Slice <br> 6 231.47094 $1,725.3555$ 0 $1,145.2434$ 743.72976 200 <br> Slice <br> 7 236.26347 $1,726.498$ 0 $1,301.8752$ 845.44763 200 <br> Slice <br> 8 241.05601 $1,727.7568$ 0 $1,442.3793$ 936.69208 200 <br> Slice <br> 9 245.84854 $1,729.1342$ 0 $1,566.9765$ $1,017.6065$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 10 250.64107 $1,730.6324$ 0 $1,675.8556$ $1,088.3133$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 11 255.4336 $1,732.2541$ 0 $1,769.1731$ $1,148.9145$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 12 260.22614 $1,734.0024$ 0 $1,847.0564$ $1,199.4925$ 200 |


| Slice <br> 13 | 265.01867 | $1,735.8805$ | 0 | $1,909.6023$ | $1,240.1103$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 14 | 269.8112 | $1,737.8921$ | 0 | $1,956.8808$ | $1,270.8132$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 274.60373 | $1,740.0414$ | 0 | $1,988.9317$ | $1,291.6274$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 279.33333 | $1,742.3009$ | 0 | $2,003.1282$ | $1,300.8466$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 284 | $1,744.6717$ | 0 | $1,999.9694$ | $1,298.7953$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 288.66667 | $1,747.1874$ | 0 | $1,982.4722$ | $1,287.4325$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 293.33333 | $1,749.8538$ | 0 | $1,950.5753$ | $1,266.7184$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 298 | $1,752.6775$ | 0 | $1,904.1917$ | $1,236.5966$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 302.66667 | $1,755.6659$ | 0 | $1,843.21$ | $1,196.9945$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 307.33333 | $1,758.8273$ | 0 | $1,767.4928$ | $1,147.8232$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 312 | $1,762.1712$ | 0 | $1,676.8768$ | $1,088.9765$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 316.66667 | $1,765.7083$ | 0 | $1,571.1725$ | $1,020.3313$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 321.33333 | $1,769.4508$ | 0 | $1,450.1661$ | 941.74887 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 326 | $1,773.4131$ | 0 | $1,313.6176$ | 853.07324 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 330.66667 | $1,777.6115$ | 0 | $1,161.2658$ | 754.13484 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 335.41486 | $1,782.1481$ | 0 | 882.95874 | 573.40011 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 340.24459 | $1,787.0566$ | 0 | 485.22856 | 315.11111 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 345.07431 | $1,792.2945$ | 0 | 80.070653 | 51.99849 | 200 |
|  | 1, |  |  | 2 |  |  |
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## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 168
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 3:34:50 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
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Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 28-28 results\latest Update 3-21-16
ast Solved Date: 3/22/2016
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc - 17 bedding 6-12
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs-17 bedding 8-12
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,500) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,1,752) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(197,1,717) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: (185.0015, 1,645.92) ft
Lower Right: $(288,1,641) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10

Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(304,1,662) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(309,1,729) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(416,1,740) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $\mathbf{1 7}^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: (12, 0.425)
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
150 psf (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(12,0.667)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
$17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

## -Intercept: 1

-Intercept: 1
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.425)$ Data Point: ( $12,0.425$ ) Data Point: $(12.1,1)$

Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -197 | 1,708 |
| Point 2 | -121 | 1,714 |
| Point 3 | -53 | 1,726 |
| Point 4 | -25 | 1,725 |
| Point 5 | 25 | 1,723 |
| Point 6 | 72 | 1,731 |
| Point 7 | 110 | 1,739 |
| Point 8 | 152 | 1,738 |
| Point 9 | 188 | 1,730 |
| Point 10 | 205 | 1,721 |
| Point 11 | 215 | 1,711 |
| Point 12 | 270 | 1,711 |
| Point 13 | 338 | 1,745 |
| Point 14 | 354 | 1,739 |
| Point 15 | 374 | 1,722 |
| Point 16 | 455 | 1,735 |
| Point 17 | 514 | 1,743 |
| Point 18 | 574 | 1,746 |
| Point 19 | 656 | 1,747 |
| Point 20 | 742 | 1,745 |
| Point 21 | 812 | 1,752 |


| Point 22 | 811 | 1,501 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 23 | -201 | 1,500 |
| Point 24 | -198.0192 | 1,655 |
| Point 25 | 811.9124 | 1,730 |
| Point 26 | 277 | 1,763 |
| Point 27 | 333 | 1,795 |
| Point 28 | 382 | 1,795 |
| Point 29 | 471 | 1,794 |
| Point 30 | 499 | 1,805 |
| Point 31 | 580 | 1,805 |
| Point 32 | 715 | 1,805 |
| Point 33 | 809 | 1,805 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs-17 <br> bedding 8-12 | $1,24,25,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 39,930 |
| Region <br> 2 | Tmc -17 <br> bedding 6-12 | $24,23,22,25$ | $1.9403 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $10,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11$ | 33,691 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 112,565
Fof S: 1.57
Volume: $5,424.7653 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $650,971.84 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $328,059.33 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: 208,918 .39
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surface
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip su
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: (205.17909, 1,721.1045) ft
Entry: (359.40509, 1,795) ft
Radius: 103.54463 ft
Center: (255.73747, 1,813.4739) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 207.61852 | $1,720.094$ | 0 | 416.80191 | 270.67433 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 212.49739 | $1,718.0731$ | 0 | $1,122.2986$ | 728.82924 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 217.37626 | $1,716.0522$ | 0 | $1,827.7953$ | $1,186.9841$ | 200 |


| Slice <br> 4 | 222.25513 | $1,714.0313$ | 0 | $2,533.292$ | $1,645.1391$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 5 | 227.13399 | $1,712.0104$ | 0 | $3,238.7887$ | $2,103.294$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 233.28649 | $1,709.462$ | 0 | $4,404.0155$ | $3,695.4078$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 239.54935 | $1,708.4367$ | 0 | $3,758.8467$ | $1,149.1948$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 244.64894 | $1,709.462$ | 0 | $3,983.9226$ | $1,218.0074$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 249.74854 | $1,710.4873$ | 0 | $4,208.9986$ | $1,286.82$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 254.7685 | $1,711.4967$ | 0 | $4,243.7852$ | $2,755.9464$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 259.70884 | $1,712.49$ | 0 | $4,452.9318$ | $2,891.7677$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 264.64917 | $1,713.4833$ | 0 | $4,662.0783$ | $3,027.5891$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 269.5895 | $1,714.4766$ | 0 | $4,871.2249$ | $3,163.4104$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 274.52983 | $1,715.4699$ | 0 | $5,080.3714$ | $3,299.2318$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 279.45294 | $1,716.4598$ | 0 | $5,285.5549$ | $3,432.4795$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 284.5653 | $1,717.4876$ | 0 | $5,735.274$ | $1,753.4492$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 289.88412 | $1,718.5571$ | 0 | $5,962.7151$ | $1,822.985$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 295.20294 | $1,719.6265$ | 0 | $6,190.1562$ | $1,892.5207$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 300.52177 | $1,720.6959$ | 0 | $6,417.5973$ | $1,962.0564$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 305.84059 | $1,721.7653$ | 0 | $6,645.0384$ | $2,031.5921$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 310.64136 | $1,725.3582$ | 0 | $3,745.3608$ | $3,142.7309$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 314.92408 | $1,731.4745$ | 0 | $3,496.1913$ | $2,933.6528$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 319.7212 | $1,738.3255$ | 0 | $3,581.4802$ | $2,325.8405$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 325.03272 | $1,745.9112$ | 0 | $3,238.8307$ | $2,103.3212$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 330.34424 | $1,753.4968$ | 0 | $2,896.1811$ | $1,880.802$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 335.64051 | $1,761.0607$ | 0 | $2,440.8986$ | $1,585.1381$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 340.92153 | $1,768.6027$ | 0 | $1,872.9832$ | $1,216.3295$ | 200 |
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| Slice <br> 28 | 346.20254 | $1,776.1448$ | 0 | $1,305.0677$ | 847.5209 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 29 | 351.48356 | $1,783.6869$ | 0 | 737.15229 | 478.71229 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 356.76458 | $1,791.229$ | 0 | 169.23684 | 109.90369 | 200 |
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## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 168
Date: 3/22/2016
Time: 3:34:50 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 28 SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 28-28 results\latest Update 3-21-16\}
Last Solved Date: 3/22/2016
Last Solved Time: 3:35:34 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational Seismic
Kind: SLOPE/W
Parent: 2 - Translational
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Parent Analysis
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No

Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

Tmc - 17 bedding 6-12
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
TQs-17 bedding 8-12
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 psf (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B. $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-201,1,500) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(812,1,752) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.1
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

Tmc $17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(5.9,1)$
Data Point: $(6,0.425)$
Data Point: $(12,0.425)$
Data Point: (12.1, 1)
150 psf (Along Bedding 8-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(8,0.667)$
Data Point: $(12,0.667)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
$17^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $8-12^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \% Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $8,0.425$ )
Data Point: (12, 0.425)
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$
Tmc 150 psf (Along Bedding 6-12 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(7.9,1)$
Data Point: $(8,0.75)$
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Data Point: $(12,0.75)$
Data Point: $(12.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Point 1 | -197 | 1,708 |
| Point 2 | -121 | 1,714 |
| Point 3 | -53 | 1,726 |
| Point 4 | -25 | 1,725 |
| Point 5 | 25 | 1,723 |
| Point 6 | 72 | 1,731 |
| Point 7 | 110 | 1,739 |
| Point 8 | 152 | 1,738 |
| Point 9 | 188 | 1,730 |
| Point 10 | 205 | 1,721 |
| Point 11 | 215 | 1,711 |
| Point 12 | 270 | 1,711 |
| Point 13 | 338 | 1,745 |
| Point 14 | 354 | 1,739 |
| Point 15 | 374 | 1,722 |
| Point 16 | 455 | 1,735 |
| Point 17 | 514 | 1,743 |
| Point 18 | 574 | 1,746 |
| Point 19 | 656 | 1,747 |
| Point 20 | 742 | 1,745 |
| Point 21 | 812 | 1,752 |
| Point 22 | 811 | 1,501 |
| Point 23 | -201 | 1,500 |
| Point 24 | -198.0192 | 1,655 |
| Point 25 | 811.9124 | 1,730 |
| Point 26 | 277 | 1,763 |
| Point 27 | 333 | 1,795 |
| Point 28 | 382 | 1,795 |
| Point 29 | 471 | 1,794 |
| Point 30 | 499 | 1,805 |
| Point 31 | 580 | 1,805 |
| Point 32 | 715 | 1,805 |
| Point 33 | 809 | 1,805 |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material |  | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Region | TQs-17 |  | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
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| 1 | bedding 8-12 | $1,24,25,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2$ | 39,930 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 2 | Tmc -17 <br> bedding 6-12 | $24,23,22,25$ | $1.9403 e+005$ |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $10,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,21,20,19,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11$ | 33,691 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 1
F of S: 1.15
Volume: $5,424.7653 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 650,971.84 lbs
Resisting Force: $318,995 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $278,106.68 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 1 slip surfaces
Exit: (205.17909, 1,721.1045) ft
Entry: (359.40509, 1,795) ft
Radius: 103.54463 ft
Center: (255.73747, 1,813.4739) ft

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ $\mathrm{Yt})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 207.61852 $1,720.094$ 0 476.49161 309.43727 200 <br> Slice <br> 2 212.49739 $1,718.0731$ 0 $1,240.0906$ 805.32426 200 <br> Slice <br> 3 217.37626 $1,716.0522$ 0 $2,003.6891$ $1,301.2109$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 4 222.25513 $1,714.0313$ 0 $2,767.2883$ $1,797.098$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 5 227.13399 $1,712.0104$ 0 $3,530.8865$ $2,292.9845$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 6 233.28649 $1,709.462$ 0 $4,950.2504$ $4,153.7533$ 225 <br> Slice <br> 7 239.54935 $1,708.4367$ 0 $3,700.7945$ $1,131.4464$ 150.075 <br> Slice <br> 8 244.64894 $1,709.462$ 0 $3,922.7957$ $1,199.319$ 150.075 <br> Slice <br> 9 249.74854 $1,710.4873$ 0 $4,144.7973$ $1,267.1917$ 150.075 <br> Slice <br> 10 254.7685 $1,711.4967$ 0 $4,118.873$ $2,674.8274$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 11 259.70884 $1,712.49$ 0 $4,322.2796$ $2,806.9212$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 12 264.64917 $1,713.4833$ 0 $4,525.6871$ $2,939.0155$ 200 |


| Slice <br> 13 | 269.5895 | $1,714.4766$ | 0 | $4,729.0935$ | $3,071.1093$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 14 | 274.52983 | $1,715.4699$ | 0 | $4,932.5011$ | $3,203.2037$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 279.45294 | $1,716.4598$ | 0 | $5,132.0533$ | $3,332.7944$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 284.5653 | $1,717.4876$ | 0 | $5,650.2235$ | $1,727.4467$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 289.88412 | $1,718.5571$ | 0 | $5,874.5574$ | $1,796.0324$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 295.20294 | $1,719.6265$ | 0 | $6,098.8919$ | $1,864.6184$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 300.52177 | $1,720.6959$ | 0 | $6,323.2258$ | $1,933.2041$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 305.84059 | $1,721.7653$ | 0 | $6,547.5603$ | $2,001.7901$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 310.64136 | $1,725.3582$ | 0 | $3,195.3405$ | $2,681.209$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 314.92408 | $1,731.4745$ | 0 | $2,980.3177$ | $2,500.7835$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 319.7212 | $1,738.3255$ | 0 | $3,115.0038$ | $2,022.9071$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 325.03272 | $1,745.9112$ | 0 | $2,813.4497$ | $1,827.0756$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 330.34424 | $1,753.4968$ | 0 | $2,511.8952$ | $1,631.2438$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 335.64051 | $1,761.0607$ | 0 | $2,111.2164$ | $1,371.0399$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 340.92153 | $1,768.6027$ | 0 | $1,611.4131$ | $1,046.4639$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 346.20254 | $1,776.1448$ | 0 | $1,111.6099$ | 721.88793 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 351.48356 | $1,783.6869$ | 0 | 611.8066 | 397.31185 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 356.76458 | $1,791.229$ | 0 | 112.00332 | 72.735805 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Fee
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
F of S Distribution Crack Option: (none)
F istribution
Advan $S$ Calculation Option: Constant anced
Number of Slices: 30
F of $S$ Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Materials
TQs $11^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 ps
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pc
Cohesion': 0
Phi: $20^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
$\operatorname{Tmc}\left(-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $12^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 ps
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-22.2728, 1,831.8909) ft

Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(100,1,854.3684) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(253,1,876.0313) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(1,026.6667,1,782)$ ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-49,1,301) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,1,863) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25,0.3)$
Data Point: (25.1, 1
150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(-25.1,1$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.667)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)
$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point:

> Data Point: $(-25,0.275)$, Data Point: $(-10,0.275)$ Data Point: $(-9.9,1)$
$2^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -47 | 1,882 |
| Point 2 | -7 | 1,838 |
| Point 3 | 66 | 1,849 |
| Point 4 | 218 | 1,873 |
| Point 5 | 238 | 1,857 |
| Point 6 | 292 | 1,830 |
| Point 7 | 439 | 1,785 |
| Point 8 | 634 | 1,739 |
| Point 9 | 727 | 1,729 |
| Point 10 | 793 | 1,729 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 1,733 |
| Point 12 | 872 | 1,737 |
| Point 13 | 900 | 1,755 |
| Point 14 | 929 | 1,767 |
| Point 15 | 964 | 1,776 |
| Point 16 | 1,022 | 1,779 |
| Point 17 | 1,050 | 1,797 |
| Point 18 | 1,069 | 1,809 |
| Point 19 | 1,173 | 1,810 |
| Point 20 | 1,224 | 1,777 |
| Point 21 | 1,277 | 1,738 |
| Point 22 | 1,312 | 1,753 |
| Point 23 | 1,340 | 1,773 |
| Point 24 | 1,429 | 1,777 |
| Point 25 | 1,546 | 1,783 |
| Point 26 | 1,643 | 1,792 |
| Point 27 | 1,723 | 1,801 |
| Point 28 | 1,769 | 1,808 |
| Point 29 | 1,794 | 1,815 |
| Point 30 | 1,830 | 1,823 |
| Point 31 | 1,851 | 1,830 |
| Point 32 | 1,862 | 1,841 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 33 | 1,886 | 1,843 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 34 | 1,913 | 1,853 |
| Point 35 | 1,955 | 1,852 |
| Point 36 | 1,993 | 1,862 |
| Point 37 | 2,050 | 1,863 |
| Point 38 | 2,049 | 1,295 |
| Point 39 | -49 | 1,301 |
| Point 40 | 244 | 1,878 |
| Point 41 | 276 | 1,871 |
| Point 42 | 302 | 1,866 |
| Point 43 | 324 | 1,861 |
| Point 44 | 381 | 1,852 |
| Point 45 | 402 | 1,847 |
| Point 46 | 458 | 1,846 |
| Point 47 | 477 | 1,845 |
| Point 48 | 502 | 1,832 |
| Point 49 | 531 | 1,823 |
| Point 50 | 577 | 1,810 |
| Point 51 | 601 | 1,800 |
| Point 52 | 634 | 1,790 |
| Point 53 | 696 | 1,771 |
| Point 54 | 734 | 1,763 |
| Point 55 | 805 | 1,769 |
| Point 56 | 757 | 1,793 |
| Point 57 | 890 | 1,789 |
| Point 58 | 1,105 | 1,828 |
| Point 59 | 1,137 | 1,828 |
| Point 60 | 1,293 | 1,811 |
| Point 61 | 1,397 | 1,816 |
| Point 62 | 1,492 | 1,824 |
| Point 63 | 1,449 | 1,812 |
| Point 64 | 1,423 | 1,810 |
| Point 65 | 1,372 | 1,791 |
| Point 66 | 1,537 | 1,831 |
| Point 67 | 1,593 | 1,846 |
| Point 68 | 1,637 | 1,860 |
| Point 69 | 1,671 | 1,876 |
| Point 70 | 1,692 | 1,876 |
| Point 71 | 1,720 | 1,864 |
| Point 72 | 1,749 | 1,849 |
| Point 73 | 1,769 | 1,843 |
| Point 74 | 1,788 | 1,843 |
| Point 75 | 1,809 | 1,855 |
| Point 76 | 1,831 | 1,855 |
| Point 77 | 1,839 | 1,857 |
| Point 78 | 1,904 | 1,856 |
| Point 79 | 1,971 | $1,856.2105$ |
| Point 80 | 293.0323 | 1,831 |
| Point 81 | 311 | 1,826 |
| Point 82 | 353 | 1,813 |
|  |  |  |
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|  | 439 | 1,787 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 84 | 494 | 1,774 |
| Point 85 | 634 | 1,741 |
| Point 86 | 727 | 1,731 |
| Point 87 | 793 | 1,731 |
| Point 88 | 830.2778 | 1,734 |
| Point 89 | 494.1087 | 1,772 |
| Point 90 | 353 | 1,811.3265 |
| Point 91 | -47.6603 | 1,650 |
| Point 92 | 1,343.5556 | 1,775 |
| Point 93 | 1,368 | 1,776 |
| Point 94 | 1,409 | 1,778 |
| Point 95 | 1,429 | 1,779 |
| Point 96 | 1,474 | 1,781 |
| Point 97 | 1,546 | 1,785 |
| Point 98 | 1,643 | 1,794 |
| Point 99 | 1,723 | 1,803 |
| Point 100 | 1,769 | 1,810 |
| Point 101 | 1,793 | 1,816.12 |
| Point 102 | 1,474 | 1,779.3077 |
| Point 103 | 1,408 | 1,776.0562 |
| Point 104 | 1,368 | 1,774.2584 |
| Point 105 | 1,175 | 1,297.4995 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc <br> $\left(12^{\circ}\right)$ | $38,37,36,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,102,24,103,104,23,22,21,20,19,105$ | $4.4177 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $4,40,41,42,43,80,6,5$ | 2,420 |
| Region <br> 3 | Qls | $43,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48,47,46,45,44$ | 24,238 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $51,56,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,88,55,54,53,52$ | 10,071 |
| Region <br> 5 | Fill | $19,60,61,62,63,64,65,92,23,22,21,20$ | 9,582 |
| Region <br> 6 | Qls | $62,63,64,65,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,73,72,71,70,69,68,67,66$ | 20,085 |
| Region <br> 7 | Fill | $73,74,75,76,77,78,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,101$ | $3,204.9$ |
| Region <br> 8 | Clay | $80,6,90,7,89,8,9,10,11,88,87,86,85,84,83,82,81$ | $1,023.3$ |
| Region <br> 9 | TQs 11 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $91,9,8,89,7,90,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 90,409 |
| Region <br> 10 | Clay | $92,23,104,103,24,102,25,26,27,28,29,101,100,99,98,97,96,95,94,93$ | 864.17 |
| Region <br> 11 | Tmc $(-$ <br> $\left.122^{\circ}\right)$ | $91,39,105,19,59,58,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9$ | $5.1344 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 131,789
F of S: 3.70
Volume: $26,037.592 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Resisting Moment: 2.0433758 e+009 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: 5.5200072e+008 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (776.3304, 1,792.4186) ft
Entry: (99.999997, 1,854.3684) ft
Radius: $1,543.9323 \mathrm{ft}$
Center: (575.54649, 3,323.2396) ft
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 1 | 111.8 | $1,850.6524$ | 0 | 646.10331 | 125.58976 | 150.075 |
| Slice 2 | 135.4 | $1,843.4266$ | 0 | $1,941.4647$ | 377.3825 | 150.075 |
| Slice 3 | 159 | $1,836.6106$ | 0 | $3,190.6562$ | 620.20073 | 150.075 |
| Slice 4 | 182.6 | $1,830.1987$ | 0 | $4,394.1759$ | 854.14127 | 150.075 |
| Slice 5 | 206.2 | $1,824.1857$ | 0 | $5,552.4809$ | $1,079.293$ | 150.075 |
| Slice 6 | 228 | $1,818.968$ | 0 | $6,625.0609$ | $1,287.7814$ | 150.075 |
| Slice 7 | 241 | $1,815.9917$ | 0 | $7,278.138$ | $1,414.7267$ | 150.075 |
| Slice 8 | 260 | $1,811.9851$ | 0 | $7,412.2497$ | $1,440.7954$ | 150.075 |
| Slice 9 | 284 | $1,807.1059$ | 0 | $7,400.3269$ | $1,438.4778$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 292.51615 | $1,805.4713$ | 0 | $7,389.3928$ | $1,436.3525$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 297.51615 | $1,804.5542$ | 0 | $7,259.2801$ | $1,411.0611$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 306.5 | $1,802.937$ | 0 | $7,003.0267$ | $1,361.2505$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 317.5 | $1,801.0387$ | 0 | $6,464.2888$ | $5,424.1824$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 338.5 | $1,797.6838$ | 0 | $6,235.7179$ | $5,232.3886$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 367 | $1,793.5221$ | 0 | $6,141.564$ | $5,153.3841$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 391.5 | $1,790.3528$ | 0 | $5,930.1512$ | $4,975.9877$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 410.83801 | $1,788.1438$ | 0 | $5,831.3502$ | $4,893.0838$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 428.51402 | $1,786.35$ | 0 | $5,920.9235$ | $4,968.2447$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 438.17601 | $1,785.4309$ | 0 | $6,065.567$ | 960.69143 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 444.43466 | $1,784.8941$ | 0 | $6,109.1394$ | 967.59263 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 453.93466 | $1,784.1097$ | 0 | $6,148.6262$ | $2,237.9169$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 467.5 | $1,783.122$ | 0 | $6,195.1591$ | $2,254.8535$ | 0 |
|  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 23 | 489.5 | $1,781.7578$ | 0 | $5,643.3169$ | $2,053.9994$ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 24 | 516.5 | $1,780.505$ | 0 | $4,681.9156$ | $1,704.0779$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 542.5 | $1,779.7038$ | 0 | $3,996.2211$ | $1,454.5055$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 565.5 | $1,779.3828$ | 0 | $3,384.5591$ | $1,231.8788$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 589 | $1,779.4125$ | 0 | $2,560.9359$ | 932.10443 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 617.5 | $1,779.9657$ | 0 | $2,019.9757$ | 735.21104 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 647.57166 | $1,781.048$ | 0 | $1,936.4795$ | 704.82091 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 673.12541 | $1,782.4407$ | 0 | $1,741.4682$ | $1,130.9227$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 697.08958 | $1,784.1458$ | 0 | $1,408.8363$ | 914.90899 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 721.05375 | $1,786.2263$ | 0 | $1,028.5467$ | 667.94601 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 745.01792 | $1,788.6839$ | 0 | 600.00183 | 389.64575 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 766.6652 | $1,791.2129$ | 0 | 190.4536 | 123.68202 | 200 |
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
F of S Distribution Crack Option: (none)
F istribution
Fof Calculation Option: Constant
nced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Materials
TQs $11^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 ps
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pc
Cohesion': 0 p
Phi: $20^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
nc $\left(-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $12^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 ps
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-22.2728, 1,831.8909) ft

1-Circular Mode of Failure

Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $100,1,854.3684$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Let-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(253,1,876.0313) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(1,026.6667,1,782)$ ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-49,1,301) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,1,863) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficient

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25,0.3)$
Data Point: (25.1, 1
150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)
$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point:

> Data Point: $(-25,0.275)$ Data Point: $(-10,0.275)$ Data Point: $(-9.9,1)$
$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.3)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -47 | 1,822 |
| Point 2 | -7 | 1,838 |
| Point 3 | 66 | 1,849 |
| Point 4 | 218 | 1,873 |
| Point 5 | 238 | 1,857 |
| Point 6 | 292 | 1,830 |
| Point 7 | 439 | 1,785 |
| Point 8 | 634 | 1,739 |
| Point 9 | 727 | 1,729 |
| Point 10 | 793 | 1,729 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 1,733 |
| Point 12 | 872 | 1,737 |
| Point 13 | 900 | 1,755 |
| Point 14 | 929 | 1,767 |
| Point 15 | 964 | 1,776 |
| Point 16 | 1,022 | 1,779 |
| Point 17 | 1,050 | 1,797 |
| Point 18 | 1,069 | 1,809 |
| Point 19 | 1,173 | 1,810 |
| Point 20 | 1,224 | 1,777 |
| Point 21 | 1,277 | 1,738 |
| Point 22 | 1,312 | 1,753 |
| Point 23 | 1,340 | 1,773 |
| Point 24 | 1,429 | 1,777 |
| Point 25 | 1,546 | 1,783 |
| Point 26 | 1,643 | 1,792 |
| Point 27 | 1,723 | 1,801 |
| Point 28 | 1,769 | 1,808 |
| Point 29 | 1,794 | 1,815 |
| Point 30 | 1,830 | 1,823 |
| Point 31 | 1,851 | 1,830 |
| Point 32 | 1,862 | 1,841 |
|  |  |  |
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| Point 33 | 1,886 | 1,843 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 34 | 1,913 | 1,853 |
| Point 35 | 1,955 | 1,852 |
| Point 36 | 1,993 | 1,862 |
| Point 37 | 2,050 | 1,863 |
| Point 38 | 2,049 | 1,295 |
| Point 39 | -49 | 1,301 |
| Point 40 | 244 | 1,878 |
| Point 41 | 276 | 1,871 |
| Point 42 | 302 | 1,866 |
| Point 43 | 324 | 1,861 |
| Point 44 | 381 | 1,852 |
| Point 45 | 402 | 1,847 |
| Point 46 | 458 | 1,846 |
| Point 47 | 477 | 1,845 |
| Point 48 | 502 | 1,832 |
| Point 49 | 531 | 1,823 |
| Point 50 | 577 | 1,810 |
| Point 51 | 601 | 1,800 |
| Point 52 | 634 | 1,790 |
| Point 53 | 696 | 1,771 |
| Point 54 | 734 | 1,763 |
| Point 55 | 805 | 1,769 |
| Point 56 | 757 | 1,793 |
| Point 57 | 890 | 1,789 |
| Point 58 | 1,105 | 1,828 |
| Point 59 | 1,137 | 1,828 |
| Point 60 | 1,293 | 1,811 |
| Point 61 | 1,397 | 1,816 |
| Point 62 | 1,492 | 1,824 |
| Point 63 | 1,449 | 1,812 |
| Point 64 | 1,423 | 1,810 |
| Point 65 | 1,372 | 1,791 |
| Point 66 | 1,537 | 1,831 |
| Point 67 | 1,593 | 1,846 |
| Point 68 | 1,637 | 1,860 |
| Point 69 | 1,671 | 1,876 |
| Point 70 | 1,692 | 1,876 |
| Point 71 | 1,720 | 1,864 |
| Point 72 | 1,749 | 1,849 |
| Point 73 | 1,769 | 1,843 |
| Point 74 | 1,788 | 1,843 |
| Point 75 | 1,809 | 1,855 |
| Point 76 | 1,831 | 1,855 |
| Point 77 | 1,839 | 1,857 |
| Point 78 | 1,904 | 1,856 |
| Point 79 | 1,971 | $1,856.2105$ |
| Point 80 | 293.0323 | 1,831 |
| Point 81 | 311 | 1,826 |
| Point 82 | 353 | 1,813 |
|  |  |  |

file:///P:/FINAL\%20PROJECTS/PARDEE/Skyline\%20Ranch/SLOPE\%20RESULTS/Sect... 3/15/2016

|  | 439 | 1,787 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 84 | 494 | 1,774 |
| Point 85 | 634 | 1,741 |
| Point 86 | 727 | 1,731 |
| Point 87 | 793 | 1,731 |
| Point 88 | 830.2778 | 1,734 |
| Point 89 | 494.1087 | 1,772 |
| Point 90 | 353 | 1,811.3265 |
| Point 91 | -47.6603 | 1,650 |
| Point 92 | 1,343.5556 | 1,775 |
| Point 93 | 1,368 | 1,776 |
| Point 94 | 1,409 | 1,778 |
| Point 95 | 1,429 | 1,779 |
| Point 96 | 1,474 | 1,781 |
| Point 97 | 1,546 | 1,785 |
| Point 98 | 1,643 | 1,794 |
| Point 99 | 1,723 | 1,803 |
| Point 100 | 1,769 | 1,810 |
| Point 101 | 1,793 | 1,816.12 |
| Point 102 | 1,474 | 1,779.3077 |
| Point 103 | 1,408 | 1,776.0562 |
| Point 104 | 1,368 | 1,774.2584 |
| Point 105 | 1,175 | 1,297.4995 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc <br> $\left(12^{\circ}\right)$ | $38,37,36,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,102,24,103,104,23,22,21,20,19,105$ | $4.4177 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $4,40,41,42,43,80,6,5$ | 2,420 |
| Region <br> 3 | Qls | $43,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48,47,46,45,44$ | 24,238 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $51,56,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,88,55,54,53,52$ | 10,071 |
| Region <br> 5 | Fill | $19,60,61,62,63,64,65,92,23,22,21,20$ | 9,582 |
| Region <br> 6 | Qls | $62,63,64,65,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,73,72,71,70,69,68,67,66$ | 20,085 |
| Region <br> 7 | Fill | $73,74,75,76,77,78,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,101$ | $3,204.9$ |
| Region <br> 8 | Clay | $80,6,90,7,89,8,9,10,11,88,87,86,85,84,83,82,81$ | $1,023.3$ |
| Region <br> 9 | TQs 11 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $91,9,8,89,7,90,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 90,409 |
| Region <br> 10 | Clay | $92,23,104,103,24,102,25,26,27,28,29,101,100,99,98,97,96,95,94,93$ | 864.17 |
| Region <br> 11 | Tmc $(-$ <br> $\left.122^{\circ}\right)$ | $91,39,105,19,59,58,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9$ | $5.1344 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 131,789
F of S: 1.68
Weight: $2,836,160.6 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $2.0043215 \mathrm{e}+009 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: 1.1898783e+009 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (776.3304, 1,792.4186) ft
Entry: ( $99.999997,1,854.3684$ ) ft
Radius: $1,543.9323 \mathrm{ft}$
Center: (575.54649, 3,323.2396) ft
Slip Slices

| X (ft) | Y (ft) | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 1 | 1111.8 | $1,850.6524$ | 0 | 619.17359 | 120.35515 | 150.075 |
| Slice 2 | 135.4 | $1,843.4266$ | 0 | $1,892.7038$ | 367.90435 | 150.075 |
| Slice 3 | 159 | $1,836.6106$ | 0 | $3,123.4463$ | 607.13645 | 150.075 |
| Slice 4 | 182.6 | $1,830.1987$ | 0 | $4,311.7169$ | 838.11286 | 150.075 |
| Slice 5 | 206.2 | $1,824.1857$ | 0 | $5,457.8001$ | $1,060.8889$ | 150.075 |
| Slice 6 | 228 | $1,818.968$ | 0 | $6,521.0424$ | $1,267.5622$ | 150.075 |
| Slice 7 | 241 | $1,815.9917$ | 0 | $7,169.2748$ | $1,393.5658$ | 150.075 |
| Slice 8 | 260 | $1,811.9851$ | 0 | $7,307.9816$ | $1,420.5277$ | 150.075 |
| Slice 9 | 284 | $1,807.1059$ | 0 | $7,304.2614$ | $1,419.8046$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 292.51615 | $1,805.4713$ | 0 | $7,296.2975$ | $1,418.2566$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 297.51615 | $1,804.5542$ | 0 | $7,169.3073$ | $1,393.5722$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 306.5 | $1,802.937$ | 0 | $6,918.7709$ | $1,344.8728$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 317.5 | $1,801.0387$ | 0 | $6,180.3396$ | $5,185.9207$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 338.5 | $1,797.6838$ | 0 | $5,982.6499$ | $5,020.0393$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 367 | $1,793.5221$ | 0 | $5,920.8056$ | $4,968.1458$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 391.5 | $1,790.3528$ | 0 | $5,740.7116$ | $4,817.029$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 410.83801 | $1,788.1438$ | 0 | $5,663.7561$ | $4,752.4557$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 428.51402 | $1,786.35$ | 0 | $5,768.4606$ | $4,840.3132$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 438.17601 | $1,785.4309$ | 0 | $6,033.9403$ | 955.68226 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 444.43466 | $1,784.8941$ | 0 | $6,078.7652$ | 962.78182 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 453.93466 | $1,784.1097$ | 0 | $6,092.7393$ | $2,217.5757$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 467.5 | $1,783.122$ | 0 | $6,145.0686$ | $2,236.6221$ | 0 |
|  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice <br> 23 | 489.5 | $1,781.7578$ | 0 | $5,606.9006$ | $2,040.7449$ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 24 | 516.5 | $1,780.505$ | 0 | $4,661.1226$ | $1,696.5099$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 542.5 | $1,779.7038$ | 0 | $3,986.2575$ | $1,450.8791$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 565.5 | $1,779.3828$ | 0 | $3,381.986$ | $1,230.9422$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 589 | $1,779.4125$ | 0 | $2,563.5517$ | 933.0565 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 617.5 | $1,779.9657$ | 0 | $2,026.4378$ | 737.56303 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 647.57166 | $1,781.048$ | 0 | $1,947.1675$ | 708.71101 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 673.12541 | $1,782.4407$ | 0 | $1,769.2355$ | $1,148.955$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 697.08958 | $1,784.1458$ | 0 | $1,438.0211$ | 933.8618 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 721.05375 | $1,786.2263$ | 0 | $1,055.9534$ | 685.74418 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 745.01792 | $1,788.6839$ | 0 | 621.85928 | 403.84014 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 766.6652 | $1,791.2129$ | 0 | 204.08524 | 132.53451 | 200 |

## Section 29-29 tran Static Left SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
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## 2 - Translational

## Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Fee
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Jan
Settings
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: ( $n o n e$ )
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Materials
TQs $11^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 ps
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pc
Cohesion': 0
Phi: $20^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## $\operatorname{Tmc}\left(-12^{\circ}\right)$

Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding - $10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 ps
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-49,1,301)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,1,863) \mathrm{ft}$

2-Translational

Slip Surface Block
Left Grid
Upper Left: $(-3,1,837)$ ft
Lower Left: (-12.7508, 1,787.0822) ft
Lower Right: $(119,1,806) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $115{ }^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(298,1,834) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: ( $284,1,817$ ) ft
Lower Right: (738, 1,714) ft
XIncrements: 10
Y Increments: 10
Ending Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: (25.1, 1)
pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point:(-9,9, 1)
$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: (-25, 0.275 )
Data Point: ( $-10,0.27$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)
$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: ( $-25,0.3$ )
Data Point: $(-10,0.3)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)

Points
Oints

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -47 | 1,822 |
| Point 2 | -7 | 1,838 |
| Point 3 | 66 | 1,849 |
| Point 4 | 218 | 1,873 |
| Point 5 | 238 | 1,857 |
| Point 6 | 292 | 1,830 |
| Point 7 | 439 | 1,785 |
| Point 8 | 634 | 1,739 |
| Point 9 | 727 | 1,729 |
| Point 10 | 793 | 1,729 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 1,733 |
| Point 12 | 872 | 1,737 |
| Point 13 | 900 | 1,755 |
| Point 14 | 929 | 1,767 |
| Point 15 | 964 | 1,776 |
| Point 16 | 1,022 | 1,779 |
| Point 17 | 1,050 | 1,797 |
| Point 18 | 1,069 | 1,809 |
| Point 19 | 1,173 | 1,810 |
| Point 20 | 1,224 | 1,777 |
| Point 21 | 1,277 | 1,738 |
| Point 22 | 1,312 | 1,753 |
| Point 23 | 1,340 | 1,773 |
|  |  |  |

2-Translational

| Point 24 | 1,429 | 1,777 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 25 | 1,546 | 1,783 |
| Point 26 | 1,643 | 1,792 |
| Point 27 | 1,723 | 1,801 |
| Point 28 | 1,769 | 1,808 |
| Point 29 | 1,794 | 1,815 |
| Point 30 | 1,830 | 1,823 |
| Point 31 | 1,851 | 1,830 |
| Point 32 | 1,862 | 1,841 |
| Point 33 | 1,886 | 1,843 |
| Point 34 | 1,913 | 1,853 |
| Point 35 | 1,955 | 1,852 |
| Point 36 | 1,993 | 1,862 |
| Point 37 | 2,050 | 1,863 |
| Point 38 | 2,049 | 1,295 |
| Point 39 | -49 | 1,301 |
| Point 40 | 244 | 1,878 |
| Point 41 | 276 | 1,871 |
| Point 42 | 302 | 1,866 |
| Point 43 | 324 | 1,861 |
| Point 44 | 381 | 1,852 |
| Point 45 | 402 | 1,847 |
| Point 46 | 458 | 1,846 |
| Point 47 | 477 | 1,845 |
| Point 48 | 502 | 1,832 |
| Point 49 | 531 | 1,823 |
| Point 50 | 577 | 1,810 |
| Point 51 | 601 | 1,800 |
| Point 52 | 634 | 1,790 |
| Point 53 | 696 | 1,771 |
| Point 54 | 734 | 1,763 |
| Point 55 | 805 | 1,769 |
| Point 56 | 757 | 1,793 |
| Point 57 | 890 | 1,789 |
| Point 58 | 1,105 | 1,828 |
| Point 59 | 1,137 | 1,828 |
| Point 60 | 1,293 | 1,811 |
| Point 61 | 1,397 | 1,816 |
| Point 62 | 1,492 | 1,824 |
| Point 63 | 1,449 | 1,812 |
| Point 64 | 1,423 | 1,810 |
| Point 65 | 1,372 | 1,791 |
| Point 66 | 1,537 | 1,831 |
| Point 67 | 1,593 | 1,846 |
| Point 68 | 1,637 | 1,860 |
| Point 69 | 1,671 | 1,876 |
| Point 70 | 1,692 | 1,876 |
| Point 71 | 1,720 | 1,864 |
| Point 72 | 1,749 | 1,849 |
| Point 73 | 1,769 | 1,843 |
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|  | 1,788 | 1,843 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 75 | 1,809 | 1,855 |
| Point 76 | 1,831 | 1,855 |
| Point 77 | 1,839 | 1,857 |
| Point 78 | 1,904 | 1,856 |
| Point 79 | 1,971 | $1,856.2105$ |
| Point 80 | 293.0323 | 1,831 |
| Point 81 | 311 | 1,826 |
| Point 82 | 353 | 1,813 |
| Point 83 | 439 | 1,787 |
| Point 84 | 494 | 1,774 |
| Point 85 | 634 | 1,741 |
| Point 86 | 727 | 1,731 |
| Point 87 | 793 | 1,731 |
| Point 88 | 830.2778 | 1,734 |
| Point 89 | 494.1087 | 1,772 |
| Point 90 | 353 | $1,811.3265$ |
| Point 91 | -47.6603 | 1,650 |
| Point 92 | $1,343.5556$ | 1,775 |
| Point 93 | 1,368 | 1,776 |
| Point 94 | 1,409 | 1,778 |
| Point 95 | 1,429 | 1,779 |
| Point 96 | 1,474 | 1,781 |
| Point 97 | 1,546 | 1,785 |
| Point 98 | 1,643 | 1,794 |
| Point 99 | 1,723 | 1,803 |
| Point 100 | 1,769 | 1,810 |
| Point 101 | 1,793 | $1,816.12$ |
| Point 102 | 1,474 | $1,779.3077$ |
| Point 103 | 1,408 | $1,776.0562$ |
| Point 104 | 1,368 | $1,774.2584$ |
| Point 105 | 1,175 | $1,297.4995$ |

Regions
Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tcc <br> $\left(12^{\circ}\right)$ | $38,37,36,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,102,24,103,104,23,22,21,20,19,105$ | $4.4177 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $4,40,41,42,43,80,6,5$ | 2,420 |
| Region <br> 3 | Qls | $43,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48,47,46,45,44$ | 24,238 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $51,56,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,88,55,54,53,52$ | 10,071 |
| Region <br> 5 | Fill | $19,60,61,62,63,64,65,92,23,22,21,20$ | 9,582 |
| Region <br> 6 | Qls | $62,63,64,65,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,73,72,71,70,69,68,67,66$ | 20,085 |
| Region <br> 7 | Fill | $73,74,75,76,77,78,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,101$ | $3,204.9$ |
| Region |  |  |  |


| 8 | Clay | $80,6,90,7,89,8,9,10,11,88,87,86,85,84,83,82,81$ | $1,023.3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 9 | TQs $11^{\circ}$ | $91,9,8,89,7,90,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 90,409 |
| Region <br> 10 | Clay | $92,23,104,103,24,102,25,26,27,28,29,101,100,99,98,97,96,95,94,93$ | 864.17 |
| Region <br> 11 | Tmc (- <br> $\left.12^{\circ}\right)$ | $91,39,105,19,59,58,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9$ | $5.1344 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 131,129
F of S: 1.51
Volume: $22,657.342 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Resisting Force: $549,522,64$
Resisting Force: $549,522.64 \mathrm{l}$
Activating Force: $363,229.78 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (653.46491, 1,797.6458) ft
Entry: $(126.86547,1,858.6103) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 205.08914 ft
Center: $(395.4586,1,873.8515) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice 1 | 127.80813 | 1,857.2641 | 0 | -18.087581 | -15.177283 | 225 |
| Slice 2 | 137.67572 | 1,853.9 | 0 | 726.65461 | 141.24735 | 150.075 |
| Slice 3 | 155.52556 | 1,849.8644 | 0 | 1,525.9783 | 296.62013 | 150.075 |
| Slice 4 | 173.3754 | 1,845.8289 | 0 | 2,325.302 | 451.99292 | 150.075 |
| Slice 5 | 191.22524 | 1,841.7933 | 0 | 3,124.6257 | 607.36571 | 150.075 |
| Slice 6 | 209.07508 | 1,837.7577 | 0 | 3,923.9494 | 762.73849 | 150.075 |
| Slice 7 | 228 | 1,833.4791 | 0 | 4,811.5487 | 935.27033 | 150.075 |
| Slice 8 | 241 | 1,830.54 | 0 | 5,445.8675 | 1,058.5694 | 150.075 |
| Slice 9 | 252 | 1,828.0531 | 0 | 5,599.0915 | 1,088.3531 | 150.075 |
| Slice | 268 | 1,824.4357 | 0 | 5,612.7769 | 1,091.0133 | 150.075 |
| Slice $11$ | 284 | 1,820.8184 | 0 | 5,651.1324 | 1,098.4689 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | 292.51615 | 1,818.893 | 0 | 5,671.8887 | 1,102.5035 | 150.075 |
| Slice $13$ | 297.51615 | 1,817.7626 | 0 | 5,567.6858 | 1,082.2485 | 150.075 |
| Slice $14$ | 306.5 | 1,815.7315 | 0 | 5,362.1069 | 1,042.288 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 317.5 | 1,813.2446 | 0 | 5,088.005 | 989.00799 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 331.25 | 1,810.1359 | 0 | 4,962.8026 | 964.67111 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 345.75 | 1,806.8577 | 0 | 5,036.3364 | 978.96462 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 360 | 1,803.636 | 0 | 5,108.6024 | 993.01172 | 150.075 |
| Slice |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 19 | 374 | $1,800.4708$ | 0 | $5,179.6008$ | $1,006.8124$ | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 20 | 391.5 | $1,796.5143$ | 0 | $5,186.5087$ | $1,008.1552$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 408.82823 | $1,792.5967$ | 0 | $5,285.4748$ | $1,027.3922$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 422.4847 | $1,789.5092$ | 0 | $5,540.5896$ | $1,076.9815$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 434.15647 | $1,786.8704$ | 0 | $5,796.3894$ | 918.05788 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 448.5 | $1,783.6275$ | 0 | $6,088.1742$ | 964.27207 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 467.5 | $1,779.3319$ | 0 | $6,442.4099$ | $1,020.3775$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 485.5 | $1,775.2624$ | 0 | $6,359.3225$ | $1,007.2177$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 498 | $1,772.4364$ | 0 | $6,000.3987$ | 950.3698 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 509.25 | $1,769.8929$ | 0 | $5,825.8628$ | 922.72601 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 523.75 | $1,766.6147$ | 0 | $5,706.502$ | 903.82112 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 538.05 | $1,763.3817$ | 0 | $5,607.8907$ | 888.20263 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 552.17418 | $1,760.2039$ | 0 | $5,529.8284$ | 875.83878 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 568.12418 | $1,762.2965$ | 0 | $5,575.1629$ | $2,029.1933$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 589 | $1,770.9436$ | 0 | $3,781.3804$ | $1,376.3099$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 609.25 | $1,779.3314$ | 0 | $2,301.0854$ | 837.52658 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 626.03919 | $1,786.2857$ | 0 | $1,539.5842$ | 560.36284 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 644.02165 | $1,793.7343$ | 0 | 698.70594 | 453.74494 | 200 |
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## 2 - Translational

## eport generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 153
Date: 3/15/2016
Time: 12:23:33 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 29-29 tran Seismic Left SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:IFINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section $29-29$ results\
Last Solved Date: 3/15/2016
Last Solved Time: 12:26:16 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Spencer
Settings
ip Surface
Direction of movement: Left to Right
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
$S$ Distribution
F of S C
divanced
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft
Search Method: Root Finder

Tolerable difference between starting and converged F of $\mathrm{S}: 3$ Maximum iterations to calculate converged lambda: 20
Max Absolute Lambda: 2

## Materials

TQs $11^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': 20
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi: $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
$\operatorname{Tmc}\left(-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-22^{\circ}\right)$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

## Tmc ( $12^{\circ}$ )

Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
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Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-49,1,301) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,1,863) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(-29,1,830)$ ft Lower Left: ( $-34,1,792$ ) ft Lower Right: $(35,1,803)$ ft
X Increments: 8
Y Increments: 8
Starting Angle: $1155^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(298,1,834) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Left: $(284,1,817) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Right: $(738,1,714) \mathrm{ft}$ I Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $0^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: (25.1 1)
50 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)

Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.667)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)
$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.275)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.275)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)
$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept:1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.3)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -47 | 1,822 |
| Point 2 | -7 | 1,838 |
| Point 3 | 66 | 1,849 |
| Point 4 | 218 | 1,873 |
| Point 5 | 238 | 1,857 |
| Point 6 | 292 | 1,830 |
| Point 7 | 439 | 1,785 |
| Point 8 | 634 | 1,739 |
| Point 9 | 727 | 1,729 |
| Point 10 | 793 | 1,729 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 1,733 |
| Point 12 | 872 | 1,737 |
| Point 13 | 900 | 1,755 |
| Point 14 | 929 | 1,767 |
| Point 15 | 964 | 1,776 |
| Point 16 | 1,022 | 1,779 |
| Point 17 | 1,050 | 1,797 |
| Point 18 | 1,069 | 1,809 |
| Point 19 | 1,173 | 1,810 |
| Point 20 | 1,224 | 1,777 |
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| Point 21 | 1,277 | 1,738 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 22 | 1,312 | 1,753 |
| Point 23 | 1,340 | 1,773 |
| Point 24 | 1,429 | 1,777 |
| Point 25 | 1,546 | 1,783 |
| Point 26 | 1,643 | 1,792 |
| Point 27 | 1,723 | 1,801 |
| Point 28 | 1,769 | 1,808 |
| Point 29 | 1,794 | 1,815 |
| Point 30 | 1,830 | 1,823 |
| Point 31 | 1,851 | 1,830 |
| Point 32 | 1,862 | 1,841 |
| Point 33 | 1,886 | 1,843 |
| Point 34 | 1,913 | 1,853 |
| Point 35 | 1,955 | 1,852 |
| Point 36 | 1,993 | 1,862 |
| Point 37 | 2,050 | 1,863 |
| Point 38 | 2,049 | 1,295 |
| Point 39 | -49 | 1,301 |
| Point 40 | 244 | 1,878 |
| Point 41 | 276 | 1,871 |
| Point 42 | 302 | 1,866 |
| Point 43 | 324 | 1,861 |
| Point 44 | 381 | 1,852 |
| Point 45 | 402 | 1,847 |
| Point 46 | 458 | 1,846 |
| Point 47 | 477 | 1,845 |
| Point 48 | 502 | 1,832 |
| Point 49 | 531 | 1,823 |
| Point 50 | 577 | 1,810 |
| Point 51 | 601 | 1,800 |
| Point 52 | 634 | 1,790 |
| Point 53 | 696 | 1,771 |
| Point 54 | 734 | 1,763 |
| Point 55 | 805 | 1,769 |
| Point 56 | 757 | 1,793 |
| Point 57 | 890 | 1,789 |
| Point 58 | 1,105 | 1,828 |
| Point 59 | 1,137 | 1,828 |
| Point 60 | 1,293 | 1,811 |
| Point 61 | 1,397 | 1,816 |
| Point 62 | 1,492 | 1,824 |
| Point 63 | 1,449 | 1,812 |
| Point 64 | 1,423 | 1,810 |
| Point 65 | 1,372 | 1,791 |
| Point 66 | 1,537 | 1,831 |
| Point 67 | 1,593 | 1,846 |
| Point 68 | 1,637 | 1,860 |
| Point 69 | 1,671 | 1,876 |
| Point 70 | 1,692 | 1,876 |
|  |  |  |


|  | 1,720 | 1,864 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 72 | 1,749 | 1,849 |
| Point 73 | 1,769 | 1,843 |
| Point 74 | 1,788 | 1,843 |
| Point 75 | 1,809 | 1,855 |
| Point 76 | 1,831 | 1,855 |
| Point 77 | 1,839 | 1,857 |
| Point 78 | 1,904 | 1,856 |
| Point 79 | 1,971 | $1,856.2105$ |
| Point 80 | 293.0323 | 1,831 |
| Point 81 | 311 | 1,826 |
| Point 82 | 353 | 1,813 |
| Point 83 | 439 | 1,787 |
| Point 84 | 494 | 1,774 |
| Point 85 | 634 | 1,741 |
| Point 86 | 727 | 1,731 |
| Point 87 | 793 | 1,731 |
| Point 88 | 830.2778 | 1,734 |
| Point 89 | 494.1087 | 1,772 |
| Point 90 | 353 | $1,811.3265$ |
| Point 91 | -47.6603 | 1,650 |
| Point 92 | $1,343.5556$ | 1,775 |
| Point 93 | 1,368 | 1,776 |
| Point 94 | 1,409 | 1,778 |
| Point 95 | 1,429 | 1,779 |
| Point 96 | 1,474 | 1,781 |
| Point 97 | 1,546 | 1,785 |
| Point 98 | 1,643 | 1,794 |
| Point 99 | 1,723 | 1,803 |
| Point 100 | 1,769 | 1,810 |
| Point 101 | 1,793 | $1,816.12$ |
| Point 102 | 1,474 | $1,779.3077$ |
| Point 103 | 1,408 | $1,776.0562$ |
| Point 104 | 1,368 | $1,774.2584$ |
| Point 105 | 1,175 | $1,297.4995$ |
|  |  |  |

Regions
Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc <br> $\left(12^{\circ}\right)$ | $38,37,36,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,102,24,103,104,23,22,21,20,19,105$ | $4.4177 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $4,40,41,42,43,80,6,5$ | 2,420 |
| Region <br> 3 | Qls | $43,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48,47,46,45,44$ | 24,238 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $51,56,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,88,55,54,53,52$ | 10,071 |
| Region <br> 5 | Fill | $19,60,61,62,63,64,65,92,23,22,21,20$ | 9,582 |
| Region <br> 6 | Qls | $62,63,64,65,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,73,72,71,70,69,68,67,66$ | 20,085 |
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| Region $7$ | Fill | 73,74,75,76,77,78,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,101 | 3,204.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Clay | 80,6,90,7,89,8,9,10,11,88,87,86,85,84,83,82,81 | 1,023.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | TQs $11^{\circ}$ | 91,9,8,89,7,90,6,5,4,3,2,1 | 90,409 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | Clay | 92,23,104,103,24,102,25,26,27,28,29,101,100,99,98,97,96,95,94,93 | 864.17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc (- } \\ & \left.12^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 91,39,105,19,59,58,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9 | $5.1344 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 87,149
Fof S: 1.27
Volume: $45,171.468 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Resisting Moment: $1.9515569 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $1.5377598 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Resisting Force: $1,377,247.4 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $1,091,642.3 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 88,209 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(851.58859,1,790.1552) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(38.221416,1$, ,
Radius: 303.08677 ft
Center: (447.65985, 1,858.4789) ft

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice 1 | 39.110708 | 1,842.9071 | 0 | -36.768767 | -30.852659 | 225 |
| Slice 2 | 53 | 1,838.6753 | 0 | 946.45563 | 183.97234 | 150.075 |
| Slice 3 | 78.666667 | 1,834.0855 | 0 | 1,912.2245 | 371.69879 | 150.075 |
| Slice 4 | 104 | 1,829.5553 | 0 | 2,875.902 | 559.01873 | 150.075 |
| Slice 5 | 129.33333 | 1,825.0251 | 0 | 3,839.5796 | 746.33867 | 150.075 |
| Slice 6 | 154.66667 | 1,820.4949 | 0 | 4,803.2571 | 933.65861 | 150.075 |
| Slice 7 | 180 | 1,815.9648 | 0 | 5,766.9347 | 1,120.9785 | 150.075 |
| Slice 8 | 205.33333 | 1,811.4346 | 0 | 6,730.6122 | 1,308.2985 | 150.075 |
| Slice 9 | 228 | 1,807.3812 | 0 | 7,631.7272 | 1,483.4575 | 150.075 |
| Slice $10$ | 241 | 1,805.0565 | 0 | 8,176.7863 | 1,589.4063 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 260 | 1,801.6589 | 0 | 8,230.399 | 1,599.8275 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 284 | 1,797.3671 | 0 | 8,146.0417 | 1,583.4301 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 292.51615 | 1,795.8443 | 0 | 8,120.679 | 1,578.5001 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 297.51615 | 1,794.9501 | 0 | 7,993.0409 | 1,553.6898 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 306.5 | 1,793.3436 | 0 | 7,745.9285 | 1,505.656 | 150.075 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 317.5 | 1,791.3766 | 0 | 7,421.6728 | 1,442.6271 | 150.075 |


| Slice <br> 17 | 338.5 | $1,787.6213$ | 0 | $7,223.8813$ | $1,404.1803$ | 150.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 18 | 367 | $1,782.5248$ | 0 | $7,211.723$ | $1,401.8169$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 391.5 | $1,778.1437$ | 0 | $7,121.9923$ | $1,384.3751$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 420.5 | $1,772.9578$ | 0 | $7,274.2399$ | $1,413.969$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 448.5 | $1,767.9507$ | 0 | $7,643.9994$ | $1,485.843$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 467.5 | $1,764.5531$ | 0 | $7,880.4055$ | $1,531.7957$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 485.5 | $1,761.3343$ | 0 | $7,700.9061$ | $1,496.9045$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 498 | $1,759.099$ | 0 | $7,285.7355$ | $1,416.2035$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 516.5 | $1,755.7908$ | 0 | $6,958.0789$ | $1,352.5135$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 542.5 | $1,751.1414$ | 0 | $6,638.2361$ | $1,290.3424$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 565.5 | $1,747.0284$ | 0 | $6,388.7918$ | $1,241.8553$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 589 | $1,742.8261$ | 0 | $5,982.4759$ | $1,162.8755$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 617.5 | $1,737.7296$ | 0 | $5,971.4305$ | $1,160.7285$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 647.58886 | $1,732.349$ | 0 | $6,498.5141$ | $1,263.1832$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 674.76659 | $1,727.489$ | 0 | $7,011.5846$ | $1,362.914$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 690.47773 | $1,724.6795$ | 0 | $7,309.2311$ | $1,553.625$ | 133.4 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 694.3 | $1,725.0042$ | 0 | $14,486.502$ | $12,155.618$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 702.34895 | $1,728.3381$ | 0 | $13,724.759$ | $11,516.44$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 710.61456 | $1,731.7619$ | 0 | $7,982.9602$ | $1,264.3767$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 723.26561 | $1,737.0021$ | 0 | $8,237.4249$ | $2,998.1775$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 37 | 745.5 | $1,746.2119$ | 0 | $6,917.9506$ | $2,517.9281$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 38 | 767.59147 | $1,755.3625$ | 0 | $5,549.5905$ | $2,019.8858$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 39 | 788.77441 | $1,764.1367$ | 0 | $4,262.9598$ | $1,551.5905$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 40 | 812.42156 | $1,773.9317$ | 0 | $3,470.8949$ | $2,254.0255$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 41 | 838.53291 | $1,784.7474$ | 0 | $1,261.0242$ | 818.91869 | 200 |
|  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure

Report generated using GeoStudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 150
Date: 3/15/2016
Time: 1:51:23 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
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Last Solved Date: 3/15/2016
Last Solved Time: 1:52:05 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5{ }^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs $11^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Tmc (-12 $\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
$\operatorname{Tmc}\left(12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(1,155,1,819) \mathrm{ft}$

Left-Zone Right Coordinate: (1,447, 1,820.2105) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(1,705,1,870.4286) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(2,006,1,862.2281) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-49,1,301) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,1,863) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Along Bedding $\mathbf{1 0}^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(-9.9,1)$
$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding -10$-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: (-25.1, 1)

Data Point: $(-25,0.275)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.275)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)

## $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: 0 \%
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-9.9,1)$

## Points

|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 1 | -47 | 1,822 |
| Point 2 | -7 | 1,838 |
| Point 3 | 66 | 1,849 |
| Point 4 | 218 | 1,873 |
| Point 5 | 238 | 1,857 |
| Point 6 | 292 | 1,830 |
| Point 7 | 439 | 1,785 |
| Point 8 | 634 | 1,739 |
| Point 9 | 727 | 1,729 |
| Point 10 | 793 | 1,729 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 1,733 |
| Point 12 | 872 | 1,737 |
| Point 13 | 900 | 1,755 |
| Point 14 | 929 | 1,767 |
| Point 15 | 964 | 1,776 |
| Point 16 | 1,022 | 1,779 |
| Point 17 | 1,050 | 1,797 |
| Point 18 | 1,069 | 1,809 |
| Point 19 | 1,173 | 1,810 |
| Point 20 | 1,224 | 1,777 |
| Point 21 | 1,277 | 1,738 |
| Point 22 | 1,312 | 1,753 |
| Point 23 | 1,340 | 1,773 |
| Point 24 | 1,429 | 1,777 |
| Point 25 | 1,546 | 1,783 |
| Point 26 | 1,643 | 1,792 |
| Point 27 | 1,723 | 1,801 |
| Point 28 | 1,769 | 1,808 |
| Point 29 | 1,794 | 1,815 |
| Point 30 | 1,830 | 1,823 |
| Point 31 | 1,851 | 1,830 |
| Point 32 | 1,862 | 1,841 |


| Point 33 | 1,886 | 1,843 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 34 | 1,913 | 1,853 |
| Point 35 | 1,955 | 1,852 |
| Point 36 | 1,993 | 1,862 |
| Point 37 | 2,050 | 1,863 |
| Point 38 | 2,049 | 1,295 |
| Point 39 | -49 | 1,301 |
| Point 40 | 244 | 1,878 |
| Point 41 | 276 | 1,871 |
| Point 42 | 302 | 1,866 |
| Point 43 | 324 | 1,861 |
| Point 44 | 381 | 1,852 |
| Point 45 | 402 | 1,847 |
| Point 46 | 458 | 1,846 |
| Point 47 | 477 | 1,845 |
| Point 48 | 502 | 1,832 |
| Point 49 | 531 | 1,823 |
| Point 50 | 577 | 1,810 |
| Point 51 | 601 | 1,800 |
| Point 52 | 634 | 1,790 |
| Point 53 | 696 | 1,771 |
| Point 54 | 734 | 1,763 |
| Point 55 | 805 | 1,769 |
| Point 56 | 757 | 1,793 |
| Point 57 | 890 | 1,789 |
| Point 58 | 1,105 | 1,828 |
| Point 59 | 1,137 | 1,828 |
| Point 60 | 1,293 | 1,811 |
| Point 61 | 1,397 | 1,816 |
| Point 62 | 1,492 | 1,824 |
| Point 63 | 1,449 | 1,812 |
| Point 64 | 1,423 | 1,810 |
| Point 65 | 1,372 | 1,791 |
| Point 66 | 1,537 | 1,831 |
| Point 67 | 1,593 | 1,846 |
| Point 68 | 1,637 | 1,860 |
| Point 69 | 1,671 | 1,876 |
| Point 70 | 1,692 | 1,876 |
| Point 71 | 1,720 | 1,864 |
| Point 72 | 1,749 | 1,849 |
| Point 73 | 1,769 | 1,843 |
| Point 74 | 1,788 | 1,843 |
| Point 75 | 1,809 | 1,855 |
| Point 76 | 1,831 | 1,855 |
| Point 77 | 1,839 | 1,857 |
| Point 78 | 1,904 | 1,856 |
| Point 79 | 1,971 | 1,856.2105 |
| Point 80 | 293.0323 | 1,831 |
| Point 81 | 311 | 1,826 |
| Point 82 | 353 | 1,813 |


|  | 439 | 1,787 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 84 | 494 | 1,774 |
| Point 85 | 634 | 1,741 |
| Point 86 | 727 | 1,731 |
| Point 87 | 793 | 1,731 |
| Point 88 | 830.2778 | 1,734 |
| Point 89 | 494.1087 | 1,772 |
| Point 90 | 353 | $1,811.3265$ |
| Point 91 | -47.6603 | 1,650 |
| Point 92 | $1,343.5556$ | 1,775 |
| Point 93 | 1,368 | 1,776 |
| Point 94 | 1,409 | 1,778 |
| Point 95 | 1,429 | 1,779 |
| Point 96 | 1,474 | 1,781 |
| Point 97 | 1,546 | 1,785 |
| Point 98 | 1,643 | 1,794 |
| Point 99 | 1,723 | 1,803 |
| Point 100 | 1,769 | 1,810 |
| Point 101 | 1,793 | $1,816.12$ |
| Point 102 | 1,474 | $1,779.3077$ |
| Point 103 | 1,408 | $1,776.0562$ |
| Point 104 | 1,368 | $1,774.2584$ |
| Point 105 | 1,175 | $1,297.4995$ |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region $1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc } \\ & \left(12^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $38,37,36,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,102,24,103,104,23,22,21,20,19,105$ | $4.4177 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region $2$ | Fill | 4,40,41,42,43,80,6,5 | 2,420 |
| Region $3$ | Qls | $43,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48,47,46,45,44$ | 24,238 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | 51,56,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,88,55,54,53,52 | 10,071 |
| Region 5 | Fill | 19,60,61,62,63,64,65,92,23,22,21,20 | 9,582 |
| Region $6$ | Qls | 62,63,64,65,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,73,72,71,70,69,68,67,66 | 20,085 |
| Region 7 | Fill | $73,74,75,76,77,78,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,101$ | 3,204.9 |
| Region 8 | Clay | 80,6,90,7,89,8,9,10,11,88,87,86,85,84,83,82,81 | 1,023.3 |
| Region $9$ | TQs $11^{\circ}$ | 91,9,8,89,7,90,6,5,4,3,2,1 | 90,409 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | Clay | $92,23,104,103,24,102,25,26,27,28,29,101,100,99,98,97,96,95,94,93$ | 864.17 |
| Region <br> 11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc (- } \\ & \left.12^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 91,39,105,19,59,58,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9 | $5.1344 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 130,058
F of S: 1.59
Volume: 3,237.8706 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: $325,573.28 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: 57,192,827 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: 36,024,456 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(1,447,1,820.2105) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(1,705,1,870.4286) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 462.56384 ft
Center: $(1,491.2654,2,280.6515) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice 1 | 1,451.2033 | 1,819.8451 | 0 | 100.7886 | 65.452884 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 1,459.6098 | 1,819.1913 | 0 | 265.74556 | 172.57718 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 1,468.0164 | 1,818.6914 | 0 | 409.35663 | 265.8393 | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 1,477.1648 | 1,818.3291 | 0 | 503.4809 | 183.25206 | 0 |
| Slice 5 | 1,487.0549 | 1,818.1332 | 0 | 565.47841 | 205.81731 | 0 |
| Slice 6 | 1,496.5 | 1,818.1392 | 0 | 654.39473 | 238.1802 | 0 |
| Slice 7 | 1,505.5 | 1,818.3286 | 0 | 771.71651 | 280.88184 | 0 |
| Slice 8 | 1,514.5 | 1,818.6935 | 0 | 870.65977 | 316.89424 | 0 |
| Slice 9 | 1,523.5 | 1,819.2342 | 0 | 951.41788 | 346.28779 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 1,532.5 | 1,819.9514 | 0 | 1,014.1604 | 369.12421 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 1,541 | 1,820.7867 | 0 | 1,101.3036 | 400.84175 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 1,549 | 1,821.7225 | 0 | 1,214.3309 | 441.98032 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 1,557 | 1,822.8 | 0 | 1,312.7235 | 477.79227 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 1,565 | 1,824.0202 | 0 | 1,396.5431 | 508.30012 | 0 |
| Slice 15 | 1,573 | 1,825.3843 | 0 | 1,465.8378 | 533.52131 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 1,581 | 1,826.8934 | 0 | 1,520.6417 | 553.46833 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 1,589 | 1,828.5492 | 0 | 1,560.9758 | 568.14872 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 1,597.4 | 1,830.4512 | 0 | 1,608.3996 | 585.40958 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 1,606.2 | 1,832.6172 | 0 | 1,661.09 | 604.5873 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 1,615 | 1,834.9675 | 0 | 1,695.8648 | 617.24431 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | 1,623.8 | 1,837.505 | 0 | 1,712.6724 | 623.36179 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | 1,632.6 | 1,840.233 | 0 | 1,711.4402 | 622.91327 | 0 |


| Slice <br> 23 | $1,641.25$ | $1,843.1018$ | 0 | $1,752.7865$ | 637.96213 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,649.75$ | $1,846.1087$ | 0 | $1,836.3781$ | 668.38695 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 25 | $1,658.25$ | $1,849.304$ | 0 | $1,901.6944$ | 692.16017 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 26 | $1,666.75$ | $1,852.6919$ | 0 | $1,948.5683$ | 638.03267 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,676.25$ | $1,856.7256$ | 0 | $1,752.9803$ | 0 |  |
| Slice <br> 28 | $1,686.75$ | $1,861.4647$ | 0 | $1,313.7877$ | 297.74251 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 29 | $1,695.25$ | $1,865.51$ | 0 | 818.04084 | 0 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 30 | $1,701.75$ | $1,868.7677$ | 0 | 273.49302 | 0 | 0 |

## Section 29-29 pseudostatic right SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz



## 1 - Circular Mode of Failure
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

1 - Circular Mode of Failure
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 1
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
F of S Distribution
F of S Calcula
Advan $S$ Calculation Option: Constant
nced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Materials
TQs $11^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 ps
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pc
Cohesion': 0
Phi': $20^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
$\operatorname{Tmc}\left(-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $12^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 ps
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: $(1,155,1,819) \mathrm{ft}$

Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(1,534,1,830.5333)$ ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: $(1,776,1,843)$ ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: (2,006, 1,862.2281)
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 50

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: $(-49,1,301) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,1,863) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficient

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25,0.3)$
Data Point: (25.1, 1
150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)
$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point:

> Data Point: $(-25,0.275)$ Data Point: $(-10,0.275)$ Data Point: $(-9.9,1)$
$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Functio
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.3)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -47 | 1,822 |
| Point 2 | -7 | 1,838 |
| Point 3 | 66 | 1,849 |
| Point 4 | 218 | 1,873 |
| Point 5 | 238 | 1,857 |
| Point 6 | 292 | 1,830 |
| Point 7 | 439 | 1,785 |
| Point 8 | 634 | 1,739 |
| Point 9 | 727 | 1,729 |
| Point 10 | 793 | 1,729 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 1,733 |
| Point 12 | 872 | 1,737 |
| Point 13 | 900 | 1,755 |
| Point 14 | 929 | 1,767 |
| Point 15 | 964 | 1,776 |
| Point 16 | 1,022 | 1,779 |
| Point 17 | 1,050 | 1,797 |
| Point 18 | 1,069 | 1,809 |
| Point 19 | 1,173 | 1,810 |
| Point 20 | 1,224 | 1,777 |
| Point 21 | 1,277 | 1,738 |
| Point 22 | 1,312 | 1,753 |
| Point 23 | 1,340 | 1,773 |
| Point 24 | 1,429 | 1,777 |
| Point 25 | 1,546 | 1,783 |
| Point 26 | 1,643 | 1,792 |
| Point 27 | 1,723 | 1,801 |
| Point 28 | 1,769 | 1,808 |
| Point 29 | 1,794 | 1,815 |
| Point 30 | 1,830 | 1,823 |
| Point 31 | 1,851 | 1,830 |
| Point 32 | 1,862 | 1,841 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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| Point 33 | 1,886 | 1,843 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 34 | 1,913 | 1,853 |
| Point 35 | 1,955 | 1,852 |
| Point 36 | 1,993 | 1,862 |
| Point 37 | 2,050 | 1,863 |
| Point 38 | 2,049 | 1,295 |
| Point 39 | -49 | 1,301 |
| Point 40 | 244 | 1,878 |
| Point 41 | 276 | 1,871 |
| Point 42 | 302 | 1,866 |
| Point 43 | 324 | 1,861 |
| Point 44 | 381 | 1,852 |
| Point 45 | 402 | 1,847 |
| Point 46 | 458 | 1,846 |
| Point 47 | 477 | 1,845 |
| Point 48 | 502 | 1,832 |
| Point 49 | 531 | 1,823 |
| Point 50 | 577 | 1,810 |
| Point 51 | 601 | 1,800 |
| Point 52 | 634 | 1,790 |
| Point 53 | 696 | 1,771 |
| Point 54 | 734 | 1,763 |
| Point 55 | 805 | 1,769 |
| Point 56 | 757 | 1,793 |
| Point 57 | 890 | 1,789 |
| Point 58 | 1,105 | 1,828 |
| Point 59 | 1,137 | 1,828 |
| Point 60 | 1,293 | 1,811 |
| Point 61 | 1,397 | 1,816 |
| Point 62 | 1,492 | 1,824 |
| Point 63 | 1,449 | 1,812 |
| Point 64 | 1,423 | 1,810 |
| Point 65 | 1,372 | 1,791 |
| Point 66 | 1,537 | 1,831 |
| Point 67 | 1,593 | 1,846 |
| Point 68 | 1,637 | 1,860 |
| Point 69 | 1,671 | 1,876 |
| Point 70 | 1,692 | 1,876 |
| Point 71 | 1,720 | 1,864 |
| Point 72 | 1,749 | 1,849 |
| Point 73 | 1,769 | 1,843 |
| Point 74 | 1,788 | 1,843 |
| Point 75 | 1,809 | 1,855 |
| Point 76 | 1,831 | 1,855 |
| Point 77 | 1,839 | 1,857 |
| Point 78 | 1,904 | 1,856 |
| Point 79 | 1,971 | $1,856.2105$ |
| Point 80 | 293.0323 | 1,831 |
| Point 81 | 311 | 1,826 |
| Point 82 | 353 | 1,813 |
|  |  |  |
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|  | 439 | 1,787 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 84 | 494 | 1,774 |
| Point 85 | 634 | 1,741 |
| Point 86 | 727 | 1,731 |
| Point 87 | 793 | 1,731 |
| Point 88 | 830.2778 | 1,734 |
| Point 89 | 494.1087 | 1,772 |
| Point 90 | 353 | 1,811.3265 |
| Point 91 | -47.6603 | 1,650 |
| Point 92 | 1,343.5556 | 1,775 |
| Point 93 | 1,368 | 1,776 |
| Point 94 | 1,409 | 1,778 |
| Point 95 | 1,429 | 1,779 |
| Point 96 | 1,474 | 1,781 |
| Point 97 | 1,546 | 1,785 |
| Point 98 | 1,643 | 1,794 |
| Point 99 | 1,723 | 1,803 |
| Point 100 | 1,769 | 1,810 |
| Point 101 | 1,793 | 1,816.12 |
| Point 102 | 1,474 | 1,779.3077 |
| Point 103 | 1,408 | 1,776.0562 |
| Point 104 | 1,368 | 1,774.2584 |
| Point 105 | 1,175 | 1,297.4995 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc <br> $\left(12^{\circ}\right)$ | $38,37,36,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,102,24,103,104,23,22,21,20,19,105$ | $4.4177 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $4,40,41,42,43,80,6,5$ | 2,420 |
| Region <br> 3 | Qls | $43,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48,47,46,45,44$ | 24,238 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $51,56,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,88,55,54,53,52$ | 10,071 |
| Region <br> 5 | Fill | $19,60,61,62,63,64,65,92,23,22,21,20$ | 9,582 |
| Region <br> 6 | Qls | $62,63,64,65,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,73,72,71,70,69,68,67,66$ | 20,085 |
| Region <br> 7 | Fill | $73,74,75,76,77,78,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,101$ | $3,204.9$ |
| Region <br> 8 | Clay | $80,6,90,7,89,8,9,10,11,88,87,86,85,84,83,82,81$ | $1,023.3$ |
| Region <br> 9 | TQs 11 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $91,9,8,89,7,90,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 90,409 |
| Region <br> 10 | Clay | $92,23,104,103,24,102,25,26,27,28,29,101,100,99,98,97,96,95,94,93$ | 864.17 |
| Region <br> 11 | Tmc $(-$ <br> $\left.122^{\circ}\right)$ | $91,39,105,19,59,58,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9$ | $5.1344 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 79,822
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 1.25$
Weight: $2,150,374,1 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Resisting Moment: $5.8700498 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: 4.6976221e+008 lbs-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 132,651 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(1,382.0225,1,815.2799) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(1,936.4936,1,856.1021) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 967.25342 ft
Center: (1,591.2339, 2,759.6368) ft
Slip Slices

| p Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) Frictional Strength <br> (psf) Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) <br> Slice 1 $1,389.5113$ $1,813.683$ 0 302.46824 196.42517 200 <br> Slice 2 $1,407.3968$ $1,810.0732$ 0 942.00415 611.74465 200 <br> Slice 3 $1,420.3968$ $1,807.5932$ 0 $1,283.5706$ 467.18149 0 <br> Slice 4 1,436 $1,805.0121$ 0 $1,672.0621$ 608.58082 0 <br> Slice 5 $1,459.75$ $1,801.4231$ 0 $2,199.6843$ 800.61963 0 <br> Slice 6 $1,481.25$ $1,798.7176$ 0 $2,565.0977$ 933.61921 0 <br> Slice 7 $1,503.25$ $1,796.4595$ 0 $3,009.0854$ $1,095.2175$ 0 <br> Slice 8 $1,525.75$ $1,794.6684$ 0 $3,527.8679$ $1,284.0389$ 0 <br> Slice 9 $1,546.3333$ $1,793.4712$ 0 $4,057.7864$ $1,476.9135$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 10 1,565 $1,792.7842$ 0 $4,607.9819$ $1,677.1683$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 11 $1,583.6667$ $1,792.458$ 0 $5,115.8578$ $1,862.0199$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 12 1,604 $1,792.5302$ 0 $5,675.1717$ $2,065.5936$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 13 1,626 $1,793.071$ 0 $6,277.1567$ $2,284.6982$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 14 $1,637.2588$ $1,793.479$ 0 $6,573.1048$ $2,392.4145$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 15 $1,640.2588$ $1,793.6304$ 0 $6,740.8743$ $1,067.6496$ 150 <br> Slice <br> 16 1,650 $1,794.1956$ 0 $7,129.9054$ $1,129.2661$ 150 <br> Slice <br> 17 1,664 $1,795.1499$ 0 $7,673.1976$ $1,215.3151$ 150 <br> Slice <br> 18 $1,681.5$ $1,796.6622$ 0 $7,829.5383$ $1,240.077$ 150 <br> Slice <br> 19 1,699 $1,798.4313$ 0 $7,339.1616$ $1,162.409$ 150 <br> Slice <br> 20 1,713 $1,800.1044$ 0 $6,568.7137$ $1,040.382$ 150 <br> Slice <br> 21 $1,721.5$ $1,801.1966$ 0 $6,081.7127$ 963.24867 150 <br> Slice <br> 22 1,736 $1,803.3684$ 0 $5,119.2065$ 810.80265 150 |


| Slice <br> 23 | 1,759 | $1,807.0977$ | 0 | $3,784.6327$ | 599.42693 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,773.8979$ | $1,809.8009$ | 0 | $3,325.5117$ | 526.7093 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | $1,783.3979$ | $1,811.6757$ | 0 | $3,315.3385$ | 704.69696 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | $1,790.5$ | $1,813.135$ | 0 | $3,498.3113$ | 743.58902 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,793.5$ | $1,813.76882$ | 0 | $3,702.1245$ | 786.91086 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | $1,801.5$ | $1,815.5455$ | 0 | $4,031.921$ | 857.01126 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 1,820 | $1,819.8937$ | 0 | $4,007.9025$ | 851.90597 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 1,835 | $1,823.6132$ | 0 | $3,681.7091$ | 782.57142 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 1,845 | $1,826.2862$ | 0 | $3,470.6193$ | 737.70291 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | $1,856.5$ | $1,829.486$ | 0 | $3,074.6337$ | 653.53356 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 1,874 | $1,834.7232$ | 0 | $2,433.1881$ | 517.19011 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 1,895 | $1,841.3691$ | 0 | $1,627.8242$ | 346.00471 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 35 | $1,908.5$ | $1,845.9089$ | 0 | $1,092.5696$ | 232.23284 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 36 | $1,920.1717$ | $1,850.0649$ | 0 | 622.18265 | 132.249 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 37 | $1,931.9185$ | $1,854.3803$ | 0 | 121.01553 | 78.588401 | 200 |

## Section 29-29 tran Static right SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz



## 2 - Translational
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## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Jan
Settings
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: ( $n o n e$ )
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Materials
TQs $11^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 ps
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pc
Cohesion': 0
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
mc ( $-12^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding - $10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc ( $\mathbf{1 2}^{\circ}$ )
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 ps
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-49,1,301)$ ft
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,1,863) \mathrm{ft}$

2-Translational

Slip Surface Block
Left Grid
Upper Left: $(1,339,1,783) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,340,1,763) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(1,703,1,786)$ ft
X Increments: 8
Y Increments: 8
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(1,735,1,810) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Left: ( $1,737,1,797$ ) ft Lower Right: $(1,850,1,824)$ ft
X Increments: 8
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Horz Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: (25.1.1)
pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point:(-9,9, 1)
$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.275)$
Data Point: (-10, 0.2
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)
$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.3)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)

Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -47 | 1,822 |
| Point 2 | -7 | 1,838 |
| Point 3 | 66 | 1,849 |
| Point 4 | 218 | 1,873 |
| Point 5 | 238 | 1,857 |
| Point 6 | 292 | 1,830 |
| Point 7 | 439 | 1,785 |
| Point 8 | 634 | 1,739 |
| Point 9 | 727 | 1,729 |
| Point 10 | 793 | 1,729 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 1,733 |
| Point 12 | 872 | 1,737 |
| Point 13 | 900 | 1,755 |
| Point 14 | 929 | 1,767 |
| Point 15 | 964 | 1,776 |
| Point 16 | 1,022 | 1,779 |
| Point 17 | 1,050 | 1,797 |
| Point 18 | 1,069 | 1,809 |
| Point 19 | 1,173 | 1,810 |
| Point 20 | 1,224 | 1,777 |
| Point 21 | 1,277 | 1,738 |
| Point 22 | 1,312 | 1,753 |
| Point 23 | 1,340 | 1,773 |
|  |  |  |

2-Translational

| Point 24 | 1,429 | 1,777 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 25 | 1,546 | 1,783 |
| Point 26 | 1,643 | 1,792 |
| Point 27 | 1,723 | 1,801 |
| Point 28 | 1,769 | 1,808 |
| Point 29 | 1,794 | 1,815 |
| Point 30 | 1,830 | 1,823 |
| Point 31 | 1,851 | 1,830 |
| Point 32 | 1,862 | 1,841 |
| Point 33 | 1,886 | 1,843 |
| Point 34 | 1,913 | 1,853 |
| Point 35 | 1,955 | 1,852 |
| Point 36 | 1,993 | 1,862 |
| Point 37 | 2,050 | 1,863 |
| Point 38 | 2,049 | 1,295 |
| Point 39 | -49 | 1,301 |
| Point 40 | 244 | 1,878 |
| Point 41 | 276 | 1,871 |
| Point 42 | 302 | 1,866 |
| Point 43 | 324 | 1,861 |
| Point 44 | 381 | 1,852 |
| Point 45 | 402 | 1,847 |
| Point 46 | 458 | 1,846 |
| Point 47 | 477 | 1,845 |
| Point 48 | 502 | 1,832 |
| Point 49 | 531 | 1,823 |
| Point 50 | 577 | 1,810 |
| Point 51 | 601 | 1,800 |
| Point 52 | 634 | 1,790 |
| Point 53 | 696 | 1,771 |
| Point 54 | 734 | 1,763 |
| Point 55 | 805 | 1,769 |
| Point 56 | 757 | 1,793 |
| Point 57 | 890 | 1,789 |
| Point 58 | 1,105 | 1,828 |
| Point 59 | 1,137 | 1,828 |
| Point 60 | 1,293 | 1,811 |
| Point 61 | 1,397 | 1,816 |
| Point 62 | 1,492 | 1,824 |
| Point 63 | 1,449 | 1,812 |
| Point 64 | 1,423 | 1,810 |
| Point 65 | 1,372 | 1,791 |
| Point 66 | 1,537 | 1,831 |
| Point 67 | 1,593 | 1,846 |
| Point 68 | 1,637 | 1,860 |
| Point 69 | 1,671 | 1,876 |
| Point 70 | 1,692 | 1,876 |
| Point 71 | 1,720 | 1,864 |
| Point 72 | 1,749 | 1,849 |
| Point 73 | 1,769 | 1,843 |
|  |  |  |
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|  | 1,788 | 1,843 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 75 | 1,809 | 1,855 |
| Point 76 | 1,831 | 1,855 |
| Point 77 | 1,839 | 1,857 |
| Point 78 | 1,904 | 1,856 |
| Point 79 | 1,971 | $1,856.2105$ |
| Point 80 | 293.0323 | 1,831 |
| Point 81 | 311 | 1,826 |
| Point 82 | 353 | 1,813 |
| Point 83 | 439 | 1,787 |
| Point 84 | 494 | 1,774 |
| Point 85 | 634 | 1,741 |
| Point 86 | 727 | 1,731 |
| Point 87 | 793 | 1,731 |
| Point 88 | 830.2778 | 1,734 |
| Point 89 | 494.1087 | 1,772 |
| Point 90 | 353 | $1,811.3265$ |
| Point 91 | -47.6603 | 1,650 |
| Point 92 | $1,343.5556$ | 1,775 |
| Point 93 | 1,368 | 1,776 |
| Point 94 | 1,409 | 1,778 |
| Point 95 | 1,429 | 1,779 |
| Point 96 | 1,474 | 1,781 |
| Point 97 | 1,546 | 1,785 |
| Point 98 | 1,643 | 1,794 |
| Point 99 | 1,723 | 1,803 |
| Point 100 | 1,769 | 1,810 |
| Point 101 | 1,793 | $1,816.12$ |
| Point 102 | 1,474 | $1,779.3077$ |
| Point 103 | 1,408 | $1,776.0562$ |
| Point 104 | 1,368 | $1,774.2584$ |
| Point 105 | 1,175 | $1,297.4995$ |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region $1$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Tmc } \\ \left(12^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 38,37,36,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,102,24,103,104,23,22,21,20,19,105 | 4.4177e+005 |
| Region $2$ | Fill | 4,40,41,42,43,80,6,5 | 2,420 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Qls | 43,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48,47,46,45,44 | 24,238 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 51,56,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,88,55,54,53,52 | 10,071 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 19,60,61,62,63,64,65,92,23,22,21,20 | 9,582 |
| Region <br> 6 | Qls | 62,63,64,65,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,73,72,71,70,69,68,67,66 | 20,085 |
| Region <br> 7 | Fill | 73,74,75,76,77,78,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,101 | 3,204.9 |
| Region |  |  |  |

file:///P:/FINAL\%20PROJECTS/PARDEE/Skyline\%20Ranch/SLOPE\%20RESULTS/Sect... 3/15/2016

| 8 | Clay | $80,6,90,7,89,8,9,10,11,88,87,86,85,84,83,82,81$ | $1,023.3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 9 | TQs $11^{\circ}$ | $91,9,8,89,7,90,6,5,4,3,2,1$ | 90,409 |
| Region <br> 10 | Clay | $92,23,104,103,24,102,25,26,27,28,29,101,100,99,98,97,96,95,94,93$ | 864.17 |
| Region <br> 11 | Tmc $(-$ <br> $\left.12^{\circ}\right)$ | $91,39,105,19,59,58,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9$ | $5.1344 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 23,682
F of S: 2.83
Volume: $14,099.861 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Resisting Force: $309,180.06 \mathrm{Ib}$
Activating Force: $109,309.83 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 59,049 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(1,475.4155,1,822.6034) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(1,756.2086,1,846.8374)$ ft
Radius: 115.60361 ft
Center: $(1,614.2434,1,852.8959) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y$ (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice 1 | 1,477.7462 | 1,821.638 | 0 | 186.56553 | 121.15707 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 1,486.0384 | 1,818.2033 | 0 | 583.91652 | 212.52823 | 0 |
| Slice 3 | 1,496.5 | 1,813.8699 | 0 | 1,144.1647 | 416.4419 | 0 |
| Slice 4 | 1,505.5 | 1,810.142 | 0 | 1,685.9154 | 613.62304 | 0 |
| Slice 5 | 1,514.5 | 1,806.4141 | 0 | 2,227.6661 | 810.80417 | 0 |
| Slice 6 | 1,523.5 | 1,802.6862 | 0 | 2,769.4168 | 1,007.9853 | 0 |
| Slice 7 | 1,532.5 | 1,798.9583 | 0 | 3,311.1675 | 1,205.1664 | 0 |
| Slice 8 | 1,541.2503 | 1,795.3338 | 0 | 3,888.3151 | 1,415.2309 | 0 |
| Slice 9 | 1,549.7509 | 1,791.8127 | 0 | 4,500.8594 | 1,638.1788 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 1,558.2515 | 1,788.2916 | 0 | 5,113.4037 | 1,861.1267 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | 1,564.4742 | 1,785.7141 | 0 | 5,412.4329 | 857.24515 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | 1,567.2647 | 1,784.973 | 0 | 5,261.5893 | 4,414.9976 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 1,572.2356 | 1,785.5052 | 0 | 5,453.7896 | 863.79542 | 150 |
| Slice $14$ | 1,580.5414 | 1,786.4179 | 0 | 5,584.1954 | 884.44967 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 1,588.8471 | 1,787.3305 | 0 | 5,714.6012 | 905.10391 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 1,597.4 | 1,788.2704 | 0 | 5,870.8939 | 929.85825 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 1,606.2 | 1,789.2373 | 0 | 6,053.0736 | 958.71267 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 1,615 | 1,790.2043 | 0 | 6,235.2533 | 987.5671 | 150 |
| Slice |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 19 | $1,623.8$ | $1,791.1712$ | 0 | $6,417.433$ | $1,016.4215$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 20 | $1,632.6$ | $1,792.1382$ | 0 | $6,599.6126$ | $1,045.276$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 1,640 | $1,792.9513$ | 0 | $6,798.2507$ | $1,076.7371$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | $1,647.6667$ | $1,793.7938$ | 0 | $7,073.0962$ | $1,120.2684$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 1,657 | $1,794.8193$ | 0 | $7,407.6907$ | $1,173.2629$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,666.3333$ | $1,795.8449$ | 0 | $7,742.2852$ | $1,226.2575$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | $1,676.25$ | $1,796.9345$ | 0 | $7,852.2482$ | $1,243.6739$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | $1,686.75$ | $1,798.0883$ | 0 | $7,737.5797$ | $1,225.5122$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,696.6667$ | $1,799.178$ | 0 | $7,430.5081$ | $1,176.8769$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 1,706 | $1,800.2035$ | 0 | $6,931.0337$ | $1,097.7679$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | $1,715.3333$ | $1,801.2291$ | 0 | $6,431.5592$ | $1,018.6589$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | $1,721.5$ | $1,801.9067$ | 0 | $6,088.3303$ | 964.29679 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | $1,729.5$ | $1,802.7858$ | 0 | $5,589.7084$ | 885.32283 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 32 | $1,736.371$ | $1,804.2956$ | 0 | $4,471.162$ | 708.1625 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 33 | $1,742.871$ | $1,818.2349$ | 0 | $2,657.9544$ | 967.4163 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 34 | $1,752.6043$ | $1,839.108$ | 0 | 690.09124 | 251.17267 | 0 |

## Section 29-29 pseudostatic right SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
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## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope
File Version: 8.15
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Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 155
Date: 3/15/2016
Time: 2:04:00 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
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Directory: P:IFINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 29-29 results\
Last Solved Date: 3/15/2016
Last Solved Time: 2:05:19 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Fee
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: pst
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Spencer
Settings
PWP
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
$S$ Distribution
F of S C
divanced
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft
Search Method: Root Finder

Tolerable difference between starting and converged F of $\mathrm{S}: 3$ Maximum iterations to calculate converged lambda: 20
Max Absolute Lambda: 2

## Materials

TQs $11^{\circ}$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': 20
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi: $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0
$\operatorname{Tmc}\left(-12^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-22^{\circ}\right)$ C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0

## Tmc ( $12^{\circ}$ )

Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
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Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-49,1,301) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(2,050,1,863) \mathrm{ft}$

## Slip Surface Block

Left Grid
Upper Left: $(1,339,1,783) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,340,1,763) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Right: ( $1,703,1,786$ ) ft
X Increments: 8
X Increments:
Y
Increment
8
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(1,735,1,810) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(1,737,1,797) \mathrm{ft}$ Lower Right: $(1,850,1,824)$ ft
X Increments: 8
Y Increments: $8{ }^{\text {Starting Angle: } 45^{\circ}}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vorrt Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $-90,1$ )
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: (25.1 1)
50 pcf (Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)

Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(-9.9,1)$
$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-25.1,1)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.275)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.275)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)
$12^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $-10^{\circ}-\left(-25^{\circ}\right)$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept:1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$, Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(-10,0.3)$
Data Point: (-9.9, 1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -47 | 1,822 |
| Point 2 | -7 | 1,838 |
| Point 3 | 66 | 1,849 |
| Point 4 | 218 | 1,873 |
| Point 5 | 238 | 1,857 |
| Point 6 | 292 | 1,830 |
| Point 7 | 439 | 1,785 |
| Point 8 | 634 | 1,739 |
| Point 9 | 727 | 1,729 |
| Point 10 | 793 | 1,729 |
| Point 11 | 831 | 1,733 |
| Point 12 | 872 | 1,737 |
| Point 13 | 900 | 1,755 |
| Point 14 | 929 | 1,767 |
| Point 15 | 964 | 1,776 |
| Point 16 | 1,022 | 1,779 |
| Point 17 | 1,050 | 1,797 |
| Point 18 | 1,069 | 1,809 |
| Point 19 | 1,173 | 1,810 |
| Point 20 | 1,224 | 1,777 |
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| Point 21 | 1,277 | 1,738 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 22 | 1,312 | 1,753 |
| Point 23 | 1,340 | 1,773 |
| Point 24 | 1,429 | 1,777 |
| Point 25 | 1,546 | 1,783 |
| Point 26 | 1,643 | 1,792 |
| Point 27 | 1,723 | 1,801 |
| Point 28 | 1,769 | 1,808 |
| Point 29 | 1,794 | 1,815 |
| Point 30 | 1,830 | 1,823 |
| Point 31 | 1,851 | 1,830 |
| Point 32 | 1,862 | 1,841 |
| Point 33 | 1,886 | 1,843 |
| Point 34 | 1,913 | 1,853 |
| Point 35 | 1,955 | 1,852 |
| Point 36 | 1,993 | 1,862 |
| Point 37 | 2,050 | 1,863 |
| Point 38 | 2,049 | 1,295 |
| Point 39 | -49 | 1,301 |
| Point 40 | 244 | 1,878 |
| Point 41 | 276 | 1,871 |
| Point 42 | 302 | 1,866 |
| Point 43 | 324 | 1,861 |
| Point 44 | 381 | 1,852 |
| Point 45 | 402 | 1,847 |
| Point 46 | 458 | 1,846 |
| Point 47 | 477 | 1,845 |
| Point 48 | 502 | 1,832 |
| Point 49 | 531 | 1,823 |
| Point 50 | 577 | 1,810 |
| Point 51 | 601 | 1,800 |
| Point 52 | 634 | 1,790 |
| Point 53 | 696 | 1,771 |
| Point 54 | 734 | 1,763 |
| Point 55 | 805 | 1,769 |
| Point 56 | 757 | 1,793 |
| Point 57 | 890 | 1,789 |
| Point 58 | 1,105 | 1,828 |
| Point 59 | 1,137 | 1,828 |
| Point 60 | 1,293 | 1,811 |
| Point 61 | 1,397 | 1,816 |
| Point 62 | 1,492 | 1,824 |
| Point 63 | 1,449 | 1,812 |
| Point 64 | 1,423 | 1,810 |
| Point 65 | 1,372 | 1,791 |
| Point 66 | 1,537 | 1,831 |
| Point 67 | 1,593 | 1,846 |
| Point 68 | 1,637 | 1,860 |
| Point 69 | 1,671 | 1,876 |
| Point 70 | 1,692 | 1,876 |
|  |  |  |


|  | 1,720 | 1,864 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 72 | 1,749 | 1,849 |
| Point 73 | 1,769 | 1,843 |
| Point 74 | 1,788 | 1,843 |
| Point 75 | 1,809 | 1,855 |
| Point 76 | 1,831 | 1,855 |
| Point 77 | 1,839 | 1,857 |
| Point 78 | 1,904 | 1,856 |
| Point 79 | 1,971 | $1,856.2105$ |
| Point 80 | 293.0323 | 1,831 |
| Point 81 | 311 | 1,826 |
| Point 82 | 353 | 1,813 |
| Point 83 | 439 | 1,787 |
| Point 84 | 494 | 1,774 |
| Point 85 | 634 | 1,741 |
| Point 86 | 727 | 1,731 |
| Point 87 | 793 | 1,731 |
| Point 88 | 830.2778 | 1,734 |
| Point 89 | 494.1087 | 1,772 |
| Point 90 | 353 | $1,811.3265$ |
| Point 91 | -47.6603 | 1,650 |
| Point 92 | $1,343.5556$ | 1,775 |
| Point 93 | 1,368 | 1,776 |
| Point 94 | 1,409 | 1,778 |
| Point 95 | 1,429 | 1,779 |
| Point 96 | 1,474 | 1,781 |
| Point 97 | 1,546 | 1,785 |
| Point 98 | 1,643 | 1,794 |
| Point 99 | 1,723 | 1,803 |
| Point 100 | 1,769 | 1,810 |
| Point 101 | 1,793 | $1,816.12$ |
| Point 102 | 1,474 | $1,779.3077$ |
| Point 103 | 1,408 | $1,776.0562$ |
| Point 104 | 1,368 | $1,774.2584$ |
| Point 105 | 1,175 | $1,297.4995$ |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | Tmc <br> $\left(12{ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $38,37,36,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,28,27,26,25,102,24,103,104,23,22,21,20,19,105$ | $4.4177 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region <br> 2 | Fill | $4,40,41,42,43,80,6,5$ | 2,420 |
| Region <br> 3 | Qls | $43,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48,47,46,45,44$ | 24,238 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $51,56,57,16,15,14,13,12,11,88,55,54,53,52$ | 10,071 |
| Region <br> 5 | Fill | $19,60,61,62,63,64,65,92,23,22,21,20$ | 9,582 |
| Region <br> 6 | Qls | $62,63,64,65,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,73,72,71,70,69,68,67,66$ | 20,085 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \end{aligned}$ | Fill | 73,74,75,76,77,78,79,35,34,33,32,31,30,29,101 | 3,204.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Clay | 80,6,90,7,89, $8,9,10,11,88,87,86,85,84,83,82,81$ | 1,023.3 |
| Region <br> 9 | TQs $11^{\circ}$ | 91,9,8,89,7,90,6,5,4,3,2,1 | 90,409 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | Clay | 92,23,104,103,24,102,25,26,27,28,29,101,100,99,98,97,96,95,94,93 | 864.17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Region } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tmc (- } \\ & \left.12^{\circ}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 91,39,105,19,59,58,18,17,16,15,14,13,12,11,10,9 | 5.1344e+005 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 23,680
F of $\mathrm{S}: 1.26$
Volume: $14,544.184 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $1,455,027 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $24,828,372 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
Activating Moment: 19,734,169 lbs-ft
Resisting Force: $337,183.67 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $268,468.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 59,049 slip surfaces
F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(1,475.4155,1,822.6034) \mathrm{ft}$
$5,1,843)$
Radius: 119.6971 ft ,

| Slip Slices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X (ft) | $Y(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Base Normal Stress (psf) | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| Slice 1 | 1,477.7462 | 1,821.638 | 0 | 438.53267 | 284.78645 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 1,486.0384 | 1,818.2033 | 0 | 759.72367 | 276.5168 | 0 |
| Slice 3 | 1,497.625 | 1,813.404 | 0 | 1,576.7607 | 573.89397 | 0 |
| Slice 4 | 1,508.875 | 1,808.7441 | 0 | 2,457.8388 | 894.58016 | 0 |
| Slice 5 | 1,520.125 | 1,804.0842 | 0 | 3,338.9169 | 1,215.2664 | 0 |
| Slice 6 | 1,531.375 | 1,799.4243 | 0 | 4,219.9949 | 1,535.9525 | 0 |
| Slice 7 | 1,541.2503 | 1,795.3338 | 0 | 5,059.0194 | 1,841.3325 | 0 |
| Slice 8 | 1,549.7509 | 1,791.8127 | 0 | 5,855.9902 | 2,131.4061 | 0 |
| Slice 9 | 1,558.2515 | 1,788.2916 | 0 | 6,652.961 | 2,421.4798 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 1,564.4742 | 1,785.7141 | 0 | 6,355.0757 | 1,006.5451 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | 1,567.2647 | 1,784.973 | 0 | 5,725.9629 | 4,804.6533 | 200 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1,574.312 | 1,785.7334 | 0 | 5,280.3356 | 836.323 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 1,586.7707 | 1,787.1024 | 0 | 5,467.7746 | 866.01042 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | 1,598.5 | 1,788.3912 | 0 | 5,670.6009 | 898.13495 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 1,609.5 | 1,789.5999 | 0 | 5,888.8145 | 932.69659 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 1,620.5 | 1,790.8086 | 0 | 6,107.0281 | 967.25823 | 150 |


| Slice <br> 17 | $1,631.5$ | $1,792.0173$ | 0 | $6,325.2417$ | $1,001.8199$ | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 18 | 1,640 | $1,792.9513$ | 0 | $6,537.405$ | $1,035.4232$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | $1,647.6667$ | $1,793.7938$ | 0 | $6,800.7715$ | $1,077.1364$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 1,657 | $1,794.8193$ | 0 | $7,121.3915$ | $1,127.9176$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | $1,666.3333$ | $1,795.8449$ | 0 | $7,442.0116$ | $1,178.6988$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | $1,676.25$ | $1,796.9345$ | 0 | $7,547.382$ | $1,195.3879$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | $1,686.75$ | $1,798.0883$ | 0 | $7,437.5026$ | $1,177.9847$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | $1,696.6667$ | $1,799.178$ | 0 | $7,143.256$ | $1,131.3806$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 1,706 | $1,800.2035$ | 0 | $6,664.6422$ | $1,055.5756$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | $1,715.3333$ | $1,801.2291$ | 0 | $6,186.0284$ | 979.77065 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 27 | $1,721.5$ | $1,801.9067$ | 0 | $5,857.1346$ | 927.67899 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 28 | $1,729.5$ | $1,802.7858$ | 0 | $5,379.3378$ | 852.0034 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | $1,736.8718$ | $1,804.3718$ | 0 | $3,554.7949$ | 563.02421 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | $1,743.3718$ | $1,810.8718$ | 0 | $2,680.63$ | 975.66955 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 1,754 | $1,821.5$ | 0 | $1,698.282$ | 618.12409 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 1,764 | $1,831.5$ | 0 | 849.14099 | 309.06204 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 33 | $1,770.533$ | $1,838.033$ | 0 | 346.86608 | 126.24893 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 34 | $1,773.783$ | $1,841.283$ | 0 | 49.030317 | 31.84066 | 200 |

## Section 32-32 Static Circular SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 32-32 Static Circular SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/14/2016 7:30:41 PM

| Materials |
| :--- |
| $\square$ TQs |
| $\square$ Qls |
| $\square$ Fill |
| $\square$ Clay |



Name: TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Name: Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$

## Name: Clay

Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$

## 2 - Circular

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 145
Date: 3/14/2016
Time: 7:30:41 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
file Name: Section 32-32 Static Circular SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 32-32 results\
Last Solved Date: 3/14/2016
Last Solved Time: 7:30:43 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Circular
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant

## Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pc
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-189.3733, 1,793.5717) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(193,1,845) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 15
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (236, 1,861.3415) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $565,1,895$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 8
Radius Increments: 8

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-199, 1,792) ft
Right Coordinate: $(566,1,650) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 1,792 |
| Point 2 | -101 | 1,808 |
| Point 3 | 45 | 1,827 |
| Point 4 | 176 | 1,843 |
| Point 5 | 92 | 1,823 |


| Point 6 | 44 | 1,814 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 7 | -8 | 1,801 |
| Point 8 | -43 | 1,786 |
| Point 9 | -73 | 1,768 |
| Point 10 | -106 | 1,744 |
| Point 11 | -155 | 1,720 |
| Point 12 | -199 | 1,720 |
| Point 13 | 193 | 1,845 |
| Point 14 | 222 | 1,814 |
| Point 15 | 153 | 1,801 |
| Point 16 | 96 | 1,788 |
| Point 17 | 44 | 1,779 |
| Point 18 | -3 | 1,773 |
| Point 19 | -39 | 1,769 |
| Point 20 | 231 | 1,860 |
| Point 21 | 272 | 1,871 |
| Point 22 | 293 | 1,862 |
| Point 23 | 386 | 1,865 |
| Point 24 | 422 | 1,880 |
| Point 25 | 450 | 1,893 |
| Point 26 | 527 | 1,894 |
| Point 27 | 565 | 1,895 |
| Point 28 | 444 | 1,859 |
| Point 29 | 398 | 1,850 |
| Point 30 | 345 | 1,837 |
| Point 31 | 264 | 1,823 |
| Point 32 | -199 | 1,650 |
| Point 33 | 566 | 1,650 |
| Point 34 | -39 | 1,771 |
| Point 35 | -3 | 1,775 |
| Point 36 | 44 | 1,781 |
| Point 37 | 96 | 1,790 |
| Point 38 | 153 | 1,803 |
| Point 39 | 220.129 | 1,816 |
| Point 40 | -69.6667 | 1,770 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Fill | $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,40,9,10,11,12$ | 12,311 |
| Region 2 | Qls | $4,5,6,7,8,40,34,35,36,37,38,39,13$ | $8,037.7$ |
| Region 3 | Fill | $13,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,14,39$ | 9,613 |
| Region 4 | TQs | $12,32,33,27,28,29,30,31,14,15,16,17,18,19,9,10,11$ | $1.1986 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 5 | Clay | $34,40,9,19,18,17,16,15,14,39,38,37,36,35$ | 595.29 |
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## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 1,140
Fof S: 2.47
Volume: $683.94696 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 77,569.632 lbs
Resisting Moment: 2,366,953.7 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $956,929.48 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1,296 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(167.45638,1,841.9565) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (236.00001, 1,861.3415) ft
Entry: (236.00001,
Center: (193.51323, 1,880.6964) ft

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) Y (ft) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 168.01281 $1,841.5936$ 0 125.6967 81.628394 200 <br> Slice <br> 2 169.8077 $1,840.5004$ 0 206.55409 75.179541 0 <br> Slice <br> 3 172.28462 $1,839.1374$ 0 377.79763 137.50709 0 <br> Slice <br> 4 174.76154 $1,837.9614$ 0 525.41828 191.23661 0 <br> Slice <br> 5 177.21429 $1,836.9654$ 0 653.46478 237.84173 0 <br> Slice <br> 6 179.64286 $1,836.1348$ 0 764.25891 278.1675 0 <br> Slice <br> 7 182.07143 $1,835.4498$ 0 858.27573 312.38682 0 <br> Slice <br> 8 184.5 $1,834.9037$ 0 936.66198 340.91708 0 <br> Slice <br> 9 186.92857 $1,834.4917$ 0 $1,000.308$ 364.08235 0 <br> Slice <br> 10 189.35714 $1,834.2101$ 0 $1,049.9006$ 382.13257 0 <br> Slice <br> 11 191.78571 $1,834.0565$ 0 $1,085.9596$ 395.25695 0 <br> Slice <br> 12 194.18384 $1,834.0286$ 0 $1,176.0515$ 428.04774 0 <br> Slice <br> 13 196.55153 $1,834.1228$ 0 $1,319.2579$ 480.17062 0 <br> Slice <br> 14 198.91922 $1,834.3381$ 0 $1,448.3558$ 527.15842 0 <br> Slice 201.2869 $1,834.6761$ 0 $1,563.3683$ 569.01951 0 |


| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 16 | 203.65946 | $1,835.1408$ | 0 | $1,578.1098$ | $1,024.8365$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 206.0369 | $1,835.7367$ | 0 | $1,590.747$ | $1,033.0432$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 208.41434 | $1,836.4683$ | 0 | $1,586.9123$ | $1,030.5529$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 210.79178 | $1,837.3426$ | 0 | $1,566.2181$ | $1,017.1139$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 213.16922 | $1,838.3684$ | 0 | $1,528.0941$ | 992.35594 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 215.54665 | $1,839.557$ | 0 | $1,471.7568$ | 955.77003 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 217.92409 | $1,840.9233$ | 0 | $1,396.162$ | 906.67819 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 220.30153 | $1,842.4862$ | 0 | $1,299.9364$ | 844.18857 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 222.67897 | $1,844.2714$ | 0 | $1,181.2736$ | 767.12808 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 225.05641 | $1,846.3138$ | 0 | $1,037.7743$ | 673.93853 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 227.43384 | $1,848.6631$ | 0 | 866.1895 | 562.51004 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 229.81128 | $1,851.3944$ | 0 | 661.98714 | 429.89947 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 232.25 | $1,854.7318$ | 0 | 397.1737 | 257.92762 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 234.75001 | $1,858.9691$ | 0 | 61.14504 | 39.708053 | 200 |

Section 32-32 Pseudostatic Circular SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Section 32-32 Pseudostatic Circular SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/14/2016 7:33:45 PM

| Materials |
| :--- |
| $\square$ TQs |
| $\square$ Qis |
| $\square$ Fill |
| $\square$ Clay |

$\underbrace{1.50}$


Name: TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25º

Name: Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Name: Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$

## 2 - Circular

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 148
Date: 3/14/2016
Time: 7:33:45 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 32-32 Pseudostatic Circular SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 32-32 results\
Last Solved Date: 3/14/2016
Last Solved Time: 7:35:00 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Circular
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant

## Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pc
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-189.3733, 1,793.5717) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: $(193,1,845) \mathrm{ft}$
Left-Zone Increment: 15
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: ( $236,1,861.3415$ ) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $565,1,895$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 8
Radius Increments: 8

2 - Circular

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: $(-199,1,792) \mathrm{ft}$
Right Coordinate: $(566,1,650) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: (9.9, 1)
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 1,792 |
| Point 2 | -101 | 1,808 |
| Point 3 | 45 | 1,827 |
| Point 4 | 176 | 1,843 |
| Point 5 | 92 | 1,823 |

2 - Circular

| Point 6 | 44 | 1,814 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 7 | -8 | 1,801 |
| Point 8 | -43 | 1,786 |
| Point 9 | -73 | 1,768 |
| Point 10 | -106 | 1,744 |
| Point 11 | -155 | 1,720 |
| Point 12 | -199 | 1,720 |
| Point 13 | 193 | 1,845 |
| Point 14 | 222 | 1,814 |
| Point 15 | 153 | 1,801 |
| Point 16 | 96 | 1,788 |
| Point 17 | 44 | 1,779 |
| Point 18 | -3 | 1,773 |
| Point 19 | -39 | 1,769 |
| Point 20 | 231 | 1,860 |
| Point 21 | 272 | 1,871 |
| Point 22 | 293 | 1,862 |
| Point 23 | 386 | 1,865 |
| Point 24 | 422 | 1,880 |
| Point 25 | 450 | 1,893 |
| Point 26 | 527 | 1,894 |
| Point 27 | 565 | 1,895 |
| Point 28 | 444 | 1,859 |
| Point 29 | 398 | 1,850 |
| Point 30 | 345 | 1,837 |
| Point 31 | 264 | 1,823 |
| Point 32 | -199 | 1,650 |
| Point 33 | 566 | 1,650 |
| Point 34 | -39 | 1,771 |
| Point 35 | -3 | 1,775 |
| Point 36 | 44 | 1,781 |
| Point 37 | 96 | 1,790 |
| Point 38 | 153 | 1,803 |
| Point 39 | 220.129 | 1,816 |
| Point 40 | -69.6667 | 1,770 |
|  |  |  |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Fill | $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,40,9,10,11,12$ | 12,311 |
| Region 2 | Qls | $4,5,6,7,8,40,34,35,36,37,38,39,13$ | $8,037.7$ |
| Region 3 | Fill | $13,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,14,39$ | 9,613 |
| Region 4 | TQs | $12,32,33,27,28,29,30,31,14,15,16,17,18,19,9,10,11$ | $1.1986 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 5 | Clay | $34,40,9,19,18,17,16,15,14,39,38,37,36,35$ | 595.29 |
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## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 409
Fof S: 1.50
Volume: $8,922.7997 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: 950,631.04 lbs
Resisting Moment: 89,120,255 lbs-ft
Activating Moment: $59,457,999 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 1,296 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (-62.248402, 1,813.043) ft
Entry: $(236.00001,1,861.3415) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 253.94132 ft
Center: (54.245628, 2,038.6873) ft

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 -56.969911 $1,810.4707$ 0 578.22517 375.50382 200 <br> Slice <br> 2 - 46.412931 $1,805.6186$ 0 $1,471.1247$ 955.35957 <br> Slice <br> 3 -35.85595 $1,801.3352$ 0 $2,235.4162$ $1,451.6963$ 200 <br> Slice <br> 4 - 25.298969 $1,797.5899$ 0 $2,888.2895$ $1,875.6771$ <br> Slice <br> 5 - 14.010239 $1,794.1706$ 0 $3,146.189$ $1,145.1191$ <br> Slice <br> 6 -2.8 $1,791.2938$ 0 $3,514.9653$ $1,279.3427$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 7 7.6 $1,789.1229$ 0 $3,818.9909$ $1,389.999$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 8 18 $1,787.4009$ 0 $4,070.8519$ $1,481.6689$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 9 28.4 $1,786.1187$ 0 $4,273.0767$ $1,555.2727$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 10 38.8 $1,785.2697$ 0 $4,427.7433$ $1,611.5668$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 11 44.5 $1,784.9335$ 0 $4,498.9212$ $1,637.4734$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 12 50.676482 $1,784.8345$ 0 $4,550.2441$ $1,656.1534$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 13 62.029447 $1,784.9288$ 0 $4,614.7252$ $1,679.6226$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 14 73.779447 $1,785.5717$ 0 $4,667.1826$ 739.20911 150 <br> Slice 85.926482 $1,786.8043$ 0 $4,647.8258$ 736.14329 150 |


| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 16 | 94 | $1,787.8852$ | 0 | $4,607.0939$ | 729.69198 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 97.885731 | $1,788.5312$ | 0 | $4,572.2288$ | 724.1699 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 105.21448 | $1,789.9756$ | 0 | $4,465.3719$ | 867.98037 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 116.10051 | $1,792.4584$ | 0 | $4,298.8008$ | 835.60222 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 126.83516 | $1,795.4046$ | 0 | $4,113.5171$ | 651.5171 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 137.41843 | $1,798.8183$ | 0 | $3,860.2757$ | 611.4076 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 148.25838 | $1,802.8651$ | 0 | $3,408.9882$ | $1,240.7702$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 159.35503 | $1,807.6006$ | 0 | $3,039.5252$ | $1,106.2967$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 170.45168 | $1,812.9808$ | 0 | $2,619.5193$ | 953.42707 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 180.25 | $1,818.2669$ | 0 | $2,215.7282$ | 806.4591 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 188.75 | $1,823.3511$ | 0 | $1,836.3519$ | 668.37741 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 198.39963 | $1,829.7309$ | 0 | $1,625.7714$ | 591.7324 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 208.33272 | $1,836.9181$ | 0 | $1,197.8709$ | 777.90643 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 217.39963 | $1,844.1829$ | 0 | 837.51494 | 543.88856 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 226.46654 | $1,852.1717$ | 0 | 429.58776 | 278.97755 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 233.5 | $1,858.8496$ | 0 | 59.738781 | 38.794818 | 200 |

## Section 32-32 Static SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 32-32 Static SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/14/2016 7:10:28 PM

| Materials |
| :--- |
| $\square$ TQs |
| $\square$ Qls |
| $\square$ Fill |
| $\square$ Clay |



Name: TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25

Name: Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$

Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$

Name: Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$

## 2 - Translational

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 142
Date: 3/14/2016
Time: 7:10:28 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 32-32 Static SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 32-32 results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/14/2016
Last Solved Time: 7:10:40 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
orce(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: No
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant

## Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-199, 1,792) ft
Right Coordinate: $(566,1,650) \mathrm{ft}$

Slip Surface Block
Left Grid
Upper Left: (-56, 1,774) ft

Lower Left: $(-53,1,763) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(152,1,796) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: $(156,1,808) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Left: $(160,1,797) \mathrm{ft}$
Lower Right: $(381,1,840) \mathrm{ft}$
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 1,792 |
| Point 2 | -101 | 1,808 |
| Point 3 | 45 | 1,827 |
| Point 4 | 176 | 1,843 |
| Point 5 | 92 | 1,823 |
| Point 6 | 44 | 1,814 |
| Point 7 | -8 | 1,801 |
| Point 8 | -43 | 1,786 |
| Point 9 | -73 | 1,768 |
| Point 10 | -106 | 1,744 |
| Point 11 | -155 | 1,720 |
| Point 12 | -199 | 1,720 |
| Point 13 | 193 | 1,845 |
| Point 14 | 222 | 1,814 |
| Point 15 | 153 | 1,801 |
| Point 16 | 96 | 1,788 |
| Point 17 | 44 | 1,779 |
| Point 18 | -3 | 1,773 |
| Point 19 | -39 | 1,769 |
| Point 20 | 231 | 1,860 |
| Point 21 | 272 | 1,871 |
| Point 22 | 293 | 1,862 |
| Point 23 | 386 | 1,865 |
| Point 24 | 422 | 1,880 |
| Point 25 | 450 | 1,893 |
| Point 26 | 527 | 1,894 |
| Point 27 | 565 | 1,895 |
| Point 28 | 444 | 1,859 |
| Point 29 | 398 | 1,850 |
| Point 30 | 345 | 1,837 |
| Point 31 | 264 | 1,823 |
| Point 32 | -199 | 1,650 |
| Point 33 | 566 | 1,650 |
| Point 34 | -39 | 1,771 |
| Point 35 | -3 | 1,775 |
| Point 36 | 44 | 1,781 |
| Point 37 | 96 | 1,790 |
| Point 38 | 153 | 1,803 |
| Point 39 | 220.129 | 1,816 |
| Point 40 | -69.6667 | 1,770 |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Fill | $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,40,9,10,11,12$ | 12,311 |
| Region 2 | Qls | $4,5,6,7,8,40,34,35,36,37,38,39,13$ | $8,037.7$ |
| Region 3 | Fill | $13,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,14,39$ | 9,613 |
| Region 4 | TQs | $12,32,33,27,28,29,30,31,14,15,16,17,18,19,9,10,11$ | $1.1986 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 5 | Clay | $34,40,9,19,18,17,16,15,14,39,38,37,36,35$ | 595.29 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 58,226
F of S: 2.01
Volume: $7,017.266 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Resisting Force: $224,845.48 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $112,133.11 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 150 slip surfaces
Exit: ( $55.128474,1,828.2371$ ) ft
Entry: $(280.83853,1,867.2121) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: (280.83853, 1,8
Radius: 103.22832 ft
Radius: 103.22832 ft
Center: $(162.93593,1,876.9558) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) | Frictional <br> Strength (psf) | Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 1 | 58.493995 | $1,826.843$ | 0 | 298.11963 | 193.60115 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 2 | 65.225036 | $1,824.0549$ | 0 | 798.65605 | 518.6533 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 3 | 71.956078 | $1,821.2668$ | 0 | $1,299.1925$ | 843.70546 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 4 | 79.491199 | $1,818.1457$ | 0 | $1,641.5874$ | 597.48896 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 5 | 87.8304 | $1,814.6915$ | 0 | $2,113.531$ | 769.26236 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 6 | 95.717463 | $1,811.4246$ | 0 | $2,555.8182$ | 930.24174 | 0 |
| Slice <br> 7 | 103.15239 | $1,808.3449$ | 0 | $2,968.449$ | $1,080.4271$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 8 | 110.58731 | $1,805.2653$ | 0 | $3,381.0799$ | $1,230.6124$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 9 | 118.02224 | $1,802.1856$ | 0 | $3,793.7107$ | $1,380.7978$ | 0 |
| Slice | 125.45717 | $1,799.106$ | 0 | $4,206.3416$ | $1,530.9831$ | 0 |


| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 11 | 129.73731 | $1,797.3331$ | 0 | $4,280.3957$ | 677.94808 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 134.08333 | $1,797.7982$ | 0 | $4,032.6616$ | 638.71085 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 141.65 | $1,799.1946$ | 0 | $3,968.8212$ | 628.59953 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 149.21667 | $1,800.5911$ | 0 | $3,904.9808$ | 618.4882 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 156.83333 | $1,801.9967$ | 0 | $3,840.7185$ | 608.31005 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 164.5 | $1,803.4116$ | 0 | $3,776.0344$ | 598.06509 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 172.16667 | $1,804.8265$ | 0 | $3,711.3503$ | 587.82013 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 180.25 | $1,806.3182$ | 0 | $3,650.9842$ | 578.25909 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 188.75 | $1,807.8869$ | 0 | $3,594.9363$ | 569.38198 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 196.39112 | $1,809.2971$ | 0 | $3,735.0052$ | 591.56671 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 203.17337 | $1,810.5487$ | 0 | $4,071.191$ | 644.81331 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 209.95563 | $1,811.8004$ | 0 | $4,407.3768$ | 698.0599 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 216.73788 | $1,813.0521$ | 0 | $4,743.5625$ | 751.3065 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 221.05526 | $1,813.8488$ | 0 | $4,957.5681$ | 785.20165 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 222.38045 | $1,814.0934$ | 0 | $4,794.7604$ | $3,113.7538$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 226.88969 | $1,814.9256$ | 0 | $5,108.7652$ | 993.04336 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 234.95 | $1,816.4131$ | 0 | $5,249.6059$ | $1,020.42$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 242.85 | $1,817.871$ | 0 | $5,327.5959$ | $1,035.5797$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 247.09422 | $1,819.0202$ | 0 | $3,298.7701$ | $2,767.9968$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 251.49037 | $1,825.2985$ | 0 | $3,198.1739$ | $2,076.9184$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 259.69422 | $1,837.0149$ | 0 | $2,418.0563$ | $1,570.3041$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 267.89807 | $1,848.7312$ | 0 | $1,637.9386$ | $1,063.6898$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 276.41926 | $1,860.9007$ | 0 | 575.15923 | 373.51277 | 200 |
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## Section 32-32 Pseudostatic SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz

Section 32-32 Pseudostatic SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E. 3/14/2016 7:18:27 PM

| Materials |
| :--- |
| $\square$ TQs |
| $\square$ Qls |
| $\square$ Fill |
| $\square$ Clay |

$e^{1.11}$


Name: TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn.
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )

Name: Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$

Name: Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$

Name: Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$

## 2 - Translational

Report generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

## File Version: 8.15

Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 145
Date: 3/14/2016
Time: 7:18:27 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 32-32 Pseudostatic SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 32-32 results\
Last Solved Date: 3/14/2016
Last Solved Time: 7:18:30 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
orce(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: psf
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

2 - Translational
Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Other GeoStudio Analysis
Slip Surface Other Analysis: ".\Section 32-32 Static SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz" - 2 - Translational [(last) Slip Surface

Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Other
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack

Tension Crack Option: (none)

## F of S Distribution

F of S Calculation Option: Constant Advanced

Number of Slices: 30
F of S Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Limits

Left Coordinate: (-199, 1,792) ft
Right Coordinate: $(566,1,650) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15

2-Translational

Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$11^{\circ}$ (Along Bedding $\mathbf{1 0 - 2 5}{ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: 100 \%
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -199 | 1,792 |
| Point 2 | -101 | 1,808 |
| Point 3 | 45 | 1,827 |
| Point 4 | 176 | 1,843 |
| Point 5 | 92 | 1,823 |
| Point 6 | 44 | 1,814 |
| Point 7 | -8 | 1,801 |
| Point 8 | -43 | 1,786 |
| Point 9 | -73 | 1,768 |
| Point 10 | -106 | 1,744 |
| Point 11 | -155 | 1,720 |
| Point 12 | -199 | 1,720 |
| Point 13 | 193 | 1,845 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Point 14 | 222 | 1,814 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 15 | 153 | 1,801 |
| Point 16 | 96 | 1,788 |
| Point 17 | 44 | 1,779 |
| Point 18 | -3 | 1,773 |
| Point 19 | -39 | 1,769 |
| Point 20 | 231 | 1,860 |
| Point 21 | 272 | 1,871 |
| Point 22 | 293 | 1,862 |
| Point 23 | 386 | 1,865 |
| Point 24 | 422 | 1,880 |
| Point 25 | 450 | 1,893 |
| Point 26 | 527 | 1,894 |
| Point 27 | 565 | 1,895 |
| Point 28 | 444 | 1,859 |
| Point 29 | 398 | 1,850 |
| Point 30 | 345 | 1,837 |
| Point 31 | 264 | 1,823 |
| Point 32 | -199 | 1,650 |
| Point 33 | 566 | 1,650 |
| Point 34 | -39 | 1,771 |
| Point 35 | -3 | 1,775 |
| Point 36 | 44 | 1,781 |
| Point 37 | 96 | 1,790 |
| Point 38 | 153 | 1,803 |
| Point 39 | 220.129 | 1,816 |
| Point 40 | -69.6667 | 1,770 |
|  |  |  |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region 1 | Fill | $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,40,9,10,11,12$ | 12,311 |
| Region 2 | Qls | $4,5,6,7,8,40,34,35,36,37,38,39,13$ | $8,037.7$ |
| Region 3 | Fill | $13,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,14,39$ | 9,613 |
| Region 4 | TQs | $12,32,33,27,28,29,30,31,14,15,16,17,18,19,9,10,11$ | $1.1986 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
| Region 5 | Clay | $34,40,9,19,18,17,16,15,14,39,38,37,36,35$ | 595.29 |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 1
Fof S : 1.11
Volume: 7,017.266 ft ${ }^{3}$
Weight: 766,942.76 lbs
Resisting Force: $219,345.96 \mathrm{lbs}$

Activating Force: $197,437.04 \mathrm{lbs}$
of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: $(55.128474,1,828.2371) \mathrm{ft}$
Entry: $(280.83853,1,867.2121) \mathrm{ft}$
Radius: 103.22832 ft
Center: $(162.93593,1,876.9558) \mathrm{ft}$

| Slip Slices |
| :--- |
|  X (ft) Y (ft) PWP <br> (psf) Base Normal <br> Stress (psf) Frictional <br> Strength (psf) Cohesive <br> Strength (psf) <br> Slice <br> 1 58.493995 $1,826.843$ 0 384.74201 249.85438 200 <br> Slice <br> 2 65.225036 $1,824.0549$ 0 956.81481 621.3628 200 <br> Slice <br> 3 71.956078 $1,821.2668$ 0 $1,528.8874$ 992.87105 200 <br> Slice <br> 4 79.491199 $1,818.1457$ 0 $1,756.8443$ 639.43901 0 <br> Slice <br> 5 87.8304 $1,814.6915$ 0 $2,261.9234$ 823.27279 0 <br> Slice <br> 6 95.717463 $1,811.4246$ 0 $2,735.2638$ 995.5546 0 <br> Slice <br> 7 103.15239 $1,808.3449$ 0 $3,176.8657$ $1,156.2845$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 8 110.58731 $1,805.2653$ 0 $3,618.4676$ $1,317.0145$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 9 118.02224 $1,802.1856$ 0 $4,060.0695$ $1,477.7444$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 10 125.45717 $1,799.106$ 0 $4,501.6714$ $1,638.4744$ 0 <br> Slice <br> 11 129.73731 $1,797.3331$ 0 $4,427.065$ 701.17821 150 <br> Slice <br> 12 134.08333 $1,797.7982$ 0 $3,975.6012$ 629.67337 150 <br> Slice <br> 13 141.65 $1,799.1946$ 0 $3,912.4922$ 619.67789 150 <br> Slice <br> 14 149.21667 $1,800.5911$ 0 $3,849.3834$ 609.68244 150 <br> Slice <br> 15 156.83333 $1,801.9967$ 0 $3,785.8574$ 599.6209 150 <br> Slice <br> 16 164.5 $1,803.4116$ 0 $3,721.9145$ 589.49335 150 <br> Slice <br> 17 172.16667 $1,804.8265$ 0 $3,657.9715$ 579.36577 150 <br> Slice <br> 18 180.25 $1,806.3182$ 0 $3,598.2973$ 569.9143 150 <br> Slice      $\|$ |


| 19 | 188.75 | $1,807.8869$ | 0 | $3,542.8915$ | 561.13889 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 20 | 196.39112 | $1,809.2971$ | 0 | $3,681.3554$ | 583.06942 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 203.17337 | $1,810.5487$ | 0 | $4,013.6891$ | 635.70591 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 209.95563 | $1,811.8004$ | 0 | $4,346.0226$ | 688.34236 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 216.73788 | $1,813.0521$ | 0 | $4,678.3562$ | 740.97882 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 221.05526 | $1,813.8488$ | 0 | $4,889.9094$ | 774.48557 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 222.38045 | $1,814.0934$ | 0 | $4,572.7126$ | $2,969.5543$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 226.88969 | $1,814.9256$ | 0 | $5,026.5448$ | 977.06132 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 234.95 | $1,816.4131$ | 0 | $5,165.4164$ | $1,004.0552$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 242.85 | $1,817.871$ | 0 | $5,242.316$ | $1,019.003$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 247.09422 | $1,819.0202$ | 0 | $2,472.4263$ | $2,074.612$ | 225 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 251.49037 | $1,825.2985$ | 0 | $2,485.8764$ | $1,614.347$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 259.69422 | $1,837.0149$ | 0 | $1,864.2451$ | $1,210.6549$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 267.89807 | $1,848.7312$ | 0 | $1,242.6135$ | 806.96266 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 276.41927 | $1,860.9007$ | 0 | 395.74496 | 256.99978 | 200 |



1 - Circular
1 - Circular

## 1 - Circular

eport generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLopE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexander Bykovtsec
Revision Number: 1
Date: $3 / 14 / 2016$
Time: 6:22:47 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 34-34 Static Circular SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 34-34 results\}

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(F) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: p
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

## 1 - Circular

Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Entry and Exit
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: ${ }^{\circ}$
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of S Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
F of $S$ Tolerance: 0.01
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

Materials

TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion:
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (TQs Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (TQs Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': 20
Phi-B: 0

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B:
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0{ }^{\circ}$
Tmc
Model: Anisotropic F
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi: 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Entry and Exit
Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-180.0022, 1,731.9235) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordina
Right Projection: Range
Right Projection: Range
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (399.3113, 1,821.7223) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $806.1524,1,852.1889$ ) ft
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 8

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: (-200, 1,738) ft
Right Coordinate: $(809,1,600) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Tmc Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Cegment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: (-90, 1) Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Tmc Along Bedding $\mathbf{1 0 - 2 5}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Modet: Spline Data Point Function
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: ( $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(25,0.75)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
$11^{\circ}$ (TQs Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: $(25,0.275)$
Data Point: (25.1, 1)
150 pcf (TQs Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$

Data Point: $(10,0.667)$ Data Point: $(25,0.667)$ Data Point: (25.1,1)

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,738 |
| Point 2 | -153 | 1,722 |
| Point 3 | -112 | 1,710 |
| Point 4 | -26 | 1,712 |
| Point 5 | 92 | 1,723 |
| Point 6 | 215 | 1,738 |
| Point 7 | 337 | 1,756 |
| Point 8 | 466 | 1,781 |
| Point 9 | 530 | 1,792 |
| Point 10 | 627 | 1,816 |
| Point 11 | 710 | 1,836 |
| Point 12 | 767 | 1,835 |
| Point 13 | 808 | 1,853 |
| Point 14 | 809 | 1,600 |
| Point 15 | -200 | 1,600 |
| Point 16 | -42 | 1,730 |
| Point 17 | -2 | 1,746 |
| Point 18 | 71 | 1,752 |
| Point 19 | 140 | 1,755 |
| Point 20 | 156 | 1,763 |
| Point 21 | 186 | 1,760 |
| Point 22 | 193 | 1,768 |
| Point 23 | 228 | 1,778 |
| Point 24 | 249 | 1,786 |
| Point 25 | 275 | 1,798 |
| Point 26 | 289 | 1,802 |
| Point 27 | 334 | 1,802 |
| Point 28 | 373 | 1,807 |
| Point 29 | 397 | 1,821 |
| Point 30 | 429 | 1,831 |
| Point 31 | 482 | 1,840 |
| Point 32 | -182 | $1,731.8723$ |
| Point 33 | -138 | 1,733 |
| Point 34 | -106 | 1,740 |
| Point 35 | -67 | 1,754 |
| Point 36 | -25 | 1,765 |
| Point 37 | 6 | 1,773 |
| Point 38 | 108 | 1,776 |
| Point 39 | 171 | 1,790 |
| Point 40 | 231 | 1,798 |
| Point 41 | 293 | 1,810 |
| Point 42 | 353 | 1,820 |
| Point 43 | 539 | 1,849 |
| Point 44 | 571 | 1,856 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Point 45 | 599 | 1,862 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 46 | 661 | 1,837 |
| Point 47 | -106 | $1,711.7143$ |
| Point 48 | -69 | 1,713 |
| Point 49 | -26 | 1,714 |
| Point 50 | 39 | 1,720 |
| Point 51 | 92 | 1,725 |
| Point 52 | 215 | 1,740 |
| Point 53 | 337 | 1,758 |
| Point 54 | 466 | 1,783 |
| Point 55 | 528 | 1,794 |
| Point 56 | 38.3636 | 1,718 |
| Point 57 | -69 | 1,711 |
| Point 58 | 497 | 1,756 |
| Point 59 | 647 | 1,756 |
| Point 60 | 808.3834 | 1,756 |

Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs | $13,12,11,10,9,8,7,58,59,60$ | 22,189 |
| Region <br> 2 | Qls | $31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55$ | 21,534 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,47,3,2$ | 11,851 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $31,43,44,45,46,11,10,9,55$ | 7,412 |
| Region <br> 5 | Clay | $47,3,57,4,56,5,6,7,8,9,95,54,53,52,51,50,49,48$ | $1,274.4$ |
| Region <br> 6 | Tmc | $7,6,5,56,4,57,3,2,32,1,15,14,60,59,58$ | $1.4185 \mathrm{e}+005$ |
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## 1 - Circular

keport generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyrigh © 1991 -2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

## File Information

File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexand
Revision Number:
Date: $3 / 14 / 2016$
Time: 6:31:32 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 34-34 Pseudostatic Circular SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\/FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section $34-34$ results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/14/2016
Last Solved Time: 6:31:38 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(f) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: ps
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

## 1 - Circular <br> Kind: SLOPE/W

Method: Bishop
Settings
PWP
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: No
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
Fof S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

## Materials

TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (TQs Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (TQs Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) Phi-B: 0
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': 20
Phi-B: 0
Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 ps
Phi: ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$
Tmc
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion:
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}($ Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 $)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25
Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Entry and Exit

Left Projection: Range
Left-Zone Left Coordinate: (-180.0022, 1,731.9235) ft
Left-Zone Right Coordinate: ( $303.4238,1,811.7373$ ) ft
Left-Zone Increment: 50
Right-Zone Left Coordinate: (399.3113, 1,821.7223) ft
Right-Zone Right Coordinate: $(806.1524,1,852.1889) \mathrm{ft}$
Right-Zone Increment: 50
Radius Increments: 8

Slip Surface Limits

1 - Circular

Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,738) \mathrm{ft}$ Right Coordinate: $(809,1,600)$ ft

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.15
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

## $12^{\circ}$ (Tmc Along Bedding $\mathbf{1 0 - 2 5}$ )

Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$

## Segment Curvature: $0 \%$

Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(25,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.75)$
Data Point: (25.1, 1)
$11{ }^{\circ}$ (TQs Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment
intercept: 1
Y-Intercept: 1
Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: (25, 0.275
Data Point: (25.1, 1)
150 pcf (TQs Along Bedding $\mathbf{1 0 - 2 5 ^ { \circ }}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Sercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor

1 - Circular

> Data Point: $(-90,1)$ Data Point: $(9.9,1)$ Data Point: $(10,0.667)$ Data Point: $(25,0.667)$

Data Point: $(25.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,738 |
| Point 2 | -153 | 1,722 |
| Point 3 | -112 | 1,710 |
| Point 4 | -26 | 1,712 |
| Point 5 | 92 | 1,723 |
| Point 6 | 215 | 1,738 |
| Point 7 | 337 | 1,756 |
| Point 8 | 466 | 1,781 |
| Point 9 | 530 | 1,792 |
| Point 10 | 627 | 1,816 |
| Point 11 | 710 | 1,836 |
| Point 12 | 767 | 1,835 |
| Point 13 | 808 | 1,853 |
| Point 14 | 809 | 1,600 |
| Point 15 | -200 | 1,600 |
| Point 16 | -42 | 1,730 |
| Point 17 | -2 | 1,746 |
| Point 18 | 71 | 1,752 |
| Point 19 | 140 | 1,755 |
| Point 20 | 156 | 1,763 |
| Point 21 | 186 | 1,760 |
| Point 22 | 193 | 1,768 |
| Point 23 | 228 | 1,778 |
| Point 24 | 249 | 1,786 |
| Point 25 | 275 | 1,798 |
| Point 26 | 289 | 1,802 |
| Point 27 | 334 | 1,802 |
| Point 28 | 373 | 1,807 |
| Point 29 | 397 | 1,821 |
| Point 30 | 429 | 1,831 |
| Point 31 | 482 | 1,840 |
| Point 32 | -182 | $1,731.8723$ |
| Point 33 | -138 | 1,733 |
| Point 34 | -106 | 1,740 |
| Point 35 | -67 | 1,754 |
| Point 36 | -25 | 1,765 |
| Point 37 | 6 | 1,773 |
| Point 38 | 108 | 1,776 |
| Point 39 | 171 | 1,790 |
| Point 40 | 231 | 1,798 |
| Point 41 | 293 | 1,810 |
| Point 42 | 353 | 1,820 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 43 | 539 | 1,849 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 44 | 571 | 1,856 |
| Point 45 | 599 | 1,862 |
| Point 46 | 661 | 1,837 |
| Point 47 | -106 | $1,711.7143$ |
| Point 48 | -69 | 1,713 |
| Point 49 | -26 | 1,714 |
| Point 50 | 39 | 1,720 |
| Point 51 | 92 | 1,725 |
| Point 52 | 215 | 1,740 |
| Point 53 | 337 | 1,758 |
| Point 54 | 466 | 1,783 |
| Point 55 | 528 | 1,794 |
| Point 56 | 38.3636 | 1,718 |
| Point 57 | -69 | 1,711 |
| Point 58 | 497 | 1,756 |
| Point 59 | 647 | 1,756 |
| Point 60 | 808.3834 | 1,756 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs | $13,12,11,10,9,8,7,58,59,60$ | 22,189 |
| Region <br> 2 | Qls | $31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55$ | 21,534 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,47,3,2$ | 11,851 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $31,43,44,45,46,11,10,9,55$ | 7,412 |
| Region <br> 5 | Clay | $47,3,57,4,56,5,6,7,8,9,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48$ | $1,274.4$ |
| Region <br> 6 | Tmc | $7,6,5,56,4,57,3,2,32,1,15,14,60,59,58$ | $1.4185 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 2,072
F of S: 1.15
Volume: $31,196.875 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $3,377,512.5 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $1.6197742 \mathrm{e}+009 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Activating Moment: $1.407829 \mathrm{e}+009 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 23,409 slip surfaces
$F$ of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: (-140.6174, 1,732.9329) ft
Entry:
Radius: $1,408.7149 \mathrm{ft}$
Center: $(15.826145,3,132.9341) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice 1 | -139.3087 | $1,732.7879$ | 0 | 43.265788 | 28.097131 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 2 | -122 | $1,731.0699$ | 0 | 707.65624 | 459.55733 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | -96.25 | $1,728.7186$ | 0 | $1,871.3863$ | $1,215.2925$ | 200 |
| Slice 4 | -76.75 | $1,727.2983$ | 0 | $2,902.8856$ | $1,885.156$ | 200 |
| Slice 5 | 61.423662 | $1,726.3499$ | 0 | $3,614.1575$ | $2,347.0613$ | 200 |
| Slice 6 | - | 48.923662 | $1,725.725$ | 0 | $3,972.66882$ | $1,445.933$ |
| Slice 7 | -33.5 | $1,725.1087$ | 0 | $4,402.5096$ | $1,602.3825$ | 0 |
| Slice 8 | -13.5 | $1,724.5714$ | 0 | $4,903.1048$ | $1,784.5842$ | 0 |
| Slice 9 | 2 | $1,724.2927$ | 0 | $5,296.6407$ | $1,927.8195$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 16.833333 | $1,724.2611$ | 0 | $5,419.9439$ | $1,972.6982$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 38.5 | $1,724.4433$ | 0 | $5,416.3775$ | $1,971.4002$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 60.166667 | $1,724.9588$ | 0 | $5,379.8108$ | $1,958.091$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 89.5 | $1,726.2689$ | 0 | $5,284.666$ | $1,923.4611$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 110.62986 | $1,727.4153$ | 0 | $5,262.4941$ | $1,915.3912$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 126.62986 | $1,728.64766$ | 0 | $5,593.0299$ | 885.84891 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 148 | $1,730.4565$ | 0 | $5,873.0408$ | 930.19828 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 163.5 | $1,732.001$ | 0 | $6,053.8869$ | 958.84149 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 178.5 | $1,733.6635$ | 0 | $6,224.5288$ | 985.86852 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 189.5 | $1,734.9703$ | 0 | $6,197.4844$ | 981.5851 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 204 | $1,736.8878$ | 0 | $6,086.5979$ | 964.0224 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 221.5 | $1,739.3298$ | 0 | $6,011.597$ | 952.14343 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 229.5 | $1,740.5193$ | 0 | $5,967.4133$ | 945.14541 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 240 | $1,742.2002$ | 0 | $5,945.5174$ | 941.67745 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 262 | $1,745.9583$ | 0 | $5,878.3605$ | 931.04083 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 281.58431 | $1,749.5305$ | 0 | $5,806.6062$ | 919.67608 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 288.58431 | $1,750.8774$ | 0 | $5,623.0211$ | $2,046.6123$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 291 | $1,751.3578$ | 0 | $5,625.3534$ | $2,047.4612$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 303.25 | $1,753.8925$ | 0 | $5,608.1025$ | $2,041.1824$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 323.75 | $1,758.3249$ | 0 | $5,551.3661$ | $2,020.532$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 343.5 | $1,762.8931$ | 0 | $5,446.5927$ | $1,982.3976$ | 0 |
| Slice | 363 | $1,767.7082$ | 0 | $5,131.633$ | $1,867.7617$ | 0 |
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| 1 - Circular |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 7 of 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 32 \end{aligned}$ | 385 | 1,773.51 | 0 | 4,474.106 | 1,628.4414 | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ | 413 | 1,781.4709 | 0 | 4,076.1201 | 1,483.5864 | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 34 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 442.25 | 1,790.3816 | 0 | 3,897.4706 | 1,418.5633 | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 35 \end{aligned}$ | 468.75 | 1,799.0893 | 0 | 3,493.0032 | 1,271.3492 | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 36 \end{aligned}$ | 495.36643 | 1,808.4278 | 0 | 3,301.8007 | 1,201.7572 | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 37 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 523.86643 | 1,819.1192 | 0 | 2,655.782 | 1,724.685 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 38 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 555 | 1,831.6004 | 0 | 1,976.7156 | 1,283.6941 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 39 \end{aligned}$ | 585 | 1,844.4137 | 0 | 1,341.458 | 871.15303 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 40 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 605.59662 | 1,853.639 | 0 | 480.20556 | 311.84914 | 200 |  |
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## 2 - Translational

## eport generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLoPE International Ltd.

File Information
File Version: 8.15
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexand
Revision Number: 160
Revision Number.
Date: $3 / 14 / 2016$
Time: 5:56:57 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section $34-34$ Static SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:IFINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section 34-34 results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/14/2016
Last Solved Time: 6:27:12 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(f) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: ps
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

## 2 - Translational

Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Janbu
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Slip Surface
Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Block
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: $1^{\circ}$
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Restrict Block Crossing: №
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
Stribution
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft

2 - Translational

Materials
TQs
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pc
Cohesion': 225 psf
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (TQs Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (TQs Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: 0
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': 20

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': $33^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Clay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 ps
Phi: ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$
Tmc
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion
Phi': 40
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$

Slip Surface Limits
Left Coordinate: (-200, 1,738) tt
Right Coordinate: $(809,1,600)$

Slip Surface Block
Left Grid
Upper Left: (-113.3841, 1,716.1673) ft
Lower Left: (-112.1694, 1,683.1928) ft
Lower Right: (512.8207, 1,778.1756) ft
X Increments: 10
Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $135^{\circ}$

2-Translational

Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $180^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2
Right Grid
Upper Left: (515.9588, 1,809.2079) ft
Lower Left: (524.9799, 1,784.4482) ft
Lower Right: (719.9715, 1,820.9519) ft
X Increments: 10
Y Increments: 10
Starting Angle: $45^{\circ}$
Ending Angle: $65^{\circ}$
Angle Increments: 2

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Tmc Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$ Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: $(25,0.3$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.75)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
$11{ }^{\circ}$ (TQs Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: ( $25,0.275$ )

Data Point: (25.1, 1)
150 pcf (TQs Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segcept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point. $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$

## Points

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,778 |
| Point 2 | -153 | 1,722 |
| Point 3 | -112 | 1,710 |
| Point 4 | -26 | 1,712 |
| Point 5 | 92 | 1,723 |
| Point 6 | 215 | 1,738 |
| Point 7 | 337 | 1,756 |
| Point 8 | 466 | 1,781 |
| Point 9 | 530 | 1,792 |
| Point 10 | 627 | 1,816 |
| Point 11 | 710 | 1,836 |
| Point 12 | 767 | 1,835 |
| Point 13 | 808 | 1,853 |
| Point 14 | 809 | 1,600 |
| Point 15 | -200 | 1,600 |
| Point 16 | -42 | 1,730 |
| Point 17 | -2 | 1,746 |
| Point 18 | 71 | 1,752 |
| Point 19 | 140 | 1,755 |
| Point 20 | 156 | 1,763 |
| Point 21 | 186 | 1,760 |
| Point 22 | 193 | 1,768 |
| Point 23 | 228 | 1,778 |
| Point 24 | 249 | 1,786 |
| Point 25 | 275 | 1,798 |
| Point 26 | 289 | 1,802 |
| Point 27 | 334 | 1,802 |
| Point 28 | 373 | 1,807 |
| Point 29 | 397 | 1,821 |
| Point 30 | 429 | 1,831 |
| Point 31 | 482 | 1,840 |
| Point 32 | -182 | 1,7318723 |
| Point 33 | -138 | 1,733 |
| Point 34 | -106 | 1,740 |
|  |  |  |


| Point 35 | -67 | 1,754 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 36 | -25 | 1,765 |
| Point 37 | 6 | 1,773 |
| Point 38 | 108 | 1,776 |
| Point 39 | 171 | 1,790 |
| Point 40 | 231 | 1,798 |
| Point 41 | 293 | 1,810 |
| Point 42 | 353 | 1,820 |
| Point 43 | 539 | 1,849 |
| Point 44 | 571 | 1,856 |
| Point 45 | 599 | 1,862 |
| Point 46 | 661 | 1,837 |
| Point 47 | -106 | $1,711.7143$ |
| Point 48 | -69 | 1,713 |
| Point 49 | -26 | 1,714 |
| Point 50 | 39 | 1,720 |
| Point 51 | 92 | 1,725 |
| Point 52 | 215 | 1,740 |
| Point 53 | 337 | 1,758 |
| Point 54 | 466 | 1,783 |
| Point 55 | 528 | 1,794 |
| Point 56 | 38.3636 | 1,718 |
| Point 57 | -69 | 1,711 |
| Point 58 | 497 | 1,756 |
| Point 59 | 647 | 1,756 |
| Point 60 | 808.3834 | 1,756 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs | $13,12,11,10,9,8,7,58,59,60$ | 22,189 |
| Region <br> 2 | Qls | $31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55$ | 21,534 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,47,3,2$ | 11,851 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $31,43,44,45,46,11,10,9,55$ | 7,412 |
| Region <br> 5 | Clay | $47,3,57,4,56,5,6,7,7,9,95,54,53,52,51,50,49,48$ | $1,274.4$ |
| Region <br> 6 | Tmc | $7,6,5,56,4,57,3,2,32,1,15,14,60,59,58$ | $1.4185 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 18,976
Fof $\mathrm{S}: 2.03$
Wolume: $19,868.061 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Resisting Force: 580,155 . 77 Ib
Resisting Force: $580,155.7 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $285,492.6 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of S Rank (Analysis): 1 of 131,769 slip surface

F of $S$ Rank (Query): 1 of 15 slip surfaces
Exit: (157.5888, 1,787.0197) ft
Entry: (590.59677, 1,860. 1993) ft
Radius: 189.22041 ft
Center: (364.81712, 1,878.4942) ft
Slip Slices

|  | X (ft) | Y (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PWP } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Base Normal Stress } \\ & \text { (psf) } \end{aligned}$ | Frictional Strength (psf) | Cohesive Strength (psf) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice 1 | 164.2944 | 1,784.2422 | 0 | 637.4732 | 413.97993 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 178.05442 | 1,778.5426 | 0 | 1,762.2363 | 1,144.4096 | 200 |
| Slice 3 | 192.16327 | 1,772.6985 | 0 | 2,830.9633 | 1,838.4491 | 200 |
| Slice 4 | 206.41327 | 1,766.796 | 0 | 3,511.2869 | 1,278.0039 | 0 |
| Slice 5 | 220.80442 | 1,760.835 | 0 | 4,315.1451 | 1,570.5844 | 0 |
| Slice 6 | 229.5 | 1,757.2331 | 0 | 4,797.7743 | 1,746.2471 | 0 |
| Slice 7 | 240 | 1,752.8839 | 0 | 5,432.9284 | 1,977.4242 | 0 |
| Slice 8 | 252.68451 | 1,747.6298 | 0 | 6,207.9552 | 2,259.5109 | 0 |
| Slice 9 | 258.14916 | 1,745.3663 |  | 6,283.2813 | 995.17399 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 261.31624 | 1,744.0544 | 0 | 7,579.9393 | 6,360.3242 | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 268.85159 | 1,744.6263 | 0 | 6,165.4235 | 1,310.5012 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | 282 | 1,747.0778 | 0 | 6,119.5675 | 1,300.7542 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 291 | 1,748.7558 | 0 | 6,113.9048 | 1,299.5506 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 297.87724 | 1,750.038 | 0 | 6,124.1259 | 1,301.7232 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 310.56586 | 1,752.4038 | 0 | 6,167.3856 | 976.81791 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 326.18862 | 1,755.3166 | 0 | 6,188.255 | 980.1233 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 17 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 335.5 | 1,757.0527 | 0 | 6,196.9024 | 981.49293 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 345 | 1,758.8239 | 0 | 6,185.5834 | 979.70016 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 363 | 1,762.18 | 0 | 5,993.8874 | 949.3385 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 379 | 1,765.1631 | 0 | 5,648.593 | 894.64924 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 391 | 1,767.4005 | 0 | 5,322.3324 | 842.97463 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 22 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 405 | 1,770.0108 | 0 | 5,258.5975 | 832.88003 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 23 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 421 | 1,772.9939 | 0 | 5,457.3885 | 864.36543 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | 435.16667 | 1,775.6353 | 0 | 5,546.6724 | 878.5066 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | 447.5 | 1,777.9348 | 0 | 5,526.4491 | 875.30355 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ | 459.83333 | 1,780.2343 | 0 | 5,506.2258 | 872.10049 | 150 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slice } \\ & 27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 474 | 1,782.8756 | 0 | 5,482.9964 | 868.42131 | 150 |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice <br> 28 | 488.71226 | $1,785.6187$ | 0 | $5,604.2002$ | 887.61811 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 502.13678 | $1,788.1217$ | 0 | $5,872.8433$ | 930.167 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 515.56131 | $1,790.6246$ | 0 | $6,141.4865$ | 972.7159 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 522.94701 | $1,792.5495$ | 0 | $5,812.1572$ | 920.55526 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 524.90959 | $1,794.5121$ | 0 | $5,273.882$ | $1,919.5361$ | 0 |
| Slice <br> 33 | 532.59937 | $1,802.2019$ | 0 | $4,087.5481$ | $2,654.4848$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 34 | 547 | $1,816.6025$ | 0 | $3,029.4351$ | $1,967.3381$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 35 | 563 | $1,832.6025$ | 0 | $1,893.1461$ | $1,229.4235$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 36 | 580.79838 | $1,850.4009$ | 0 | 625.1631 | 405.98566 | 200 |
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## Eeport generated using Geostudio 2012. Copyright © 1991-2016 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

File Information
File Version: 8.15
Title: Static
Title: Static Slope Stability Analyses for Skyline Ranch Development project, Tract 60922, Los Angeles CA
Comments: Run By: Dr. Alexander Bykovtsev, Ph.D., P.E.
Last Edited By: Alexand
Revision Number: 169
Revision Number.
Date: $3 / 14 / 2016$
Time: 6:48:09 PM
Tool Version: 8.15.5.11777
File Name: Section 34-34 Pseudostatic SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz
Directory: P:\/FINAL PROJECTS\PARDEE\Skyline Ranch\SLOPE RESULTS\Section $34-34$ results\}
Last Solved Date: 3/14/2016
Last Solved Time: 6:48:11 PM

## Project Settings

Length(L) Units: Feet
Time(t) Units: Seconds
Force(f) Units: Pounds
Pressure(p) Units: ps
Strength Units: psf
Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf
View: 2D Wate
Element Thickness: 1

## Analysis Settings

## 2 - Translational

Kind: SLOPE/W
Method: Spencer
Settings
PWP Conditions Source: (none)
Initial Slip Surface Source: Other GeoStudio Analysis
Slip Surface Other Analysis: ".|Section 34-34 Static SSA for Skyline Ranch.gsz" - 2 - Translational [(last)]

## Slip Surface

Direction of movement: Right to Left
Use Passive Mode: No
Slip Surface Option: Critical Slip Surfaces from Othe
Critical slip surfaces saved: 10
Resisting Side Maximum Convex Angle: 1
Driving Side Maximum Convex Angle: $5^{\circ}$
Optimize Critical Slip Surface Location: №
Tension Crack
Tension Crack Option: (none)
F of $S$ Distribution
F of S Calculation Option: Constant
Advanced
Number of Slices: 30
Minimum Slip Surface Depth: 0.1 ft
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Search Method: Root Finder
Tolerable difference between starting and converged $F$ of $\mathrm{S}: 3$
Maximum iterations to calculate converged lambda: 20
Max Absolute Lambda: 2

## Materials

TQs
Model. Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion':
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi': $40^{\circ}$
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}$ (TQs Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $11^{\circ}\left(\right.$ TQS Along Bedding $\left.10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}\right)$
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (TQs Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$ )
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Qls
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 0 psf
Phi': $20^{\circ}$

Fill
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi': 33
lay
Model: Mohr-Coulomb
Unit Weight: 100 pcf
Cohesion': 150 psf
Phi': $9^{\circ}$
Phi-B: $0^{\circ}$
Tmc
Model: Anisotropic Fn
Unit Weight: 120 pcf
Cohesion': 200 psf
Phi-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: $12^{\circ}$ (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25
C-Anisotropic Strength Fn.: 150 pcf (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) Phi-B: 0

## Slip Surface Limits <br> Left Coordinate: $(-200,1,738)$ t <br> Right Coordinate: $(809,1,600) \mathrm{ft}$

## Seismic Coefficients

Horz Seismic Coef.: 0.1
Vert Seismic Coef.: 0

## Anisotropic Strength Functions

$12^{\circ}$ (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: (-90, 1)
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.3)$
Data Point: ( $25,0.3$ )
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$
150 pcf (Tmc Along Bedding 10-25 ${ }^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.75)$
Data Point: (25.1, 1)
$11^{\circ}$ (TQs Along Bedding $10^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: 0\%
Y-Intercept:1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.275)$
Data Point: ( $10,0.275$ )
Data Point: $(25,0.275)$
Data Point: (25.1, 1)
150 pcf (TQs Along Bedding $10-25^{\circ}$ )
Model: Spline Data Point Function
Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination
Curve Fit to Data: $100 \%$
Segment Curvature: $0 \%$
Y-Intercept: 1
Data Points: Inclination ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), Modifier Factor
Data Point: $(-90,1)$
Data Point: $(9.9,1)$
Data Point: $(10,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25,0.667)$
Data Point: $(25.1,1)$

Points

|  | $\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Y (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point 1 | -200 | 1,738 |
| Point 2 | -153 | 1,722 |
| Point 3 | -112 | 1,710 |
| Point 4 | -26 | 1,712 |
| Point 5 | 92 | 1,723 |
| Point 6 | 215 | 1,738 |
| Point 7 | 337 | 1,756 |
| Point 8 | 466 | 1,781 |
| Point 9 | 530 | 1,792 |
| Point 10 | 627 | 1,816 |
| Point 11 | 710 | 1,836 |
| Point 12 | 767 | 1,835 |
| Point 13 | 808 | 1,853 |
| Point 14 | 809 | 1,600 |
| Point 15 | -200 | 1,600 |
| Point 16 | -42 | 1,730 |
| Point 17 | -2 | 1,746 |
| Point 18 | 71 | 1,752 |
| Point 19 | 140 | 1,755 |
| Point 20 | 156 | 1,763 |
| Point 21 | 186 | 1,760 |
| Point 22 | 193 | 1,768 |
| Point 23 | 228 | 1,778 |
| Point 24 | 249 | 1,786 |
| Point 25 | 275 | 1,798 |
| Point 26 | 289 | 1,802 |
| Point 27 | 334 | 1,802 |
| Point 28 | 373 | 1,807 |
| Point 29 | 397 | 1,821 |
| Point 30 | 429 | 1,831 |
| Point 31 | 482 | 1,840 |
| Point 32 | -182 | 1,731.8723 |
| Point 33 | -138 | 1,733 |
| Point 34 | -106 | 1,740 |
| Point 35 | -67 | 1,754 |
| Point 36 | -25 | 1,765 |
| Point 37 | 6 | 1,773 |
| Point 38 | 108 | 1,776 |
| Point 39 | 171 | 1,790 |
| Point 40 | 231 | 1,798 |
| Point 41 | 293 | 1,810 |
| Point 42 | 353 | 1,820 |
| Point 43 | 539 | 1,849 |
| Point 44 | 571 | 1,856 |
| Point 45 | 599 | 1,862 |
| Point 46 | 661 | 1,837 |


| Point 47 | -106 | $1,711.7143$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Point 48 | -69 | 1,713 |
| Point 49 | -26 | 1,714 |
| Point 50 | 39 | 1,720 |
| Point 51 | 92 | 1,725 |
| Point 52 | 215 | 1,740 |
| Point 53 | 337 | 1,758 |
| Point 54 | 466 | 1,783 |
| Point 55 | 528 | 1,794 |
| Point 56 | 38.3636 | 1,718 |
| Point 57 | -69 | 1,711 |
| Point 58 | 497 | 1,756 |
| Point 59 | 647 | 1,756 |
| Point 60 | 808.3834 | 1,756 |

## Regions

|  | Material | Points | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region <br> 1 | TQs | $13,12,11,10,9,8,7,58,59,60$ | 22,189 |
| Region <br> 2 | Qls | $31,30,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55$ | 21,534 |
| Region <br> 3 | Fill | $32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,29,28,27,26,25,24,23,22,21,20,19,18,17,16,47,3,2$ | 11,851 |
| Region <br> 4 | Fill | $31,43,44,45,46,11,10,9,55$ | 7,412 |
| Region <br> 5 | Clay | $47,3,57,4,56,5,6,7,8,9,55,54,53,52,51,50,49,48$ | $1,274.4$ |
| Region <br> 6 | Tmc | $7,6,5,56,4,57,3,2,32,1,15,14,60,59,58$ | $1.4185 \mathrm{e}+005$ |

## Current Slip Surface

Slip Surface: 4
F of S: 1.18
Volume: $22,880.08 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$
Weight: $2,464,111.4 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Moment: $1.0284906 \mathrm{e}+008 \mathrm{lbs}$-ft
Activating Moment: $86,923,335 \mathrm{lbs}-\mathrm{ft}$
Resisting Force: $688,887.8 \mathrm{lbs}$
Resisting Force: $688,887.88 \mathrm{lbs}$
Activating Force: $582,224.48 \mathrm{lbs}$
F of $S$ Rank (Analysis): 1 of 10 slip surface
F of S Rank (Query): 1 of 10 slip surfaces
Exit: ( $157.5888,1,787.0197$ ) ft
Entry: (619.1507, 1,853.8747) ft
Radius: 194.07119 ft
Center: $(381.10704,1,870.5885) \mathrm{ft}$
Slip Slices

|  | $X(\mathrm{ft})$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{ft})$ | PWP <br> (psf) | Base Normal Stress <br> (psf) | Frictional Strength <br> (psf) | Cohesive Strength <br> (psf) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slice 1 | 164.2944 | $1,784.2422$ | 0 | $1,047.907$ | 680.51874 | 200 |
| Slice 2 | 178.05442 | $1,778.5426$ | 0 | $2,695.7509$ | $1,750.6411$ | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Slice 3 | 192.16327 | $1,772.6985$ | 0 | $4,261.4981$ | $2,767.4492$ | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slice 4 | 206.41327 | $1,766.796$ | 0 | $4,353.7437$ | $1,584.6331$ | 0 |
| Slice 5 | 220.80442 | $1,760.835$ | 0 | $5,350.4701$ | $1,947.4119$ | 0 |
| Slice 6 | 229.5 | $1,757.2331$ | 0 | $5,948.8962$ | $2,165.2212$ | 0 |
| Slice 7 | 240 | $1,752.8839$ | 0 | $6,736.4412$ | $2,451.8641$ | 0 |
| Slice 8 | 252.68451 | $1,747.6298$ | 0 | $7,697.4185$ | $2,801.6312$ | 0 |
| Slice 9 | 258.14916 | $1,745.3663$ | 0 | $7,146.1451$ | $1,131.8382$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 10 | 261.31624 | $1,744.0544$ | 0 | $12,962.851$ | $10,877.123$ | 200 |
| Slice <br> 11 | 268.85159 | $1,744.5762$ | 0 | $5,925.6355$ | $1,259.5327$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 12 | 282 | $1,746.9205$ | 0 | $5,893.805$ | $1,252.7669$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 13 | 291 | $1,748.5252$ | 0 | $5,896.6499$ | $1,253.3716$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 14 | 303.18414 | $1,750.6976$ | 0 | $5,920.5055$ | $1,258.4423$ | 150 |
| Slice <br> 15 | 323.68414 | $1,754.3526$ | 0 | $5,948.9415$ | 942.21978 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 16 | 335.5 | $1,756.4594$ | 0 | $5,969.3885$ | 945.45825 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 17 | 345 | $1,758.1532$ | 0 | $5,965.8792$ | 944.90243 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 18 | 363 | $1,761.3625$ | 0 | $5,797.2114$ | 918.18809 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 19 | 378.44304 | $1,764.116$ | 0 | $5,494.8265$ | 870.29501 | 150 |
| Slice <br> 20 | 390.44304 | $1,7666.2555$ | 0 | $5,199.7517$ | $1,010.7293$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 21 | 405 | $1,768.851$ | 0 | $5,139.9996$ | 999.11471 | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 22 | 421 | $1,771.7037$ | 0 | $5,346.2378$ | $1,039.2034$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 23 | 438.25 | $1,774.7794$ | 0 | $5,444.6804$ | $1,058.3387$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 24 | 456.75 | $1,778.0779$ | 0 | $5,435.3277$ | $1,056.5207$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 25 | 474 | $1,781.1535$ | 0 | $5,423.3141$ | $1,054.1855$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 26 | 489.66667 | $1,783.9468$ | 0 | $5,567.044$ | $1,082.1237$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 27 | 505 | $1,786.6807$ | 0 | $5,869.1789$ | $1,140.8528$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 28 | 520.33333 | $1,789.4146$ | 0 | $6,171.3137$ | $1,199.5819$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 29 | 529 | $1,790.9598$ | 0 | $6,342.085$ | $1,232.7764$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 30 | 534.5 | $1,791.9404$ | 0 | $6,351.4472$ | $1,234.5963$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 31 | 547 | $1,794.1691$ | 0 | $6,377.5625$ | $1,239.6726$ | 150.075 |
| Slice <br> 32 | 563 | $1,797.0219$ | 0 | $6,450.4781$ | $1,253.8459$ | 150.075 |
| Slice | 576.33658 | $1,799.3998$ | 0 | $6,508.5723$ | $1,265.1383$ | 150.075 |
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| 2-Translational |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 7 of 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 334 \end{aligned}$ | 583.55076 | 1,803.0327 | 0 | 2,887.3957 | 2,422.8127 | 225 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slice } \\ & 35 \end{aligned}$ | 592.21418 | 1,815.4054 | 0 | 2,566.0884 | 1,666.4373 | 200 |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Slice } \\ 36 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 609.07535 | 1,839.4856 | 0 | 986.83337 | 640.85708 | 200 |  |

## APPENDIX E

LGC VALLEY, INC.

## General Earthwork and Grading Specifications For Rough Grading

### 1.0 General

1.1 Intent: These General Earthwork and Grading Specifications are for the grading and earthwork shown on the approved grading plan(s) and/or indicated in the geotechnical report(s). These Specifications are a part of the recommendations contained in the geotechnical report(s). In case of conflict, the specific recommendations in the geotechnical report shall supersede these more general Specifications. Observations of the earthwork by the project Geotechnical Consultant during the course of grading may result in new or revised recommendations that could supersede these specifications or the recommendations in the geotechnical report(s).
1.2 The Geotechnical Consultant of Record: Prior to commencement of work, the owner shall employ a qualified Geotechnical Consultant of Record (Geotechnical Consultant). The Geotechnical Consultant shall be responsible for reviewing the approved geotechnical report(s) and accepting the adequacy of the preliminary geotechnical findings, conclusions, and recommendations prior to the commencement of the grading.

Prior to commencement of grading, the Geotechnical Consultant shall review the "work plan" prepared by the Earthwork Contractor (Contractor) and schedule sufficient personnel to perform the appropriate level of observation, mapping, and compaction testing.

During the grading and earthwork operations, the Geotechnical Consultant shall observe, map, and document the subsurface exposures to verify the geotechnical design assumptions. If the observed conditions are found to be significantly different than the interpreted assumptions during the design phase, the Geotechnical Consultant shall inform the owner, recommend appropriate changes in design to accommodate the observed conditions, and notify the review agency where required.

The Geotechnical Consultant shall observe the moisture-conditioning and processing of the subgrade and fill materials and perform relative compaction testing of fill to confirm that the attained level of compaction is being accomplished as specified. The Geotechnical Consultant shall provide the test results to the owner and the Contractor on a routine and frequent basis.
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1.3 The Earthwork Contractor: The Earthwork Contractor (Contractor) shall be qualified, experienced, and knowledgeable in earthwork logistics, preparation and processing of ground to receive fill, moisture-conditioning and processing of fill, and compacting fill. The Contractor shall review and accept the plans, geotechnical report(s), and these Specifications prior to commencement of grading. The Contractor shall be solely responsible for performing the grading in accordance with the project plans and specifications. The Contractor shall prepare and submit to the owner and the Geotechnical Consultant a work plan that indicates the sequence of earthwork grading, the number of "equipment" of work and the estimated quantities of daily earthwork contemplated for the site prior to commencement of grading. The Contractor shall inform the owner and the Geotechnical Consultant of changes in work schedules and updates to the work plan at least 24 hours in advance of such changes so that appropriate personnel will be available for observation and testing. . The Contractor shall not assume that the Geotechnical Consultant is aware of all grading operations.

The Contractor shall have the sole responsibility to provide adequate equipment and methods to accomplish the earthwork in accordance with the applicable grading codes and agency ordinances, these Specifications, and the recommendations in the approved geotechnical report(s) and grading plan(s). If, in the opinion of the Geotechnical Consultant, unsatisfactory conditions, such as unsuitable soil, improper moisture condition, inadequate compaction, insufficient buttress key size, adverse weather, etc., are resulting in a quality of work less than required in these specifications, the Geotechnical Consultant shall reject the work and may recommend to the owner that construction be stopped until the conditions are rectified. It is the contractor's sole responsibility to provide proper fill compaction.

### 2.0 Preparation of Areas to be Filled

2.1 Clearing and Grubbing: Vegetation, such as brush, grass, roots, and other deleterious material shall be sufficiently removed and properly disposed of in a method acceptable to the owner, governing agencies, and the Geotechnical Consultant.

The Geotechnical Consultant shall evaluate the extent of these removals depending on specific site conditions. Earth fill material shall not contain more than 1 percent of organic materials (by volume). No fill lift shall contain more than 10 percent of organic matter. Nesting of the organic materials shall not be allowed.

If potentially hazardous materials are encountered, the Contractor shall stop work in the affected area, and a hazardous material specialist shall be informed immediately for proper evaluation and handling of these materials prior to continuing to work in that area.

As presently defined by the State of California, most refined petroleum products (gasoline, diesel fuel, motor oil, grease, coolant, etc.) have chemical constituents that are considered to be hazardous waste. As such, the indiscriminate dumping or spillage of these fluids onto the ground may constitute a misdemeanor, punishable by fines and/or imprisonment, and shall not be allowed. The contractor is responsible for all hazardous waste relating to his work. The Geotechnical Consultant does not have expertise in this area. If hazardous waste is a concern, then the Client should acquire the services of a qualified environmental assessor.
2.2 Processing: Existing ground that has been declared satisfactory for support of fill by the Geotechnical Consultant shall be scarified to a minimum depth of 6 inches. Existing ground that is not satisfactory shall be overexcavated as specified in the following section. Scarification shall continue until soils are broken down and free from oversize material and the working surface is reasonably uniform, flat, and free from uneven features that would inhibit uniform compaction.
2.3 Overexcavation: In addition to removals and overexcavations recommended in the approved geotechnical report(s) and the grading plan, soft, loose, dry, saturated, spongy, organic-rich, highly fractured or otherwise unsuitable ground shall be overexcavated to competent ground as evaluated by the Geotechnical Consultant during grading.
2.4 Benching: Where fills are to be placed on ground with slopes steeper than 5:1 (horizontal to vertical units), the ground shall be stepped or benched. Please see the Standard Details for a graphic illustration. The lowest bench or key shall be a minimum of 15 feet wide and at least 2 feet deep, into competent material as evaluated by the Geotechnical Consultant. Other benches shall be excavated a minimum height of 4 feet into competent material or as otherwise recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant. Fill placed on ground sloping flatter than $5: 1$ shall also be benched or otherwise overexcavated to provide a flat subgrade for the fill.
2.5 Evaluation/Acceptance of Fill Areas: All areas to receive fill, including removal and processed areas, key bottoms, and benches, shall be observed, mapped, elevations recorded, and/or tested prior to being accepted by the Geotechnical Consultant as suitable to receive fill. The Contractor shall obtain a written acceptance from the Geotechnical Consultant prior to fill placement. A licensed surveyor shall provide the survey control for determining elevations of processed areas, keys, and benches.
3.1 General: Material to be used as fill shall be essentially free from organic matter and other deleterious substances evaluated and accepted by the Geotechnical Consultant prior to placement. Soils of poor quality, such as those with unacceptable gradation, high expansion potential, or low strength shall be placed in areas acceptable to the Geotechnical Consultant or mixed with other soils to achieve satisfactory fill material.
3.2 Oversize: Oversize material defined as rock, or other irreducible material with a maximum dimension greater than 8 inches, shall not be buried or placed in fill unless location, materials, and placement methods are specifically accepted by the Geotechnical Consultant. Placement operations shall be such that nesting of oversized material does not occur and such that oversize material is completely surrounded by compacted or densified fill. Oversize material shall not be placed within 10 vertical feet of finish grade or within 2 feet of future utilities or underground construction.
3.3 Import: If importing of fill material is required for grading, proposed import material shall meet the requirements of Section 3.1. The potential import source shall be given to the Geotechnical Consultant at least 48 hours ( 2 working days) before importing begins so that its suitability can be determined and appropriate tests performed.

### 4.0 Fill Placement and Compaction

4.1 Fill Layers: Approved fill material shall be placed in areas prepared to receive fill (per Section 3.0) in near-horizontal layers not exceeding 8 inches in loose thickness. The Geotechnical Consultant may accept thicker layers if testing indicates the grading procedures can adequately compact the thicker layers. Each layer shall be spread evenly and mixed thoroughly to attain relative uniformity of material and moisture throughout.
4.2 Fill Moisture Conditioning: Fill soils shall be watered, dried back, blended, and/or mixed, as necessary to attain a relatively uniform moisture content at or slightly over optimum. Maximum density and optimum soil moisture content tests shall be performed in accordance with the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM Test Method D1557-12).
4.3 Compaction of Fill: After each layer has been moisture-conditioned, mixed, and evenly spread, it shall be uniformly compacted to not less than 90 percent of maximum dry density (ASTM Test Method D1557-12). Compaction equipment shall be adequately sized and be either specifically designed for soil compaction or of proven reliability to efficiently achieve the specified level of compaction with uniformity.
4.4 Compaction of Fill Slopes: In addition to normal compaction procedures specified above, compaction of slopes shall be accomplished by backrolling of slopes with sheepsfoot rollers at increments of 3 to 4 feet in fill elevation, or by other methods producing satisfactory results acceptable to the Geotechnical Consultant. Upon completion of grading, relative compaction of the fill, out to the slope face, shall be at least 90 percent of maximum density per ASTM Test Method D1557-12.
4.5 Compaction Testing: Field tests for moisture content and relative compaction of the fill soils shall be performed by the Geotechnical Consultant. Location and frequency of tests shall be at the Consultant's discretion based on field conditions encountered. Compaction test locations will not necessarily be selected on a random basis. Test locations shall be selected to verify adequacy of compaction levels in areas that are judged to be prone to inadequate compaction (such as close to slope faces and at the fill/bedrock benches).
4.6 Frequency of Compaction Testing: Tests shall be taken at intervals not exceeding 2 feet in vertical rise and/or 1,000 cubic yards of compacted fill soils embankment. In addition, as a guideline, at least one test shall be taken on slope faces for each 5,000 square feet of slope face and/or each 10 feet of vertical height of slope. The Contractor shall assure that fill construction is such that the testing schedule can be accomplished by the Geotechnical Consultant. The Contractor shall stop or slow down the earthwork construction if these minimum standards are not met.
4.7 Compaction Test Locations: The Geotechnical Consultant shall document the approximate elevation and horizontal coordinates of each test location. The Contractor shall coordinate with the project surveyor to assure that sufficient grade stakes are established so that the Geotechnical Consultant can determine the test locations with sufficient accuracy. At a minimum, two grade stakes within a horizontal distance of 100 feet and vertically less than 5 feet apart from potential test locations shall be provided.

### 5.0 Subdrain Installation

Subdrain systems shall be installed in accordance with the approved geotechnical report(s), the grading plan, and the Standard Details. The Geotechnical Consultant may recommend additional subdrains and/or changes in subdrain extent, location, grade, or material depending on conditions encountered during grading. All subdrains shall be surveyed by a land surveyor/civil engineer for line and grade after installation and prior to burial. Sufficient time should be allowed by the Contractor for these surveys.

### 6.0 Excavation

Excavations, as well as over-excavation for remedial purposes, shall be evaluated by the Geotechnical Consultant during grading. Remedial removal depths shown on geotechnical plans are estimates only. The actual extent of removal shall be determined by the Geotechnical Consultant based on the field evaluation of exposed conditions during grading. Where fill-over-cut slopes are to be graded, the cut portion of the slope shall be made, evaluated, and accepted by the Geotechnical Consultant prior to placement of materials for construction of the fill portion of the slope, unless otherwise recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant.

### 7.0 Trench Backfills

7.1 The Contractor shall follow all OHSA and $\mathrm{Cal} / \mathrm{OSHA}$ requirements for safety of trench excavations.
7.2 All bedding and backfill of utility trenches shall be done in accordance with the applicable provisions of Standard Specifications of Public Works Construction. Bedding material shall have a Sand Equivalent greater than 30 (SE>30). The bedding shall be placed to 1 foot over the top of the conduit and densified by jetting. Backfill shall be placed and densified to a minimum of 90 percent of maximum from 1 foot above the top of the conduit to the surface.
7.3 The jetting of the bedding around the conduits shall be observed by the Geotechnical Consultant.
7.4 The Geotechnical Consultant shall test the trench backfill for relative compaction. At least one test should be made for every 300 feet of trench and 2 feet of fill.
7.5 Lift thickness of trench backfill shall not exceed those allowed in the Standard Specifications of Public Works Construction unless the Contractor can demonstrate to the Geotechnical Consultant that the fill lift can be compacted to the minimum relative compaction by his alternative equipment and method.
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## SKYLINE RANCH (REVISED VITM 060922) ON-SITE ROADWAY ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION
October, 2016

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the traffic study evaluation of access to the Skyline Ranch (VTTM 060922) development, including a new elementary school intersection. The project is located in the Santa Clarita Valley area of unincorporated Los Angeles County, immediately north of the City of Santa Clarita. More specifically, the project site is located in an undeveloped area generally between Whites Canyon Road/Plum Canyon Road and Sierra Highway. The project is submitting a revised tentative map and this study evaluates an on-site roadway system that has been changed subsequent to the approval of VTTM 060922 in 2008.

The proposed project consists of 1,035 single-family residential units, 165 detached condominium units (for a total of 1,200 residential units), an elementary school and a public park. Figure 1 illustrates the proposed conceptual site plan for the project. The project site is currently vacant with no prior land usage. The site is zoned for residential use and the proposed project is consistent with the land use designations under the Santa Clarita One Valley One Vision (OVOV) Area Plan.

A Traffic Impact Analysis was approved by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works in October 2008 for a project description that included slightly more residential units and a different roadway layout on-site.

### 2.0 TRIP GENERATION

Table 1 summarizes the anticipated trip generation of the proposed project. Vehicle trip generation estimates for the site have been calculated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) "Trip Generation" rates for Single Family Residential and the Elementary School, and the LA County trip generation rates have been used for the Townhouse/Condominium uses.

For the residential land use, the proposed project consists of fewer dwelling units than the approved traffic study. The proposed project is forecast to generate a total of approximately 11,173 vehicle trips per day, with 865 occurring in the AM peak hour ( 661 outbound), and 1,156 occurring in the PM peak hour (730 inbound). In comparison, the projects approved traffic study evaluated 12,154 ADT, 953 AM peak hour trips ( 711 outbound), and 1,283 PM peak hour trips ( 813 inbound). See Table 2 for trip generation summary from previously (October 2008) approved land use traffic study. As shown, the revised project generates less traffic than what was approved.
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Table 1 Land Use and Trip Generation Summary - Current Project

| Land Use | Amount | Units | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | ADT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IB | OB | Total | IB | OB | Total |  |
| Trip Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family (210) |  | DU | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 9.52 |
| Detached Condominium |  | DU | 0.06 | 0.48 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 0.73 | 8.00 |
| Elementary School (520) |  | STU | 0.25 | 0.20 | 0.45 | -- | -- | -- | 1.29 |
| Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family | 1035 | DU | 194 | 582 | 776 | 652 | 383 | 1,035 | 9,853 |
| Detached Condominium | 165 | DU | 10 | 79 | 89 | 78 | 43 | 121 | 1,320 |
| Sub-Total |  |  | 204 | 661 | 865 | 730 | 426 | 1,156 | 11,173 |
| Elementary School | 750 | STU | 186 | 152 | 338 | -- | -- | -- | 968 |
| Total |  |  | 390 | 813 | 1,203 | 730 | 426 | 1,156 | 12,141 |

Trip Rate Source:
Single Family \& Elementary School: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), 9th Edition, 2012.
Condominium: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines, 1997.
Notes:

1. DU-Dwelling Units
2. STU-Students
3. ADT - Average Daily Trips

The volume of off-off site elementary school traffic in the PM peak hour was considered negligible in the 2008 traffic study.

Table 2 Land Use and Trip Generation Summary - Previously Approved (2008)

| Land Use | Amount | Units | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | ADT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IB | OB | Total | IB | OB | Total |  |
| Trip Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family (210) |  | DU | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.75 | 0.64 | 0.37 | 1.01 | 9.57 |
| Elementary School (520) |  | STU | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.42 | -- | -- | -- | 1.29 |
| Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family Residential | 1,270 | DU | 241 | 711 | 953 | 813 | 470 | 1,283 | 12,154 |
| Elementary School | 750 | STU | 173 | 143 | 315 | -- | -- | -- | 968 |
| Total |  |  | 414 | 854 | 1,268 | 813 | 470 | 1,283 | 13,121 |

Trip Rate Sources:
Single Family \& Elementary School: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), 7th Edition, 2003.
Notes:

1. DU - Dwelling Units
2. STU-Students
3. ADT - Average Daily Trips

The volume of off-off site elementary school traffic in the PM peak hour was considered negligible in the 2008 traffic study.
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Access to the project site will be via a new roadway referred to here as Skyline Ranch Road. The project site has been redesigned such that Skyline Ranch Road is aligned along the west of the proposed project. It provides access to the development through two roundabouts-one on the north end of the development and the other towards the south end of the developmentapproximately 3,500 feet apart. The use of a single-lane roundabout can be very effective as a traffic management tool. It provides better speed control opportunities and a better safety record than traffic signals.

The elementary school, which will be part of the Sulphur Springs School District, will predominantly serve students from the project site. The access to the school is located approximately 1,100 feet north of the south roundabout. The public park, which is adjacent to the school, has access approximately 600 feet north of the school intersection.

Figure 2 shows a conceptual striping plan for Skyline Ranch Road. See Figure 3 and Figure 4 for AM and PM peak hour turning movements volumes at the site access locations. This traffic analysis evaluates long-range cumulative conditions, which are derived from the Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model (SCVCTM) for a scenario that includes build-out of the area consistent with the OVOV Area Plan.

Initially, four concepts were explored for traffic management at the school in draft reports dated May 17 and July 21, 2016.

1. Full access unsignalized intersection
2. A roundabout at the school entrance
3. A right/left-in and right-out only access at school with a roundabout at the park
4. A right/left-in and right-out only access at school with a U-turn at the park

A fifth alternative was subsequently developed through consultation with the LA County Public Works staff and the findings of that analysis is discussed in this report. This preferred alternative consists of a full access unsignalized intersection at the school with a channelized/dedicated right-turn lane into the school. A dedicated acceleration/merge lane will be provided for the exiting school traffic turning left onto southbound Skyline Ranch Road. A U-turn at the park will also be allowed as a secondary means for traffic to head south on Skyline Ranch Road. County Public Works anticipates prohibiting left-turn into the school during the peak times, preferring instead to have the inbound traffic proceed to the southerly roundabout to make a U-turn and return to the school in the northbound direction and enter as right-turns.

Based on the peak hour signal warrant analysis, a traffic signal is not warranted at the school intersection (see Figure 5 for the peak hour traffic signal warrant analysis). A traffic signal is not recommended for the school entrance due to the close proximity to the south roundabout and because the traffic signal would not meet the minimum volume warrants.
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Figure 5 Peak Hour Signal Warrant

California MUTCD 2014 Edition
Page 837
(FHWA's MUTCD 2009 Edition, including Revisions $1 \& 2$, as amended for use in California)

Figure 4C-3. Warrant 3, Peak Hour

"Note: 150 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 100 vph applies as the lower
AM Peak (Minor St - 152; Major - 1140) threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.
PM Peak (Minor St - 116; Major - 1147)

An evaluation of the roundabout concepts has been prepared with SIDRA software. Appendix A contains summary worksheets for the SIDRA analysis. The analysis indicates that both the north and the south roundabouts would operate at good LOS based on a single-lane roundabout configuration, as shown in Table 3, below.

Table 3 LOS \& Delay Summary at Roundabouts

| Roundabout Locations | AM |  | PM |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | Average Delay <br> (sec) | LOS | Average Delay <br> (sec) |
| Skyline Ranch Rd \& North Roundabout | A | 9.7 | B | 13.0 |
| Skyline Ranch Rd \& South Roundabout | B | 10.6 | B | 10.4 |
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The queue lengths for each leg of the north and south roundabouts on Skyline Ranch Road are shown in Table 4, below

Table 4 Queue Lengths for Each Leg of Roundabouts

|  | North Roundabout <br> Queve Length (Ft.) |  | South Roundabout <br> Queue Length (Ft.) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| South Leg (Skyline Ranch Rd) | 85.9 | 101.1 | 79.1 | 118.3 |
| East Leg (Loop Road) | 97.7 | 45.5 | 66.9 | 39.5 |
| North Leg (Skyline Ranch Rd) | 139.7 | 277.5 | 204.7 | 196.0 |

To evaluate the operation of the Skyline Ranch Road intersections, a Synchro/SimTraffic simulation model was prepared for Skyline Ranch Road and the north, south, park and school intersections. Worksheets with delay calculations are included in Appendix B.

Simulation results for the school driveway shows that the average vehicle, after dropped off students, would take approximately 24.1 seconds and 12.7 seconds to exit left and right, respectively, out of the school driveway during the AM peak.

The park intersection also provides a convenient location for exiting traffic to make a U-turn and proceed south on Skyline Ranch Road. Table 5 summarizes the lane LOS and approach delay at the school and park intersections during both AM and PM peak. The analysis indicates that the school site access would operate at LOS C or better during both AM \& PM peak hour with a maximum queve length of 136 feet during the AM peak.

Table 5 LOS, Delay \& Queue Summary at School and Park

| Location |  | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay $(\mathrm{sec})$ | Queve (95th) | LOS | Delay $(\mathrm{sec})$ | Queue (95th) |
| Skyline Ranch Rd \& School | WBL | C | 24.1 | 136 | B | 14.2 | 71 |
|  | WBR | B | 12.7 | 52 | B | 12.6 | 59 |
| Skyline Ranch Rd \& Park | WBL/R | C | 20.8 | 39 | C | 21.0 | 43 |
|  | SBL | A | 8.6 | 27 | A | 8.4 | 21 |

## Stantec

## SKYLINE RANCH (REVISED VITM 060922) ON-SITE ROADWAY ANALYSIS
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October, 2016

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

The revised project consists of fewer dwelling units than the approved traffic study. The revised project is forecast to generate a total of approximately 11,173 vehicle trips per day, with 865 occurring in the AM peak hour ( 661 outbound), and 1,156 occurring in the PM peak hour ( 730 inbound). In comparison, the project's approved 2008 traffic study evaluated 12,154 ADT, 953 AM peak hour trips ( 711 outbound), and 1,283 PM peak hour trips ( 813 inbound). Therefore, the revised project generates less traffic than what was approved.

An analysis of the proposed roundabouts on Skyline Ranch Road indicates that each would operate acceptably during the peak hours. Specifically, each roundabout would operate at LOS B or better under long-range cumulative conditions.

Through consultation with County Department of Public Works Traffic and Lighting staff, a preferred alternative for the school access driveway was developed. The preferred configuration consists of a full access unsignalized intersection for the school driveway with a channelized/dedicated right-turn lane into the school. A dedicated acceleration/merge lane will be provided for the exiting school traffic turning left onto southbound Skyline Ranch Road. A U-turn at the park will also be allowed as a secondary means for traffic to head south on Skyline Ranch Road. County Public Works anticipates prohibiting left-turn into the school during the peak times, preferring instead to have the inbound traffic proceed to the southerly roundabout to make a U-turn and return to the school in the northbound direction and enter as right-turns.

Given the preferred school driveway configuration described above, the full access unsignalized intersection would result in LOS C conditions with average vehicular delay of 24.1 and 12.7 seconds for exiting left and right turning vehicles, respectively, during the AM peak hour.

A traffic signal is not recommended for the school entrance due to the close proximity to the south roundabout, and because the traffic signal would not meet the minimum volume warrants. A review of pedestrian access routes to the school also indicates that a traffic signal would not be necessary for pedestrian crossings of Skyline Ranch Road at the school driveway since there will be no development on the west side of Skyline Ranch Road (i.e., opposite of the school). Pedestrians will access the school from the neighborhood trail system that connects directly to the school site and from Skyline Ranch Road via sidewalks along the school frontage that connect to the site's internal roadway system.
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## Appendix A SIDRA WORKSHEETS

## LEVEL OF SERVICE

Site: SkylineRanchRd-North - AM
New Site
Roundabout


Lane LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per lane. LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).

## INTERSECTION SUMMARY

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-North - AM

New Site
Roundabout

| Intersection Performance - Hourly Values |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Vehicles | Persons |
| Demand Flows (Total) | 1558 veh/h | 1869 pers/h |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (Demand) | 3.0 \% |  |
| Degree of Saturation | 0.588 |  |
| Practical Spare Capacity | 44.5 \% |  |
| Effective Intersection Capacity | 2648 veh/h |  |
| Control Delay (Total) | 4.21 veh-h/h | 5.05 pers-h/h |
| Control Delay (Average) | 9.7 sec | 9.7 sec |
| Control Delay (Worst Lane) | 11.6 sec |  |
| Control Delay (Worst Movement) | 11.6 sec | 11.6 sec |
| Geometric Delay (Average) | 0.0 sec |  |
| Stop-Line Delay (Average) | 9.7 sec |  |
| Idling Time (Average) | 6.1 sec |  |
| Intersection Level of Service (LOS) | LOS A |  |
| 95\% Back of Queue - Vehicles (Worst Lane) | 5.5 veh |  |
| 95\% Back of Queue - Distance (Worst Lane) | 139.7 ft |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio (Worst Lane) | 0.09 |  |
| Total Effective Stops | $660 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 792 pers/h |
| Effective Stop Rate | 0.42 per veh | 0.42 per pers |
| Proportion Queued | 0.58 | 0.58 |
| Performance Index | 49.5 | 49.5 |
| Travel Distance (Total) | 721.2 veh-mi/h | 865.5 pers-mi/h |
| Travel Distance (Average) | 2445 ft | 2445 ft |
| Travel Time (Total) | 27.6 veh-h/h | 33.2 pers-h/h |
| Travel Time (Average) | 63.9 sec | 63.9 sec |
| Travel Speed | 26.1 mph | 26.1 mph |
| Cost (Total) | 459.57 \$/h | 459.57 \$/h |
| Fuel Consumption (Total) | $18.2 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Carbon Dioxide (Total) | 162.8 kg/h |  |
| Hydrocarbons (Total) | $0.070 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Carbon Monoxide (Total) | $0.535 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| NOx (Total) | $0.297 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Intersection LOS value for Vehicles is based on average delay for all vehicle movements
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.

| Intersection Performance - Annual Values |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Performance Measure | Vehicles | Persons |
| Demand Flows (Total) | $747,652 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{y}$ | $897,183 \mathrm{pers} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Delay | $2,019 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ | $2,423 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Effective Stops | $316,667 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{y}$ | $380,000 \mathrm{pers} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Travel Distance | $346,188 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{y}$ | $415,425 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Travel Time | $13,261 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ | $15,913 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Cost | $220,593 \mathrm{\$} / \mathrm{y}$ | $220,593 \mathrm{\$} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Fuel Consumption | $8,752 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Carbon Dioxide | $78,134 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Hydrocarbons | $33 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Carbon Monoxide | $257 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| NOx | $142 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
|  |  |  |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-North - AM

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Mov} \\ & \mathrm{ID} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles <br> veh | Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: SkylineRanchRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 483 | 3.0 | 0.416 | 6.9 | LOS A | 3.4 | 85.9 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 22.4 |
| 18 | R2 | 50 | 3.0 | 0.416 | 6.9 | LOS A | 3.4 | 85.9 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 22.4 |
| Appr |  | 533 | 3.0 | 0.416 | 6.9 | LOS A | 3.4 | 85.9 | 0.35 | 0.16 | 22.4 |
| East: LoopRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 184 | 3.0 | 0.500 | 11.6 | LOS B | 3.8 | 97.7 | 0.77 | 1.46 | 27.2 |
| 16 | R2 | 207 | 3.0 | 0.500 | 11.6 | LOS B | 3.8 | 97.7 | 0.77 | 1.46 | 27.2 |
| Appr |  | 390 | 3.0 | 0.500 | 11.6 | LOS B | 3.8 | 97.7 | 0.77 | 0.73 | 27.2 |
| North: SkylineRanchRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 74 | 3.0 | 0.588 | 10.9 | LOS B | 5.5 | 139.7 | 0.66 | 0.90 | 28.8 |
| 4 | T1 | 561 | 3.0 | 0.588 | 10.9 | LOS B | 5.5 | 139.7 | 0.66 | 0.90 | 28.8 |
| Approach |  | 635 | 3.0 | 0.588 | 10.9 | LOS B | 5.5 | 139.7 | 0.66 | 0.45 | 28.8 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1558 | 3.0 | 0.588 | 9.7 | LOS A | 5.5 | 139.7 | 0.58 | 0.42 | 26.1 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## LEVEL OF SERVICE

Site: SkylineRanchRd-North - PM
New Site
Roundabout


Lane LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).

## INTERSECTION SUMMARY

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-North - PM

New Site
Roundabout

| Intersection Performance - Hourly Values |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Vehicles | Persons |
| Demand Flows (Total) | 1692 veh/h | 2031 pers/h |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (Demand) | 3.0 \% |  |
| Degree of Saturation | 0.778 |  |
| Practical Spare Capacity | 9.3 \% |  |
| Effective Intersection Capacity | 2176 veh/h |  |
| Control Delay (Total) | 6.13 veh-h/h | 7.35 pers-h/h |
| Control Delay (Average) | 13.0 sec | 13.0 sec |
| Control Delay (Worst Lane) | 16.2 sec |  |
| Control Delay (Worst Movement) | 16.2 sec | 16.2 sec |
| Geometric Delay (Average) | 0.0 sec |  |
| Stop-Line Delay (Average) | 13.0 sec |  |
| Idling Time (Average) | 8.9 sec |  |
| Intersection Level of Service (LOS) | LOS B |  |
| 95\% Back of Queue - Vehicles (Worst Lane) | 10.8 veh |  |
| 95\% Back of Queue - Distance (Worst Lane) | 277.5 ft |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio (Worst Lane) | 0.18 |  |
| Total Effective Stops | $792 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 951 pers/h |
| Effective Stop Rate | 0.47 per veh | 0.47 per pers |
| Proportion Queued | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Performance Index | 60.0 | 60.0 |
| Travel Distance (Total) | 793.7 veh-mi/h | 952.5 pers-mi/h |
| Travel Distance (Average) | 2476 ft | 2476 ft |
| Travel Time (Total) | 31.6 veh-h/h | 37.9 pers-h/h |
| Travel Time (Average) | 67.2 sec | 67.2 sec |
| Travel Speed | 25.1 mph | 25.1 mph |
| Cost (Total) | 523.83 \$/h | 523.83 \$/h |
| Fuel Consumption (Total) | $20.6 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Carbon Dioxide (Total) | $183.9 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Hydrocarbons (Total) | $0.080 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Carbon Monoxide (Total) | $0.603 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| NOx (Total) | $0.337 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Intersection LOS value for Vehicles is based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.

| Intersection Performance - Annual Values |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Vehicles | Persons |
| Demand Flows (Total) | $812,348 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{y}$ | $974,817 \mathrm{pers} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Delay | $2,941 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ | $3,529 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Effective Stops | $380,326 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{y}$ | $456,392 \mathrm{pers} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Travel Distance | $380,999 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{y}$ | $457,199 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Travel Time | $15,160 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ | $18,192 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ |
|  |  | $251,437 / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Cost | $9,885 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{y}$ | $251,437 \mathrm{\$} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Fuel Consumption | $88,248 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Carbon Dioxide | $38 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Hydrocarbons | $289 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Carbon Monoxide | $162 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| NOx |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-North - PM

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance <br> ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: SkylineRanchRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 312 | 3.0 | 0.501 | 9.9 | LOS A | 3.9 | 101.1 | 0.67 | 1.02 | 21.3 |
| 18 | R2 | 171 | 3.0 | 0.501 | 9.9 | LOS A | 3.9 | 101.1 | 0.67 | 1.02 | 21.3 |
| Appr |  | 483 | 3.0 | 0.501 | 9.9 | LOS A | 3.9 | 101.1 | 0.67 | 0.51 | 21.3 |
| East: LoopRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 118 | 3.0 | 0.283 | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.8 | 45.5 | 0.59 | 0.91 | 29.2 |
| 16 | R2 | 133 | 3.0 | 0.283 | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.8 | 45.5 | 0.59 | 0.91 | 29.2 |
| Appr |  | 251 | 3.0 | 0.283 | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.8 | 45.5 | 0.59 | 0.46 | 29.2 |
| North: SkylineRanchRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 255 | 3.0 | 0.778 | 16.2 | LOS B | 10.8 | 277.5 | 0.75 | 0.90 | 26.1 |
| 4 | T1 | 703 | 3.0 | 0.778 | 16.2 | LOS B | 10.8 | 277.5 | 0.75 | 0.90 | 26.1 |
| Appr |  | 959 | 3.0 | 0.778 | 16.2 | LOS B | 10.8 | 277.5 | 0.75 | 0.45 | 26.1 |
| All V |  | 1692 | 3.0 | 0.778 | 13.0 | LOS B | 10.8 | 277.5 | 0.70 | 0.47 | 25.1 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## LEVEL OF SERVICE

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-South - AM

New Site
Roundabout


Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane. LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).

## INTERSECTION SUMMARY

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-South - AM

New Site
Roundabout

| Intersection Performance - Hourly Values |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Vehicles | Persons |
| Demand Flows (Total) | 1632 veh/h | 1958 pers/h |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (Demand) | 3.0 \% |  |
| Degree of Saturation | 0.701 |  |
| Practical Spare Capacity | 21.2 \% |  |
| Effective Intersection Capacity | 2326 veh/h |  |
| Control Delay (Total) | 4.79 veh-h/h | 5.74 pers-h/h |
| Control Delay (Average) | 10.6 sec | 10.6 sec |
| Control Delay (Worst Lane) | 14.0 sec |  |
| Control Delay (Worst Movement) | 14.0 sec | 14.0 sec |
| Geometric Delay (Average) | 0.0 sec |  |
| Stop-Line Delay (Average) | 10.6 sec |  |
| Idling Time (Average) | 6.9 sec |  |
| Intersection Level of Service (LOS) | LOS B |  |
| 95\% Back of Queue - Vehicles (Worst Lane) | 8.0 veh |  |
| 95\% Back of Queue - Distance (Worst Lane) | 204.7 ft |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio (Worst Lane) | 0.14 |  |
| Total Effective Stops | $658 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 790 pers/h |
| Effective Stop Rate | 0.40 per veh | 0.40 per pers |
| Proportion Queued | 0.58 | 0.58 |
| Performance Index | 52.6 | 52.6 |
| Travel Distance (Total) | 755.5 veh-mi/h | 906.6 pers-mi/h |
| Travel Distance (Average) | 2445 ft | 2445 ft |
| Travel Time (Total) | 29.0 veh-h/h | 34.8 pers-h/h |
| Travel Time (Average) | 64.0 sec | 64.0 sec |
| Travel Speed | 26.1 mph | 26.1 mph |
| Cost (Total) | 482.89 \$/h | 482.89 \$/h |
| Fuel Consumption (Total) | $19.2 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Carbon Dioxide (Total) | $171.3 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Hydrocarbons (Total) | $0.073 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Carbon Monoxide (Total) | $0.561 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| NOx (Total) | $0.315 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Intersection LOS value for Vehicles is based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.

| Intersection Performance - Annual Values |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Vehicles | Persons |
| Demand Flows (Total) | $783,130 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{y}$ | $939,757 \mathrm{pers} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Delay | $2,298 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ | $2,757 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Effective Stops | $315,829 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{y}$ | $378,994 \mathrm{pers} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Travel Distance | $362,626 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{y}$ | $435,151 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Travel Time | $13,918 \mathrm{veh}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ | $16,702 \mathrm{pers}-\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{y}$ |
|  | $231,787 / \mathrm{y}$ | $231,787 \mathrm{\$} / \mathrm{y}$ |
| Cost | $9,208 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Fuel Consumption | $82,212 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Carbon Dioxide | $35 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Hydrocarbons | $269 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Carbon Monoxide | $151 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| NOx |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-South - AM

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: SkylineRanchRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 461 | 3.0 | 0.379 | 6.1 | LOS A | 3.1 | 79.1 | 0.25 | 0.18 | 22.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 61 | 3.0 | 0.379 | 6.1 | LOS A | 3.1 | 79.1 | 0.25 | 0.18 | 22.6 |
| Appr |  | 522 | 3.0 | 0.379 | 6.1 | LOS A | 3.1 | 79.1 | 0.25 | 0.09 | 22.6 |
| East: LoopRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 175 | 3.0 | 0.410 | 9.6 | LOS A | 2.6 | 66.9 | 0.70 | 1.24 | 27.9 |
| 16 | R2 | 155 | 3.0 | 0.410 | 9.6 | LOS A | 2.6 | 66.9 | 0.70 | 1.24 | 27.9 |
| Appr |  | 330 | 3.0 | 0.410 | 9.6 | LOS A | 2.6 | 66.9 | 0.70 | 0.62 | 27.9 |
| North: SkylineRanchRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 41 | 3.0 | 0.701 | 14.0 | LOS B | 8.0 | 204.7 | 0.75 | 1.04 | 27.6 |
| 4 | T1 | 738 | 3.0 | 0.701 | 14.0 | LOS B | 8.0 | 204.7 | 0.75 | 1.04 | 27.6 |
| Appr |  | 779 | 3.0 | 0.701 | 14.0 | LOS B | 8.0 | 204.7 | 0.75 | 0.52 | 27.6 |
| All Ve |  | 1632 | 3.0 | 0.701 | 10.6 | LOS B | 8.0 | 204.7 | 0.58 | 0.40 | 26.1 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## LEVEL OF SERVICE

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-South - PM

New Site
Roundabout


Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane. LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).

## INTERSECTION SUMMARY

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-South - PM

New Site
Roundabout

| Intersection Performance - Hourly Values |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Vehicles | Persons |
| Demand Flows (Total) | 1650 veh/h | 1980 pers/h |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (Demand) | 3.0 \% |  |
| Degree of Saturation | 0.673 |  |
| Practical Spare Capacity | 26.2 \% |  |
| Effective Intersection Capacity | 2451 veh/h |  |
| Control Delay (Total) | 4.78 veh-h/h | 5.74 pers-h/h |
| Control Delay (Average) | 10.4 sec | 10.4 sec |
| Control Delay (Worst Lane) | 12.1 sec |  |
| Control Delay (Worst Movement) | 12.1 sec | 12.1 sec |
| Geometric Delay (Average) | 0.0 sec |  |
| Stop-Line Delay (Average) | 10.4 sec |  |
| Idling Time (Average) | 6.8 sec |  |
| Intersection Level of Service (LOS) | LOS B |  |
| 95\% Back of Queue - Vehicles (Worst Lane) | 7.7 veh |  |
| 95\% Back of Queue - Distance (Worst Lane) | 196.0 ft |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio (Worst Lane) | 0.13 |  |
| Total Effective Stops | $609 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 731 pers/h |
| Effective Stop Rate | 0.37 per veh | 0.37 per pers |
| Proportion Queued | 0.59 | 0.59 |
| Performance Index | 53.1 | 53.1 |
| Travel Distance (Total) | 759.9 veh-mi/h | 911.9 pers-mi/h |
| Travel Distance (Average) | 2432 ft | 2432 ft |
| Travel Time (Total) | 29.7 veh-h/h | 35.6 pers-h/h |
| Travel Time (Average) | 64.7 sec | 64.7 sec |
| Travel Speed | 25.6 mph | 25.6 mph |
| Cost (Total) | 491.09 \$/h | 491.09 \$/h |
| Fuel Consumption (Total) | $19.3 \mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Carbon Dioxide (Total) | $172.5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Hydrocarbons (Total) | $0.075 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Carbon Monoxide (Total) | $0.568 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| NOx (Total) | $0.310 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Intersection LOS value for Vehicles is based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.

| Intersection Performance - Annual Values |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Vehicles | Persons |
| Demand Flows (Total) | 792,000 veh/y | 950,400 pers/y |
| Delay | 2,294 veh-h/y | 2,753 pers-h/y |
| Effective Stops | 292,223 veh/y | 350,668 pers/y |
| Travel Distance | 364,752 veh-mi/y | 437,702 pers-mi/y |
| Travel Time | 14,237 veh-h/y | 17,084 pers-h/y |
| Cost | 235,725 \$/y | 235,725 \$/y |
| Fuel Consumption | 9,274 gal/y |  |
| Carbon Dioxide | 82,799 kg/y |  |
| Hydrocarbons | $36 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| Carbon Monoxide | 273 kg/y |  |
| NOx | $149 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{y}$ |  |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: SkylineRanchRd-South - PM

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Mov} \\ & \mathrm{ID} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: SkylineRanchRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 388 | 3.0 | 0.532 | 9.3 | LOS A | 4.6 | 118.3 | 0.55 | 0.69 | 21.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 221 | 3.0 | 0.532 | 9.3 | LOS A | 4.6 | 118.3 | 0.55 | 0.69 | 21.5 |
| Appr |  | 609 | 3.0 | 0.532 | 9.3 | LOS A | 4.6 | 118.3 | 0.55 | 0.34 | 21.5 |
| East: LoopRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 113 | 3.0 | 0.256 | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.5 | 39.5 | 0.62 | 1.01 | 29.0 |
| 16 | R2 | 100 | 3.0 | 0.256 | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.5 | 39.5 | 0.62 | 1.01 | 29.0 |
| Appr |  | 213 | 3.0 | 0.256 | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.5 | 39.5 | 0.62 | 0.50 | 29.0 |
| North: SkylineRanchRd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 147 | 3.0 | 0.673 | 12.1 | LOS B | 7.7 | 196.0 | 0.61 | 0.71 | 28.1 |
| 4 | T1 | 682 | 3.0 | 0.673 | 12.1 | LOS B | 7.7 | 196.0 | 0.61 | 0.71 | 28.1 |
| Appr |  | 828 | 3.0 | 0.673 | 12.1 | LOS B | 7.7 | 196.0 | 0.61 | 0.35 | 28.1 |
| All Ve |  | 1650 | 3.0 | 0.673 | 10.4 | LOS B | 7.7 | 196.0 | 0.59 | 0.37 | 25.6 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## SKYLINE RANCH (REVISED VTTM 060922) ON-SITE ROADWAY ANALYSIS

Appendix B Synchro/SimTraffic Worksheet
October, 2016

## Appendix B SYNCHRO/SIMTRAFFIC WORKSHEET


(1) Southbound through volume of 685 vph would be a non-conflicting movment due to the provision of a decicated acceleration/merge lane for westbound left-turns.


(1) Southbound through volume of 755 vph would be a non-conflicting movment due to the provision of a decicated acceleration/merge lane for westbound left-turns.


## Intersection: 3: Skyline Ranch Rd

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 85 | 50 | 130 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 46 | 15 | 58 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 85 | 45 | 129 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 192 | 692 | 1416 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 7: Skyline Ranch Rd

| Movement | SE | NW | SW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | ULT | TR | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 520 | 41 | 78 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 259 | 9 | 41 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 584 | 34 | 74 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 671 | 439 | 359 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 93: Skyline Ranch Rd \& School

| Movement | WB | WB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 149 | 60 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 72 | 32 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 136 | 52 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 276 | 276 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Queuing and Blocking Report
Long-range Buildout - Alternative 5
Intersection: 97: Park

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 44 | 35 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 19 | 6 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 39 | 27 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 315 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 150 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Zone Summary
Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 0

## Intersection: 3: Skyline Ranch Rd

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 47 | 75 | 1349 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 23 | 37 | 917 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 51 | 79 | 1646 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 192 | 692 | 1416 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  | 21 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 7: Skyline Ranch Rd

| Movement | SE | NW | SW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | ULT | TR | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 250 | 68 | 57 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 97 | 27 | 28 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 242 | 65 | 56 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 671 | 439 | 359 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 93: Skyline Ranch Rd \& School

| Movement | WB | WB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 77 | 63 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 38 | 37 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 71 | 59 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 276 | 276 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Queuing and Blocking Report
Long-range Buildout - Alternative 5
Intersection: 97: Park

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 52 | 31 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 20 | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 43 | 21 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 315 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 150 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Zone Summary
Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Memo

| To: | Scott Ashlock <br> Placeworks <br> 2073009990 | From: | Daryl Zerfass <br> Ftantec |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| File: | Date: | December 5, 2016 |  |

## Reference: $\quad$ Skyline Ranch (Revised VTTM 060922) Land Use and Trip Generation Update

This memorandum addresses updates to the residential unit mix and the total number of units for the Skyline Ranch Revised Tract Map No. 060922, and the resulting change in trip generation. Skyline Ranch (Revised VTTM 060922), is a development project located in the Santa Clarita Valley area of unincorporated Los Angeles County. In October 2008, a Traffic Impact Analysis was approved by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public works (LADPW) and in October 2016, the Skyline Ranch (Revised VTTM 060922) On-Site Roadway Analysis, prepared by Stantec, was approved by LADPW.

The On-Site Roadway Analysis evaluated the on-site roadway system for the revised VTTM 060922, and was based on 1,035 single-family residential units, 165 detached condominium units (a total of 1,200 residential units), an elementary school and a public park. The mix and total number of residential units have since changed slightly from a total of 1,200 units to 1,220 units, a net increase of 20 units. The attached Table 1 summarizes the land use and the corresponding trip generation and gives a comparison between the land use assumed in the approved On-Site Roadway Analysis, and the most recent VTTM 060922 land use.

Although the total number of residential units increased by 20 units, the change in the mix of residential units resulted in less net trips generated by VTTM 060922 . Specifically, 82 less daily trips (ADT), 22 less AM peak hour trips, and 29 less PM peak hour trips. Therefore, the approved Skyline Ranch (Revised VTTM 060922) On-Site Roadway Analysis represents a conservative worst-case scenario and the subsequent change in net trips is negligible.

## Stantec Consulting Services Inc.



Daryl Zerfass, PE, PTP
Principal, Transportation Planning \& Traffic Engineering
Phone: (949) 923-6058
Daryl.Zerfass@stantec.com
Attachment: Table 1 Land Use and Trip Generation Comparison

Memo

Table 1: Land Use and Trip Generation Comparison

| Land Use | Amount | Units | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | ADT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IB | OB | Total | IB | OB | Total |  |
| Trip Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family (210) |  | DU | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 9.52 |
| Detached Condominium |  | DU | 0.06 | 0.48 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 0.73 | 8.00 |
| Elementary School (520) |  | STU | 0.25 | 0.20 | 0.45 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.28 | 1.29 |
| Land Use and Trip Generation in the On-Site Roadway Analysis (October 2016) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family | 1,035 | DU | 194 | 582 | 776 | 652 | 383 | 1,035 | 9,853 |
| Detached Condominium | 165 | DU | 10 | 79 | 89 | 78 | 43 | 121 | 1,320 |
| Total Residential |  |  | 204 | 661 | 865 | 730 | 426 | 1,156 | 11,173 |
| Elementary School | 750 | STU | 186 | 152 | 338 | -- | -- | -- | 968 |
| Total |  |  | 390 | 813 | 1,203 | 730 | 426 | 1,156 | 12,141 |
| Revised Land Use and Trip Generation (VITM 060922) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family | 876 | DU | 164 | 493 | 657 | 552 | 324 | 876 | 8,340 |
| Detached Condominium | 344 | DU | 21 | 165 | 186 | 162 | 89 | 251 | 2,752 |
| Total Residential |  |  | 185 | 658 | 843 | 714 | 413 | 1,127 | 11,092 |
| Elementary School | 750 | STU | 186 | 152 | 338 | -- | -- | -- | 968 |
| Total |  |  | 371 | 810 | 1,181 | 714 | 413 | 1,127 | 12,059 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Difference |  |  | -19 | -3 | -22 | -16 | -13 | -29 | -82 |

## Trip Rate Source:

Single Family \& Elementary School: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), 9th Edition, 2012.
Condominium: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Traffic Impact Analysis Report
Guidelines, 1997.
Notes:
DU = dwelling unit; STU = student; ADT = average daily trips; IB = inbound; OB = outbound
The volume of off-off site elementary school traffic in the PM peak hour was considered negligible in the 2008 traffic study.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The California Air Resources Board (CARB) approved the SCAQMD's request to redesignate the SoCAB from serious nonattainment for $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ to attainment for $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ under the national AAQS on March 25, 2010, because the SoCAB has not violated federal 24-hour $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ standards during the period from 2004 to 2007. In June 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved the State of California's request to redesignate the South Coast $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ nonattainment area to attainment of the $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ National AAQS, effective on July 26, 2013.
    ${ }^{2}$ CARB has proposed to redesignate the SoCAB as attainment for lead and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ under the California AAQS (CARB 2013).

[^1]:    Consistent: The Modified Project would be compatible with neighboring existing and planned communities, including the Plum Canyon community west of the project site and the existing residential neighborhoods south of the site in the City of Santa Clarita. The

[^2]:     ICAL LOG REVIEVED TO DEIERMINE FEATURE TYPE

[^3]:    ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

[^4]:    Project
    Skyline Ranch
    Location B80
    Depth
    Material Landslide Debris - clayey SAND with gravel

[^5]:    | Project | Skyline Ranch |
    | :--- | :--- |
    |  |  |
    | Location | B80 |
    | Depth | $30^{\prime}$ |

    Material Saugus Formation - CONGLOMERATE

[^6]:    Project Skyline Ranch
    Location B83
    Depth
    Material Landslide Debris - sandy GRAVEL with clay

[^7]:    | Project | Skyline Ranch |
    | :--- | :--- |
    |  | B85 |

    Depth 8'
    Material Landslide Debris - clayey SAND with gvl

[^8]:    | Project | Skyline Ranch |
    | :--- | :--- |
    |  |  |
    | Location | B85 |
    | Depth | $29^{\prime}$ |

    Material Saugus Formation - CONGLOMERATE

[^9]:    Project $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Skyline Ranch } \\ \end{array}$
    Depth 7'
    Material Landslide Debris - clayey SAND with gvl

[^10]:    $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Project } & \text { Skyline Ranch } \\ & \text { B86 }\end{array}$
    Depth 29'
    Material Landslide Debris - SAND with trace gvl

[^11]:    | Project | Skyline Ranch |
    | :--- | :--- |
    |  |  |
    | Location | B88 |
    | Depth | $40^{\prime}$ |
    |  |  |

    Material Landslide Debris - silty SAND and GRAVEL

[^12]:    | Project | Skyline Ranch |
    | :--- | :--- |
    |  |  |
    | Location | B89 |
    | Depth | $19^{\prime}$ |
    |  |  |

    Material Landslide Debris - gravelly SAND

[^13]:    | Project | Skyline Ranch |
    | :--- | :--- |
    |  | B89 |

    Depth 40'
    Material Landslide Debris - clayey SAND with gvl

[^14]:    | Project | Skyline Ranch |
    | :--- | :--- |
    |  |  |
    | Location | B89 |
    | Depth | $50^{\prime}$ |
    |  |  |

    Material Landslide Debris - clayey SAND with gvl

[^15]:    | Project | Skyline Ranch |
    | :--- | :--- |
    |  |  |
    | Location | B90 |
    | Depth | $10^{\prime}$ |
    |  |  |

    Material Landslide Debris - gravelly SAND

[^16]:    <,

[^17]:    file:///P:/FINAL\%20PROJECTS/PARDEE/Skyline\%20Ranch/SLOPE\%20RESULTS/Sect... 3/19/2016

[^18]:    Tmc (150 psf $\mathbf{1 7}^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8ㅇ)
    Model: Spline Data Point Function
    Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

[^19]:    Tmc (150 psf $17^{\circ}$ A-Bed 4-8ㅇ
    Model: Spline Data Point Function
    Function: Modifier Factor vs. Inclination

[^20]:    file://C:/Users/Alexander/Desktop/LGC\%20valley/original\%20sections/section\%2010-10... 3/19/2016

